commercial market on Tokugawa village society, pointing to growing surpluses, the maintenance of communal harmony, and a rising standard of living. Most modernizationists argue that these "early modern" developments, in turn, made possible a rapid yet consensual process of change in the Meiji period: in other words, Japan's dramatic transformation during the Meiji period resulted from a cooperative relationship between a modernization-minded government and an already-modernizing populace. Esenbel, in contrast, identifies both a source of fundamental discontinuity between Tokugawa and Meiji and a major point of conflict between the Meiji state and the Japanese people. This source of discontinuity and conflict was the entirely new relationship between state and society enforced by the Meiji government. In Esenbel's narrative, the flexible Tokugawa order, which allowed peasants to influence local administration, stands in contrast to the intrusive, uncompromising Meiji state that suppressed the Nakano uprising. In this sense, her portrayal of the Tokugawa-Meiji transition resembles the tragic narrative of loss and betrayal one often finds in the work of Marxian or "People's History" (minshūshi) historians, except that she rejects the notion of the Restoration as a failed or betrayed revolution. Rather, the tragedy in Esenbel's narrative is the passing of the Tokugawa order and its systemic values of flexibility, local agency, and compromise; Esenbel repeatedly uses the term "feudal" (perhaps too unproblematically) to describe the Tokugawa period, but the term's connotation is quite positive. Esenbel does not discuss the Tokugawa-Meiji transition in such explicitly positive or negative terms; nevertheless, the implicit narrative behind her analysis is worth pointing out, if only because it represents an unusual mixture of elements from very different historiographical traditions.

If there is a flaw in this book, it is Esenbel's tendency to overstate her revisionism. Although her perspective on rural uprisings is quite similar to that of James White, her book does contain a healthy dose of original and provocative ideas. However, her desire to set up her own argument in categorical opposition to what she calls "mainstream scholarship" sometimes prevents her from engaging the ideas of individual scholars in a more meaningful way. For instance, while she accurately identifies the "exploitation/impoverishment/dissolution" model used by many Marxian scholars to analyze rural conflict, she lumps the work of William Kelly, Stephen Vlastos, and Anne Walthall into this category without recognizing the important ways in which these scholars depart from this model. These scholars would also be surprised, I'm sure, to be grouped (not explicitly, but de facto) with "mainstream scholarship" that strips peasants of agency by reducing their actions to larger structures. But these shortcomings in Esenbel's discussion of the existing literature on rural conflict do not substantially detract from her own research, which is solid and careful. Her case study of Takaino village and the Nakano uprising provides us with valuable insights into the critical issue of the commercialization of the household economy and its relationship to rural uprisings.

Brian Platt
Department of History
George Mason University


In this work, Marleen Kassel discusses Hirose Tansō, who established the Kangien academy in Hita, Kyushu, in 1817. In the course of his career at Kangien, Tansō taught some 3,000 students,
one third of which were Buddhist clergy (among whom were two nuns, his only female students). The Buddhist component of this school is not insignificant because a tight monastic regimen of communal living regulated the life of the students within and outside its precincts with a daily schedule (suspended one holiday a month) starting at 6:00AM and consisting mainly of six hours lecture and discussion time, three or four hours of tests and three hours of study. A complicated point system of the students' scholastic progress and a close monitoring of their behavior through, among other things, a numerical record keeping of one's moral performance, entered daily in ledgers of merit and tallied monthly, and regular evaluations of one's spiritual profile capped this system. Students were boarded, commuted or passed through for brief periods of time, about fifty percent staying less than three years and very few completing all the levels of instruction.

Such information, which the author provides in Chapter Six, constitutes the most interesting part of this book. And yet, not much if anything is new -- except some mistakes, as we shall see -- for anyone who has read Richard Rubinger's forty-page chapter devoted to Kangien, its institutional setup, curriculum, rules and regulations and student body in his *Private Academies of Tokugawa Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982). A brief concluding chapter attempts to positively assess the academy's legacy in terms of contributions to Japan's modernization. The argument, or, since declarations replace arguments proper, the thesis is that this academy was, on the one hand, typical of the kind of thought and educational policy that fed into Meiji developments, but, on the other hand, at the same time quite exceptional: its student body was larger than most other private academies, it had an egalitarian admission policy but was merit-based in its educational structure.

