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From the Editor

編纂者のメッセージ

Appreciations: Perhaps it goes without saying that production of a publication of this sort requires the cooperation of a number of people. In producing this number, I have been particularly fortunate in having very responsive, competent assistance from both Lawrence Marceau and Azumi Ann Takata whose assistance has made timely publication possible despite the fact that the editorial work and formatting have all been done in Japan. Their help and willingness to work with me in taking advantage of the flexibility offered by desktop publishing software and the internet have made my job much easier.

I would like to take the time also to express my very warm appreciation to David Pollack of the University of Rochester who, over the past two issues has stepped in to serve temporarily as book review editor while Larry Marceau was on leave. I have enjoyed working with David and have especially appreciated his helpful comments to both me and to authors of manuscripts submitted for our consideration.

All of the articles for this issue focus on re-examination of the cultural life of kinsei Japan. All attempt to place developments in the fields of poetry, nativism, and Confucian studies in broad political, social and economic contexts. Methodologically, all are linked through the conceptualizations and insights provided by the work of Pierre Bourdieu, to which Mark McNally provides a brief introduction below. The articles are cast in sufficiently broad context as to be of interest to a wide array of EMJ readers. If you do indeed find this symposium as stimulating as I expect, I hope you will consider putting together a symposium of your own to submit for possible publication in EMJ.

Philip Brown

Introduction to “Rethinking School Relations in Tokugawa Japan” Mark McNally, Department of History, University of Hawai’i, Manoa

The study of culture has grown in popularity in both the U.S. and Europe during the last twenty years. New approaches to the study of culture have challenged previous scholarship that emphasized either the brilliance of individual cultural producers or of their cultural products. One of these new approaches attempts to link producer and product together and to situate them in a broader social context. The creator of this methodology is the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu.

The three papers introduced here were inspired by Bourdieu’s approach. Steven Carter’s essay looks at the state of waka during the eighteenth century. He specifically examines the efforts of the Reizei house, and how they maintained their relevance in an age of increasing competition from the commoner poets of kokugaku. Mark McNally’s essay focuses on the internal workings of a group of nineteenth-century adherents of kokugaku. McNally argues that the intellectual disputes that erupted among these scholars had a crucial role in the institutional development of kokugaku. Finally, Samuel Yamashita examines the Confucian debates of the seventeenth century to understand the process by which one controversial figure, Yamazaki Ansai, rose to prominence, and became the preeminent Confucian scholar of his day. All three papers attempt to use Bourdieu’s notion of the “field” in their analyses of cultural production during the Tokugawa period. It is therefore appropriate to briefly introduce this concept and its place in Bourdieu’s conceptualization.

A field is a social space occupied by individual agents engaged in a certain form of cultural production. Thus, Bourdieu has identified diverse fields such as the religious field, the juridical and political fields, the field of art, the
literary and intellectual fields, and a special one that he calls the “field of power.” Although the agents in any field are subject to influences outside of the field, internal forces within the field are even more important in the shaping of cultural production.1 He writes:

[I] call each of these a field, that is, an autonomous universe, a kind of arena in which people play a game which has certain rules, rules which are different from those of the game that is played in the adjacent space.3

Thus, Carter has identified a field of poetry, McNally a kokugaku field, and Yamashita a Confucian field.

Within each field, agents occupy distinct positions. These positions signify critical differences (intellectual, artistic, etc.) among agents, and comprise a socio-political hierarchy. The latter is determined by forms of “capital,” both in terms of “the overall volume,” and according to their “relative weight.”4 Bourdieu has identified various types of capital, including social, cultural, economic, and symbolic.5 Agents and the positions that they occupy in the field are defined in terms of their aggregate capital and are relational.

The idea of positions in a field is related to Bourdieu’s concept of “position-taking.” He describes position-taking as “the structured system of practices and expressions of agents.”6 The products of cultural production are, therefore, examples of position-takings. The concept of position-taking assumes an even greater importance in the context of Bourdieu’s observation that most fields are sites of constant struggle among its agents.7 The goal of the struggle, what Bourdieu calls the “stakes,” is to attain forms of capital that give one the power to set the boundaries of the field.8 Thus, agents compete with one another over the power to define the contours of the field and the requirements of legitimate membership within it. In this way, they can deal with rivals by simply denying them a position within the field. Those who are recognized as legitimate members can also use their capital to establish dominant positions for themselves within the field.

All three of the papers here support Bourdieu’s contention that fields are sites of struggle. Yamashita shows how the polemic nature of seventeenth-century Confucian writings reveal the lines of struggle in the Confucian field. With the backing of important officials within the Edo bakufu, Yamazaki Ansai became the most influential Confucian scholar of the seventeenth century and displaced the Hayashi family and other rivals. In Carter’s analysis, the Reizei deployed forms of capital (material and symbolic) in the struggle against their rivals, the Nijō, and against upstart commoner poets and scholars. Although studies of Tokugawa poetry focus primarily on the efforts of the latter, Carter shows how the Reizei and the Nijō managed to create dominant positions for themselves in a developing field of waka; characterizations of the decline of the Dōjō poets during the Tokugawa do not capture the true complexity of the waka

2Ibid., p. 105.
7Ibid., p. 101.
8Ibid., p. 104.
field during the eighteenth century. McNally shows how the nativist Hirata Atsutane acquired crucial forms of capital during his tour of the Kansai in an effort to create a legitimate position for himself among the disciples of Motoori Norinaga. His experiences during this stay in Kansai, most notably the fierce antagonism to his scholarship, prompted him to use these forms of capital to claim a dominant position in the field. Rather than accept the status of one disciple among hundreds of others, he asserted that he was the school’s leading figure.

*    *    *    *    *    *    *    

Bourdieu’s concepts outlined above — capital, positions, position-takings, and, above all, field — are all prominent features in each of the three papers. In addition, Yamashita also addresses the issue of power relations when he analyzes the role of political patronage in the development of the Confucian field. All three add a social dimension to the analysis of culture. Bourdieu offers an alternative to approaches that privilege either producers (authors, poets, scholars, painters, etc.) or their products (literary, scholarly, artistic, etc., works). Advocates of the latter have criticized those who support the former by highlighting their reliance on subjectivity. Scholars who focus their analysis primarily on the cultural product have given us, among other things, deconstruction. Bourdieu’s methodology allows scholars to use the analytic strengths of both: to see scholars and poets not as Cartesian subjects but as agents, and to interpret their work within a particular context represented by the field.

Yamasaki Ansai and Confucian School Relations, 1650-1675

I

In 1650, Hayashi Razan (1583-1657) and his son Hayashi Gaho (1618-1680) were the preeminent Confucian scholars of their day and their school in Edo the leading Confucian academy in the country. There were other scholars and academies — those run by Matsunaga Sekigo (1592-1657), Tani Jitchu (1598-1649), and Nakae Toushi (1608-1648) — but none was the equal of the Hayashi and their school. This changed, however, in the course of the 1650s and early 1660s as other Confucian scholars emerged to challenge the Hayashi — notably Yamasaki Ansai (1618-1682), Kumazawa Banzan (1619-1691) and Yamaga Sokoh (1622-1685). All three opened their own schools where they taught their own distinctive philosophies and contested Hayashi teachings. The Hayashi were not pleased and responded quickly, mocking the challengers and belittling their views. They even accused one of the challengers of seditious motives, claiming that he was conspiring against the Tokugawa regime, charges that were patently false. Remarkably, one of the challengers, Yamasaki Ansai, not only survived the Hayashi counterattacks; he even managed to displace them and to have his other rivals arrested or exiled. By 1666 he was the preeminent, and perhaps the most powerful, Confucian scholar of the day.

Yamazaki’s success begs for answers to several questions. How did a virtually unknown scholar manage to best the Hayashi and do in his better-known and well-connected rivals Yamaga and Kumazawa? Why was there so much enmity between these scholars? What was at stake? What form did their rivalries take and what did each do to improve his standing? These are the questions I address below. I will argue that answers to these questions may be found in what I am calling contemporary school relations. When I use the term “contemporary school relations,” I am referring, first, to Yamasaki’s relationships with the Hayashi and other Confucians, chiefly his

1 I would like to thank C. T. Nishimoto and Mark McNally, who gave this paper close readings that greatly improved it. I also would like to acknowledge the helpful comments of Wai-ming Ng, Barry Steben, and others at a conference on “Confucian Currents in Japan and East Asia, 17th to 19th Centuries” held at the National University of Singapore in December 1997.
rivals Yamaga and Kumazawa, relationships that were intellectual, not personal. As far as I know, these scholars never met. Yet they were well aware of one another and had a good sense of what each was teaching in his school and saying about others. Moreover, all of these scholars — the Hayashi as well as their challengers — had knowledge of the same classical Chinese texts and the medieval Chinese, and to some extent Korean, commentaries on those texts as well as Taoism, Shinto, and even military science. Not surprisingly, they used the same philosophical vocabulary but each inflected it differently to distinguish himself from the others, highlighting some ideas, redefining others, and rejecting others. These philosophical similarities and differences comprise a second dimension of contemporary school relations. These scholars also knew who their rivals’ patrons were and what notables they were cultivating, which reminds us that Yamazaki’s rivalry with the Hayashi, Yamaga and Kumazawa had a third dimension, a political one, involving their respective patrons and backers. Clearly, the scholar who enjoyed the patronage of the shogun or his most trusted advisers was primus inter pares — in 1650 Hayashi Razan was that scholar. The next most powerful were those who had the backing of the shogun’s top officials — the senior elders — and so on down through the hierarchy of domain-holding lords and Tokugawa bannermen. So contemporary school relations, as they existed between 1650 and 1675, involved inter-school rivalry, philosophical disputation, and politics and patronage at the shogun’s court. All of which –I shall argue — must be considered if one is to understand Yamazaki Ansai’s dramatic rise to pre-eminence and power.

II

In retrospect, Yamazaki Ansai’s prevailing over the Hayashi in 1665 seems unlikely, and even something of a fluke. Who would have predicted that Yamazaki, an obscure and struggling scholar, would be the one to do this. Consider what he was up against. By 1650 there were four established Confucian schools — Hayashi Razan’s school, founded in Edo in 1630, and Matsunaga Sekigo’s offshoot, which opened in Kyoto in 1637; in addition, both Tani Jitchū and Nakae Tōju had schools and sizable followings — the former in Tosa domain and the latter in the Kyoto area. These four schools comprised the Confucian field as it existed in 1650 — five years before Yamazaki opened his school in Kyoto and first challenged the Hayashi. Of these four, Hayashi Razan's school was unquestionably dominant, owing to his special relationship with the shogun Tokugawa leyasu (r. 1603-1605) and his successors Tokugawa Hidetada (r. 1605-1623) and Tokugawa Iemitsu (r. 1623-1651). After the deaths of the Buddhist priests Süden in 1633 and Tenkai in 1643, Hayashi became indispensable to Iemitsu and performed the tasks they had once performed — drafting important documents, compiling historical works, writing anti-Christian legislation, and meeting with visiting foreign dignitaries. Hayashi had had Buddhist training and had taken the tonsure, but he also had studied Ch'eng-Chu philosophy — a variant of what is commonly known in the western scholarship as Neo-Confucianism — with Fujiwara Seika (1561-1619). Yet the things Iemitsu had Hayashi do should not be seen as an official affirmation of Confucianism and certainly not as the adoption of Confucianism as the state ideology, as was once thought. Hayashi was a bonze valued chiefly for his Buddhist training and his service to the shogunate.


4 For a powerful refutation of the view that the Tokugawa regime adopted Confucianism as their state ideology, see Herman Ooms, Tokugawa Ideology: Early Constructs, 1570-1680 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985).
his literacy and erudition.\textsuperscript{5}

What is important to this discussion is that Hayashi's proximity to Tokugawa Ieyasu and Hidetada and his usefulness to Iemitsu gave his school a special position and thus an advantage over the three others. There is much evidence that suggests so. In 1630, Iemitsu gave Hayashi land in Edo near Shinobazu Pond on which to build a school. Then, when the school burned down during the Great Meireki Fire in 1657, the bakufu paid to have it rebuilt.\textsuperscript{6} Clearly, the special favor the Tokugawa bestowed on the Hayashi served to legitimize their school and the variety of Ch'eng-Chu philosophy that Hayashi Razan taught to his students. Their privileged position allowed the Hayashi to dominate the Confucian field.

Confucian school relations changed dramatically after 1650 as Yamazaki Ansai, Kumazawa Banzan, and Yamaga Sokō emerged to challenge the preeminence of the Hayashi school. Let's consider the challengers. The first, Yamazaki Ansai, was a native of Kyoto and studied Buddhism from the age of seven. At nineteen he was sent to continue his religious studies in Tosa domain, where he met a Confucian scholar named Tani Jitchū who introduced him to Ch'eng-Chu teachings and drew him to Confucianism.\textsuperscript{7} Not long afterward, Yamazaki abandoned Buddhism and returned to Kyoto, where he opened a school in 1655. His star was slow to rise, however. Indeed, Yamazaki was not very well known before he challenged the Hayashi. While a student in Tosa, he had the support of high-ranking officials, notably Nonaka Kenzan and Ogura Sansei, but once he set out on his own and even after he opened his school in Kyoto in 1655, he was virtually unknown.\textsuperscript{8} However, he boldly attacked Hayashi Razan at this point, writing:

\begin{quote}
Mr. Hayashi! What sort of man is he? The whole world knows about his unfiliality [having become a monk]. He has served under four shoguns but has never expounded the Way of Yao and Shun before them. That is what is known as lack of reverence. . . . Mr. Hayashi! What kind of learning does he have? A so-called encyclopedic knowledge which he trumpets about in his arrogance. His mind is dark and his knowledge blocked.\textsuperscript{9}
\end{quote}

After Hayashi Razan’s death in 1657, Yamazaki moved to Edo in 1658, and his fortunes improved slightly, although he appears to have had only two patrons: Inoue Masatoshi, lord of Kazama domain, and Katō Yasuyoshi, lord of Ōzu domain. Nevertheless, this was how his career began.

