

Yamaga Sokô's Seikyô yôroku:

An English Translation and Analysis (Part Two)

John Allen Tucker

University of North Florida

A. Introduction

This essay traces the *bakumatsu*-Meiji revival of Yamaga Sokô's 山鹿素行 (1627-85) *shidô* 士道, or samurai philosophy, first as promoted by Yoshida Shôin 吉田松陰 (1830-59) during the early *bakumatsu* period (1853-67), and then as continued by various political, military, and ideological leaders of Meiji Japan who were influenced by Shôin's teachings. The paper initially highlights the metamorphosis in critical value, from negative to positive, in allegations linking Sokô's *shidô* with the Akô *rônin* 赤穂浪人 vendetta of 1703. It suggests that the same spurious charges which had damned Sokô's philosophy in the intellectual world of mid-eighteenth-century Edo, were largely responsible for the widespread support that it gained during the Meiji period (1868-1912). The paper then distinguishes two phases in the Sokô revival. The first featured an unprecedented expression of imperial praise for the self-sacrificing loyalty that the Akô *rônin* had demonstrated for their daimyô, or samurai lord, in carrying out their vendetta. During the second phase, occurring in the late-Meiji period, Sokô was posthumously honored with imperial rank and his *shidô* exalted for its proimperial focus. The implicit message of this revival was that Meiji Japan possessed a valuable ideological asset in Sokô's *shidô* since the latter could presumably inculcate in Japanese the kind of imperial loyalty that the *rônin* had displayed for their daimyô. Because of its special ideological potency, Sokô's *shidô* was acclaimed in late-Meiji times as a key ingredient in a nascent "civil religion,"¹ one combining imperialist, ultranationalist, and militarist themes.

¹ The term "civil religion" is borrowed, with significant adaptation, from Peter Duus and Irwin Scheiner, "Socialism, Liberalism, and Marxism, 1901-1931," *The Cambridge History of Japan, Volume 6, The Twentieth Century*, ed. Peter Duus (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 655. While Duus and Scheiner refer to "civil religion" in relation to Inoue Tetsujirô's (1856-1944) thought, this paper does so in relation to Sokô's thought, as championed by Inoue, as well.

B. The Late-Tokugawa Metamorphosis of the Sokô-Akô *Rônin* Link

As was explained in the introductory essay to part one of this translation of Sokô's *Seikyô yôroku*,² opponents of Sokô's teachings such as Satô Naokata 佐藤直方 (1650-1719), a disciple of Yamazaki Ansai's 山崎闡齋 (1618-1682) purist Neo-Confucian philosophy, and Dazai Shundai 太宰春台 (1680-1747), an advocate of Ogyû Sorai's 萩生徂徠 (1666-1728) ancient learning, first blamed Sokô's *shidô* for the Akô vendetta. Their accusations sought to discredit Sokô's philosophy in the eyes of the Tokugawa *bakufu*. They were deemed credible because of incriminating but ultimately circumstantial links between Sokô and the *rônin*. For example, between 1652 and 1660, Sokô had served Asano Naganao 滝野長直 (1610-1692), the *tozama* 外様 daimyô of Akô domain, as an instructor in martial philosophy. *Tozama* daimyô were major samurai lords who had not been vassals of the Tokugawa family before the battle of Sekigahara 關ヶ原 (1600) which secured Tokugawa hegemony over Japan. Not all *tozama* fought against the Tokugawa, but those who did were generally viewed as the least loyal daimyô in the new political order. Asano Nagamasa 滝野長政 (1544-1611), the head of the main line of the Asano family, was one of the relatively few *tozama* daimyô who had supported the Tokugawa at Sekigahara. As a result he was well rewarded after the Tokugawa victory, receiving a much enlarged domain including the relatively new Hiroshima castle.

The branch of the Asano family which Sokô later served, led by Asano Naganao, was treated more ambiguously. While initially entrusted with Kasama 笠間 domain (in modern Ibaraki 茨城 prefecture), with an assessment of 30,000 *koku*, they were transferred, in 1644, to Akô, a domain with a larger rice yield, 53,000 *koku*, but a castle in a bad state of disrepair. The Tokugawa eventually allowed the Asano daimyô to build a new castle in Akô, but did so only in 1653,³ and then unenthusiastically. However in 1701, Naganao's grandson, Naganori 長矩 (d. 1701), criminally violated Tokugawa law by drawing his sword on a high ranking master of court ceremonies, Kira Yoshinaka 吉良義央 (d. 1703), within the inner confines of the shogun's castle. Exacerbating the seriousness of Naganori's offense was the fact that it had been committed during preparations for an annual New Year's ritual welcoming representatives of the imperial court to the shogun's castle.

The Tokugawa wasted no time in revealing that Naganori's branch of the Asano family merited little special treatment: in less than 24 hours the *bakufu* ordered Naganori to commit suicide. Tragically for Sokô's *shidô*, his earlier service to Naganao as an instructor of samurai philosophy linked him, albeit decades before Naganori's 1701 attack, with the daimyô family that later capitally violated *bakufu* law. Sokô's service to Naganao also linked him with Akô, the domain that later carried out the 1703 vendetta against Kira Yoshinaka as revenge for Naganori's death. Because the *bakufu* also judged the vendetta to be a criminal act, Sokô's earlier links to the Asano family and the Akô samurai seemed

² See *Sino-Japanese Studies* (6 1): 22-39.

³ Hori Isao 堀勇雄, *Yamaga Sokô* 山鹿素行, *Jinbutsu sôsho* 人物叢書 series, vol. 33 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan, 1959), p. 126

especially incriminating since their misdeeds seemed to have had only one philosophical denominator: his *shidō*.

Making Sokô seem all the more culpable was the fact that the *bakufu* had once exiled him to Akô, between 1666 and 1675, as punishment for publication of his supposedly inflammatory treatise, the *Seikyô yôroku* 聖教要錄 (Essential Meanings of the Sagely Confucian Teachings). Because the *bakufu* had already cast Sokô as an ideological offender, the allegations of Naokata and Shundai seemed to corroborate its earlier verdict. Thus, Sokô's *shidō* was easily and convincingly assigned philosophical responsibility for the Akô vendetta. Though the allegations were tantamount to slander, being based on evidence that was at best circumstantial, many Edo samurai found them to be sufficiently credible. What remained of Sokô's school of samurai philosophy was soon shunned by all but its most dedicated followers. Following decades of continuing atrophy, Sokô's *shidō* completely disappeared from Edo in 1744.⁴ That fate seems most ironic when one recalls that Sokô, a resident of Edo since early childhood, had dreamed throughout his adult life of serving the *bakufu* as an instructor of samurai philosophy.⁵

By Yoshida Shôin's day, however, the Akô *rônin* were increasingly being viewed as chivalrous samurai who had broken *bakufu* law, but only so that they could fulfill a more praiseworthy ideal, that of self-sacrificing loyalty to their lord. Of course, the ever-growing popularity of productions of *Kanadehon chûshingura* 假名手本忠臣藏 (Treasures of Loyalty and Fidelity) in puppet and *kabuki* theatres facilitated these more positive appraisals of the *rônin*.⁶ More significantly, the increasing ineffectiveness of the *bakufu* as a ruling force further contributed to the popular idolization of the *rônin* as valorous men of action. The allegations that had vilified Sokô's *shidô* when Tokugawa authority was strong thus underwent a metamorphosis parallelling the transformation of the Akô *rônin* from official criminals to popular heroes. Instead of implying that Sokô's *shidô* had incited Akô samurai to engage in violent and illegal behavior, those allegations came to suggest, with praise, that Sokô's learning could instill in samurai an exceptional readiness to sacrifice themselves courageously for the sake of loyalty and fidelity.

The *Sentetsu sôdan gohen* 先哲叢談後編 (Biographies of Confucian Scholars, Part Two, 1829), thus claimed, quite admiringly, that Sokô had decisively transformed Akô samurai between the years 1652 and 1660, i.e., the period when Asano Naganao had first retained Sokô as a *shidô* instructor. Almost fifty years later, after the *bakufu* ordered Naganori to commit *seppuku* and confiscated the family's domain, forty-seven ex-retainers of the Asano family

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 319.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 304-315.

⁶ For a discussion of the popularity of *Kanadehon Chûshingura* as a literary model in Tokugawa Japan see Suwa Haruo 諏訪春雄, "Kanadehon Chûshingura to kindai kôki shôsetsu" 假名手本忠臣藏と近代後期小説 (*Chûshingura* and Early Modern Novels), in *Akô jiken ni kansuru bungei to shisô* 赤穂事件に関する文芸と思想 (Literature and Thought Related to the Akô Rônin Incident) (Tokyo: Gakushûin daigaku Tôyô bunka kenkyûjo, 1984), pp. 1-18. Also, Donald Keene, "Variations on a Theme: *Chûshingura*," *Chûshingura: Studies in Kabuki and Puppet Theatre*, ed. James R. Brandon (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1982), pp. 1-57.

made evident what they had learned from Sokô, successfully taking revenge on their deceased master's enemy by brutally assassinating him.⁷ Of course the *Sentetsu sôdan gohen* did not mention that Sokô spent only seven months in Akô during his entire eight-year tenure in service to Naganao.⁸ Most of the time Sokô had remained in Edo. Nor did it address the fact that even the eldest of the forty-seven Akô *rônin* was a mere child when Sokô was exiled there.⁹ Those problems notwithstanding, Shôin, like many samurai of his day, apparently accepted, as pure and simple fact, the popular myth that Sokô's *shidô* had been the key philosophical force behind the *rônin* vendetta.