Kassel singles out three men whom Japanese historians have identified as having been historically significant products of the academy. The first is Takano Chōei, who, however, learned his main trade in Nagasaki and built a medical career in Edo. The second is Omura Masujirō, a scholar of Dutch Learning, who opened his own military academy in Edo and became military advisor to Chōshū. Given these two men's careers, one should not be surprised at Kassel's evaluation of Chōei, which certainly applies as well to Masujirō, that "There is no evidence that his tenure at Kangien had any particular lasting influence on him" (p. 147). The third figure, Chō Sanshū, made it into Meiji and drafted a good part of the Fundamental Code of Education (*Gakusei*) of 1872, served in the Ministry of Education, and, as imperial tutor, molded emperor Taishō's mind.

Any attempt to make special claims for a specific Kangien impact on Meiji developments must fail and be watered down to general statements about the values of hard work, frugality, discipline and the like. Kassel takes that direction after futile attempts at shoring up the record of historical influence and winds up qualifying, but only mildly, her final evaluation of Tansō's legacy, which "In the end ... served both to ease and to hinder Japan's transition to modernity" (p. 152).

It is also important to know that neither of the three men Japanese historians have singled out to argue Kangien's importance were in any way judged by Tansō to be among his favorite students. In addition, Kassel makes surprising disclaimers when she states without much ado about Tansō's achievements that "The discrepancy that exists between his theory and practice is not really significant in the overall scheme of things" (p. 118) or, on the regular written character and academic evaluation, that "This system . . . is an interesting idea, but was never actually practiced" (120).

Kassel's avowed aim in writing this book is to be found elsewhere. She states that it "is limited to Tansō's philosophical and practical goals" (p. 6). Part III of the book serves this purpose well. Here the reader will find thirty-six pages of translations, that include Section 5 on the educational system of Tansō's 1840 work on statecraft, *Ugen* (Roundabout Words), and his 1829 *Yakugen* (Essential Teachings) whereby one can have direct access to a brief selection of Tansō's writings on philosophy and education through a well-executed translation. Part I is devoted to presenting three "settings" (historical, educational and intellectual) for understanding Tansō and his work. The Historical Setting "introduces Tansō as the scion of an important merchant family that functioned also as the official money lender to the Tokugawa intendant in charge of Tokugawa
territories in Kyushu -- Rubinger has already provided all the details. It includes a brief summary of Ugen, Tanso's essay on statecraft that runs through the usual list of ills of the time. In "The Education Setting" Kassel provides a general introduction of some aspects of private academies in the Tokugawa period and traces the development of the Kangien academy; again overly familiar territory. These are rather short chapters, as are those of Part II, which introduces Tanso's philosophy centered on a reverence for Heaven, which, as far as I can judge, is an original contribution, and his educational system.

"The Intellectual Setting," constituting about one third of the book, is by far the longest chapter. Kassel here states that "Describing just what Neo-Confucian [sic] is, and in what ways Hirose Tanso was an actor on the Neo-Confucian stage, is the task at hand" (p. 51). Does the author succeed better at this task than in her strained assessment of Tanso's legacy?

Kassel rushes us through a considerably extended line of "orthodox" Neo-Confucians in Japan and China that runs from Chang Tsai through the Ch'eng brothers, Chu Hsi, Wang Yang-ming, Lo Ch'in-shun and on to Nakae Tōju, Kumazawa Banzan, Yamazaki Ansai, Kaibara Ekken (who "included the humble masses within the scope of Neo-Confucianism" [p. 70]), Ogyū Sorai (through whose school, "After an early history of prosperity and diversity, Tokugawa Neo-Confucianism met with greater acceptance" [p. 73]), Kokugaku, what Kassel labeled the Orthodox Chu Hsi School centered in Osaka, and Mito Learning. Kassel here summarizes the summaries scholars like Wing-tsit Chang, Theodore de Bary, Minamoto Ryoen, Testuo Najita, and others have made of these thinkers.