Kumazawa Banzan, the second Confucian scholar to challenge the Hayashi in the 1650s, had both more and less success than Yamazaki. His career began well enough. At fifteen he entered the service of Ikeda Mitsumasa, lord of Okayama domain, rose quickly in the domainal bureaucracy, and came to be valued and trusted by his lord. Then he left for several years — from 1638 to 1645 — to study with Nakae Tōju, who was partial to the teachings of the Chinese philosopher Wang Yang-ming (1472-1529), and when he reentered Lord Ikeda’s service, he championed his teacher's views.\textsuperscript{10} His

\textsuperscript{5} Hori, \textit{Hayashi Razan}, pp. 168, 253, 270. Watanabe Hiroshi makes the same point in \textit{Tokugawa zenki jugakushi no ichi jōken (1)}, \textit{Kokka gakkai zasshi} 94(1-2):18, n. 22.

\textsuperscript{6} Hori, \textit{Hayashi Razan}, pp. 275, 281.


\textsuperscript{8} Abe, \textit{Nihon no shushigaku to chōsen}, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{9} Herman Ooms, \textit{Tokugawa Ideology}, pp. 210-211.

\textsuperscript{10} Modern scholars disagree on how long Kumazawa studied with Nakae. Hara says Kumazawa was an itinerant student for seven years but has him studying with Nakae Tōju from
relationship with Nakae would cause him untold problems, as shall become clear below. But Kumazawa also had an impact on domain policy and advised his lord on rural administration. Lord Ikeda rewarded him with a promotion to captain of the guards and a 3000 koku salary.11

In the first month of 1657, he resigned his position in Okayama for two reasons. First, although Kumazawa was a trusted adviser to Lord Ikeda, his recommendations and policies were widely opposed and resisted in the domain. Second, his espousal of the “learning of the heart-mind,” although endorsed by his lord for a time, was condemned by the Tokugawa authorities, and later even by his lord.12 In any case, after his resignation, Kumazawa moved to Kyoto and opened a school there the following year, quickly attracting students, including members of the nobility.13 In 1659 he moved to Edo for a time, then returned to Kyoto and made occasional trips to Okayama, all the while advising his former employer, Lord Ikeda, as well as other lords who sought his counsel.14 All of this was done under the watchful eyes of the Tokugawa regime.

The career of Yamaga Sokō, the third challenger, offers us a different glimpse of school relations in Edo in the 1650s and early 1660s. Yamaga was an instructor of military science in the service of Asano Naganao, lord of Akō domain, when he resigned his position in the ninth month of 1660. He moved to Edo, where he was already well known as an authority on Confucianism, Taoism, and military science. Yamaga had been raised there and was remembered as something of a prodigy. When he was eight, his parents had enrolled him in the Hayashi school, where he learned Ch'eng-Chu philosophy. He also studied military science with Obata Kagenori and Hōjō Ujinaga as well as Shinto and Taoism.15 As a boy, he was so precocious that, like some young Mozart, he was often asked to display his talents to the rich and powerful. When he was ten, for example, he was invited to read classical Chinese texts for Horio Tadaharu, lord of Matsue domain, who promptly asked young Yamaga to enter his service, but his father would not allow it. At fourteen, Yamaga gave public lectures on the Great Learning and, at fifteen, on the Mencius and the Analects.16 In the 1640s, Yamaga was a fixture in the city's

1641 to 1645. Hara, Sentetsu sōdan, pp. 124, 128.


12 Gotō, "Kumazawa Banzan no shōgai to shisō no keisei," NST, 30: 491-493 and Sagara, Kinsei nihon ni okeru jukyō undō no keifū, pp. 76-78. There are other explanations: one account suggests that something happened when Kumazawa accompanied his lord to Edo but does not tell us exactly what it was. Itakura Shigemune, the Kyoto deputy and a distant relative, advised Kumazawa to resign from feudal service and "never discuss social issues" or "come east" again. Hara, Sentetsu sōdan, p. 128. A second account has Kumazawa being implicated in an anti-Tokugawa conspiracy, as will be discussed later. A third account suggests that his health may have been a factor: his lord referred to Kumazawa's "illness" in his diary, and Kumazawa himself later spoke of the "great malady that broke out when I was around forty." There also is mention of a back injury that kept him from riding or even drawing a bow. Mitsumasa nikki, 1/9/1657 entry, and Kumazawa Banzan, Shugi gaisho, kan 2, cited in Gotō Yōichi, "Kumazawa Banzan no shōgai to shisō no keisei," Nihon shisō taikei (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1974), vol. 30: Kumazawa Banzan, 488-489. Hereafter Nihon


16 Ibid., p. 319.
intellectual life, counting among his patrons and students more than a dozen lords and large numbers of Tokugawa bannermen and rear vassals.\(^\text{17}\) He was even invited to serve prominent lords, including Tokugawa Yorinobu, Ieyasu's tenth son and the lord of Wakayama domain, but he always refused.\(^\text{18}\) Apparently Yamaga had his heart set on a bakufu position, which he might have gotten in the late 1640s if the shogun himself — Tokugawa Iemitsu — had not died in 1651, leaving him without the backing he needed for such a position.\(^\text{19}\) At that point, in 1652, Yamaga entered the service of the Asano in Akō. He remained in Akō for eight years, but in 1660 decided to return to Edo. Given his reputation in Edo, his decision to return there is hardly surprising. It meant, however, that he would now teach and write not from the relative safety of Akō domain in western Honshu but at the very site of Tokugawa power and in the shadow of the Hayashi school.

The early careers of these three Hayashi challengers tell us much about Confucian school relations in the 1650s and early 1660s. First, it is telling that all three challengers began their careers as house Confucians away from Edo, in either Kyoto or the provinces. As the dominant Confucian presence in Edo, the Hayashi jealously guarded their special relationship with the shōgun and his senior advisers, so Kyoto and the provincial domains were ideal sites for their challengers. Kyoto was still the country's intellectual, cultural, and publishing center and would remain so until the early 1700s, and although it contained well-established Buddhist and Shinto communities, it had only one Confucian school, the one that Matsunaga Sekigo opened in 1637. And provincial domains, given their distance from Edo and their relative political independence, offered a sanctuary for emerging Confucian scholars. It is telling that all three challengers moved to Edo after Hayashi Razan’s death in 1657.

Second, the challengers opened schools just before they began attacking the Hayashi — Yamazaki in 1655, Kumazawa in 1657, and Yamaga in 1660. This is understandable. Their schools offered a safe haven where they could articulate their own philosophical views and distinguish themselves from the Hayashi. Moreover, their teaching was an important means of spreading their views and attracting a following, and typically word of new and popular teachers quickly reached domain-holding lords, high-ranking bakufu officials, and eventually the shōgun and his aides as well.

Obviously, it was vital that the challengers attract the attention of high-ranking bakufu officials and powerful lords, and this required moving to Edo where domain-holding lords spent alternate years and Tokugawa retainers were concentrated—a third important point. Why was this so crucial? Because such political backing was essential for any aspiring scholar, and it could be found most easily in Edo. Yamazaki’s meteoric rise in 1665, for example, would have been unthinkable had he not moved to Edo in 1658, and he would have remained an obscure Kyoto scholar with a modest following. Similarly, Yamaga moved to Edo in 1660, opened a school, and began noisily to contest Hayashi teachings largely because he believed that he had sufficient backing among the powerful. He was right. He did have powerful backers. And even Kumazawa, who would have the worst luck of all, lived briefly in Edo in 1659 and was protected for many years by Lord Ikeda of Okayama domain without whose support he might have met a bad end sooner than he did.

III

Yamazaki’s success in challenging the Hayashi had a second source — the


\(^\text{19}\) For a detailed account of who supported his candidacy for a bakufu position, see Yamaga, "Haisho zampitsu," pp. 323-324; and Hori, *Yamaga Sokō*, pp. 92-93.
distinctiveness of his philosophical views, especially his views on ethical issues. Like the Hayashi, Yamazaki subscribed to Ch’eng-Chu philosophy and thus shared much with them philosophically, nonetheless his views diverged significantly from theirs and constituted an important challenge. They also diverged from the views of the other challengers, Yamaga and Kumazawa. Thus, to do justice to Yamazaki’s philosophical innovations, the challenge they posed to the Hayashi and their appeal to his patrons and students, one also must consider the views of the Hayashi as well as those of the other challengers — Kumazawa Banzan and his teacher Nakae Tōju, and Yamaga Sokō.

The Hayashi were staunch advocates of Ch’eng-chu philosophy. They believed that humans possessed an innate capacity for virtue. Hayashi Razan spoke of this as “the principle inherent in people’s heart-minds” and observed that it was because human nature was endowed with principle that the Three Virtues were present and that human nature was innately good.20 He further explained evil as a product of the physical nature. “Human nature is originally without physical form,” he wrote. “When it assumes physical form, it also receives the mixed and ambiguous endowment of material force — both the pure and the turbid, the clear and the dark, the thick and the thin.” “This is why,” he continued, “human nature, which receives material force, is fundamentally good but is overwhelmed by physical form and is estranged from [its original goodness] by desire.”21 Thus, recovery of this original nature required self cultivation.

The Hayashi also believed that the best means of self cultivation was study. Here “study” meant reading — the reading of the Chinese classics, histories, scientific works, and even literature. As Hayashi Razan put it, the goal was “to plumb principle and to extend knowledge.”22 Here simply learning more and more was not enough. One was to grasp the universal principles that existed within the self as the original nature and in the external world as well. No matter what one called these universal principles—whether the Three Virtues or the Five Relations—they were universal, true for all people, in the past as in the present.23 So if one understood these universal principles, one understood the world at large.

The views of Hayashi Razan and his son Gahō were a virtual philosophical doxa in the 1650s and early 1660s, and the Hayashi were fiercely vigilant. Having just emerged as the dominant presence in the Confucian field, they were acutely aware of not only their own following but also their critics. They knew precisely who was publicly contesting their views and understood what these challenges represented, both philosophically and politically. After all, Hayashi Razan himself had once been a challenger, patiently biding his time while the Buddhist priests Tenkai and Sūden served as the shogun’s chief aides. After their deaths, when he finally emerged as the shogun’s “brain,” Hayashi soon found himself the object of others’ envy and the target of their attacks.

Nakae Tōju’s “heart learning” was actually the first challenge. Nakae quickly attacked the Hayashi by name and became known as one of their critics. In a 1632 piece, for example, Nakae wrote,

Hayashi Dōshun [Razan] has an exceptional memory, encyclopedic knowledge and extensive experience. He espouses the Confucian way, vainly embellishes his words, and imitates the Buddhists' methods. He needlessly took the tonsure, left the quiet abode that Humanity offers, and abandoned the correct path of Righteousness and no longer follows it. He is Master Chu's clever talking parrot but calls himself a true Confucian.24


21 Ibid.

22 Ibid., p. 152.

23 Ibid., p. 159.

24 Nakae Tōju, "Hayashi-shi kami o sori, i o
By 1643, however, Hayashi’s position in the shōgun’s government was firm. Although Nakae continued to criticize him in Dialogues with an Old Man (Okina mondō), he neither attacked him as bluntly as he did in 1632 nor did he do so by name. Instead, he resorted to euphemism, writing of a certain "vulgar Confucian" whose scholarship was little more than "memorization and literary style."25

When Dialogues with an Old Man was republished in 1649-1650, Hayashi was furious, and his fury apparently was transmitted to his successor, his son Gahō. In a letter to a fellow Confucian written in 1654, Hayashi Gahō complained about the influence of this “ignorant and stubborn fellow”:

Not long ago there was an ignorant and stubborn fellow who cribbed his name from Wang Shou-jen [Yang-ming], espoused heterodox teachings, and in the end deceived the uneducated people. His [influence] even has reached those who are lettered, which is truly one of the world’s saddest affairs and something we grieve. We have to suppress and eliminate [his influence].26

Nakae’s being dead for three years did not matter. The Hayashi still regarded the publication of Dialogues with an Old Man and its circulation as a threat. Accordingly, Hayashi Gahō closes with "we have to suppress and eliminate [it]," an ominous statement of the confidence that he and his father now had the power to silence their rivals.

With Nakae dead, the Hayashi had only his leading disciple, Kumazawa Banzan, to attack. So Hayashi Razan went on the offensive, attacking Kumazawa in two pieces he wrote in 1651. In one of them, he even linked Kumazawa with an abortive conspiracy to overthrow the Tokugawa regime.27 Yui Shōsetsu and Maruya Chūya and their band of masterless warriors hoped to take advantage of the new shogun’s youth — Tokugawa Ietsuna was only ten when he became shogun in 1651—but their plot was discovered, and they were arrested and punished. That Hayashi Razan would accuse Kumazawa of fomenting rebellion and would do so in writing leaves little doubt how he and his patrons, the Tokugawa authorities, viewed him and reveals how far they were willing to go to erase what they regarded as Nakae’s unhappy influence.28 Their campaign against Kumazawa would receive support from other quarters and continue for some time.

Hayashi concern with Nakae Tōju and Kumazawa Banzan is understandable. They were followers of Wang Yang-ming, whose insistence on spiritual practice was a far cry from Hayashi scholasticism. As a result, both sides disagreed openly with each other on fundamental issues and criticized each other’s teachings. The two other challengers, however, were even more forthright and aggressive than Nakae and Kumazawa, none more so than Yamaga Sokō, who criticized the Hayashi publicly in Essentials of the Sages’ Teachings (Seikyō yōroku).

Essentials of the Sages’ Teachings presents Yamaga’s disagreements with the Hayashi on ethical issues. One area of disagreement was human nature. As Yamaga saw it, most of his contemporaries divided human nature into two parts: the "heavenly inspired nature," which was innately good, and the "physical nature," which was a mixture of good and evil. Certainly the Hayashi did this. Yamaga himself believed in the existence of only a physical nature and regarded the idea of a "heavenly inspired nature" as the source of a variety of problems. "Scholars tasted the [theory of an] innately good human nature," he wrote, "and the result was the theories of the learning of the heart-mind and the learning of
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principle." Yamaga uses a kind of shorthand, or code, to refer to the major schools of his day: "learning of principle" (J. rigaku) to refer to the Hayashi and Bokumon schools and "learning of heart-mind" (J. shingaku) for the views of Wang Yang-ming and his Japanese followers, notably Nakae Tōju and Kumazawa Banzan. These schools' positions on human nature troubled Yamaga because "the sages had not distinguished the heavenly ordained and physical natures" as the scholars associated with these schools did. Yamaga could not accept their conception of two natures.