C. Yoshida Shôin's Idolization of Sokô and the Akô *Rônin*

From early childhood, Yoshida Shôin's life was dominated by Sokô's philosophy. As hereditary instructors of Sokô's *shidô* for the daimyô of Chôshû 長州 domain, the Yoshida family had first gained certification in those teachings in 1714, just a decade after the then infamous Akô *rônin* incident. Close vassals of the Tokugawa had rallied behind the *bakufu* and its denunciation of the vendetta, and, by implication, Sokô's teachings. That was not the perspective, however, of the Chôshû daimyô, the Môri 毛利 family. As *tozama* lords, the Môri were not at all comfortable with Tokugawa rule. Prior to their defeat at Sekigahara the Môri had ruled the second wealthiest domain in Japan, their holdings totalling 1,205,000 *koku*. But after 1600, following the Tokugawa decision to quarter their holdings, the Môri domain was assessed at a mere 298,480 *koku*, and the territory that they ruled was reduced to two provinces, Nagato 長門 and Sôu 周防, "less than a fourth of their previous domains."¹⁰ In later generations, the animosities engendered by this reduction facilitated a fascination for, and then dedication to, Sokô's teachings partly because they were linked to defiance of Tokugawa laws.

In 1835, Shôin, then only six years old, became the official instructor of Sokô's philosophy in Chôshû. In 1840, at eleven, he began lecturing his daimyô Môri Takachika 毛利敬親 (1819-71) on Sokô's *Bukyô zensho* 武教全書 (Complete Works [of Yamaga Sokô] on Martial Philosophy), a compilation that Shôin studied and taught for the rest of his life. With Takachika's support, Shôin travelled, in 1850, to Hirado 平戸, a hallowed center of Sokô's

⁷ Quoted from Inoue Tetsujirô, *Nihon kogakuha no tetsugaku* 日本古学派の哲学 (The Philosophy of the Japanese School of Ancient Learning) (Tokyo: Fuzanbô, 1921 revised edition of the 1902 ed.), pp. 25-26.

⁸ Hori, *Yamaga Sokô*, p. 127.

⁹ David Earl's *Emperor and Nation in Japan* admits that Ôishi Kuranosuke, leader of the Akô *rônin*, was "only a boy" when Sokô was exiled to Akô, but insists that Kuranosuke was among Sokô's pupils, and declares that "there is no doubt that the action taken by the men of Akô...was inspired by Sokô's personal teaching of *bushidô*." Earl, *Emperor and Nation in Japan: Political Thinkers of the Tokugawa Period* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964), p. 39. However, it offers no evidence proving that Sokô inspired the *rônin*. Nor does *Emperor and Nation* mention Hori's argument that Sokô exerted no direct impact on the Akô *rônin*. Many other equally reputable Western studies of Tokugawa Japan repeat the same line without critical analysis.

¹⁰ Albert Craig, *Chôshû and the Meiji Restoration* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 21, 11-25.

shidō since its institutional demise in Edo in 1744. In Hirado, Shōin studied under Yamaga Bansuke 山鹿萬助 (d. 1856), a distant relative of Sokō.¹¹ But Shōin's time there must have been frustrating because Bansuke, apparently rather ill, cancelled his lectures repeatedly. Shōin thus returned to Chōshū, hoping for another opportunity to gain advanced instruction in Sokō's samurai philosophy. The next year, 1851, Shōin received that chance, accompanying his daimyō to Edo and enrolling in Yamaga Sosui's 山鹿素水 newly opened academy, the first Yamaga school in the shogun's capital in over a century. While studying under him, Shōin was asked to edit Sosui's *Renpei setsuryaku* 練兵說略 (Summary of Yamaga Military Strategies).¹² Shōin also studied with the Neo-Confucian scholar, Asaka Gonsai 安積良齋 (1791-1860), of the Shōheikō 昌平校, and Sakuma Shōzan 佐久間象山 (1811-64), an admirer and advocate of Western military techniques. Though impressed by Shōzan's views about the practical need for Western learning, Shōin remained a proponent of Sokō's *shidō*, instructing his daimyō twice monthly at the Mōri residence in Edo.¹³

Shōin revealed how strongly the exploits of the Akō *rōnin* loomed in his mind when, without receipt of written permission from his daimyō, he and two other students of Sokō's philosophy left on a journey to northern Honshū on 12/14 of 1852. Shōin recorded in his *Tōhoku yū nikki* 東北遊日記 (Diary of My Travels North) how the three had pledged to leave Edo on the same date that the *rōnin* had executed their vendetta against Kira Yoshinaka.¹⁴ The destination of Shōin and his comrades was Tsugaru 津輕 domain, the stronghold of Sokō's teachings in northeastern Honshū. Not surprisingly, during their pilgrimage the three *shidō* students often discussed *Chūshingura*.¹⁵

On returning to Edo in the spring of 1853, Shōin turned himself in to his daimyō. Like the Akō *rōnin*, who reported their vendetta to the Tokugawa authorities in Edo as soon as they had successfully completed it, Shōin had no intention of evading responsibility for his deeds, despite the fact that he had offended his daimyō. In departing without official written permission Shōin had violated an important aspect of lord-vassal protocol. As punishment, Shōin's daimyō Takachika ordered him back to Chōshū and there reduced him to *rōnin* status. Although a serious demotion, that punishment possibly gave Shōin what he wanted since it provided him with a social status identical to that of his apparent heroes, the Akō *rōnin*.

¹¹ Yoshida Shōin, *Saiyū nikki* 西遊日記 (Diary of Travels in Western Japan), in *Yoshida Shōin*, Nihon shisō taikei 日本思想体系 (Grand Anthology of Japanese Thought; hereafter, NST), vol. 54, eds: Yoshida Tsunekichi 吉田常吉, Fujita Shōzō 藤田省三, and Nishida Taichirō 西田太一朗 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1978), pp. 403-06, 413-18, 423, 425-26, 430-33, 438, 441.

¹² Shōin, *Shokan* 書簡 (Correspondence), in *Yoshida Shōin*, NST, vol. 54, p. 56.

¹³ Shōin's lifelong bond with the Yamaga school is often omitted by even respected studies. For example George M. Wilson's interpretive study of the Meiji Restoration, *Patriots and Redeemers in Japan: Motives in the Meiji Restoration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992) does not mention Shōin's affiliation with the Sokō's teachings.

¹⁴ Shōin, *Tōhokuyū nikki* 東北遊日記 (Diary of Travels to Northeastern Japan), in *Yoshida Shōin*, NST, vol. 54, p. 447.

¹⁵ Cf., Shōin, *Ibid.*, NST, pp. 505, 507, 522.

Takachika also revealed his sympathy for Shōin by permitting him to travel outside of the domain for ten years. Shōin promptly returned to Edo to resume study under Sosui.

Throughout the 1850's Shōin regularly alluded to Sokō's writings. For example, Shōin opened his *Tōhoku yū nikki* by speaking of *yūshi no shi* 有志の士, or samurai with resolve, referring to impassioned activists who were ready to sacrifice themselves for some cause, much as the Akō *rōnin* had for their lord. Shōin discussed the same figures elsewhere calling them *shishi* 志士. In doing so he made multiple allusions. One was to *Lunyu* 論語 4/9 (Analects), where Confucius spoke of *shi* 士, or "knights," whose *shi* 志, or "intentions," were centered on the moral Way. Another was to Sokō's military writings, especially his works entitled *Shidō* 士道 (Samurai Philosophy) and the *Bukyō shōgaku* 武教小學 (The Elementary Learning for Samurai), where Sokō described *shishi* as ideal Confucian samurai. But often it appears that when Shōin spoke of *shishi* he had in mind the heroic, loyalist activism of the Akō *rōnin*. The latter kind of allusion, along with expressions of intense concern for the welfare of imperial Japan, the new focus of his loyalty, pervaded Shōin's final years.

For example, in 1854, after violating the official Tokugawa foreign policy of *sakoku* 鎮國, or national seclusion, by trying to stowaway on one of Commodore Matthew Perry's flagships, the USS *Powhatan*, Shōin explained that he saw his violation of *bakufu* law as continuing a paradigm that the Akō *rōnin* had exemplified earlier, one calling for principled disobedience when the demands of righteous action conflicted with those of the law. Writing from Denma-chō 傳馬町 prison, Shōin reasoned: "When Akō was offended, the 47 righteous samurai sacrificed themselves to take revenge on their lord's enemy... The Akō samurai, in serving their lord, defied the law. For the sake of my country, I too had to defy the law."¹⁶ Shōin's *Kaikoroku* 回顧錄 ([Prison] Memoirs), finished during his confinement in Chōshū, further reveals that he modelled his life in prison after the example of the Akō *rōnin*. Regarding Shōin's austere, self-imposed diet, the *Kaikoroku* recalls, with admiration, how the *Akō gishi den* 赤穂義士傳 (Accounts of the Akō Samurai) related that the *rōnin*, though detained in groups isolated from one another, consistently declined the succulent dishes offered to them.¹⁷ Later in the *Kaikoroku* Shōin argued that his own suffering for a righteous cause would benefit the nation just as the righteous samurai of Akō had benefitted Japan, and just as the righteous martyrdoms of Bo Yi 伯夷 and Shu Qi 叔齊 (12th cent. B.C.E.) had benefitted China. Shōin then suggested that the Akō samurai, Bo Yi, and Shu Qi were all *seijin* 聖人, or Confucian sages, who deserved respect as "the teachers of hundreds of generations."¹⁸ Thus did Shōin reveal that he modelled his martyr's course after that of the Akō *rōnin*, whom he considered to be Japanese exemplars of a sagely way which was tracable even to ancient China.