Why this genealogical procedure? In this reviewer's opinion, an understanding of Tanso's thought does not require rehearsing author by author (and greatly simplifying) what others before Tanso may have written. This becomes necessary, however, if one's aim is to trace a rather amplified "Neo-Confucian" tradition and to position Tanso within that tradition, which is ultimately Kassel's purpose.

Having spread her Neo-Confucian net so widely, Kassel has to account for what other scholars may consider to be an incongruous collection of fish that they certainly would set out to assort further. Yet, none are rejected. The argument for variety within a commonality is stated as follows: "Philosophers considered to be part of the Neo-Confucian school of thought are an extremely diverse group who are united by the issues they address" (p.52). This is surprising. One would rather think that it is the way they address issues rather than the issues themselves that make scholars Neo-Confucian or not. Could one call Neo-Confucian anyone addressing issues like statecraft, or Heaven, or fate that are discussed up and down Chinese history? Confusing? Certainly. Everything and everyone ultimately turns out in the end to be Neo-Confucian. What Kassel has to say about Sorai, for example, shows how unreflectively she uses the term.

Sorai "expanded the concept of learning to be something that addressed society in general ... [and] the scope of political theory beyond that of early Tokugawa Neo-Confucianism" (p. 71). A few pages later comes the statement, quoted earlier, that Sorai was at the source of late Tokugawa's greater acceptance of Neo-Confucianism after it had already prospered and diversified initially. Anyone even slightly acquainted with Maruyama Masao's work, still standard in the field, would be surprised at such an interpretation of Sorai that is even logically puzzling. Still further, on page 79, some scholars could claim affiliation with two apparently separate traditions: Sorai and Sung Neo-Confucianism. Now the qualifier "Sung" is introduced, making Sorai, by implication a non-Sung, yet still "Neo" Neo-Confucian. Tanso, an avowed eclectic, is said to be heir to the Neo-Confucian tradition, and his eclecticism is limited to selecting his methods from within that tradition (p. 85) -- which hardly meets the definition of eclecticism as used for late Tokugawa thought. Even the Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890 is said to "emanate from the Neo-Confucian tradition" (p. 151).

Kassel is aware that the usefulness of the term Neo-Confucian has been seriously questioned in the 1990s but she brushes the debate aside and opts to use the term "in its broadest sense" (note 1, p. 85). Unfortunately, this blurs things and hinders rather than furthers any attempt to understand thinkers in their own right, especially.
avowed genuine eclectics like Tansō. Almost all scholars in late Tokugawa were playing with parts of a Confucian repertoire that they combined with elements from Shinto and even Western Learning. To reduce all this "in the last instance," so to speak, to Neo-Confucianism is doctrinaire and unwarranted.

A number of factual mistakes further mar the general understanding of Tokugawa Japan. Mixing up modern prefectures and feudal domains, Kassel assumes that Tokugawa Japan had sixty-eight domains when she twice states that Kangien students came from sixty-four out of sixty-eight domains (pp. 1, 37). Mixing up early with late Tokugawa, the author also asserts that early Tokugawa would have had 1,493 private schools and ten times as many temple schools (p. 28). No reference is given for these statistics. Ronald Dore gives a rough ("largely worthless") estimate of 10,000 (not 15,000 as Kassel would have it) for the end of the period "of which only 400 date from before 1800" (Ronald P. Dore, Education in Tokugawa Japan [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965], p. 253). Readers will be mistaken if they assume that Yamazaki Ansai's Kimon school (referred to in pages 65 and 70), with its focus on "Principle," is the same as (rather than the opposite of) what Abe Yoshio singularly has called the "Kimon School," a loose term misleadingly capitalized in note 39, page 89, under which Abe Yoshio grouped together scholars from various Schools slanted to privilege "Material Force" as opposed to "Principle." The sense of philosophical orthodoxy is said to have been diminishing only to be reasserted in the second half of the eighteenth century (p. 24). Quite the contrary is true. It was not "heterodox" teachings (whatever that may mean in a Tokugawa context) that were spreading in the eighteenth century, but a sense of hermeneutic and doctrinal exclusivism that was forging then for the first time a notion of orthodoxy as a political weapon in an academic turf war. In other words, an early sense of "orthodoxy" was not weakened; it just grew throughout most of the eighteenth century.