Yamaga was right on both issues. Ancient Confucians did not distinguish two types of human nature in the way his contemporaries did. Furthermore, the Hayashi, Bokumon, and Ōyōmei schools did embrace a dualistic conception of human nature. As we have seen, Hayashi Razan argued that it was because human nature was endowed with principle that the Three Virtues were present and that human nature was innately good. Nakae Tōju agreed with Hayashi Razan on this point. In *Dialogues with an Old Man*, he described human nature as "a spiritual trace unequalled in the realm that can be called perfect virtue and the essential way." He also wrote, "The nature of the Five Constants of Humanity, Righteousness, Propriety, Knowledge, and Trust are inherent in the hearts of human beings and are the foundation for the self," and he added, "These Five [Constants] are eternal and unchanging principles."

Yamaga's attack on both the "learning of principle" and "learning of heart-mind" makes sense when we recall Confucian school relations in the 1650s and early 1660s. When he wrote *Essentials of the Sages' Teachings*, the "learning of principle" and the "learning of the heart-mind" represented the major Confucian schools of the day, the schools that had either official Tokugawa sanction (the schools of Hayashi and Matsunaga Sekigo) or the largest followings (Nakae Tōju's school); thus, these code words encompassed all the schools in the contemporary Confucian field. By openly disagreeing with these schools on the issue of human nature, Yamaga, as a newcomer, hoped to create a space for himself in that field.

Yamaga went further. He also disagreed with his contemporaries on a second and related issue, the importance of actual practice, and once again the Hayashi school was his target. He complained that the members of this school neither engaged in self-cultivation nor practiced Confucian virtues: "In our day," he wrote, "decadent Confucians of vulgar learning do not cultivate themselves or work at loyalty or filial piety." Of course, Yamaga's "decadent Confucians of vulgar learning" refers to the Hayashi, as the following passage from his *zuihitsu* confirms: "Someone said, 'You had Hayashi Dōshun [Razan] as a teacher. Why is Dōshun not interested in the Way?' I answered, 'What interests him is very different. It is merely for the sake of memorization, and he is not interested in overcoming the self and returning to ritual.'" Having studied at their school, Yamaga
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knew just how preoccupied the Hayashi were with textual study. Yamaga's alternative to Hayashi scholasticism was "actual practice" (J. jikkō), the emphasis on which appears to have originated in his work in military science. His teacher Hōjō Ujinaga had taught him to value practice and even was critical of Essentials of the Sages' Teachings because it did not insist strongly enough on "actual practice." 38 Yamaga's interest in practice also echoed the ethical discourse prevailing among Confucians in the Kyoto area in the latter half of the seventeenth century, in which spiritual practice was valued more than textual study. Nakae Tōju, for example, similarly criticized the Hayashi when he wrote, "The vulgar Confucians read the writings of the Confucian way, memorize the exegeses, and exclusively memorize and write — this is what they hear and what they explain. They may know virtue, but they do not carry out the way." 39 For both Yamaga and Nakae studying virtue was not enough; one had to practice it. Another Kyoto Confucian, Yamazaki Ansai, seconded this call for practice, and he, too, was critical of Hayashi scholasticism. Although like the Hayashi, he accepted a dualistic conception of human nature, Yamazaki urged Confucians to do more than engage in the kinds of textual study or literary exercises that the Hayashi favored. One actually had to practice Confucian virtues, particularly what he termed "seriousness" (J. kei). Yamazaki was critical of those who engaged in what one of his students called "desktop discussions" of ethical issues and avoided real ethical practice. 40 When Yamazaki wrote that those who failed to practice "seriousness" in their daily lives were engaged in "vulgar learning" (J. zokugaku), he had the Hayashi in mind. 41 To Yamazaki, as to his contemporaries, the Hayashi were "vulgar Confucians" who practiced "vulgar learning." That all of these Hayashi critics used the same terms — "vulgar Confucians" and "vulgar learning" — reminds us that whoever was preeminent in the Confucian field was the natural target of all challengers and fair game. In the 1650s and early 1660s that target was the Hayashi. These philosophical agreements and disagreements confirm, first, (what almost goes without saying) that all three challengers — Yamazaki, Kumazawa, and Yamaga — explicitly criticized Hayashi teachings. This is what marked them as challengers. They were critical of what they regarded as Hayashi scholasticism, arguing that textual study and literary exercises were not enough and calling for some form of practice. One critic, Yamaga Sōkō, challenged the Hayashi on a second, more fundamental issue — the definition of human nature — and argued that humans had only one nature, a physical nature — not two, as the Hayashi and others claimed. The challengers' criticisms of the Hayashi are hardly surprising. Why? Because such attacks, even when substantive and sincere, were their chief tactic, their best means of attracting students and patrons and making places for themselves in an already crowded Confucian field. It may seem paradoxical, however, that those who challenged the Hayashi also agreed with them in many ways. Both the Hayashi and their challengers discussed and wrote about the same things — human nature, self-cultivation, the way, virtue, and principle. They also expressed themselves in similar ways, appealing to the authority of the Chinese classics, offering their own readings of cardinal Confucian concepts, and invoking or alluding to latter-day continental philosophers. In a word, they shared a Confucian discourse, used the same rhetoric, and favored the same hermeneutical approach to classical and medieval texts. This is what made them "Confucians" and members of an extended community of Confucians in China, Korea, Annam, and, of course, Japan. The Hayashi and their challengers also comprised a different sort of community of scholars, what I am calling the contemporary Confucian field and which the Hayashi
dominated in the 1650s and early 1660s. Each wrote as much for his rivals as for his own followers. For example, the Hayashi wrote openly, and usually disparagingly, of their opponents — Nakae Tōju was an "ignorant and stubborn fellow" and Yamazaki Ansai a pompous character who discussed "human nature and principle in lofty terms" and "threw around [difficult] words." In contrast, Hayashi critics resorted to euphemisms or known epithets — such as "vulgar Confucians" — when speaking of their chief adversary, and their doing so confirmed Hayashi dominance. And they were even more direct and vicious when referring to one another, revealing how intense was the competition between the challengers as they jockeyed for position in the Confucian field. So while the Hayashi and their challengers shared a Confucian discourse and could even be said to be members of a Confucian community, albeit one scattered throughout the country and dispersed throughout Asia, not all had a place in the Confucian field, which the Hayashi dominated and Yamazaki, Yamaga, and Kumazawa were trying to enter.

Although philosophical debates, school rivalries, and the struggle to establish positions within the Confucian field tell us why the challengers felt compelled to take on the Hayashi and why they disputed Hayashi views of particular issues, they do not explain the intensity of the challengers' attacks and the ferocity of Hayashi responses. Nor do they tell us very much about how Yamazaki, the least well known of the three challengers, not only survived Hayashi counterattacks but also prevailed over them. Or why Yamaga and Kumazawa failed in their bids for entry into the Confucian community. Obviously, there was something more — contemporary politics.

IV

School relations also had much to do with politics in Edo. The challengers' blunt attacks on the Hayashi, the fierce Hayashi responses, and Yamazaki’s success and his rivals’ failure cannot be understood without considering the shogunal succession of 1651 and the political changes that accompanied it. When the shogun, Tokugawa Iemitsu, died that year, Ietsuna, his heir and eldest son, succeeded him. But because Ietsuna was only ten, Iemitsu had asked his younger brother, Hoshina Masayuki (1611-1672), to serve as the young shogun’s guardian and to act as regent. Hoshina, who was lord of the Aizu domain at the time, complied with Iemitsu’s wishes and moved to Edo. While he served as Ietsuna’s guardian and regent, Hoshina was a surrogate shogun and was widely recognized as the most powerful man in Edo, perhaps the country. He also ruled with the help of several powerful Tokugawa retainers, notably Abe Tadaaki (1602-1675) and Sakai Tadakiyo (1624-1681), and this represented a new pattern in Tokugawa politics. Even after Ietsuna achieved his majority in 1661 and began to rule on his own, Hoshina retained much of his power.42

This was still the case in 1665 when Yamazaki Ansai became an adviser to Hoshina. For the next seven years he spent half the year in Edo and half in Kyoto.43 The relationship was fortuitous. Yamazaki and Hoshina together compiled a number of works, including A Record of the Two Ch’eng’s Political Teachings (Nitei jikyō-roku) and A Record of the Mind/Heart as Transmitted through the Ch’engs and the Three Teachings (Iraku sanshi denshin-roku).44 Their collaboration was a great boon to Yamazaki. With the powerful Hoshina as his patron, Yamazaki’s views — particularly the variety of of Ch’eng-Chu philosophy he favored — acquired a certain legitimacy, and he was able to displace Hayashi Gahō, the head of the Hayashi School, as the preeminent Confucian of the day, and establish
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himself in the Confucian field. Hayashi Gahō quickly recognized that Hoshina’s hiring Yamazaki in 1665 threatened his position. "Recently," he wrote, "I hear that there is someone who discusses human nature and principle in lofty terms, construes [his teachings] as the rebirth of Ch'eng-Chu [philosophy], throws around [difficult] words, speaks of extensive knowledge as an obstacle, and refers to us as the vulgar Confucians." He continued: "He has his way of doing things, and I mine. Because our ways are not the same, there will be no commerce between us. I simply will defend my house enterprise." These are telling words. Hayashi's carefully distinguishing his school from Yamazaki's — "He has his way of doing things, and I mine" — confirms their philosophical differences. Moreover, the resignation of his "I simply will defend my house enterprise" signals Yamazaki's entry into the Confucian field and his realization that his rival's relationship with Hoshina meant that the Hayashi school would no longer be the dominant Confucian academy in Edo. Hayashi Gahō's words reveal much about the importance of patronage for aspiring scholars and the relationship of scholarship and politics in mid-seventeenth-century Edo.

If Yamazaki's new preeminence reduced the Hayashi advantage, it was disastrous for the other challengers. In the tenth month of 1666, the Tokugawa authorities arrested Yamaga Sokō for what they termed his "arrogance" and exiled him to Ako domain. What did Yamaga do to warrant such harsh treatment? Earlier that year he had published Essentials of the Sages’ Teachings and announced the formation of the "Yamaga school." Apparently, his frank and critical assertions about Ch'eng-Chu ethics in Essentials of the Sages' Teachings, which were obviously an attack on Hayashi views, were the chief reason for his arrest and exile.

Yamaga had ample warning. Several months earlier, he had been summoned to meet with Senior Elder Itakura Shigenori, whom he once had taught. In that meeting, Yamaga was asked whether his views were at odds with those of Yamazaki Ansai, and he admitted that they were. He could hardly have missed the the significance of Itakura’s visit and his pointed question. Despite this, he went ahead and had Essentials of the Sages’ Teachings published. Thus he should not have been surprised when he was summoned to the residence of his mentor, Lord Hōjō Ujinaga, on the third day of the tenth month of 1666. When Lord Hōjō appeared, Yamaga wrote later, "he said that because I had published a book dealing with matters that did not concern me, the bakufu was going to place me in the custody of Lord Asano." As Yamaga recalled, in the presence of Inspector Shimada Shigeharu, Lord Hōjō was even more specific: "He [Lord Hōjō] then informed me that, because I had published an offensive book, the Council of Elders has said I was to be placed in the custody of Lord Asano." As Yamaga recalled, in the presence of Inspector Shimada Shigeharu, Lord Hōjō was even more specific: "He [Lord Hōjō] then informed me that, because I had published an offensive book, the Council of Elders has said I was to be placed in the custody of Lord Asano." Yamaga continued:

I replied, "I should like to say first of all that I submit to the bakufu's decision. But I would like to know what the bakufu found offensive in my book." But Lord Hōjō said to Shimada, "Yamaga may have something to say in self-defense, but it would not do any good since the order has already been given."
Lord Hōjō’s words “. . . it would not do any good since the order has already been given” suggest that the order to arrest Yamaga had come from the upper reaches of the government and points to Yamazaki Ansai’s influence. There was little Yamaga could do or say in his defense. His bid to enter the Confucian field failed, and he was driven into exile.53

Kumazawa Banzan’s fate was similar if less dramatic. In 1669, the Tokugawa authorities placed him in the custody of Matsudaira Nobuyuki, lord of Akashi domain and a Kumazawa admirer.54 When Matsudaira became, in succession, lord of the Koriyama and Koga domains, Kumazawa had to accompany him there.55 Once again, it is likely that Yamazaki Ansai had engineered Kumazawa’s arrest and continuing detention.

Thus, Yamazaki’s stunning success and the virtual disappearance of Yamaga and Kumazawa from the Confucian field in Edo beg the obvious question: why did Yamazaki succeed and Yamaga and Kumazawa fail? Contemporary school relations between 1650 and 1675 offer some tentative answers. In the 1650s and 1660s, the two most important features of school relations were, first, the Hayashi family’s special position, which gave their school a legitimacy that no other Confucian academy possessed, and, second, the active interest of Hoshina and his colleagues in producing, with the help of scholars, what Herman Ooms has called a new “ruling discourse.”56 Moreover, because the shogun himself had conferred these privileges on the Hayashi family, their dominance in the Confucian field both originated in, and paralleled, Tokugawa dominance in contemporary political and military affairs. This is a key point, as it meant that scholars who challenged the Hayashi not only disrupted contemporary Confucian school relations but also unwittingly challenged Tokugawa hegemony and threatened the larger structure of contemporary power relations within which the Confucian field was located. This may be an instance of what French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu termed the "double logic" of cultural fields located within fields of power.57 That is, the struggles in the Confucian field in the 1650s and 1660s originated not only in personal rivalries, authentic philosophical disagreements and valiant attempts to enter the Confucian field but also in the dominating political presence of the shogun and those who ruled in his name.

This begs a second question: if the Hayashi position was tied so closely to Tokugawa power, how was it even possible for challenges to be mounted? How could Yamazaki, Yamaga, and Kumazawa dare to challenge the Hayashi? What enabled their challenges, in a word, were backers, powerful backers, especially domain-holding lords and high-ranking Tokugawa retainers. After all, lords, especially domain-holding lords, enjoyed considerable power in the political order that Tokugawa Ieyasu and his successors created after the Battle of Sekigahara and the Osaka campaign. The shogun, although preeminent, was only the most powerful of the nearly 250 domain-holding lords in the country. Moreover, a new political order emerged during the reign of the third shogun, Iemitsu. High bakufu offices were no longer held by the men who had served, and even fought for, Tokugawa Ieyasu. Iemitsu brought in his own men, all Tokugawa vassals, and appointed them to high offices. And this, as Conrad Totman has pointed out, increased the power of these office holders and diminished the power of the shogun.58 No doubt, Ietsuna’s youth and Hoshina’s regency further encouraged this development. Therefore, it was hardly surprising that Kumazawa and Yamaga and, to a lesser
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extent, Yamazaki had powerful supporters before they mounted their challenges.