In 1856, after being released from Noyama 野山 prison, Shōin was allowed to lecture on his samurai philosophy at the Shōka sonjuku 松下村塾, an academy founded in Chōshū by his uncle Kubo Seitarō 久保清太郎. Shōin's pupils included Itō Hirobumi 伊藤博文 (1841-1909), Yamagata Aritomo 山縣有朋 (1838-1922), and other Chōshū samurai who later became leaders in the Meiji imperial regime. At the Shōka sonjuku one of Shōin's key

¹⁶ Quoted from Earl, *Emperor and Nation*, pp. 125-26.

¹⁷ Shōin, *Kaikoroku* (Prison Memoirs), NST, vol. 54, p. 549.

¹⁸ Shōin, *Ibid.*, p. 562.

texts was Sokô's *Bukyô zensho*. In his lectures, Shôin lauded Sokô's impact on the *rônin* while simultaneously linking it to imperial loyalism.

We samurai...must strive to repay the grace and bounty provided for us through this imperial land by striving always to fulfill the way of the samurai... If samurai wish to comprehend their way they must accept the precepts of our samurai teacher, Yamaga Sokô. Throughout history myriad books have been written, so why are Master Sokô's so worthy of belief? When you have studied what Master Sokô recorded in the *Bukyô zensho*, you will fathom this completely. But allow me to explain just one point... When one thoroughly examines the Akô vendetta, one realizes what Ôishi Kuranosuke 大石内藏助 (1659-1703), the leader of the Akô samurai, learned from Master Sokô.¹⁹

According to Shôin, the heroics of the *rônin* exemplified how Sokô's *shidô* could inculcate in samurai an admirable willingness to respond to duties, including those to the imperial nation, which possibly transcended mere *bakufu* decrees.

Shôin also expanded themes that were only marginally present in Sokô's writings. For example, he claimed that the essence of Sokô's *Bukyô shôgaku* consisted in its account of *shidô* and *kokutai* 國體, or the distinctive national essence of Japan. The latter Shôin explained as the national essence of Japan as a *shinshû* 神州, or divine land. He claimed that Sokô wrote the *Bukyô shôgaku* to keep Japan from losing its divine *kokutai*. In formulating this interpretation Shôin was combining ideas from Sokô's years in exile, when Sokô had expounded a nationalistic and pro-imperial line of thought in his *Chûchô jijitsu* 中朝事實 (The True Reality of the Central Kingdom), with Sokô's earlier works which were more concerned with the basics of samurai behavior than theories about the national polity. Nevertheless, Shôin's reinterpretation of Sokô reveals that Shôin's extreme pro-imperial line, often indicated by the phrase *somô* 尊王, or rever the emperor, had clear and distinct roots in Sokô's thought.²⁰

Shôin's study of Sokô's philosophy was the strongest, most resilient thread binding his intellectual development. In a letter to his uncle, dated 1858, Shôin related: "Having studied the *Bukyô zensho* for decades, I am beginning to grasp some of its meaning." Evidently, however, Shôin was most inspired by *shidô* teachings which could be related to or explained in terms of the bravery of the Akô *rônin*. Not surprisingly, Sokô's final years seem to have been an attempt at matching the loyalist martyrdom of the *rômin*, though with the imperial throne serving as the focus of his efforts. After hearing that Ii Naosuke 井伊直助 (1815-60), then the guiding force within the *bakufu*, planned to conclude treaties with several Western nations despite imperial opposition to them, Shôin decided that the *bakufu* had to be stopped. After all it had become, in his eyes, the enemy of the emperor and the imperial nation. In late 1858, he

¹⁹ Quoted from Tawara Tsuguo 田原嗣郎, "Yamaga Sokô to bushidô" 山鹿素行と武士道 (Yamaga Sokô and Bushidô), *Yamaga Sokô* 山鹿素行, Nihon no meicho 日本の名著 series (Japanese Classics), vol. 12, (Tokyo: Chûô kôron sha, 1971), p. 16.

²⁰ Hori, *Yamaga Sokô*, pp. 143-144. Also see, Tawara, "Yamaga Sokô to bushidô," *Yamaga Sokô*, pp. 13-18.

and seventeen Chōshū samurai thus made a blood pledge to assassinate Manabe Akitatsu 間部詮勝 (1804-84), a *rōjū* 老中, or Senior Councillor, whom the *bakufu* was sending to quash anti-Tokugawa sentiment in Kyoto. Again Shōin and his co-conspirators mimicked the Akō *rōnin*. Shōin and his comrades, however, meant to avenge imperial honor, not that of a daimyō. In their conspiracy, the Chōshū samurai were not alone: a band of Mito 水戸 samurai also plotted to assassinate Ii Naosuke.²¹ In 1859, the *bakufu* uncovered the conspiracy led by Shōin, and promptly executed him at Denma-chō prison on 10/27. In his last testament, *Ryūkon roku* 留魂錄 (My Spiritual Pilgrimage), Shōin declared: "Even if I return seven times from the dead, I shall never forget to drive away the foreigner."²² In his final hours Shōin thus dreamed of compounding himself into a one-man battalion, ready to sacrifice every self his imagination could muster to more fully approximate the daring heroics for which the *rōnin* were famous.

D. Sokō and the Akō *Rōnin* in Meiji Culture

1. Legitimization of the *Rōnin*

Shōin was buried by his ex-pupils, including Itō Hirobumi and Kido Kōin 木戸孝允 (1833-77). Another of his former students, Yamagata Aritomo, remarked that Shōin's death was "an ineradicable tragedy, causing great sadness to all [imperial] loyalists and ineffable sorrow to me."²³ Shōin's disciples soon made sure, however, that his interpretations of Sokō's philosophy gained a kind of legitimization via imperial decree. By Tokugawa legal standards the Akō *rōnin* remained outlaws, despite the widespread public following that they enjoyed, theatrically and otherwise. Shōin had glorified the *rōnin* because he, too, was an outlaw of sorts, one intent on challenging if not overthrowing the *bakufu*. Much the same could be said of Shōin's ex-disciples including Itō Hirobumi, Yamagata Aritomo, and Kido Kōin. Yet once the *bakufu* had been destroyed and those surviving Chōshū revolutionaries had become Meiji statesmen, they sought to rehabilitate their late-teacher (and themselves) by having his idols, the Akō *rōnin*, imperially designated as exemplars of samurai loyalty. In the process they were also inadvertently legitimizing Sokō's philosophy since it was widely believed that Sokō's *shidō* had inspired the *rōnin* vendetta.

In early-Meiji Japan Shōin's earlier glorification of the *rōnin* as paragons of Sokō's *shidō* was therefore brought to an ultimate state of completion. In the eleventh lunar month of 1868, the Meiji emperor, having moved to Tokyo from Kyoto, dispatched an envoy to the Sengaku 泉岳 temple to deliver an imperial declaration before the gravestones of Ōishi Kuranosuke and the other *rōnin* buried there. The decree read:

²¹ Earl, *Emperor and Nation*, p. 134.

²² Quoted from H. Van Straelen, *Yoshida Shōin: Forerunner of the Meiji Restoration* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1952), p. 130.

²³ Quoted from Roger F. Hackett, *Yamagata Aritomo in the Rise of Modern Japan, 1838-1922* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 17.

Kuranosuke and the rest of you resolutely grasped the duty that samurai have to their lord. You met death serving the rule that samurai should take revenge against their lord's enemies. You inspired the sentiments of one hundred generations. We convey our profound approbation.²⁴

This statement was most surely engineered by representatives of the Chōshū clique in the new imperial government, many of whom had once studied under Shōin. More than any of Shōin's other ex-students, Kidō played a crucial role in moving the imperial capital to Edo, and in working with the Meiji emperor to consolidate his power there during the first year of the restoration. Kidō was therefore possibly the Chōshū representative who encouraged the Meiji emperor, upon arrival in Tokyo, to honor Kuranosuke.²⁵ The imperial declaration was certainly most meaningful to those Chōshū samurai who had studied under Shōin, taken part in the anti-*bakufu* and pro-imperial struggles, and then risen to positions of high authority in the Meiji regime.

Because the Meiji period was an age of modernization and Westernization in Japan, the Meiji emperor's communique to Kuranosuke might seem more like a throwback to the feudal past than a harbinger of significant future trends. Proof that the imperial decree echoed, and perhaps had excited, widespread public sympathy for the *rōnin* appeared in a press controversy following the publication of Fukuzawa Yukichi's 福澤諭吉 (1837-1901) *Gakumon no susume* 學問のすすめ (An Encouragement of Learning). Among other things, *Gakumon* sharply criticized vigilantes who took the law into their own hands executing those whom they had deemed to be criminals. One of the most egregious examples of this, Fukuzawa noted, occurred when vigilantes assassinated government officials just as the Akō *rōnin* had done. Though Fukuzawa recognized that the Japanese public admired the *rōnin*, he declared that they had died a meaningless death, literally that they had died like "short-tempered dogs" (*kenkai no inujini* 犬介の犬死) in sacrificing themselves for the sake of their master.²⁶ In making this point *Gakumon* equated the *rōnin* with a pathetic samurai named Gonsuke 権助 whom Fukuzawa fabricated for the sake of illustrating his point. Gonsuke hanged himself with his loin cloth after losing a coin that his master had given him. The suicides of the Akō *rōnin* were no more meaningful, Fukuzawa boldly declared, than that of Gonsuke.²⁷

²⁴ *Meiji tennō ki* 明治天皇記 (Annals of the Meiji Emperor) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1968), vol. 1, p. 888. Cf., Tawara, "Yamaga Sokō to bushidō," *Yamaga Sokō*, pp. 10-11.

