

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 co-operation 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.”¹ 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.² 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*

¹Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 76, n. 16.

²*Ibid.*, p. 105.

³Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), p. 215.

⁴Pierre Bourdieu, *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*, translated by Matthew Adamson (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990), p. 128.

⁵Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, translated by Susan Emanuel (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), p. 351, n. 33.

⁶Bourdieu (1992), p. 105.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁸*Ibid.*, 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.

Yamazaki Ansai and Confucian School Relations, 1650-1675¹

I

In 1650, Hayashi Razan (1583-1657) and his son Hayashi Gahō (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 Jitchū (1598-1649), and Nakae Tōju (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 Yamazaki Ansai (1618-1682), Kumazawa Banzan (1619-1691) and Yamaga

Sokō (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, Yamazaki 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 Yamazaki'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 pare* — 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 Ieyasu (r. 1603-1605) and his successors Tokugawa Hidetada (r. 1605-1623) and Tokugawa Iemitsu (r. 1623-1651). After the deaths of the Buddhist priests Sūden 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.² 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).³ 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.⁴ Hayashi was a bonze valued chiefly for

² Hori Isao, *Hayashi Razan* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1964), Jinbutsu sōsho no. 118, pp. 286-292, 309, 312-336, 343, 384-400.

³ For a full discussion of the varieties of Neo-Confucianism embraced by Tokugawa scholars, see William Theodore deBary, *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy and the Learning of the Mind-and-Heart* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), pp. 167-216.

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.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.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.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-

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

⁶ Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 275, 281.

⁷ Hara, *Sentetsu sōdan* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1994), Tōyō bunko no. 574, p. 108; Abe, *Nihon shushigaku to chōsen* (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 1971), p. 239, and Sagara Tōru, *Kinsei nihon ni okeru jukyō undō no keifū* (Tokyo: Risōsha, 1965), p. 62.

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.⁸ However, he boldly attacked Hayashi Razan at this point, writing:

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.⁹

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.¹⁰ His

⁸ Abe, *Nihon no shushigaku to chōsen*, p. 7.

⁹ Herman Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology*, pp. 210-211.

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

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

¹¹ Hara, *Sentetsu Sōdan*, p. 125. Ian James McMullen, *Idealism, Protest and The Tale of Genji: The Confucianism of Kumazawa Banzan (1619-1691)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), pp. 111-112, 115.

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 taikai* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1974), vol. 30: Kumazawa Banzan, 488-489. Hereafter *Nihon*

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

shisō taikai is cited as *NST*.

¹³ Nomura Kentarō, *Edo jidai no keiseika* (Tokyo: Daiyamondosha, 1942), p. 176.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 176 and Gotō, "Kumazawa Banzan no shōgai to shisō no keisei," pp. 493, 499-500.

¹⁵ Yamaga Sokō, "Haisho zampitsu," *NST*, vol. 32: Yamaga Sokō, 318.

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.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.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.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

¹⁷ Hori Isao, *Yamaga Sokō* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1967), Jinbutsu sōsho no. 33, pp. 90-92.

¹⁸ The reasons for his declining Lord Tokugawa's offer are complicated. See Yamaga, "Haisho zampitsu," pp. 320-321; and Hori, *Yamaga Sokō*, pp. 86-88.

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.

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

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

²⁰ Hayashi Razan, “Santokushō,” *NST*, vol. 28: *Fujiwara Seika-Hayashi Razan*, 159, 163-164.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, p. 152.

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

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

ukuru on ben," *NST*, 29: 16.

²⁵ Nakae Tōju, "Okina mondō," p. 50.

²⁶ Hara, *Sentetsu sōdan*, 1:42-43.

²⁷ Sagara, *Nihon ni okeru jukyō undō no keifū*, p. 39.

²⁸ Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 396.

principle."²⁹ Here 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.³⁰ 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.³¹ 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.³² 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.³³ 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."³⁴ 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."³⁵

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."³⁶ 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.'"³⁷ Having studied at their school, Yamaga

²⁹ Yamaga Sokō, "Seikyō yōroku," p. 345.

³⁰ John Whitney Hall, "Ikeda Mitsumasa and the Bizen Flood of 1654," in Albert Craig and Donald Shively, eds., *Personality in Japanese History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970), p. 66.

³¹ Yamaga Sokō, "Seikyō yōroku," p. 345.

³² The concept of two natures is originally Buddhist. Ancient Confucian philosophers addressed the issue of human nature but did not speak of two natures. Confucius discussed human nature in *Lun-yü*, V:12, VI:17, 19, XVI:9, XVII:2, 3; Mencius in *Meng-tzu*, 2A:6, 4B:26, and 6A:1-6; and Hsün-tzu in *Hsün-tzu*, chap. 23.