Kumazawa was typical. After entering Ikeda Mitsumasa's service as a boy, he had a brilliant career as a young retainer and was immensely popular with other lords as well. In 1651, for example, when he accompanied his lord to Edo for a period of alternate attendance, he attracted great attention, and a number of lords asked to study with him. Even the shogun, Tokugawa Iemitsu, was interested in interviewing Kumazawa but died before this could be arranged. Kumazawa's obvious appeal was such that when the masterless warriors arrested in connection with the Yui Shōsetsu incident claimed to be his followers, Hayashi Razan's attempt to implicate him seemed plausible.

Yamaga had an even wider following among high-ranking Tokugawa retainers and domain-holding lords. His career may explain this. As was mentioned earlier, he first achieved fame as a child prodigy and lectured on the Chinese classics as a boy. In 1642, at the age of nineteen, he published *A Collection of Military Tactics and Preparedness* (Heihō yubi-sho), a fifty-volume work on military affairs, and that year he was invited by three prominent lords to serve them — Abe Tadaaki, a senior elder and lord of Oshi domain, Tokugawa Yorinobu, lord of Wakayama domain, and Maeda Mitsutaka, lord of Komatsu domain — but he declined. Through the 1640s, Yamaga taught nearly two dozen lords, several of whom later rose to the highest bakufu positions — Kuze Hiroyuki, who became a senior elder in 1663; Naitō Shigeyori, who served as the keeper of Osaka Castle (1685-1687) and Kyoto deputy (1687-1690); and Itakura Shigenori, who became a senior elder in 1665 and Kyoto deputy in 1668; it was he who was sent to interrogate Yamaga in 1666. Yamaga also gave invited lectures to lords. In 1646, he gave a lecture on the *Chuang Tzu* at the residence of Niwa Mitsushige; in 1647 he lectured on the *Lao Tzu* at the Kuze compound; and in 1651 he delivered a lecture on the *Chuang Tzu* to Itakura Shigenori and his retainers. And Yamaga's supporters even tried to secure a bakufu position for him but failed when the shogun died and the political scene in Edo changed. Thus, Yamaga had impressively broad contacts among powerful lords and high-ranking Tokugawa retainers before he announced the formation of the "Yamaga school" and published *Essentials of the Sages' Teachings* in 1666.

Yamazaki, in contrast, had a more modest following before his star rose. Clearly, the shogunal succession of 1651 was the signal event in his successful challenge of the Hayashi school. It not only resulted in Hoshina's elevation to regent but also led to dramatic changes in the Confucian field. Just as Iemitsu and his cronies had had their favorite scholars — including Hayashi, Yamaga and Kumazawa — Hoshina had his, including Yamazaki. Accordingly, whereas scholars like Kumazawa and Yamaga mounted their challenges and started their own schools only when they had sufficient backing, Yamazaki gained a powerful benefactor and all the backing he needed largely as a result of the 1651 shogunal succession and the political changes it occasioned.

Yamazaki was also both lucky and shrewd. Staking out a position in a new field is not easy for three reasons: first, the rules governing fields are not obvious; second, they are not codified; and third, newcomers are rarely welcome. Typically, newcomers who survive are either very lucky or very shrewd. Yamazaki had the good fortune to meet Hoshina Masayuki and to get along well with him, which gave him access to the most powerful senior bakufu officials, some of whom he even taught and was friendly with. Moreover, Yamazaki was shrewd enough to make the most of this opportunity. For seven years, he spent half of every year in Kyoto and half in Edo, which must have been inconvenient to say the least, but it paid off. Yamazaki rose dramatically to preeminence and gained an advantage over the Hayashi. His relationship with Hoshina even resembled the Hayashi family's relationship with
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the first three shoguns. The resemblance ends there, however. Yamazaki's standing in Edo was temporary; he could hold this position only while Hoshina was alive, unlike the Hayashi, whose position, by the 1660s, was hereditary.

By contrast, Yamaga was neither lucky nor shrewd, and his timing was poor. He should have announced the opening of his school and published *Essentials of the Sages' Teachings* before 1665. Had he acted earlier, he would not have had Yamazaki to contend with. Why he chose to wait is unclear. Of course, he could not have known that Yamazaki would become such an important presence in the shogun's court. Yamaga's reluctance to act also may reflect his understanding an important feature of contemporary school relations — their relational nature. He may have recognized that a newcomer like himself could not enter the Confucian field without disturbing, and even threatening, those who held established positions in it — namely, the Hayashi. No doubt, he knew that the Hayashi would understand perfectly what his challenge meant and respond forcefully, as indeed they did. After all, if he succeeded in establishing a position for himself in the Confucian field, their position would be diminished and the Ch'eng-Chu project as a whole jeopardized. He would need to gather sufficient backing before he went head to head with Hayashi Gahō. Perhaps this is why he waited. Then, when Yamazaki was suddenly elevated to prominence in 1665 and the Hayashi star fell, he may have decided to act, as he did in 1666, publishing *Essentials of the Sages' Teachings* and announcing the formation of the "Yamaga school."

However, Yamaga's tactics backfired, and he was arrested for his "arrogance" and summarily driven from Edo. Why? Yamaga obviously underestimated Yamazaki's pre-eminence. But he also misjudged his own following. Memories of his popularity as a young scholar in Edo in the 1640s and his nearly achieving a *bakufu* position in 1651 may have inflated his sense of importance and heightened his expectations. The Asano were his chief backers, but they were in Akō domain, the safe haven Yamaga left to challenge the Hayashi on their own home ground. Two lords he had once taught — Kuze Hiroyuki and Itakura Shigenori — became senior elders in 1663 and 1665, which meant they were among the most powerful men in the country, but even they could not save Yamaga. As I noted earlier, Itakura even visited Yamaga to warn him. There were now greater forces at work in Edo politics — namely, Yamazaki and his patron Hoshina.

Kumazawa Banzan was a different case altogether. It is traditional to describe him as a victim, and this actually appears to have been the case — he was a victim of both his ties with Nakae Tōju and his own success as an adviser to Lord Ikeda of Okayama domain. His espousal of Nakae's "learning of the heart-mind" as well as his meteoric rise in Okayama made him suspect in the eyes of the Tokugawa authorities. In fact, Kumazawa was the object of *bakufu* suspicion even before Nakae's *Dialogues with an Old Man* was published in 1649-1650 and before he was implicated in the Yui Shōsetsu affair in 1651. In 1646, Great Elder Sakai Tadakatsu and others had urged Ikeda Mitsumasa, Kumazawa's lord, to abandon the "learning of the heart-mind." Ikeda was quite taken with this philosophy and promoted and used it in Okayama.62 In the upper reaches of the Tokugawa government, however, it was believed that the "learning of the heart-mind" undermined the Ch'eng-Chu project and had serious political implications. Not surprisingly, the Tokugawa authorities continued to issue warnings to Ikeda through the 1650s and into the 1660s.63

Kumazawa's tragic career is the clearest demonstration of the "double logic" operating in contemporary school relations. His misfortune was that he was seen not just as a critic of Ch'eng-chu philosophy and a contender for a position in the Confucian field but also as a threat to Tokugawa hegemony. In the wake of the suspicions generated by the Yui Shōsetsu affair, Kumazawa's advocacy of "learning of the heart-
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mind" became what Bourdieu would call a "euphemized" form of a power struggle between the Tokugawa authorities and those perceived as their enemies. The authorities' concern about what they regarded as a seditious philosophy persisted. Great Elder Sakai Tadakiyo's warning to the Ikeda, issued in 1667, communicated Kyoto Deputy Makino Chikanari's concerns about Kumazawa. When Kumazawa learned about this, he left Kyoto immediately and lived as an itinerant, and perhaps fugitive, scholar. His flight from Kyoto delayed the authorities for a time, but in 1669, he was put under house arrest. Lacking his lord's active support and moving about in remote areas, Kumazawa was at a clear disadvantage and remained so until his death in 1691. Clearly, there was little he could do to allay the fears of the Hayashi, and later Yamazaki, and their Tokugawa patrons. Thus, Kumazawa could not escape the subtle and inexorable workings of the coincidence of belief and power.

When Hoshina Masayuki died in 1672, Yamazaki Ansai lost his patron. He immediately returned to Kyoto and started teaching full-time, at which he was a great success. His seven years with Hoshina had enhanced his appeal and his following swelled to six thousand students, outnumbering by far those attending the Hayashi and Bokumon schools. Among those who came to study with Yamazaki were the three students who would be the major transmitters of his philosophy after his death in 1682—Satō Naokata (1650-1719), Miyake Shōsai (1662-1741), and Asami Keisai (1652-1711). In their capable hands, Yamazaki's school would survive, despite the continuing opposition of other schools, and its survival is the best evidence that he had succeeded in creating a position for his school in the Confucian field. Yet Yamazaki's departure from Edo is noteworthy. It confirms that his position was never institutionalized in the way that the position of the Hayashi was and that he recognized that without his patron Hoshina he was no match for the Hayashi. So Hoshina's death left him with no choice but to leave Edo, even though he was able to retain his position in the broader Confucian field.

Yamaga Sōkō was pardoned and allowed to return to Edo on the eighth day of the eleventh month of 1675. With Hoshina’s death and Yamazaki’s return to Kyoto, no doubt his supporters were able to lobby successfully on his behalf. Even after his return, however, Yamaga was kept under surveillance and had to report to bakufu officials from time to time. His choice to work chiefly in military science, not Confucianism, is significant. It meant he steered clear of the kind of controversy that led to his exile. In contrast, Kumazawa Banzan’s difficulties with the Tokugawa authorities continued. A new work, Questions on the Great Learning (Daigaku wakumon), touched on political issues and led to his house arrest in Koga in 1686. He was still under house arrest when he died in 1691.

The varying fates of the three challengers reveal once again the importance of power to the success, and even survival, of Confucian schools. Seventeenth-century Confucians were truly, as Bourdieu put it, a "dominated class" serving those with real power—the shogun, his most powerful retainers, and domain-holding lords—and thus were utterly dependent on them. It was
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the support of those with real political power in Edo that enabled the challengers to compete with the Hayashi school for prestige and honor and to try to stake out their own positions. The "double logic" of the contemporary Confucian field demanded this. Given Tokugawa support for the Hayashi, only scholars with the backing of those who held the highest bakufu offices or domain- holding lords had any chance of breaking into the Confucian field, and even when that happened, there was no certainty of success, or even survival — as the case of Yamaga reveals. A challenger's loss of this support immediately undermined his position as happened with Kumazawa and Yamazaki.

Second, even those who prevailed — the Hayashi and Yamazaki — may have had power, but it was of the symbolic and cultural variety, which reminds us that mid-seventeenth-century Confucians and the broader field they comprised existed within contemporary power relations. Thus, the power of the established scholars as members of a "dominated class" was always subordinate to real political power. This did not make what power they had any less precious, and members of the Hayashi school and, for a time, Yamazaki Ansai jealously guarded what they had, as Nakae, Kumazawa, and Yamaga quickly discovered.69 In the end, only Yamazaki succeeded in his quest for greater symbolic power and cultural capital; only Yamazaki was able to create a position for himself in the Confucian field and to found a school that would survive.

The challengers' fortunes also confirm the special place given to Ch'eng-Chu philosophy — a third important point. To wit, both the Hayashi and Yamazaki Ansai prospered and Nakae Tōju, Kumzawa Banzan and Yamaga Sokō failed. As long as the Hayashi were primus inter pares, Ch'eng-Chu teachings were the philosophical doxa of the day: those who embraced these teachings obviously had the most symbolic and cultural capital, and those critical of these teachings, had less capital or none at all. Predictably, both the Hayashi and Yamazaki did everything they could to maintain their privileged positions, which meant suppressing their critics and preventing newcomers from carving out positions for themselves within the Confucian field.

Finally, this school relations analysis reveals that mid-seventeenth-century Japanese scholars were not solitary figures teaching and writing in isolation. Rather, they were quintessential urban intellectuals: they resided in major cities or castle towns, advised and lectured to the powerful, taught growing numbers of students, and even traveled widely. They also were acutely aware of each other, both those with established positions in the Confucian field and other challengers, and were familiar with their ideas.

The school relations approach has two other benefits for contemporary researchers. It allows us to analyze Confucian scholars' statements at a lower level of generality than has been customary. For example, rather than see Yamaga Sokō as simply opposing "Neo-Confucianism," we can see him responding to specific ideas espoused by a particular school or philosopher at one moment in time—for example, Hayashi Razan’s dualistic conception of human nature. In addition, the concept of school relations also helps us periodize more carefully. Using the configuration of competing Confucian schools as an index, I believe that the period from 1640 to 1730 can be further divided into three subperiods: 1640 to 1675, 1676 to 1709, and 1710 to 1730. Different challengers appear in each subperiod: Nakae, Kumazawa, Yamazaki, and Yamaga in the first; Itō Jinsai (1627-1705) and the disciples of both Yamazaki and Kinoshita Jun'an (1621-1698) in the second; and Ogyū Sorai (1666-1728) in the third.
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There were two forms of nativism during the Tokugawa period. The first was literary in orientation. Literary nativists undertook exhaustive and comprehensive studies of Japan’s classical literature, and both poetry and prose works were central to their scholarship. An array of luminary intellects mostly from the eighteenth century made their mark on this form of nativism, including Keichū (1640-1701) and Kamo no Mabuchi (1697-1769). The most famous member of this cohort was Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801). The second incarnation of nativism was radically different from its literary counterpart. These scholars, mostly of the nineteenth century, emphasized the profound role of Shinto in antiquity. The ancient classics had value not only as literary works, but had religious significance as well. Scholars of this religious form of nativism included Suzuki Shigetane (1812-1863) and Okuni Takamasa (1792-1871). The most famous member of this group was Hirata Atsutane (1776-1843).