²⁵ Cf., *Meiji tennō ki*, vol. 1, pp. 851-911. As the *Meiji tennō ki* reveals, Asano Nagakoto 浅野長勲 (1842-1937), daimyō of Hiroshima domain, was also close to the Meiji emperor during the same time. Perhaps he wanted the *rōnin*, who had been loyal to his distant relative, exonerated. Kidō and other Chōshū samurai allied with the Meiji emperor had reason to see Nagakoto as a one of their own: Nagakoto had earlier refused a *bakufu* request that he mobilize troops for an expedition against Chōshū.

²⁶ Fukuzawa Yukichi, "Gakumon no susume no hyō" 學問のすすめの評 (A Defense of *An Encouragement of Learning*), in *Gakumon no susume* 學問のすすめ (An Encouragement of Learning), ed. Koizumi Shinzō 小泉信三 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1986), p. 166.

²⁷ Fukuzawa, "Kokuhō no tōtoku o ronzu" 国法の貴きを論ず (On Respecting the Laws of the State, ch. 6) and "Kokumin no shokubun o ronzu" 国民の職分を論ず (On the Duties of Citi-

Due to his criticisms of the *rōnin* Fukuzawa was repeatedly lambasted in the press. Threats were even made on his life. These finally prompted him to write a defense of *Gakumon* in which he admitted that the ideas which he advanced had come from an ethics text by an American philosopher, Francis Wayland. By shifting the blame to Wayland, Fukuzawa partly relieved himself of responsibility for his shocking assessment of the *rōnin*. Though he never apologized, Fukuzawa's criticisms of the *rōnin*, and the concomitant threats against Fukuzawa, diminished shortly after his defense of *Gakumon* appeared. Albert Craig's study of Fukuzawa sees 1875, the year in which this controversy was largely played out, as a "transitional point in Fukuzawa's thought," it being the year that Fukuzawa became "uncertain" and more and more "disillusioned." Craig explains that as of 1875, Fukuzawa had lost faith in a utopia ruled by natural laws, and was tending towards a "moderate relativism"; the latter perspective supposedly reflecting his doubts about the prospects for real progress in Meiji Japan.²⁸ Kada Tetsuji 加田哲二 has similarly suggested that Fukuzawa's backsliding in the wake of the media imbroglio reflected the practical need for him to be less headstrong in expressing ideas, like his criticisms of the *rōnin*, that could provoke hostile reactions rather than enlightenment.²⁹

Vis-à-vis Shōin's thought, Fukuzawa's retreat from an outspoken liberalism is quite significant. In exonerating the Akō *rōnin*, the Meiji emperor decisively reversed the Tokugawa verdict that they were criminals. The emperor even praised the *rōnin*, much as Shōin had, as teachers who had instructed hundreds of generations. Thereafter the Akō *rōnin* were not just popular folk heroes of *kabuki* theatre; they were imperially sanctioned cultural models as well. Even eminent thinkers like Fukuzawa felt obliged to accommodate, via prudent silence, the Akō *rōnin*. To criticize them further, Fukuzawa apparently concluded, was unwise and counterproductive; moreover such criticism could be construed as an insult directed at the Meiji emperor. After the *rōnin* were vindicated from on high, perhaps it was simply a matter of time before their supposed teacher, Yamaga Sokō, was granted similar legitimacy.

zens, ch. 7), in *Gakumon no susume*, ed. Koizumi, pp. 54-72. For an English translation, see David Dilworth and Umeyo Hirano, *Fukuzawa Yukichi's An Encouragement of Learning* (Tokyo: Sophia University, 1969), pp. 35-47. Discussions of the Nankō-Gonsuke ron are found in Nagao Masanori 長尾正憲, *Fukuzawa Yukichi no kenkyū* 福沢諭吉の研究 (Studies of Fukuzawa Yukichi) (Tokyo: Shibunkaku shuppan, 1988), pp. 253, 360. Kada Tetsuji 加田哲二, "Akō gishi hyōron" 赤穂義士評論 (Critical Discussion of the Righteous Samurai of Akō) and "Nankō-Gonsuke ron" 楠公権助論 (The Nankō-Gonsuke Controversy), in *Shisōka to shite no Fukuzawa Yukichi* 思想家としての福沢諭吉 (Fukuzawa Yukichi Viewed as a Intellectual) (Tokyo: Keiō tsūshin, 1958), pp. 121-35. Aida Kurakichi 会田鞍吉, *Fukuzawa Yukichi* 福沢諭吉 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1974), pp. 181-83. Ishikawa Kanmei 石河幹明, "Iwayuru Nankō-Gonsuke ron" いわゆる楠公権助論 (The So-called Nankō-Gonsuke Controversy), *Fukuzawa Yukichi den* 福沢諭吉伝 (Biography of Fukuzawa Yukichi), vol. 2 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1932), pp. 327-42.

²⁸ Albert M. Craig, "Fukuzawa Yukichi: The Philosophical Foundations of Meiji Nationalism," in *Political Development in Modern Japan*, ed. Robert E. Ward (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), pp. 124, 127.

²⁹ Kada, *Shisōka to shite no Fukuzawa Yukichi*, p. 135.

2. Legitimization of Sokô in Late-Meiji Japan

Due to Shôin's impact on many of the key leaders of the Meiji leadership, ties between Sokô and the Akô *rônin* were glorified, celebrated, and then sanctified in Meiji Japan. One Meiji newspaper, for example, ran a serial account of the Akô *rônin* incident, providing details of the vendetta along with biographies of the *rônin*. The latter, written by the journalist Fukumoto Nichinan 福本日南 (1857-1921), was so well received that the same material was later published as a monograph, *Akô kaikyo roku* 赤穂快舉錄 (Record of the Akô Incident), and went through many late-Meiji editions.³⁰ At theatres in Tokyo, Osaka, and Kyoto, sell-out crowds attended *Chûshingura* so regularly that it became a metaphor for things immensely popular.³¹ A quasi-religious sect devoted to remembrance of Sokô also emerged, sponsoring ritual ceremonies commemorating Sokô's life and publishing literature by or about him. On September 26, 1885, a decade before the Sino-Japanese War, the Sôsanji 宗三 temple (in modern Shinjuku), where Sokô was buried, commemorated the 200th anniversary of his demise. Twenty years later, on June 6, 1906, following the Russo-Japanese war, it held another memorial service for him. Three months later there was yet another. Thereafter these rites became annual events, adding a religious layer to the Sokô revival. On April 20, 1907, the Sôsanji continued its apotheosis of Sokô by sponsoring an exhibit of his *Bukyô zensho*, *Nenpu* 年譜 (Chronological Biography), and *Kafu* 家譜 (Family Genealogy).³²

Tokyo University Professor of Philosophy Inoue Tetsujirô 井上哲次郎 (1856-1944) took the lead in academia in identifying Sokô's thought as a key ingredient in Japan's *kokusui* 國粹, i.e., national essence, and its *kokutai*, or national substance. Inoue's *Nihon kogaku no tetsugaku* 日本古學の哲學 (The Philosophy of the Japanese School of Ancient Learning), published in 1902, advanced the revival by crediting Sokô's teachings with having decisively influenced Ôishi Kuranosuke and the Akô *rônin*. In doing so Inoue annotated myths linking Sokô to the Akô *rônin* with the kind of academic respectability that only a professor at Japan's premier imperial university could have given them. Inoue's socio-political thought, recently dubbed "neotraditionalism," typically blended elements of Confucian morality with nativist myth.³³ Also, Inoue often deployed Sokô's ideas about Japan's *kokutai* to fashion an unofficial

³⁰ Quoted in Tawara, "Yamaga Sokô to shidô," *Yamaga Sokô*, p. 11.

³¹ James L. Huffman, *Politics of the Meiji Press: The Life of Fukuchi Gen'ichirô* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1980), p. 96.

³² *Yamaga Sokô ryaku nenpu* 山鹿素行略年譜 (Abbreviated Chronological Biography of Yamaga Sokô), in *Yamaga Sokô zenshû* 山鹿素行全集 (Complete Works of Yamaga Sokô; hereafter, *YSZ*), ed. Hirose Yutaka 広瀬豊 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1942), vol. 1, pp. 70-71.