What one assumes to be the absence of professional editing has resulted in awkward sentences and a good number of mistakes in the bibliography, which was also in need of updating. Works by Peter Bol published in 1982 and 1992 or Benjamin Elman (1984, 1990) that considerably refined our conception of the term "Neo-Confucianism" are absent. Reference is made to Cynthia Brokaw's 1987 article on "ledgers of merit," but not to her 1991 book on the subject. Peter Nosco's 1978 Ph.D. dissertation Remembering Paradise is there, but not his 1990 book by the same title. Overall, this leads me to conclude that this study should have been judged to have been several steps away from deserving to see the light of published day.

Herman Ooms
Department of History
University of California,
Los Angeles

Book Notice: Residence Groups and Rank-Order Consciousness in Early Modern Japan
Philip C. Brown, Ohio State University


As is true in Western language studies, Japanese images of early modern urban areas have largely been based on examination of Japan's "three great metropolitan centers", Edo, Osaka, and Kyoto. Watanabe sets out to address this imbalance in scholarly studies by examining smaller urban areas, both those that were castle towns and others that were not. He also examines some rustic urban areas that were not formally classified as towns (zaikata machi 在方町). He is partly concerned with examining what features distinguished these towns (if any) and the ways in which commoner residents in these communities were organized.

After an introduction, the book is divided into two parts. Part I looks at residents' groups and concentrates on analysis of Kusukabe (Musashi province), Kōriyama (Mutsu province) and Sendai. A "supplement" for chapter 3 serves not only as a summary, but also provides Watanabe a venue in which to compare and contrast the three
great urban areas with other urban centers. Part II explores rank-order consciousness primarily in Moriguchi (in Settsu province, a zaikata machi), Köriyama (a zaikata machi which is formally re-classified by authorities as a town), and Sendai (a castle town).

Watanabe frames his final conclusions in terms of different “visions” of towns. On the one hand, there is the vision of the domain authorities, on the other those of the townsmen, suggesting that a good fit between those visions made for a more peaceful urban order. Going beyond this concern for commoner-domain relations, Watanabe suggests that townsmen’s visions of themselves changed as towns were re-classified as urban areas by domain authorities, a change that reflected a rise in social standing as well as a promotion within domain administration.

**Book Notice:** *The Early Modern Order and the Daimyo House Disturbances*

Philip C. Brown, Ohio State University


While studies of samurai from ancient times are slowly growing in Western scholarship, much of interest has yet to be introduced in the Western literature, especially for the early modern era. Among those subjects, the great household disturbances, primarily of the seventeenth century, certainly must rank high. These disturbances pitted cliques of retainers against each other and the daimyo. Study of them illuminates the process of domain formation, the reorientation of warriors to peacetime lives, the roles of samurai cliques in domain politics, and the establishment of stable domain administration. This study touches on many facets of these issues.

Study of these incidents is not a new subject in Japan. Fukuda begins by reviewing the literature on these disturbances, with an emphasis on developments since the 1960s. Part I begins with an overview of the very early *kinsei* order, taking the Keichō-Genna era as a transition, one that looks at the emergence of the samurai concern with *bun* (文, literary arts such as calligraphy), and even the transformation of martial arts to emphasize falconry and horsemanship, the development of house laws, and other attributes that contributed to internal stabilization.

Part II begins the actual examination of *oie sōdō*. Fukuda focuses primarily on single case studies in her explanation of the key types of disturbances, events that she classifies by period. For the Keichō-Genna era’s conflicts between relatively autonomous major retainers (*kashin*), she focuses on the Mogami Disturbance; for the Kan’ei era when key issues centered on reform of retainer fiefs, she explores primarily the Kuroda Disturbance. For the late 17th century she focuses on the Echigo Disturbances indicating that these disturbances tended to avoid involving the shogunate in the dispute settlement process. This latter characteristic distinguished late period disturbances from those of the first two eras.

**NOTE:** EMJ welcomes submission of short book notices that introduce recent work by Japanese scholars to our readers. Please send submissions to Philip C. Brown, Department of History, Ohio State University, 230 West 17th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210 or contact him by e-mail at brown.113@osu.edu.