Of these two strains, literary nativism developed first. Adherents of religious nativism, therefore, had to reconcile their interests with classical literature. Many literary scholars were unmoved by these efforts, and some began to develop notions of intellectual orthodoxy to deal with their piously devoted colleagues. As the first scholar of the religious tradition, Hirata Atsutane was a lightening rod for criticism from the ranks of the literary nativists, most of who tried to uphold the scholarship and teachings of Motoori Norinaga. The presence of Atsutane in the midst of literary scholars, generated a lasting antagonism that defined his career despite his claimed discipleship under Norinaga. As a resident of Edo, he continued his religious scholarship while his enemies, residing mostly in the Kansai area, denounced and refuted him. The confrontation between the two sides, however, began to lose its vitality by 1820. When Atsutane departed on a tour of Kansai in 1823, the debate exploded. Atsutane now had the opportunity to meet his detractors face to face.

His journey to Kyoto created a furious controversy among Norinaga’s disciples (Norinaga himself had died in 1801). The letters that they wrote to one another about his presence provide valuable insight into the precise nature of their reservations about his scholarship. At the same time, Atsutane recorded his own reflections that summarized how he saw himself and his scholarship within the context of their refutations. His journey, and the lingering debate that surrounded it, revealed the extent to which distinct intellectual positions had formed among the ranks of Norinaga’s disciples. Of particular importance were the two positions that had come to represent their ideological poles. One of these stood for Atsutane and his religious scholarship. The other, represented by a Kyoto academy called the Nudenoya, had a membership who held uncompromising literary views. The tensions between these two sides gave the ranks of
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1 Defining the precise meanings of either “nativism” or kokugaku is a difficult task. For this paper, I will treat them as equivalent and use the term “nativism.” The issue of terminology, however, is an important one and deserves a fuller treatment. Maruyama Masao understood this very well. He observed that scholars could approach kokugaku in either of two ways: historically, in which case the issue of identifying a founder would be important; or, categorically, in which case scholars could view kokugaku as a movement (Maruyama chose the latter). Maruyama Masao, Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan, translated by Mikiso Hane (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 143. I have argued elsewhere that Hirata Atsutane understood this issue as well. Atsutane was the first Tokugawa scholar to emphasize kokugaku as an historical phenomenon, and he tightened the intellectual rules of inclusion to exclude scholars who clearly belonged in kokugaku according to the categorical definition. My use of “nativism” will refer to the latter definition of kokugaku.
Norinaga disciples a kind of energy and dynamism that they lacked previously, and these conflicts transformed their collective intellectual and institutional identity.

The Suzunoya and the Norinaga School

Motoori Norinaga led discussions of the major works of classical literature at his home in Matsusaka. Over the course of the latter half of the eighteenth century, the number of students who attended these meetings grew; as was the custom during the Tokugawa period, he kept registers of his officially enrolled students (called monjin), and his nativist academy was born. Norinaga usually delivered his lectures from the second-floor study where he displayed his collection of bells; over time, his students referred to it as the Suzunoya or “hall of bells,” and the name came to signify his academy as well.

The study of ancient verse was, not surprisingly, a cornerstone of the Suzunoya’s curriculum. In this way, Norinaga followed the lead of his famous predecessor, Kamo no Mabuchi, who had devoted his career primarily to the study of the Man’yōshū. He parted ways with Mabuchi, however, in one significant way; whereas Mabuchi had privileged the Man’yōshū over all other classical works, Norinaga believed that other poetic anthologies had aesthetic merit as well. In addition, he asserted that classical prose works, such as histories and narrative tales, were important as well. He did not want scholars to limit themselves only to investigations of ancient verse.

If one studies antiquity and composes verse [in order to] understand the feelings of antiquity is trivial.3

He believed that the Japanese cultural essence, which he called the ancient Way, was lived and practiced by the ancients before the importation of foreign forms of knowledge, especially Buddhism and Confucianism. They left their wisdom regarding the ancient Way in the Japanese classics. An exclusive focus on verse, therefore, failed to reveal the ancient Way in its entirety.

Norinaga left one important teaching for his students to follow after his death. It was an admonition not to simply replicate his scholarship and his philological conclusions. He told his students not to be afraid to correct his conclusions if they were mistaken and based on flawed evidence. It would be far worse, he told them, if they continued to perpetuate his mistakes because a correct understanding of the ancient Way would suffer.

Students who will try to follow my teachings, after I am gone, should scrutinize my interpretations, pronounce my failings, and propagate [their own] good views. All that I have taught my students has been to explicate the Way. Thus, in their attempt to do this, they use [my teachings]. Revering me, without thinking of the Way, is not what I had in mind.4

Norinaga emphasized this lesson perhaps because he knew that his disciples would find it difficult to follow. It was an issue in his thoughts when he designated his daughter’s husband, Inagake Shigeo, as his legal heir; Shigeo took the

3Motoori Norinaga, Shibun yōryō, Motoori Norinaga shū (Shinchōsha, 1983), p. 223. [All places of publication in Japan are Tokyo, unless otherwise noted.]
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2For one of the few sources on the Suzunoya in English, see Richard Rubinger, Private Academies of Tokugawa Japan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), especially pp. 159-173.
name Motoori Ōhira (1756-1833). Ōhira became the steward of the Motoori family’s affairs upon Norinaga’s death. He resided in Matsusaka as his heir until 1809, when the daimyo of Kii-Wakayama, Tokugawa Harutomi (1771-1852), offered him a position as his physician and tutor. Norinaga had served as the teacher of Harutomi’s father from 1789 until his death. Whereas Norinaga had asked for permission to remain in Matsusaka because of his advanced age, Harutomi asked Ōhira to move to Wakayama.

At around the same time as Ōhira’s move to Wakayama, Norinaga’s biological son, Haruniwa (1763-1828), was thinking of reviving his father’s academy. Ōhira’s departure from Matsusaka only strengthened Haruniwa’s ambitions. Norinaga chose not to designate his own son as his legal heir because Haruniwa had lost his eyesight during the early 1790s. Thinking that Haruniwa would be unable to supervise the affairs of the family and serve the daimyo of Kii-Wakayama, he chose Ōhira instead. To make matters worse for Haruniwa, Norinaga informed his son that a career in scholarship was out of the question. Haruniwa, who had wanted to follow in his father’s footsteps, was told to study medicine for a career in Matsusaka. With his father’s death and Ōhira’s departure, he was finally able to pursue his dream of life as a scholar. Thus, by 1809, Norinaga’s disciples congregated into two major academies,both of which were affiliated with the old Suzunoya. This was the beginning of the Norinaga school.

Both Haruniwa and Ōhira readily accepted students into their academies. Ōhira had a distinct advantage over Haruniwa because of his official status in Wakayama; he enrolled more than twice as many disciples as his brother, roughly one-third of who were warriors from the surrounding domain. The combined enrollments of both scholars were nearly three times larger than Norinaga’s Suzunoya, greatly expanding the prestige and influence of his scholarship. Many of the most enthusiastic of their students lived outside of both Matsusaka and Wakayama; as a result, they were unable to attend meetings with any regularity. A few of the intrepid decided to establish their own academies, which they would link to Norinaga’s scholarship via either Haruniwa or Ōhira. One of the first of these affiliated academies was founded in Osaka by Fujii Takanao (1764-1840); a few years later, his colleague, Murata Harumon (1765-1836), opened a second academy in Osaka. In Nagoya, Suzuki Akira (1764-1837), a long-time student of Norinaga, began teaching nativism in his academy around 1833. Two other important academies opened in the two largest cities of Tokugawa Japan, Kyoto and Edo. The latter was Atsutane’s Ibukiya, which he founded in Edo around 1805 and affiliated with Haruniwa shortly thereafter. The other was Kido Chidate’s (1778-1845) Kyoto academy, the Nudenoya, which he established in 1816. Thus, Norinaga’s disciples created a network of academies that functioned as a social space for their cultural production. As we will see, this was the first stage in the formation of what Pierre Bourdieu calls “field” of cultural production.

As Norinaga’s legal successor, Ōhira was pleased with the growing number of adherents to his father’s scholarship. He understood that most of these disciples would be unable to fathom Norinaga’s scholarship in its entirety; he anticipated that the leaders of these affiliated academies would specialize in one specific aspect of his father’s scholarship. Ōhira himself focused his research on ancient kagura. Haruniwa and Suzuki Akira collaborated on linguistics. Fujii Takanao carried on Norinaga’s research into narrative tales. Atsutane emphasized ancient religious ceremonies and practices, while Murata Harumon and Kido Chidate spent their energies on the study of ancient verse. Ōhira observed that
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6Ibid., p. 46.
7Ibid., p. 52.
8Haga Noboru, Kokugaku no hitobito (Hyōronsha, 1975), pp. 274-275.
while nativism began with the study of verse, traces of the ancient Way were inherent in all of the textual sources from antiquity. As long as scholars pursued their research with the ancient Way in mind, their particular specialization was of little importance.

Current adherents of ancient learning [nativism] divide all matters into separate subjects. More and more of them consider the evidence and correct the meanings of words. This is a very good development. These are the fundamentals of learning...Among the students of the Old Man of the Suzunoya [Norinaga], [no one] focuses solely on verse. They broadly study Chinese writings, as well as Japanese writings, such as national histories, legal codes, and ritual texts.9

Ōhira’s expressed tolerance of scholarship that did not specifically focus on ancient verse was consistent with his father’s statement that studies of antiquity that relied only on poetic sources were too narrow. There were, however, two conditions for Ōhira. First, scholarship had to be based on the classical sources. Second, despite variations in specialization, all scholars dedicated to Norinaga’s teachings had to use a philological methodology.10

Although Chidate was one of Norinaga’s most active supporters in Kyoto, he believed that Norinaga was too liberal in his approach to antiquity. The key to the revelation of the ancient Way was the study of verse, especially those of the Man’yōshū.11 In this way, Chidate’s view of antiquity was similar to Mabuchi’s. After he had founded his Nudenoya, he instructed his students primarily in the study of ancient verse. Since he was aware of his ideological proximity to Mabuchi, he openly courted ties with scholars in Edo, known collectively as the Edo-ha, who traced their intellectual heritage back to Mabuchi. One of these scholars was Shimizu Hamaomi (1776-1824), a disciple of Murata Harumi (1746-1811), who himself was a former student of Mabuchi. Hamaomi visited the Nudenoya in 1820. As head of the school, Chidate discussed a whole range of nativist topics with him, most notably classical poetry and Mabuchi’s scholarship.12

Hamaomi agreed with him that despite Norinaga’s intellectual stature, he had neglected the centrality of ancient verse. Scholarship on the Man’yōshū was still the foundation of nativism.13

Unlike Chidate and Hamaomi, Atsutane applauded the intellectual tolerance of Norinaga and Ōhira. He dedicated his scholarship to revealing the ancient Way as it was manifested in Shinto. True nativism, he declared, was based on knowledge of the divine and the afterlife.

[The idea of] supporting pillars is (also) the basis [shizumari] of the Japanese spirit for those who practice ancient learning [nativism]...By adhering to [the idea of] of the destination of the soul, they establish these pillars...Seeking to fortify and solidify their Japanese spirit, they begin with knowledge of the destination of the soul.14

The ancients had lived their lives in harmony with their ancestors and the divine; they


10Ibid., 40.


understood the mysterious relationship between the world of the living and the hereafter. This wisdom was none other than the ancient Way itself. He flatly rejected the views of scholars who upheld the primacy of verse, which revealed little about the ancient Way. He was especially critical of the scholars of the Edo-ha, such as Hamaomi, whose research into classical verse was ultimately irrelevant. Although they saw themselves as the heirs to Mabuchi’s teachings, they had fundamentally misunderstood his interpretation of the ancient Way. Although Atsutane was himself a resident of Edo, he criticized the work of his Edo-ha neighbors as pointless, believing that his academy had found a more hospitable home in its association with the Norinaga school.

Chidate, who esteemed the scholarship of Mabuchi and his followers, took exception to Atsutane’s statement. He was also upset over criticisms Atsutane had made about Ōhira’s scholarship several years earlier. Chidate was fully aware of Atsutane’s growing self-confidence and claims to be a Norinaga disciple.

Even though Atsutane said that a scholar [gakusha] is a scholar, even in Kyoto, he [also] said that he had become a disciple of the Old Man [Norinaga] in a dream…I do not believe him. Moreover, to say that his scholarly methods meet with the approval of the Great Man [Norinaga], makes him a charlatan [literally, someone “with a lot of mountain air”].

Chidate himself had joined the Suzunoya in 1794; as a bookseller, he was an instrumental figure in Norinaga’s publication efforts in Kyoto. In Chidate’s mind, Atsutane was a fraud, but as long as he confined his activities to Edo, Chidate felt assured that the integrity of Norinaga’s true disciples would not be threatened.

Atsutane’s Tour of the Kansai

While the Norinaga school grew and expanded during the first two decades of the nineteenth century, Atsutane continued his eschatological research. In the Kanto area, his scholarship was gaining its own following, and the number of Atsutane’s disciples grew. As his scholarship became more popular, he came to the attention of Yoshida Shinto priests in Kyoto who had ties to the imperial court. Some had heard about his work on Shinto theology and were understandably intrigued by it. Members of the Yoshida contacted Atsutane via the Kan’eiji temple in Ueno, asking him to come to Kyoto and offer them copies of his books for presentation to the court. Atsutane was excited to hear the news. He had planned a trip to Kyoto seven years earlier in 1816 but pressing family and school obligations prevented him from making the journey. He presented the news to the Itakura family, for whom he worked as a physician, and they granted him an indefinite leave of absence. Accompanied by two of his students, he set out for Kyoto on 1823/7/22 and arrived there on 8/6.

Atsutane set for himself four goals that he wished to accomplish with this trip. The first was to establish some kind of relationship with both the Yoshida and with the imperial court. Second, he wanted to meet his nativist colleagues living in the Kansai, especially Osaka and Kyoto. Third, he wanted to make a pilgrimage to Norinaga’s grave in Yamamuro just outside of Matsusaka. Finally, he wanted to meet Ōhira and Haruniwa as well. This last goal would prove to be especially important in Atsutane’s efforts to garner forms of what Bourdieu calls “symbolic
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capital,” in order to signify his intellectual and spiritual standing in the Norinaga school.