³³ Duus and Scheiner, "Socialism, Liberalism, and Marxism, 1901-1931," pp. 654-55. Also see Irokawa Daikichi, *The Culture of the Meiji Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), pp. 280, 288, 291. Irokawa characterizes Inoue as an ideologue who followed Katô Hiroyuki 加藤弘之 (1836-1916) in solidifying the emperor system in late-Meiji Japan via notions such as "the family state" (*kazoku kokka* 家族国家), "loyalty to the emperor" (*chûkun* 忠君), and "patriotism" (*aikoku* 愛國). Irokawa does not explore Inoue's thoughts on Yamaga Sokô, though similar

but widely accepted “civil religion” which buttressed the imperial state with traditional militaristic teachings glorifying self-sacrificing loyalty. Reiterating ideas that Sokô had developed in his *Chûchô jijitsu*, Inoue, for example, claimed that the unbroken imperial line which had ruled Japan since antiquity was the crucial factor differentiating Japan from all other nations. Sokô had argued that Japan’s unbroken line reflected the virtue of its people who would not dare murder their emperor as Chinese had so repeatedly done; it also proved the true divinity of the imperial line itself. Significantly, Inoue’s popularization of this emperor-centered understanding of Japan’s *kokutai* “informed textbooks, the education of schoolteachers, and the training of lesser functionaries in the police, the military, and the judicial service.”³⁴

To an extent Inoue’s emphasis on (1) Sokô’s impact on the Akô *rônin*, and (2) Sokô’s imperial loyalism, was not an entirely accurate historical recapitulation of Sokô’s thought. After all, Sokô never pointed to his impact on Akô samurai as proof of the efficacy of his teachings. In fact it seems that Sokô’s experiences in Akô domain were not his proudest ones. Apart from his *Haisho zanpitsu* 配所殘筆 (Exile Testament) and his *Nenpu* (Chronological Diary), Sokô rarely referred to Akô. Though his *Chûchô jijitsu*, written during his last years in exile, did foreshadow later *kokugaku* 國學, or national learning, literature by emphasizing the sanctity of Japan’s imperial line, there is little evidence that the *Chûchô jijitsu* was a widely known work in Tokugawa Japan. Moreover there is no strong evidence suggesting that Sokô saw the imperial loyalism of the *Chûchô jijitsu* as a definitive feature of his thought. For example, Sokô did not emphasize imperial loyalism after returning to Edo following his pardon in 1675. Inoue’s reading of Sokô’s philosophy thus seems to derive more from Shôin’s lectures on Sokô’s *Bukyô zensho*: there Shôin argued that samurai must master Sokô’s ideas so that they could repay the imperial virtue and preserve Japan’s sacred *kokutai*. Shôin also explained the efficacy of Sokô’s ideas by observing that they conveyed the same wisdom which Sokô had communicated to Ôishi Kuranosuke. In combining samurai loyalism and imperial loyalism as characteristics of Sokô’s thought, Inoue’s understanding of Sokô then seems to derive mostly from Shôin’s interpretation of Sokô’s *shidô* which focused loyalism on the imperial center.

Because they impacted popular and scholarly literature about Sokô, in both Japan and the West, for the much of the remainder of the twentieth century, Professor Inoue’s writings on Sokô, the Akô *rônin*, and Japanese *kokutai* were undoubtedly among the most influential elements of the Sokô revival in Meiji Japan. However General Nogi Marusuke 乃木希典 (1849-1912), the son of a Chôshû samurai, eclipsed Inoue’s contributions to the Sokô revival by attempting to embody the kind of self-sacrificing loyalty that had earlier been displayed by the Akô *rônin*, while giving that loyalism a distinct imperial focus. In 1907, Nogi spearheaded an effort culminating in Sokô’s posthumous receipt of the fourth imperial court rank, junior level (*shôshii* 正四位). Thus did the Meiji emperor reverse the 1666 *bakufu* verdict that Sokô’s *Seikyô yôroku* was *futodoki naru shomotsu* 不届な

themes appear in Inoue’s exposition of Sokô’s *shidô*. One could arguably find traditional grounds for Inoue’s pro-imperial ideology in Sokô’s ideas.

³⁴ Duus and Scheiner, “Socialism, Liberalism, and Marxism, 1901-1931,” pp. 654-55.

る書物 or “an intolerably outrageous writing.”³⁵ Not long after, Nogi and a small group of Sokô admirers visited the Sôsanji cemetery. Nogi read the following statement before Sokô’s grave, announcing to him his posthumous elevation to imperial rank by the Meiji emperor:

My teacher, your virtue was the highest in your generation; your perception surpassed that of ancient and modern times; your learning was broad and profound; your discourses were excellent. Early on you illuminated the essential blossoms of the spirit of our national polity, clarifying the difference between the true Central Empire and things alien. You rectified matters of name and station, explaining brilliantly the way of the samurai. Your intentions were always focused on the administration of the realm; your talents combined both the martial and civil arts. Unfortunately, your age did not appreciate you. Your exile separated you from the world. Thus you passed away unable to have realized your magnificent aspirations. Was it not tragic? ...

When I was a child, my father taught me your philosophy as we read your works together. In my heart I revere the lofty wind; gazing up I strive to be a model samurai.³⁶

The next year, 1908, the newly organized Sokô kai 素行會, or “Yamaga Sokô Commemorative Society,” began sponsoring annual memorial services for Sokô at the Sôsanji, as well as lectures on Sokô’s thought and publication of his remaining works.³⁷ Not surprisingly, Professor Inoue, General Nogi, and Admiral Tôgô Heihachirô 東郷平八郎 (1847-1934) were among the Society’s more prominent members.³⁸

In 1912, Nogi personally underwrote the first post-Tokugawa edition of Sokô’s *Chûchô jijitsu*. On 9/11 of the same year, the day before his death, Nogi presented a copy of the *Chûchô jijitsu* to the crown prince, the future Taishô 大正 emperor.³⁹ On the day of the Meiji emperor’s funeral, Nogi and his wife followed their lord, the Meiji emperor, in death by committing *seppuku*. In his suicide note, Nogi deplored the decadent self-indulgence of young people, exhorting them to live by the warrior code of the samurai.⁴⁰ No doubt he had in mind Sokô’s *shidô*. After Nogi’s death, a contemporary newspaper, *Taiyô* 太陽 (The Sun) remarked, “nothing has so stirred up the sentiments of the nation

³⁵ Hori, *Yamaga Sokô*, pp. 206-230.

³⁶ Quoted in Tawara, *Yamaga Sokô*, p. 13.

³⁷ *Yamaga Sokô ryaku nenpu*, in YSZ, vol. 1, pp. 70-71.

³⁸ Inoue Tetsujirô, “Yamaga Sokô,” *Nihon jinmei daijiten* 日本人名大事典 (Encyclopedia of Japanese Names), vgol. 6 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1979 reprint of 1938 ed.), pp. 314-15.

³⁹ Mark Peattie suggests that Nogi’s interest in Sokô derived from Sokô’s emphasis on the imperial throne as the focus of all loyalties. Peattie does not, however, discuss the role Nogi played in having imperial rank conferred on Sokô. See Mark R. Peattie, “The Last Samurai: The Military Career of Nogi Maresuke,” *Princeton Papers in East Asian Studies, Japan* (Princeton: Program in Asian Studies, 1972), pp. 101-02, 108.

⁴⁰ Michael Montgomery, *Imperialist Japan* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1987), p. 224.

since the vendetta of the 47 *rōnin* in 1703.”⁴¹ However, Nogi’s links with the *rōnin*, and Sokō as well, were most definitively established by Professor Inoue who, in his later writings, emphasized the exceptional potency of Sokō’s *shidō* by pointing to its successive exemplars---the Akō *rōnin*, Yoshida Shōin, and General Nogi---in Japanese history. (To be continued.)

* * * *

Translation of Yamaga Sokō’s *Seikyō yōroku* (cont.)

Chapter Two

(1) The Mean (*chū* 中)

The mean refers to duly regulated behavior without any partial biases.⁴² Confucius noted that “perceptive people often go beyond the mean in their actions, while less capable ones do not always attain it.” That is why the mean is not more widely practiced.⁴³ If it were widely practiced then all human feelings---pleasure, anger, sorrow, and joy---would be well governed, as would families, states, and the world. After all, the *Doctrine of the Mean* states that “the mean is the great foundation of the world!”⁴⁴

The sagely way consists of practicing the mean (J. *yō* 廉, Ch. *yong*).⁴⁵ Such practice consists of extending one’s knowledge of the rites and following that knowledge

⁴¹ Ukita Kazutami, “Nogi Taishō no junshi o ronzuru” 乃木大将の殉死を論ずる (A Discussion of General Nogi’s Suicide after the Meiji Emperor’s Death), *Taiyō* 太陽 18.15 (Nov. 1912), p. 2; quoted in Carol Gluck, *Japan’s Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), pp. 221-25. Gluck also notes, “it was Nogi---not the emperor---who became the embodiment of the Meiji period in popular culture. Along with the forty-seven *rōnin*, he appeared the ubiquitous protagonist...the most popular entertainment of the time.” Gluck, *Japan’s Modern Myths*, p. 224.

⁴² *Doctrine of the Mean* (Ch. *Zhongyong*; hereafter, *The Mean*), ch. 1; Shimada Kenji 島田慶次, ed., *Daigaku Chūyō* 大学中庸 (The Great Learning, The Doctrine of the Mean), Chūgoku koten 中国古典 series, vol. 4 (Tokyo: Asahi shinbunsha, 1978), pt. 2, p. 37. “The mean prevails when the feelings have not yet emerged. Harmony exists when they emerge, attaining their due degree.” Also, *The Mean*, ch. 10; Shimada, ed., *Daigaku Chūyō*, pt., 2, p. 58. “Gentlemen...abide in the mean, without partial biases.” And, Zhu Xi 朱熹, comp., *Zhongyong zhangju* 中庸章句 (Commentary on the Words and Phrases of the Doctrine of the Mean), eds. Suzuki Yoshijirō 鈴木由次郎 et al. (Tokyo: Meitoku shuppansha, 1974), Shushigaku taikei 朱子学体系 (Anthology of Zhu Xi’s Neo-Confucianism; hereafter, ST), vol. 8, pp. 14, 450, remarks, “The mean is without partial biases.”

⁴³ *The Mean*, ch. 4, pt. 2, p. 46.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, ch. 1, pt. 2, p. 37.