³³ Hayashi, "Santokushō," pp.159, 163-164.

³⁴ Nakae, "Okina mondō," p. 22.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

³⁶ Yamaga Sokō, "Seikyō yōroku," p. 331.

³⁷ Yamaga Sokō, *Yamaga Sokō zenshū*, 11:342, cited in Hori, *Yamaga Sokō*, p. 167.

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 Sokō, 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

³⁸ Hori, *Yamaga Sokō*, p. 222.

³⁹ Nakae, "Okina mondō," p. 50.

⁴⁰ Abe, *Nihon no shushigaku to chōsen*, pp. 323-324, 405.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 327, 366, 405.

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 field. 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'engs' 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 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

⁴² John Whitney Hall, "Introduction" and "The bakuhan System" in Hall, ed., *The Cambridge History of Japan*, vol. 4: *Early Modern Japan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 20, 165 and Conrad D. Totman, *Politics in the Tokugawa Bakufu, 1600-1867* (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 210-213.

⁴³ Abe, *Nihon no shushigaku to chōsen*, pp. 239-240.

⁴⁴ Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology*, p. 44.

himself in the Confucian field.⁴⁵ 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."⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷ 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 Akō 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."⁴⁸ 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.⁴⁹ He could hardly have missed 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."⁵⁰ 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."⁵¹ 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."⁵²

⁴⁵ Sagara, *Kinsei nihon ni okeru jukyō undō no keifū*, p. 62.

⁴⁶ Hara, *Sentetsu sōdan*, p. 43.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Hori, *Yamaga Sokō*, p. 223.

⁵⁰ Yamaga, "Haisho zampitsu," p. 329.

⁵¹ Here I use Shuzo Uenaka's reliable English translation of this work. See Uenaka, "Last Testament in Exile: Yamaga Sokō's *Haisho Zampitsu*," *Monumenta Nipponica* 32(1977): 143.

⁵² Ibid., p. 143.

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

⁵³ Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology*, p. 225.

⁵⁴ Hara, *Sentetsu sōdan*, p. 129.

⁵⁵ Nomura, *Edo jidai no keiseika*, p. 176.

⁵⁶ Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology*, pp. 107-108.

⁵⁷ Pierre Bourdieu and Loic J. D. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 106.

⁵⁸ Totman, *Politics in the Tokugawa Bakufu*, p. 208.

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.⁵⁹ Even the shogun, Tokugawa Iemitsu, was interested in interviewing Kumazawa but died before this could be arranged.⁶⁰ 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.⁶¹ 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

⁵⁹ Gotō, "Kumazawa Banzan no shōgai to shisō no keisei," p. 482.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 482.

⁶¹ Hori, *Yamaga Sokō*, pp. 92-93.

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-

⁶² McMullen, *Idealism, Protest and The Tale of Genji*, pp. 87, 90, 121.

⁶³ Hall, "Ikeda Mitsumasa and the Bizen Flood of 1654," p. 66; and Gotō, "Kumazawa Banzan no shōgai to shisō no keisei," pp. 483, 490, 511-512.

mind" became what Bourdieu would call a "euphemized" form of a power struggle between the Tokugawa authorities and those perceived as their enemies.⁶⁴ 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.

V

When Hoshina Masayuki died in 1672, Yamazaki Ansai lost his patron. He immediately returned to Kyoto and started teaching full-time teaching, 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.⁶⁵ 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).⁶⁶ In their

⁶⁴ See Bourdieu, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, p. 106.

⁶⁵ Okada Takehiko, "Practical Learning in the Chu Hsi School: Yamazaki Ansai and Kaibara Ekken," in deBary and Bloom, *Principle and Practicality*, p. 233. Hara reports that Ansai had around six thousand students; see Hara, *Sentetsu sōdan*, p. 114.

⁶⁶ Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology*, pp. 4-5.

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 Sokō 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 1686.⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ It was

⁶⁷ Gotō Yōichi and Tomoeda Ryūtarō, "Shuroku sōmoku kaidai," *NST*, 30:590.

⁶⁸ See Bourdieu's essay in Randal Johnson, ed., *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), pp. 190, 194.

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, Kumazawa 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 those 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.

Samuel Hideo Yamashita
Henry E. Sheffield Professor
of History
Pomona College

⁶⁹ Pierre Bourdieu, trans. Matthew Adamson, *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology* (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1990) p. 145.