The Imperial Court and the Yoshida House

Atsutane used his contacts at court to present his works to members of the Imperial family. He was fortunate enough to have connections to the current emperor, Ninkō (1800-1846), and his recently abdicated father, Kōkaku (1771-1840). He turned one set of his books over to his contact with the abdicated emperor, a court poet and scholar who had ties to Kōkaku via his daughter. The next day a letter from his contact arrived at his lodgings informing him that Kōkaku had received the books. Atsutane gave a second set of his works, all of which were hand copies, to two Yoshida Shinto priests, who submitted them to Ninkō. Shortly thereafter, he received word that the emperor had accepted his books. This time, however, the letter stated that Ninkō was deeply impressed with Atsutane’s scholarship. Since the emperor had voiced his approval, some Yoshida priests approached Atsutane with the idea of becoming their consultant in Shinto theology. Consequently, they formally enrolled as his students.

Although Atsutane never received an official endorsement from the imperial court, the fact that Kōkaku had accepted his works and that Ninkō had held them in some esteem was more than enough for him. Since Ninkō had indicated his approval, Atsutane was able to establish a scholarly relationship with the Yoshida house, the ritual specialists to the imperial court. Such patronage was vital to the national profile of his school and would help boost the ranks of his disciples. More importantly, his ties to the imperial court validated and even vindicated his scholarship, providing him with the kind of sanction that no other Norinaga disciple enjoyed.

This was especially poignant for Kido Chidate, laboring in relative obscurity and removed from contact with members of the imperial court. Atsutane’s ties to the Yoshida house and to the imperial court would later function as forms of symbolic capital in his effort to create a dominant position for himself within the emerging field of the Norinaga school.

Calling on the Nudenoya: Takanao and Nakatsune

Atsutane intended to meet the other Norinaga disciples in Kyoto, most of who were members of Chidate’s Nudenoya. When he called upon the academy for the first time, he was surprised to find that Fujii Takanao was there. Takanao was a resident of Osaka who was visiting the Nudenoya at the time. During his stay, he had taken ill, and when Atsutane saw him, he was still in recovery. Takanao was elated to see him. Two years earlier, he had visited Edo. Someone introduced him to Atsutane, as a fellow disciple of Norinaga. Atsutane insisted that he stay with his family as their house guest. Takanao thanked him for his graciousness, and he lodged at Atsutane’s home for more than three months. Before leaving Edo, he told Atsutane that he would repay his kindness should Atsutane ever find himself in the Kansai area. Now Takanao had his chance to reciprocate.

Another pleasant surprise awaited Atsutane on this first day at the Nudenoya. Another of Norinaga’s disciples, Hattori Nakatsune (1756-1824) of Ise, was also there. Like Takanao, Nakatsune was delighted to meet Atsutane for what was the first time. The two scholars were very familiar with one another’s work. About twenty years earlier, Nakatsune had come under attack by Ōhira and others for a treatise that he had written on a metaphorical interpretation of the Age of the Gods chapters of the Kojiki. Ōhira had argued that the Kojiki was a kind of native scripture that should only be interpreted literally.

When a scholar seeks to understand the details of the Age of the Gods, they interpret and distort [shīte] matters that
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have no classical references [literally, “transmissions,” *tsutae*] and are [therefore] unknown. One interprets and distorts the original meanings of words, so that the result invariably becomes a flawed explication. These are the teachings of our Old Man [Norinaga] that he left in his *Kojiki-den*. These are teachings that those who practice ancient learning [nativism] know well.\(^22\)

Nakatsune was stunned by Ōhira’s critique, since Norinaga himself had approved of his work and even included it in the published edition of his magnum opus, the *Kojiki-den*, in 1792. Ōhira waited until after Norinaga’s death to brush his refutation, accusing Nakatsune of dabbling too much in astronomical works of Dutch Learning.\(^23\) Atsutane was the only major scholar of the Norinaga school to defend Nakatsune against these attacks. He viewed Nakatsune’s metaphorical interpretation as an opportunity to justify his views of the afterlife which were difficult to document otherwise. He wrote no fewer than three defenses of Nakatsune. Nakatsune was grateful to him for his efforts, and hoped that he would someday have the chance to meet him.

Takanao was a good friend of Chidate, and he decided to use his influence to persuade the leader of the Nudenoya to allow Atsutane to deliver lectures at the academy.\(^24\) Most of the Norinaga disciples in Kansai had already known about Chidate’s reservations about Atsutane, but

\(^{22}\) Motoori Ōhira, *Sandaikō-ben*, unpublished manuscript, University of Tokyo Library, no pagination in the original.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., no pagination in the original.

\(^{24}\) The details of Atsutane’s activities in Kyoto during the late summer of 1823 can be found in a liturgical text written by Hattori Nakatsune in 1824. See *Minoda Suigetsu Hattori Nakatsune-ā norito*, in *Kiyosōhansho*, *Shinshū Hirata Atsutane zenshū*, supplemental vol. 5 (Meichō Shuppan, 1980), pp. 454-472.

Takanao thought that Chidate would lay aside his personal feelings and give Atsutane the chance to speak. He was mistaken. Chidate pointed out that his school was not open to the public, in a comment that showed how he still did not recognize Atsutane’s membership in the Norinaga school. He further explained that outside of Haruniwa, Ōhira, and a handful of daimyo, no one was allowed to attend meetings at the Nudenoya.\(^25\) Takanao, believing that finding a place for Atsutane to deliver some lectures was the best way to repay him, approached two other scholars of the Nudenoya and asked for their help; both agreed to lend whatever assistance they could. A few days later, however, both withdrew their offer because of pressure from Chidate. Atsutane, therefore, never was able to deliver any lectures in Kyoto.

In a letter that Chidate wrote to Ōhira soon after this incident, he explained his side of the story. He had two basic criticisms of Atsutane. First, Atsutane neglected the study of ancient verse. In fact, he noted, Atsutane’s scholarship was hardly literary at all, which was the reason why he never recognized Atsutane as a fellow disciple of Norinaga, and why he saw no reason to allow Atsutane to deliver lectures at the Nudenoya.

As for meeting him, since he has no aesthetic refinement [*miyabi*], he has nothing to say that any of us should hear. As for his ancient learning, we have the works of our previous teacher [Norinaga]. We also have Hirata’s [sic] views in his *Koshichō* and other works. If we peruse them, we can understand what he means.\(^26\)

His second criticism had to do with Atsutane’s letter of admission to Haruniwa’s


academy in 1806. By 1823, it was common knowledge among scholars of the Norinaga school that Atsutane claimed to be a direct disciple of Norinaga because of a dream that he had had. In this dream, Norinaga had supposedly accepted Atsutane as one of his disciples. Atsutane related the details of his dream to Haruniwa in his letter of admission. Haruniwa accepted Atsutane and noted how the dream had truly demonstrated Atsutane’s commitment to the ancient Way: “Recently, Hirata Atsutane has deeply concentrated on the Way. He has studied the texts of our Old Man [Norinaga] with profound devotion.”

Atsutane’s dream was an important aspect of his membership credentials in the Norinaga school in two ways. His claim of discipleship via a dream sounded plausible to those who were inclined to accept it because of similar accounts in other cultural and religious traditions, such as Zen. In addition, the implication of the dream was that Norinaga’s spirit had appeared to Atsutane, Norinaga having died four years earlier. This idea both bolstered Atsutane’s views of a spiritual realm in the hereafter and was, in turn, reinforced by them. At the very least, Atsutane appeared to be consistent.

Chidate reserved his sharpest criticisms of Atsutane for the dream. He expressed his utter amazement that other Norinaga disciples could possibly take it or Atsutane seriously. He sarcastically observed that if Norinaga appeared in Atsutane’s dream and accepted him as his disciple, then he could easily claim that Norinaga had appeared in his dream and disavowed Atsutane. Although Chidate could do nothing about his presence in Kyoto, he tried very hard to persuade his students to ignore him. Chidate himself met Atsutane only once, and their meeting was very brief.

Hattori Nakatsune was also interested in finding a suitable venue for Atsutane to lecture. He, however, had an additional, more profound way to express his gratitude to Atsutane for coming to his defense. In a private meeting with him, Nakatsune told him about a conversation that he had had with Norinaga just months before he died. On this occasion, he had walked Norinaga home after a moon-viewing party held by Ōhira in Matsusaka. During their stroll, the two talked about the state of the Suzunoya. Norinaga was happy that his scholarship had become so popular (he had more than four hundred enrolled students by then). He was disappointed, however, that of his legion of disciples, no one devoted their energies to the study of the ancient Way, preferring literary scholarship instead. As Nakatsune observed,

[I told Norinaga that I] should have some time this autumn to devote to the Way and learn a little about the composition of poetry and prose. The Great Man [Norinaga] replied, ‘No, you should not engage in the composition of poetry and prose! [Unfortunately,] there are those who esteem that kind of learning. Thus, there is absolutely no one who pursues ancient learning in the main. Even if I lament what is a lamentable situation, it seems that this will continue into the future. You, [however], have ceased to engage in the composition of poetry and prose, and you have concentrated [instead] on the Way of the Gods.’

Thus, the only exception to the general practice was Nakatsune, as demonstrated in his
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metaphorical interpretation of the *Kojiki*. Nakatsune told Atsutane that he had kept this conversation a secret for more than twenty years. The time had come to tell Atsutane because he, too, had demonstrated his devotion to the ancient Way by composing his defenses of Nakatsune’s work. Nakatsune was grateful for the opportunity to relate the secret to Atsutane since he felt that his own death was imminent. Nakatsune promised him that he would put the details of the secret in writing, which Atsutane received after he returned to Edo in the eleventh month of that year; Nakatsune died less than four months later, leaving Atsutane as the only “true” Norinaga disciple.

The Return Journey: Haruniwa and Ōhira

After a stay of more than two and a half months in Kyoto, Atsutane departed for Osaka on 10/20. Although it is not clear, he most likely intended to visit the two academies located there; one of these was run by another of his avowed critics, Murata Harumon. He stayed in Osaka for only one night, however, and he never recorded any visitation to either of these academies. Atsutane may have simply changed his mind after arriving in Osaka, after his rather cool reception in Kyoto. He and his party pressed on, and they reached Wakayama by the evening of the following day.

He called on Ōhira late the next day. This was the first meeting between the two. Ōhira was not taken completely off-guard, however, since Nakatsune had insisted on writing ahead to tell him of Atsutane’s impending visit. Atsutane wanted to meet Ōhira in order to clear the air of any lingering misunderstandings in the wake of their previous disagreements, one of which was over the merits of Nakatsune’s scholarship. Ōhira was impressed with Atsutane’s serious yet gentle demeanor; he was especially moved by Atsutane’s humility. Ōhira agreed that it was time to finally end their feud. As a token of his respect for Atsutane, he gave him two of Norinaga’s prized possessions: the first was a portrait of Norinaga painted by a disciple at the end of the eighteenth century; the second was a wooden *shaku* (scepter) personally made by Norinaga himself. The latter gift was especially important symbolically to Atsutane, since it was one of three such objects; each of the other two were in the possession of Ōhira and Haruniwa. Atsutane was overcome with joy by this second gift. It seemed like an appropriate gift to him, however, when considering (1) his newly won imperial favor and (2) the revelation of Nakatsune’s secret. All three of these confirmed his self-perception that he was the most important of all of the scholars of the Norinaga school. These were also forms of symbolic capital that not only justified Atsutane’s membership credentials in the Norinaga school (which Chidate opposed), but also, more importantly, helped to legitimate the perception of his dominant position within the school.

Two days later, Atsutane and his companions set out for Matsusaka, finally arriving on 11/1. He journeyed there in order to pay his respects at Norinaga’s grave. He initially called on Haruniwa to inform him of his intentions and to get directions to the gravesite. This was his first meeting with Haruniwa, and the conversation between the two was lively and amiable. Before departing, Haruniwa gave him a set of brushes used by Norinaga in the composition of his greatest works. Realizing the significance of this gift, Atsutane wept.

Conclusion

Atsutane’s only visit to the Kansai marked the beginning of a new stage in his scholarly life. The imperial favor that he had received, along with the patronage of the Yoshida house, significantly raised the profile of his school. It gave his scholarship a form of distinction that other disciples, his critics especially, did not have. His meetings with other disciples in Kyoto demonstrated that his scholarship and
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33Watanabe (1942), p. 84.

membership in the Norinaga school were a reality that they could not ignore. Atsutane needed to meet his rivals and critics in order to drive this point home. The sociologist, Randall Collins, in his study of global intellectual history, asserts that intellectual life “hinges on face-to-face situations,” since these meetings elicit such emotional responses. Although Atsutane’s most ardent foes experienced no change of heart, his personality was instrumental in winning at least one of his critics, Motoori Ōhira, over to his side.

The various forms of symbolic capital that Atsutane either generated or received, such as Nakatsune’s revelation and the gifts from Ōhira and Haruniwa, were also important results of his journey. They functioned as signs of legitimation and official sanction for his scholarship. They helped to confirm that his intellectual outlook, especially as it pertained to literature, was correct, and that the literary inclinations of his critics were misguided. Literary studies, especially of ancient verse, were insufficient for the investigation of the ancient Way. Thus, he felt justified in moving his own scholarship even further away from the ancient sources. Eventually, he abandoned textualism entirely, preferring to use the techniques of evidential scholarship to conduct field research on the supernatural.

At the same time, Kido Chidate, perhaps his most implacable enemy, only strengthened his resolve to preserve poetic studies as the foundation of the Norinaga school in the aftermath of Atsutane’s visit. Atsutane and Chidate, as well as their students and supporters, all claimed to uphold the true nature of Norinaga’s scholarship. The two, therefore, represented polar oppositions within the Norinaga school. These polarities were the culmination of a process that had begun more than a decade earlier, in a debate over the merits of Nakatsune’s scholarship. Although Ōhira and others opposed Nakatsune, Atsutane was not the central focus of the debate, and Chidate was not involved in any way. The irreconcilable differences between the scholarship of Atsutane and Chidate, however, fundamentally transformed the social structure of the school. In the words of Bourdieu, the school had become an autonomous field of cultural production. Opposing poles of this kind give a field a kind of dynamism and energy that focuses the attention of its members inward. Issues of orthodoxy and legitimacy dominate their attention, while matters originating outside of the field become less prominent.

It is clear that the field-effect which results from the opposition between the two schools, and is intensified by the process of institutionalization that is needed to constitute a fully-fledged literary group, i.e., an instrument for accumulating and concentrating symbolic capital...tends to consecrate and underscore the critical differences.