⁴⁵ Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 (1017-73), “Teachers,” *Tongshu* 通書 (Penetrating the Book of Changes); Fumoto Yasutaka 麗保孝 et al., eds., *Shushi no senku* 朱子の先覺 (Master Zhu’s

exactly in practice. The sagely Confucian remarks: “Be discriminating, be unified,” “use the mean,” and “choose the mean and its practicality,”⁴⁶ emphasize the importance of practicing the mean. However, one cannot practice the mean by merely examining the mind’s intentions and hoping for enlightenment. Nor can one practice the mean by scrutinizing the mind prior to its agitation. Rather, practice refers to what one does regularly. People can only practice the mean in their daily tasks. It is mistaken to think that practice refers to a special method of cultivation distinct from the mean.⁴⁷

(2) The Way (*michi* 道)

Because “the way,” as a concept, generally refers to the course that one should follow in daily activity, it also signifies, more specifically, those rational and ethical principles which a person ought to follow.⁴⁸ Heaven revolves around all things; earth supports them;⁴⁹ and human beings and animals dwell among them. Each realm has a way from which it cannot differ.

The moral Way is practical. Unless it can be followed everyday in practice, it is not the true moral Way. The sagely Confucian Way is the moral Way of humanity; thus it consists of the ethical course that everyone should follow in their daily activities regardless of time and place. If it were artificial or contrived so that only one person could practice it but others could not, or so that the ancients could embody it but moderns could not, then

Predecessors), ST, vol. 2, p. 143. “The mean is the principle of regularity, the universally recognized law of morality, and is that to which the sage is devoted.”

⁴⁶ *Shujing* 書經 (Book of History), “The Counsels of Great Yu”; James Legge, trans., *The Chinese Classics* (hereafter, CC) (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University, 1970 reprint of the Oxford University Press edition), vol. 3, p. 61. “Be discriminating, be unified, so that you can sincerely hold fast to the mean.” *The Mean*, ch. 6; Shimada, pt. 2, p. 49. “The Master said, ‘Shun ... used the mean in governing.’” Also, *The Mean*, ch. 8, pt. 2, p. 53. “The Master said, ‘Yan Hui always chose the mean.’”

⁴⁷ Sokô objects to treating *yong/yō* 常 (practice) as distinct from “the mean.” Cf., Chen Beixi 陳北溪, “Centrality [The Mean] and Ordinary [Practice],” *Xingli ziyi* 性理字義 (hereafter, XLZY), (1632 edition), pp. 68a-b; Wing-tsit Chan, trans., *Neo-Confucian Terms Explained* (hereafter, NCTE), (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), p. 126. Beixi criticizes the same tendency. Zhu Xi explained “the mean and practice” as distinct notions in his *Lunyu jizhu* 論語集注 (Commentary on Analects), 6/27, ST, vol. 7, pp. 128 (409). But Beixi insists: “This should not imply that outside the mean there is another practice.”

⁴⁸ Cf., Chen Beixi, “The Way,” XLZY, p. 51a; Chan, trans., NCTE, p. 105. “Essentially *dao* (J. *michi*) signifies those principles people should follow in daily affairs and human relations. Only what is followed by all people can be called the way. Generally the word *dao* conveys the idea of something that is used daily in practical human affairs, as well as the idea of something people follow.” Translation adapted.

⁴⁹ Cf., *Zhuangzi* 莊子, “Heaven Revolves”; *Zhuangzi yinde* 莊子引得 (Concordance to the Zhuangzi, hereafter, ZZYD) (Taipei: Hongdao wenhua shiye youxian gongsi, 1972), p. 36. “Heaven revolves, while earth holds its place.”

it would not be the moral Way of humanity, nor would the *Doctrine of the Mean* have stated that the moral Way “follows human nature.”⁵⁰

The notion of “the moral Way” arose from the word *dao* 道 which signifies a road that people follow.⁵¹ In travelling, people must follow roads. Their wagons and carriages, for example, all proceed along large highways linking the imperial capital with every direction. Because these highways facilitate the flow of people and commodities, everyone wants to use them.⁵² Back alleys, although convenient for locals, are narrow, cramped, and difficult to navigate; nevertheless they are occasionally pleasant. Confucius’ moral Way is a great thoroughfare, while heterodox ways are mere alleys. The latter provide trifling amusements but no real peace or security. Great thoroughfares may lack roadside attractions but myriad alleys flow into them; therefore one can never really leave them.

(3) Principle (*ri* 理)

Principle refers to rational order.⁵³ Everything has an order. If that is thrown into confusion, then matters of precedence and hierarchy will never be right. One errs greatly in defining human nature and heaven as principle.⁵⁴ A natural order pervades heaven, earth, and humanity. Rituals embody that order.

(4) Virtue (*toku* 德)

Virtue (*toku* 德) refers to gaining (*toku* 得). As one’s knowledge is perfected, one comes to embody it. Practicing virtue refers to gaining virtue in one’s mind and physically embodying it in one’s behavior. When virtue is practiced impartially, one comes to com-

⁵⁰ *The Mean*, ch. 1; Shimada, pt. 2, p. 29.

⁵¹ Chen Beixi, “The Way,” *XLZY*, pp. 51a-b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 105. “The word *dao* (J: *michi*) refers to a road. Originally *dao* signified people on a road. As roads refer to places that many people follow, one would not call something a road if only one person used it. Essentially, *dao* signifies those principles people should follow in daily affairs and human relations... In reality, however, the word *dao* derives from places that people walk along.” Translation adapted.

⁵² Cf., *Mencius*, 1A/7; *Mengzi yinde* 孟子引得 (Concordance to the Mencius; hereafter, *MZYD*), eds. Hong Ye 洪業 (William Hung) et al. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988), p. 4. “Travellers all would wish to use the King’s roads (if he ruled humanely).” Also *Mencius*, 6B/2, *MZYD*, p. 47. “The way is like a large road.”

⁵³ Cf., *Mencius*, 5B/1; *MZYD*, p. 39. “Proceeding along with...the rational order of things is the work of wisdom.”

⁵⁴ This refers to the Cheng-Zhu position that “nature is principle” and that “heaven is principle.” In “The Decree” (*ming* 命), Beixi states that the decree of Heaven can be understood in terms of principle or material force. *XLZY*, pp. 1a-b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, pp. 37-38. Discussing “Human Nature” (*xing* 性), Beixi says “Human nature is principle.” *XLZY*, p. 5b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 46.

prehend heaven and earth without being confused by anything. Such all-penetrating virtue is called heavenly virtue or luminous virtue.⁵⁵ If one's achievements are weak and shallow like thin ice, then one cannot be called virtuous.

(5) Humaneness (*jin* 仁)

Humaneness enables people to be truly human.⁵⁶ One becomes humane by “overcoming selfishness and returning to propriety.”⁵⁷ Just as heaven and earth manifest the virtue of origination,⁵⁸ people should display humaneness in their daily behavior. Confucius exhaustively explained the total substance and the great functioning⁵⁹ of humaneness by answering Yanzi's 颜子 questions about humaneness with both general and particular explanations.⁶⁰ Humaneness encompasses all of the five constant virtues;⁶¹ thus, it is the highest of all the sage Confucian teachings.

Han and Tang scholars explained humaneness as love (*ai* 愛),⁶² but their accounts are insufficient. Song Confucians equated humaneness with human nature (*sei* 性),⁶³ yet

⁵⁵ *Book of Changes*, “Explanation of the Words and Sentences;” James Legge, *I Ching* (New York: University Books, 1964), p. 414; *Book of Changes*, “Treatise on the Symbols”; *Zhouyi deng shizhong yinde* 周易等十種引得 (Concordances to the Zhou Book of Changes and Ten Other Works), eds. Hong Ye et al. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988), includes the *Zhouyi yinde* 周易引得 (Concordance to the Zhou Book of Changes; hereafter, *ZYYD*), p. 2, and refers to “heavenly virtue.” *Great Learning*, ch. 1; Shimada, pt. 1, p. 62, refers to “luminous virtue.”

⁵⁶ *The Mean*, ch. 20; Shimada, pt. 2, p. 118. Also, Legge, *Li Chi*, Vol. 2, p. 333.

⁵⁷ *Analects*, 12/1; *Lunyu yinde* 論語引得 (Concordance to the Analects; hereafter, *LYYD*), eds. Hong Ye et al. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988), p. 22.

⁵⁸ *Book of Changes*, “Explanation of the Words and Sentences”; Legge, *I Ching*, p. 408; *ZYYD*, p. 1. Zhu Xi's *Ren shuo* 仁說 (Treatise on Humaneness) opens stating: “The mind of heaven and earth is to create things.” *Huiyan xiansheng Zhu wengong wenji* 晦庵先生朱文公文集 (Collected Literary Works of Zhu Xi), eds. Okada Takehiko 岡田武彥 and Satô Hitoshi 佐藤仁 (Taipei: Dahua Book Co., 1986), vol. 2, p. 4950.

⁵⁹ The substance/function dichotomy, which derived from Neo-Daoist writings, is crucial to Zhu Xi's “Treatise on Humaneness.” *Huiyan xiansheng Zhu Wengong wenji*, vol. 2, pp. 4950-53. Zhu also refers to the mind in terms of “the total substance and great functioning” in his *Daxue zhangju* 大学章句(Commentary on the Great Learning), ST, vol. 7, pp. 359 (444).

⁶⁰ *Analects*, 12/1; *LYYD*, p. 22. After Confucius generally described humaneness as “overcoming selfishness and returning to propriety,” Yan Hui asked about the particulars. Confucius said, “Do not look, listen, speak, or act contrary to propriety.”

⁶¹ The five constant virtues are humaneness, rightness, propriety, wisdom, and faithfulness. Zhu Xi's “Treatise on Humaneness” states: “The human mind possesses four virtues, humaneness, rightness, propriety, and wisdom. But none of these four is not included within the one virtue, humaneness.” *Huiyan xiansheng Zhu Wengong wenji*, vol. 2, p. 4951.

⁶² Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (ca. 179-ca. 104 B.C.E.), *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露 (Luxuriant Dew of the Spring and Autumn Annals); Wing-tsit Chan, *A Source Book of Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 286. “The principle of humaneness consists in loving

their views exaggerate its meaning. Thus did Han, Tang, and Song Confucians badly misunderstand Confucius's teachings on the notion of humaneness. The ideas of the Han and Tang scholars were relatively innocuous, but the philosophical damage done by the Song and Ming Confucians was egregious. In explaining humaneness Confucius was much more specific than the Han, Tang, and Song scholars ever recognized.

Contrasted with rightness, humaneness refers to what one likes as opposed to what one dislikes.⁶⁴ Yet humaneness and rightness cannot be dissected: one practices humaneness by relying on rightness and one completes rightness by relying on humaneness. Human feelings, which consist of our likes and dislikes, are natural emotions. Humaneness and rightness are our duly regulated likes and dislikes.

As Mencius explained,⁶⁵ each of the five constant virtues has its own function. In this respect they neither overlap nor exist independently of one another. One Song Confucian claimed, however, that "all beings composed of vital fluids and generative force are endowed with the five constants."⁶⁶ That is most absurd! The five constants are the duly regulated manifestations of human feelings. Without extending knowledge and energetically practicing the moral Way, a person cannot embody the five constant virtues. Everyone has feelings; only by practicing the Way can they be duly regulated.

(6) Rituals (*rei* 禮)

Rituals are the ethical rules of behavior that people should follow in their lives. People follow them so that they can regulate their actions according to the mean and bring order to their daily tasks.⁶⁷ One who can both understand and practice rituals is a sage. Without rituals, people would not know what to do with their hands and feet, or what they should look at or listen to! Without rituals, people would not know when to advance and

the people and not in loving oneself." Han Yu 韓愈 (768-824), "Yuan dao" 原道 (Inquiry into the Origin of the Way), in *Gujin wenxuan* 古今文選 (Anthology of Ancient and Modern Literature), vol. 3 (Taipei: Guoyu erbaoshe, 1958), p. 1469. "Loving extensively is humaneness."

⁶³ Cheng Mingdao 程明道 (1032-85), *Yishu* 遺書 (*Surviving Works*) sect. 9, *Er Cheng quanshu* 二程全書 (Complete Works of the Cheng Brothers), ch. 10, p. 341. "The five constant virtues are human nature." Cheng Yichuan 程伊川 (1033-1108), *Yishu*, sect. 4, *Er Cheng quanshu* (Sibei buyao ed.; hereafter, SBBY), ch. 19, p. 532. "Love is feeling while humaneness is human nature."

⁶⁴ Cf., *Mencius*, 2A/6; *MZYD*, p. 13. "Mencius said, 'The feeling of commiseration is the beginning of humanity; the feeling of shame and dislike is the beginning of rightness.'"

⁶⁵ *Mencius*, 2A/6; *MZYD*, pp. 11-12. But here Mencius was speaking of the four virtues, not the five constants.

⁶⁶ Cheng Yi, *Yishu*, sect. 7, *Er Cheng quanshu*, ch. 23, p. 780.

⁶⁷ *Book of Rites*, "Evolution of the Rites"; Legge, *Li Chi*, vol. 1, p. 367. "Confucius said, '... to neglect [the rites] is to die, while to follow them enables one to live a proper life.'" *Book of Rites*, "Confucius at Ease in his Home"; Legge, *Li Chi*, vol. 2, p. 271. "Confucius said, '...with rituals one adjusts one's behavior to the mean.'" Translations adapted.

when to retreat, or when to press on and when to yield.⁶⁸ With rituals, peace prevails in the home, the community, the imperial house, and in civilian and samurai society. Rituals do not distort feelings nor do they simply embellish appearances: instead they provide natural regulation. Rituals thus constitute the moral Way from which we cannot depart. The sagely Confucian teachings therefore consist simply of rituals and music.

(7) Truth (*makoto* 誠)

Truth refers to what cannot be denied. Pure, unitary, and unadulterated, it spans past and present unchanged. The *Book of Poetry*'s remark, "The decree of Heaven! How profound and unrelenting!"⁶⁹ refers to that eternal aspect of truth. Sagely Confucian teachings never depart from truth. The moral Way, virtue, humaneness and rightness, rituals and music, are all inescapable truths for mankind. Like the love between fathers and sons, truth is not something artificially molded onto people.

The Song Confucians misunderstood the meaning of truth in claiming that "the absence of absurdity is truth" and "genuine reality without any absurdity is truth."⁷⁰ Contrary to their claims, it is by advancing the undeniable truth that one achieves a level of moral behavior in which every word, deed, and task is void of any falsehood.

(8) Loyalty and Empathy (*chujo* 忠恕)

Loyalty (*chu* 忠) means doing things for others unselfishly; faithfulness (*shin* 信) means being honest, not deceitful.⁷¹ Loyalty demands that one not be selfish, while faithfulness requires that one refrain from deceit. Loyalty relates to the mind; faithfulness to tasks and affairs.⁷² Rulers and elders should be served with loyalty, while friends should be treated faithfully. Confucius' sagely teachings consist primarily of loyalty and faithfulness!

⁶⁸ *Book of Rites*, "Confucius at Ease in his Home;" Legge, *Li Chi*, Vol. 2, p. 273. "Without the rites, one would not know how to dispose of his hands and feet, or how to apply his ears and eyes; and his advancing and retiring, his bowings and giving place would be without any definite rules." Translation adapted.

⁶⁹ *Shijing* 詩經 (Book of Poetry), "Mao," no. 267; Legge, *CC*, vol. 4, p. 570.

⁷⁰ Cheng Yi, *Yishu*, sect. 7, *Er Cheng quanshu*, ch. 23, p. 781; Zhu Xi, *Zhongyong zhangju* (Commentary on the Doctrine of the Mean), ST, vol. 8, pp. 45 (457). These remarks are quoted in the same order in Chen Beixi, "Sincerity," *XLZY*, p. 44a; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 97.

⁷¹ Cf., Cheng Yi, as quoted by Beixi, states: "Loyalty means exerting oneself to the utmost and faithfulness means making things real." *XLZY*, p. 37b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 86.

⁷² Cf., Chen Beixi, "Loyalty and Faithfulness"; *XLZY*, p. 37b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 86. "Loyalty refers to what issues from within one's mind... What emerges in relation to external events, being wholly real and true, is faithfulness."

Empathy (*jo* 怨) means not doing to others what one does not wish for oneself.⁷³ Loyalty means dealing with matters unselfishly; empathy entails governing people by taking them into consideration.

(9) Seriousness and Respectfulness (*keikyō* 敬恭)

Seriousness refers to being deliberate and reverent in conduct, and refraining from doing things in a wild and unregulated way. If one perfectly manifests seriousness in every aspect of the rites, one behaves with proper vigilance. When discussed apart from the rites, however, seriousness sounds oppressive, cramped, and uncomfortable.

Confucius' sagely teachings focus on ritual behavior. When practicing the rites one does become serious. Yet dwelling in seriousness is not the way to master ritual propriety. Song Confucians, however, mistakenly declared that seriousness is the foundation of learning; they also wrongly claimed that seriousness is the means by which one can perfectly embody the sagely Confucian learning from beginning to end.⁷⁴ When people follow the Song methods of "concentrating on one thing" (*shuichi* 主一) and "quiet sitting" (*seiza* 靜坐),⁷⁵ they become overly reverent, submerged in silence, and oppressively narrow. Confucius explained seriousness in terms of being cautious and apprehensive.⁷⁶ Yet when one's seriousness is an outgrowth of ritual behavior, the caution and apprehension accompanying it engenders a natural calmness and serenity. Dwelling exclusively on seriousness as the Song Neo-Confucians did incarcerates the human mind within itself so that it penetrates nothing.

Respectfulness (*kyō* 恭) refers to seriousness manifested externally.⁷⁷

(10) Ghosts and Spirits (*kishin* 鬼神)

Ghosts and spirits are mysterious, omnipresent entities. The spiritual energies of *yin* and *yang* are traces of ghosts and spirits (*kishin no ato* 鬼神之跡), as are the all-

⁷³ Cf., Analects, 15/24; *LYYD*, p. 32.

⁷⁴ Cf., Zhu Xi (1130-1200), *Zhuzi quanshu* 朱子全書 (Complete Works of Zhu Xi), 2:21b; Chan, *A Source Book*, p. 606. "Seriousness is the first principle of the Confucian school. From the beginning to the end, it must not be interrupted for an instant." Translation adapted.

⁷⁵ Cheng Yi, *Yishu*, sect. 1, *Er Cheng quanshu*, ch. 16, p. 445. "Seriousness is concentrating on one thing." Also, Chen Beixi, "Seriousness," *XLZY*, p. 47a; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 100 "Master Cheng said, 'Seriousness is concentrating on one thing.'" Quiet sitting was a Neo-Confucian meditative practice aimed at nourishing and preserving the mind. Li Yanping 李延平(1088-1163), a student of the Cheng brothers, taught it to Zhu Xi.

⁷⁶ Cf., *The Mean*, ch. 1; Shimada, pt. 2, p. 35. "Gentlemen are cautious and apprehensive."

⁷⁷ Cf., Chen Beixi, "Respect and Seriousness," *XLZY*, p. 50a; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 103. "Respectfulness is seriousness manifested externally; seriousness is respectfulness within."

penetrating, creative currents of heaven, earth, man, and things.⁷⁸ Ghosts are associated with *yin*, and spirits with *yang*.⁷⁹

The sage Confucius first dealt with matters relating to heaven, earth, and human affairs; thereafter he discussed ghosts and spirits.⁸⁰ Once people have mastered Confucius's teachings on heaven, earth, and humanity, they too will begin to understand ghosts and spirits despite their invisibility.