Both Atsutane and Chidate were compelled to deal with these issues, but they did so in divergent ways. Chidate chose to affirm what he thought was the strongest ideological position within the Norinaga school, since he thought that the majority of disciples felt the same way as he about classical poetry. As Atsutane’s experiences in Kyoto clearly demonstrated, he did not have the same kind of support in the school. The only way that he could defend his position within the school was to transform it into something else by claiming to be its leading scholar. The forms of capital that he acquired were critical in this effort. The confrontation between Atsutane and Chidate can best be described by Collins, in his analysis of intellectual conflict in general:

Each intellectual faces a strategic choice. One can go all out, try to be king of the
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mountain, which means trying to be alone or nearly alone at the center of one of the major intellectual positions. Or one might cut one’s losses and aim for a more modest position: as loyal follower of some successful position. 38

In 1834, as part of Atsutane’s effort “to be king of the mountain,” he published an account of his tour of the Kansai which he entitled the Kiyosōhansho (“Writings of Both Praise and Condemnation”). Eleven years after his journey, he triumphantly declared victory over his opponents.
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Remodeling the Reizei House: The State of the Poetic Field in Eighteenth Century Japan

Miyabe Yoshihimasa 宮部義正 (1729-1792), also known variously as Chūhachirō, Genpachi, and so on, was a samurai who served as retainer in the Takasaki Han 高崎藩 (of Kōzuke Province 上野 — modern Gunma ken), which in his time was governed by a branch of the Ōkōchi clan. If he is remembered at all now, however, it is for his work in the world of waka 和歌, specifically for his service as tutor in poetry to the shogun, for his own collections of poetry, and for a kikigaki 聞書 he wrote in the late 1770s. Unpretentiously titled Yoshimasa kikigaki 義正聞書, the latter work records the substance of conversations he had over the years with his noble teacher, Reizei Tamemura 冷泉為村 (1712-1774).¹

To some it may come as a surprise that a samurai in shogunal service during the eighteenth century, a samurai who spent most of his life in Edo or in his own domain, should have studied under a member of the ancient Reizei house. Indeed, it may come as a shock for many to learn that the Reizei house still existed as an active poetic house during an era we associate more readily with kokugaku 国学 poets such as Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1697-1769) and Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 (1730-1801). The fact is, however, that during the time of Reizei Tamemura and his son Tameyasu 為泰 (1735-1816), the Reizei house was as prosperous as it ever had been in the past or ever would be again. One reason for this had less to do with the efforts of the house itself than with the labors of a string of very “literary” emperors — particularly Go-Mizuno’o 後水尾 (1596-1680), Reigen 零元 (1654-1732), and Sakuramachi 桜町 (1720-1750)—who sponsored a host of poetic activities; but one cannot discount the efforts of Tamemura and his immediate predecessors to put the house on a sound footing after a period of relative decline in its fortunes. Whatever the reasons, Tamemura is said to have had 3,000 disciples, which must have meant that his house on Imadegawa Avenue in Kyōto was the site of a veritable cottage industry. For the role of the head of the Reizei house was not simply to produce poetry, or critical writings, or even teachings in any general sense, but explicitly to train disciples in poetic composition, which meant, first of all, correcting their work—acting essentially the role of tenja 点者 (“marker”) in the world of haikai 俳諧. One can only imagine what sort of effort was entailed in maintaining an active correspondence with 1,000 students, let alone 3,000.²

Exactly how or when Miyabe Yoshimasa became a disciple of the Reizei house is not clear. But we do know that he traveled to Kyōto often; and we also know that Tamemura visited Edo frequently, specifically to meet with his many disciples in the East Country, who numbered in the hundreds. Over the years, Yoshimasa recorded responses to some of the questions he asked his teacher, at least to those he was allowed to commit to written form. Sometime between 1764 and 1772, the first “edition” of Yoshimasa’s notes was lost in a fire; thereafter he recorded what he could from memory. The first of two volumes was produced in or around 1775, the next a few years later.³

The format of Yoshimasa kikigaki seems familiar to any student of medieval Japanese poetry and poetic culture. Like many similar medieval works, it is in the mondō form, in which a master responds to questions posed by a disciple. The content of Tamemura’s answers, on the other hand, comes somewhat as a surprise. For Tamemura’s declarations on poetic style, aesthetic ideals, and even poetic history, differ

¹ Text available in Kinsei kagaku shūsei 近世歌学集成, vol. 2 (Meiji Shoin, 1997).


³ Kinsei kagaku shūsei, volume 2, pp. 989-990.
decidedly from the traditions of the Reizei house as established in the late fourteenth century. For instance, in response to a question concerning the well-known friction between the Reizei house and the Nijō house, both of which descended from Fujiwara Teika, Tamemura has this to say:

Question: What was the cause of disharmony between Tameuji 為氏 and Tamesuke 為相?

Answer: One feels bad about having to say this, but it appears that Tameie 為家 and Tameuji were not on good terms, and Tameie’s bequest therefore came to this house. Homes, books, and many estate rights were deeded to Tamesuke. For that reason, after Tameie’s death, the nun Abutsu 阿仏 went down to the East Country to plead her case concerning the estate rights, and it appears that that is why the relations between the brothers became strained. One also hears that at that time, Tameuji was also not getting along with his young brothers Tamenori 為教 and Tamekane 為兼, who were very kind to Tamesuke. Of course, among Tamesuke’s siblings by the same mother were Tamemori 為守, later called Kyōgetsubō 暁月房, and Dharma Eye Genshō 源承, and two or three girls. And then there were a number of other siblings of Tameuji, by the same mother. Now the lineage of Tameuji has died out; only the descendants of Tamesuke remain. That is why even those of Tameuji’s lineage come here for instruction.4

Anyone who knows the history of the Mikohidari 御子左 house knows that indeed the original arguments the led to the division of the house into the Nijō 二条, Kyōgoku 京極, and Reizei sub-lineages were in fact over inheritance — and not only the inheritance of shōen deeds but also books and other treasures, as Tamemura says. Yet it is also true that later on disputes arose between the two over stylistic and philosophical issues that are hard to dismiss as trivial. Even when a question by Yoshimasa allows him a clear opportunity to declare those differences, however, Tamemura demurs. In fact, in one passage, he nearly goes so far as to deny any connection of Reizei traditions to the poems of the Gyokuyōshū 玉葉集 (“The Collection of Jeweled Leaves,” 1313) and the Fūgashū 風雅集 (“Collection of Elegance,” 1347) — the imperial anthologies of the so-called Kyōgoku school that were by all accounts instrumental in defining Reizei traditions:

Question: Is it true that Tamesuke and Tamehide were actually involved as compilers at time of Gyokuyōshū and Fūgashū?

Answer: This is an unfortunate contention, a contention that comes from the later disciples of the Nijō house, who wish to speak ill of the Reizei. To be sure, Tamekane and Tamesuke were on very good terms, and Tamehide was called upon during the two reigns of Fushimi 伏見 — that is how the idea came to be. But Tamekane’s style was one style, while the style of Tamesuke and Tamehide 為秀 were each different. The notion that the Mikohidari [Tameyō 為世], Bishamondō 毘沙門堂 [Tamekan], and Fujigayatsu 藤が谷 [Tamesuke] divided up into three separate styles is something the later disciples argue about. However, the late Major Counselor [Tamehisa 為久] wrote a poem:

All of one thread
are the teachings of the way of Many Islands.
Who was it that strayed away

4 Yoshimasa kikigaki, section 83 (p. 700).
and began the division? 5

shikishima no / michi no oshie wa /
hitosuji o / ta ga mayoi yori / wakare
someken

One can quibble here about the ambiguity of some of these lines, which do seem to admit the existence of ideological differences between the branches of the house. However, the position Tamemura is staking out is clearly one that puts distance between his own position and that of the long-defunct Kyōgoku House, de-emphasizing a historical reality that for some reason makes him uncomfortable. Even when he admits some differences, as in the following passage, it is within the context of a larger commonality.

Question: Are they any differences in the way the Nijō House and the Reizei House compose poems?

Answer: The Nijō House, the Reizei House — all descend from Tameie, and their teachings are not different. Long ago, however, there was disharmony, and so people think that their teachings were different. In recent times, all, including this house, have sought imperial recognition, and there is no difference between the Nijō and the Reizei in the proper way of composition (shōfū 正風). It is just that the various tenets of the houses have continued down from ancient times, and in this the Reizei and the Asukai 飛鳥井, for instance, are indeed different.6

The question, of course, is, Why would Tamemura want to emphasize commonalities rather than differences? The historical record makes it clear that in earlier times competition between the various branches for preference at court had been constant and fierce, regardless of how much Tamemura wants to downplay it.

Japanese scholars who deal with Edo period waka have at least two answers to the question. The first points to the fact that Tamemura and his immediate forebears were instructed by teachers of the Nijō school their youth, arguing that he naturally followed the example of his own masters; the second tries to account for Tamemura’s posture by reference to his “innate” proclivities as an artist.

The first of these contentions is accurate as far as it goes. Even within the pages of the kikigaki itself Tamemura gives homage to the members of the Nijō school who had lent the Reizei a hand in difficult times:

Question: It is said that Tametsuna 為綱 was a disciple of [Nakano’in] Michimochi 通茂—but is that true?

Answer: Because Tametsuna lost [his father] Tamekiyo 為清 at a young age, Tametsuna’s mother asked Michimochi’s help, and he provided assistance and trained him as a poet. Later . . . the house was returned to prominence, all thanks to Michimochi.7

As this passage indicates, Tamemura’s grandfather, Tametsuna (1664-1722), was in fact tutored by Nijō adherents, whose tendency to dismiss the Kyōgoku style as unorthodox (ifū 異風) is well documented; Tamemura himself is known to have studied under the Nijō poet Karasumaru Mitsuhide 烏丸光栄 (1689-1748) in his youth and to have maintained friendly relationships with those families all of his life.

But this explanation leaves unanswered two questions, namely: Why, if there was nothing distinct in its traditions to preserve, Tamemura would want to maintain his own house at all? And why does his own poetry and that of his disciples demonstrably carry on the stylistic traditions of Tamesuke, Tamehide, and, even

5 Yoshimasa kikigaki, section 182, p. 717.

6 Yoshimasa kikigaki, section 51, p. 691.

7 Yoshimasa kikigaki, section 82, pp. 699-700.
This latter fact also challenges the validity of the second response above — that Tamemura’s position was simply dictated by his personal stylistic preferences. Why, then, if he still declares his identity as a descendant of the Reizei lineage and still continues to compose poetry that is recognizably Reizei in style, should Tamemura want to gloss over these differences and enunciate an affiliation with his erstwhile opponents in the Nijō line?

I suggest that there is another way to answer to this question, which is, simply put, to consider more carefully the position of the Reizei house (and also the houses that had inherited the Nijō traditions) in the larger literary world of the seventeenth century, a world that was obviously different from the one that same house had occupied three hundred years before. Here the writings of Pierre Bourdieu can be useful, because those writings have the good sense to consider literary works and practices not only as the products of individual artists, genres, or even traditions but rather as products of agents operating within socio-economic and discursive constraints beyond the control of any individual — to, in his own words, replace “numberless individual histories” with “families of intragenerational trajectories at the core of the field of cultural production.” Bourdieu’s concepts of the literary field, of various kinds of extra-financial capital, and of position-taking within the field on the basis of those kinds of capital are particularly valuable in understanding the position of the Reizei House in Tamemura’s day. To quote another relevant passage: Bourdieu contends that

“every position . . . depends for its very existence, and for the determinations it imposes on its occupants, on the other positions constituting the field; and that the structure of the field, i.e., the space of positions, is nothing other than the structure of the distribution of the capital of specific properties which governs success in the field and the winning of the external or specific profits (such as literary prestige) which are at stake in the field.”

If this passage sounds a little abstract when quoted out of context, its reverberations become clear when applied to the case of the Reizei house in the 1700s. As any scholar of Edo literary history knows, the literary field at the time was undergoing rapid change, owing to factors such as increased commercial activity, a general trend toward urbanization, population growth and heightened mobility, rising literacy rates, and so on. One immediate sign of this is the emergence of new genres such as the ukiyo zōshi 浮世草子, kibyōshi 黄表紙, jōruri 浄瑠璃, and kabuki 歌舞伎, etc., that for the first time exploited the possibilities of a burgeoning popular market. But big changes were taking place in more traditional genres as well, as an analysis of the fortunes of the Reizei House makes clear. For certainly since the founding of the house in the 1300s, the socio-political situation had changed in ways that on the surface seemed detrimental to the future of the house; likewise, the market for their talents had changed, too.

There can be no doubt, in other words, that the need of kuge 公家 houses to protect their interests against forces inimical to them was so overwhelming that the choice to unite against outside competition was only rational. To be a kuge poet simply did not mean the same thing as it had in the 1200s, or even the 1500s. To begin with, the noble houses had clearly come down in the world economically, being reduced to small stipends provided by the Tokugawa.

---

8 On the specific features of Tamemura’s style, see Kubota, “Dōjō waka no dentō to bunka’en 堂上和歌の伝統と文化苑,” 1993.


Similarly, they were encouraged by law to focus their interests and activities to the cultural realm. Until the beginning of the Edo period, competition was basically among various kuge families — the various branches of the Mikohidari house, to begin with; and later the Asukai, the Sanjōishi 三条西, and the Nakano’in 中院 houses, all of whom had pedigrees at least as illustrious as that of the Reizei and all of whom sought preference in the imperial court and in the chambers of military leaders. In the mid-Edo period, on the other hand, the old courtly houses faced competition from the “outside,” so to speak, both in the literary field generally and in the field of uta specifically. I refer here specifically to the kokugaku poets and other jige 地下 (“commoner”) poets, who, for reasons also related to their positions, were moving toward a more public discourse and away from the particular rule of exclusivity that perforce dominated dōjō 堂上 (“aristocratic”) poetry and poetics.

The animosity of the “outsider” poets toward the old houses is apparent in any number of documents. One example is the famous Kokka hachiron 国家八論 (“Eight Treatises on National Poetry”) of 1742 in which Kada no Arimaro 荷田在満 (1706-1751) specifically attacks the kanka 官家 (“houses of court officials”) for their tendency to define themselves as unimpeachable authorities, for their practice of disallowing anything but their own highly rarefied vocabulary into poetic discourse, for unbending adherence to old forms of etiquette, etc. — in other words, for perpetuating an attitude toward Japanese poetry that can only be characterized as proprietary.

Looking at their poems, one sees that they are in a wispy style, as lacking in power as willow fronds. What fun can there be in composing such poems?

This may be my own stubbornness talking, but I think with a scribe to write for me I could produce several hundred such poems in quick order. Yet those who do nothing but turn out such bland efforts, when confronted with a poem of real power (chikara aru uta 力ある歌), say, “That’s in the commoner style (jigefū 地下風); it’s not a poem.”

One can’t help but comment here upon how well this quote illustrates Bourdieu’s contention that what is ultimately at stake in struggles in the literary field is the authority to decide what “counts” as literature and who counts as a writer — what he calls “the monopoly of the power of consecration of producers and products.” What is even more remarkable about Arimaro’s statement when taken in its own historical context, however, is that what he says about dōjō poets is what those poets would probably say about themselves, although perhaps in more delicate language. They did claim exclusive knowledge, special privileges, and so on — not publicly, of course, for that would have been to disobey the first law of privilege by entering into a debate with social inferiors. But in statements to students they sometimes spoke with great candor. As Tamemura’s noble contemporary Mushanokōji Sanetake 武者小路実岳 (1721-1760) unblushingly puts the matter, “Those born into the poetic houses have a natural excellence.” Certainly their modes of practice and general aloofness amount to an admission of the accuracy of the kokugaku critique.

The same things is true in the case of the

---

11 The first set of regulations, titled kuge shohatto 公家諸法度, appeared in 1615. Additions were made to it later.


14 Sanetake-kyō kuden no ki 実岳卿口伝の記 (section 43, p. 633), in volume 2 of Kinsei kagaku shūsei.
well-known attack on the aristocratic houses by the Confucian scholar Dazai Shundai 太宰春台 (1680-1747) in his Dokugo 独語 (“Talking to Myself,” 1747). Here again, there are statements Tamemura would not readily consent to, such as Shundai’s claim that “the poetry of our nation has been in decline ever since the time of Teika 定家,”15 or that it was lamentable how anyone who wants to get a little learning “unfailingly takes someone from one of the famed houses (meika 名家) as a teacher.”16 Judging from both practice and statements made to students, however, the heir of the Reizei house would have to agree with his critic’s characterization of the dōjō tradition as being limited to composition on conventional topics (dai 题).17 Virtually all poems written by the Reizei (or for that matter their Nijō counterparts) were indeed written on dai; indeed, the traditions simply did not allow the contemplation of poetic composition on any other terms.

In this sense, the position of Tamemura may be characterized as reactionary, a kind of retrenchment motivated by a desire to avoid, as Bourdieu says, being “pushed in the status of outmoded or of classic works.”18 But saying that doesn’t get one very far in understanding the historical particularities of Reizei position-taking at the time. Another, more positive way to look at the issue is to consider the capital or resources the Reizei House had at its disposal in the constant struggle that is the field. In this regard, their distinction, their difference from their opponents on the outside is as clear as is their natural affinity for other poetic houses at court.

The first resource of the Reizei House was of course noble lineage itself, a form of capital that was both social and symbolic. As any number of scholars have recently shown, proximity to the emperor still meant a great deal in Edo period Japan, and the Reizei could claim a proximity going back to the Heian period. Even the shogunate, which was careful to restrict the power of the court, economic and otherwise, sought identification with noble families through intermarriage and acts of patronage. In this sense the Reizei House, along with their contemporaries in the Asukai and Nakano’in lineages, could claim a kind of symbolic power — with both social and economic ramifications — that was the envy even of other court families. Specifically, the Reizei House could document unbroken descent from Fujiwara no Michinaga 藤原の道長 (966-1027) and the northern branch of the Fujiwara that had dominated politics the Heian period, the golden age in the narrative of Japanese cultural history. Of even more importance in the literary field was their descent from Fujiwara no Shunzei 藤原の俊成 (1114-1204), his son Teika (1162-1241), and the latter’s son Tameie (1198-1275) both seminal figures in the history of Japanese poetry and poetics. In the status-conscious society of the Edo period, such connections constituted a position of almost unassailable authority — at least within certain social strata. Certainly it was for this reason, among others, that men such as Miyabe no Yoshimasa sought out contact with Tamemura, or for that matter with other heads of old aristocratic lineages.

Another of the resources of the house was more tangible: From their illustrious forebears the Reizei had inherited a library, called the obunko 御文庫, housed in its own quarters on the family lot in Kyōto. Within were antiques, paintings, furnishings, memorabilia, and texts in the hands of the masters of old — and not just any texts, but texts treated as holy, such as the sandaishū 三代集 (the first three imperial anthologies), in Teika’s own hand, no less. Needless to say, access to these resources had to be limited if they were to retain their value: to remain sacred, they had to be secret. To bona fide disciples, however, they could occasionally be displayed. Thus when Yoshimasa asks his teacher how many volumes of Teika’s famous
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16 Dokugo, p. 318.
17 Dokugo, p. 322.
18 Bourdieu, The Field of Cultural Production, p. 32.
diary, Meigetsuki 名月記, are contained in the house collection, Tamemura replies with an answer that must have excited his student considerably:

Answer: The journal was kept by Lord Teika from his sixteenth year until his old age. It is a national treasure, and a mirror to this house. More than sixty fascicles in Teika’s own hand have been passed down to this house. Soon I will show them to you.19

When Tamemura fulfilled his promise Yoshimasa doesn’t say, but one can only imagine the excitement of anyone interested in traditional poetry when confronted with a text in Teika’s own hand — and other texts by Shunzei, Tameie, and others, as well as artefacts (section 76) and even local gravesites (sections 39-47), which were also shown by Tamemura to his disciple from Edo. To be honored in this way meant a kind of prestige that enhanced Yoshimasa’s own position in the field while at the same time reaffirming his dependence on the Reizei house. This was common practice. This is why the family continued to collect material for the library throughout the Edo period — again not just any material, but specifically sacred materials, such as kaishi 側紙 (“pocket paper”; square sheets of paper upon which poems were recorded) and other documents written by members of the imperial family. To this day, many of the texts and other materials (including furniture, art works and articles of clothing with courtly connections that enhance their value, etc.) remain locked up in the library, unavailable even to scholars and thus maintaining the mystique that is part and parcel of their status as symbolic as well as “informational” capital.

A third kind of capital held in abundance by the Reizei came in the form of teachings. These included secret teachings (kuden 口伝) and historical facts primarily of symbolic value that Tamemura could not allow Yoshimasa to record. ("I’m afraid I cannot talk with you about such things," Yoshimasa reports him as saying about the secret teachings on Kokinshū 古今集, for instance.)20 But there were other instructions that he could and did share — on composition and a host of practices involving everything from the proper organization of specific poetic events such as memorial services or various festivals to how to record names on pocket paper, or kaishi (section 29 of Yoshimasa’s kikigaki), the proper posture when sitting before a desk (section 198), even how to properly wrap a tanzaku 短冊 ("poem strip") around a flowering branch (section 58). At court, poetic composition was a ritual activity that demanded a knowledge of etiquette that only families like the Reizei and their cohorts in the Nijō tradition possessed — etiquette that students sought out as a way to legitimize their own practice. Indeed, I think it is useful to think of the courtly houses as having a kind of licensing authority over certain practices. To function at poetic meetings, as scribe, as lector, as chooser of dai, in a highly stratified society demanded knowledge that the Reizei had in abundance, knowledge with the imprimatur of centuries of precedent. In this sense the noble houses could claim to possess both practical teachings and what Bourdieu calls “consecratory” authority.21

Finally, I think it should also be emphasized that affiliation with the Reizei allowed students access to a social network that was itself of considerable value in itself. As I have argued elsewhere about Bashō and haikai, patronage was still of great importance, economically and politically, in the early to mid-Edo periods. Bashō’s support came directly from patrons and not from publishing, putting him in contrast to workers in new genres such as Saikaku and gesaku 戯作 writers.22 The same

19 Yoshimasa kikigaki, section 16, p. 651.
20 Yoshimasa kikigaki, section 52., p. 691.
21 Bourdieu, The Field of Cultural Production, pp. 121-125.
was still true in the world of *uta*, at least as the dominant faction practiced it: connections were everything. The Reizei knew this, and pursued relationships with the political elite for that reason. In particular, this meant the shogunal house and its attendants, among the ranks of which Tamemura was able to gain numerous disciples — including even the most prominent of figures, such as Tanuma Okitsugu 田沼意次 (1719-1788), and Okun 阿薫 (1685-1752, wife of the shogun Ienobu 家宣 (1633-1712) and the mother of the shogun Ietsugu 家継 (1709-1716). Any disciple who kept his dues paid, so to speak, had some access to other disciples, who were usually people of privilege and whose acquaintance could be turned to good use.23 Thus the network offered what Bourdieu calls a kind of “reinforcement” of the field by “external forces” of economic, social, and sometimes even direct political significance.24

This brief overview of the capital available to the Reizei House reveals many things. First, as Bourdieu would claim, to a great extent the resources of the house dictated their position-taking, or at least the nature of the position open to them, as well as the shape of their practices. Not surprisingly, for instance, the Reizei house insisted on an approach to teaching that required students to become paying disciples of a master, usually from the ranks of the nobility or the elite samurai class, usually the head of the house or a licensed surrogate who also owed fealty to the house that was specifically declared by oath. To teach in any way that allowed for broader dissemination of their esoteric knowledge would have threatened the future viability of the house: what they were offering was esoteric knowledge and practices, not a rational “method” per se. For the same reason, the house favored an approach to poetic composition that required a knowledge of the court tradition, i.e., of the old poems recorded in books in the library and of *dai* (set topics) on which those poems had all been written and also of the proper conduct of social gatherings at which poems were produced. And finally, in a general way, it is also obvious that in Tamemura’s time the house was still actively investing in the maintenance of its mystique. Tamemura not only rebuilt the house on Imadegawa; he collected more manuscripts and other objects of courtly affiliation and even searched out gravesites and other historical sites of importance to the lineage, making them stops on tours with students, Yoshimasa among them (see Sections 39-47). In all this the Reizei were like their cohorts in the Nijō line, who operated in the same market and whose resources were similar in nature although not identical in substance.

Obviously, all of this is in direct contrast to *kokugaku* and other *jige* poets affiliated with *kokugaku* or working on their own, such as Ozawa Roan 小沢兼庵 (1723-1801). They too taught poetry to students, but whereas the Reizei and other court families emphasized ritual and memory-based composition (*daiei* 题詠), *kokugakusha* marketed rationality in the form of philology and ideals such as creativity and “direct expression of feeling” or the use of “plain words” (*tadagoto* ただごと). These outsider poets too taught students composition and claimed a fund of specialized knowledge, but that knowledge was already to a large part in the public domain, and they made little effort to restrict its dissemination. Certainly they too trafficked in manuscripts, but they had nothing like the *obunko* as a resource and therefore had no reason to restrict access in the same way. Finally, they too held poetry gatherings and could not help but mimic or parody many of the conventions of the aristocratic tradition in doing so, but at the same time they had a vested interest in arguing against excessive formality.

---


Another point revealed by an examination of the capital of the Reizei House concerns the nature of their retrenchment — which in some ways is clearly not retrenchment at all but a true “repositioning.” Bourdieu is very careful to point out the field is in fact constituted by struggle, a place where changes are constantly taking place. Thus “. . . a position-taking changes,” he notes, “even when the position remains identical, whenever there is change in the universe of options that are simultaneously offered for producers and consumers to choose from.”25 In this sense, the advent of competition on the outside could not but have an effect on insiders, literally pushing them closer together, so to speak. Between themselves they still maintained distinctions, I should add—mainly distinctions that involved ritual and practices rather than poetic style, but still distinctions (regarding how to record poems on paper, how to conduct meetings, and so on). Nonetheless, they did have a common bond, albeit one less central to their self-conception than it had been in the past.

Finally, a close look at the Reizei House in its broader context opens up another revelation for anyone interested in larger questions of educational methods and institutions. An analysis of Reizei practices reveals why an old model of instruction, based in rote learning and ritual reinforcement rather than what might be called the empiricism of the kokugakusha, still survived in the Edo period—namely, because it had a strong social base and offered highly valued rewards to all concerned in social and symbolic capital. This older mode of education, which prevails in artistic discourses such as tea and flower arrangement to this day, should not be overlooked if we want to understand how “learning” has been defined over the past three centuries of Japanese history. It is not by happenstance that Tamemura teaches Miyabe Yoshimasa that the first and most important step in one’s keiko (practice or training) is to “memorize old poems”:

I was also told when asked about how young people should practice (keiko) that the main thing is to memorize old poems. Poems learned when one is young infuse one’s heart and are not forgotten. One should study carefully the Three Collections, of course, and also the Three Collections of this house, and Tameie’s personal collections. Even if one doesn’t understand them, one should first of all memorize them, he taught. And the poems one composes one should learn to do correctly from the very beginning, he said.26

This is an approach to learning that may be perplexing to modern readers, but one that, for that very reason deserves our attention. Memory, as codified in various teachings and practices and texts, was in fact the primary cultural capital of the nobility, whose assets were in that sense as prodigious as anything claimed by their competitors among the ranks of the Nationalist scholars. A steady and reliable memory, and skills honed by long years of keiko, would stand one better in a formal poetry gathering than any amount of imagination or even scholarly knowledge. Furthermore, shared memory is obviously crucial in building and maintaining a sense of community. It is not surprising, then, that the old elite, faced with challenges to their authority from below, should respond by enunciating the importance of memory not only personally but in their professional practice. Or that Tamemura, when asked by Yoshimasa who among the Reizei disciples in — all from the jige or commoner ranks, of course — had truly become masters of the art, replied,


25 Bourdieu, The Field of Cultural Production, p. 30; see also The Rules of Art, pp. 231-234.
“These people have been undergoing practice [keiko] for many years, of course; but if I am asked whether they have arrived at the level of true understanding, I am dubious.”

That Tamemura should say such a thing so unapologetically to a disciple who was himself from commoner ranks is perhaps not entirely surprising; but that Yoshimasa should write it down without comment, accepting it in the way he did all the other teachings of the master is more remarkable. Some students, it would seem, even in an era that we generally associate with the vitality of the “lower” classes, were still impressed by the noble mystique and the position-taking that sustained it. In the end, the noble families had less to gain from competition than from solidarity with each other in their struggles to maintain a place in the new age.
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27 Yoshimasa kikigaki, section 35, p. 685.