Ghosts and spirits pervade everything, even mysterious, profound spaces. Although we can neither perceive nor hear them, they consist of the same generative force (*ki* 氣) that humans do. Thus their existence cannot be doubted.

The heavenly components of the soul (*kon* 魂) belong to *yang*, and spirits are their spiritual forces. The earthly components of the soul (*haku* 魄) belong to *yin*, and ghosts are their spiritual forces.⁸¹ Human beings and animals are incarnations of *yin* and *yang*.⁸² The essential spiritual forces of *yin* and *yang* (*inyō no reisei* 陰陽之靈) are the earthly and heavenly components of the soul.

As human beings and animals embody form, ghosts and spirits appear within them. Indeed the refined generative force of ghosts and spirits informs all things.⁸³ When humans and animals no longer embody physical form their ghosts and spirits flow about, producing aberrations in the creative work of the universe. It is the wandering of the heavenly components of the soul (*yūkon* 游魂) that produces these aberrations.⁸⁴

⁷⁸ Cf., Cheng Yi, *Yi quan* 易傳 (Commentary on the Book of Changes), 1:7b; *Er Cheng quanshu*. "Ghosts and spirits are the traces of creation." And, Zhang Zai 張載 (1020-77), "The Great Harmony," *Zhengmeng* 正蒙 (Correcting Youthful Ignorance], in *Zhang Zai quanshu* 張載全書 (Complete Works of Zhang Zai), SBBY ed., ch. 2, p. 4a; Chan, *A Source Book*, p. 505. "Ghosts and spirits are the spontaneous activity of the two generative forces (*yin* and *yang*). Translation adapted. These remarks are quoted in succession in Chen Beixi, "Ghosts and Spirits," *XLZY*, p. 73b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 143. Sokô's view of "the spiritual forces of *yin* and *yang*" as "the traces of ghosts and spirits" derives from them.

⁷⁹ Cf., Chen Beixi, "Ghosts and Spirits," *XLZY*, p. 73b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 143. "Spirits are the spiritual forces of *yang* while ghosts are the spiritual forces of *yin*." Beixi paraphrases Zhu's *Zhongyong zhangju*, ch. 16, ST, vol. 8, pp. 31 (454).

⁸⁰ Cf., *Analects*, 11/12; *LYYD*, p. 20. "Zilu asked about the spirits of the dead. The Master replied, 'If you are still not able to serve humanity, how can you serve the spirits?'"

⁸¹ Cf., Chen Beixi, "Ghosts and Spirits," *XLZY*, p. 75b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 146. "Heavenly components of the soul belong to *yang* and make spirits, while earthly components of the soul belong to *yin* and make ghosts."

⁸² Chen Beixi, "Ghosts and Spirits," *XLZY*, p. 74b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 144. Beixi quotes the *Book of Rites* which states, "Human beings consist of the interaction of *yin* and *yang* and the convergence of ghosts and spirits."

⁸³ *Book of Changes*, "Appended Judgements;" *ZYYD*, p. 40. "The refined generative force integrates to become things." Cf., Legge, *I Ching*, p. 354.

⁸⁴ Cf., Chen Beixi, "Ghosts and Spirits," *XLZY* (1632), p. 76b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 147. Sokô's discussion essentially paraphrases this section of Beixi's text which, in turn, is based on the *Book of Changes*' remark, "The refined generative force integrates to become things. As it dis-

When people are busy, they remain diligent. Yet when idle, they become indolent. The myriad things are all rooted in heaven, but people are also rooted in their ancestors. The practices of making sacrifices to ancestors and worshiping distant kin reflect these inescapable truths of human existence. How could the religious rituals of humanity be mere artificial fabrications? When descendants worship their ancestors, the latter can respond to them because they share a common generative force with their descendants. Although the ancestral spirits may be far apart, they will gather to respond to the generative force of their progeny because it is the same as their own.⁸⁵

A constant rule of ritual propriety is that great matters of state should be announced to heaven, earth, and the entire host of spirits. Apart from that, however, people have specific spirits to whom they should sacrifice. Likewise, ghosts and spirits have descendants from whom they should receive sacrifices.

(11) *Yin* and *Yang* (*inyō* 陰陽)

Yin and *yang* fill all space in heaven and earth, effecting the creative activities of the universe. As complimentary forces that ceaselessly grow and disintegrate, come and go, expand and contract, produce and reproduce, *yin* and *yang* are the whole substance of heaven, earth, and humanity.⁸⁶

Yang is light and so it rises; *yin* is heavy and therefore descends. *Yang* is the generative force of things, while *yin* provides form. Yet generative force and form are inseparable. *Yin* and *yang* are likewise mutually related: one cannot cleave from the other, nor can one function apart from the other. Therefore neither *yin* nor *yang* assumes a fixed position as they jointly preside over creation.

Of the phenomena that *yin* and *yang* inform, fire and water are the most salient: they mutually oppose and rely on one another as their activities pervade the universe. Of the myriad creations of *yin* and *yang*, they are the greatest.

(12) The Five Elements (*gogyō* 五行)

integrates, the wandering away of its spirit becomes change. From this we know the characteristics and conditions of ghosts and spirits.” Translation adapted.

⁸⁵ Cf., Chen Beixi, “Ghosts and Spirits,” *XLZY*, p. 78a; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 149.

⁸⁶ Cf., Chen Beixi, “The Decree,” *XLZY*, p. 1b; Chan, trans., *NCTE*, p. 39. “The creation of man and things involves nothing other than the generative forces of *yin* and *yang* and the five elements.” Translation adapted.

The five elements provide *yin* and *yang* with form, and are the active agents of creation within heaven and earth.⁸⁷ *Yin* and *yang* are generative force, while the five elements provide the form of generative force. The five elements are not artificial; they exist naturally. Water and fire are the master elements. Water and fire are basically formless, despite the fact that they are real phenomena. Through mutual opposition and interaction, their creative powers exhaust myriad transformations.

Within the five elements there are cycles of production, action, and mutual succession. Amidst heaven, earth, and humanity, the five elements ceaselessly overcome, rely on, and then produce one another. Their cycles of creation, circulation, and succession are inexhaustible.

(13) Heaven and Earth (*tenchi* 天地)

Heaven and earth are the greatest forms manifested by *yin* and *yang*. Because they exist naturally and necessarily, heaven and earth never resort to artifice. They are eternal, having neither beginning nor end. Their dimensions cannot be measured, nor can instruments qualitatively analyze them further. One can only acknowledge that the flowing currents of *yin* and *yang* produce heaven and earth, the sun and moon, and the human and physical worlds.

Generative force ascends infinitely and thus forms heaven. Descending and congealing, it becomes earth. The truly inevitable nature of these ascents and descents is the most conspicuous characteristic of *yin* and *yang*.

Heaven and earth produce and reproduce ceaselessly.⁸⁸ Their creative energy is inexhaustible. Thus, the *Book of Changes* notes: "The mind of heaven and earth is evident in the hexagram 'Returning' (*fu* 復)." ⁸⁹ When finished with one thing heaven and earth

⁸⁷ Cf., Zhou Dunyi, "Taiji tushuo" 太極圖說 (Explanation of the Diagram of the Great Ultimate), in *Shushi no senku*, ST, vol. 2, p. 130. "By the transformation of *yang* and its union with *yin*, the five elements of water, fire, wood, metal, and earth arise." The five elements mutually oppose each other in that water overcomes fire, fire overcomes metal, metal overcomes wood, wood overcomes earth, and earth overcomes water. They interact in that water produces earth [ashes] by overcoming fire, earth produces wood by overcoming water, wood produces fires, and fire produces metal.

⁸⁸ Cf., Cheng Yi, *Yishu*, sect. 7, *Er Cheng quanshu*, ch. 16, p. 442. "The transformations of heaven and earth naturally produce things."

⁸⁹ Cf., Zhou Dunyi, "Taiji tushuo," in *Shushi no senku*, ST, vol. 2, p. 130. "By the transformation of *yang* and its union with *yin*, the five elements of water, fire, wood, metal, and earth arise." The five elements mutually oppose each other in that water overcomes fire, fire overcomes metal, metal overcomes wood, wood overcomes earth, and earth overcomes water. They interact in that water produces earth [ashes] by overcoming fire, earth produces wood by overcoming water, wood produces fires, and fire produces metal.

⁸⁸ Cf., Cheng Yi, *Yishu*, sect. 7, *Er Cheng quanshu*, ch. 16, p. 442. "The transformations of heaven and earth reproduce without end."

⁸⁹ *Book of Changes*, "Treatise on the T'uan"; Legge, *I Ching*, p. 233; ZYYD, p. 16.

initiate another so that their creative work has neither beginning nor end. The virtues of heaven and earth are most magnificent, most just, and most correct; in them one sees the ethical sentiments of heaven and earth.⁹⁰

Of the myriad manifestations of *yin* and *yang*, heaven and earth are the greatest, but the sun and moon are the most essential. Suspended above all creation, the sun and moon illuminate every phenomena⁹¹ so that the myriad things of heaven and earth attain their proper lot. The sun and moon penetrate every transformation within heaven and earth; thus do they participate in the activities of heaven and earth.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, "Treatise on the T'uan;" ZYYD, p. 20. "One sees the feelings of heaven, earth, and the myriad things."

⁹¹ Cf., *Book of Changes*, "Appended Judgements"; Legge, *I Ching*, p. 373; ZYYD, p. 44. "Of the phenomena suspended in the heavens, none is more illuminating than the sun and moon."