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Jusha, Literati and Yangban: Confucianists in Japan, China and Korea

HIROSHI WATANABE
The University of Tokyo

1. Introduction

The main theme of this paper is the social existence of the “jusha,” or the Confucianist, as an example of Japanese intellectual in the Tokugawa era. The “literati” of China and the “yangban” of Korea during the same period are discussed first for comparison. These three groups were the bearers of Confucian culture, and shaped the development of Confucianism in their respective countries.

2. “LITERATI”—IN CHINA

After the establishment of the Qing dynasty in China, which paralleled the Tokugawa era of Japan for a long period of time, there was an age when Chinese Confucian “intellectuals” or “literati” were dominant socially and politically. They had prominent social prestige as a symbol of the culture. There was a deep-rooted belief that they alone were capable of performing the duties required of the bearers and leaders of the moral principles of this world. It was said that the common people, while subject to the same principles, could not become literati “only because their circumstance did not permit them to acquire adequate culture to do so” (Kojiro Yoshikawa). In the biographies of leading merchants that appeared in local gazetteers there are found such Chinese phrases as “Qiru-jiushang” or “Qiru-jingshang,” which mean “he gave up pursuing the rank of scholar, and instead engaged in commerce.” This is in striking contrast to Japanese merchants, who, even while proud of their ancestors being samurai (warriors), used to urge their sons to work for the “family business” or “family trade” nevertheless. The literati were supposed to form the government in accordance with the Confucian teachings of “governing the people by self-cultivation.” They became government officials.
through a state examination system, which was formally open to almost all classes of people, and they participated directly in government affairs.

Some degrees in the examination system (the lowest of which was “shengyuan”), however, could be bought with money. Besides government officials with the highest degree “jinshi,” there were a great many people, including the “shengyuan,” who were aspiring to obtain degrees and assume high governmental posts. As Wu Jingzi (author of “Rulin Waishi”), Li Baojia (author of “Guanchang Xianxingji”) and others depicted, there were many government officials who were extremely vulgar. In these senses, the literati were not always government officials, nor were government officials always high-minded Confucianists. However, both the principle and the system of selecting government officials from among the literati were firmly established.

Literati, once promoted to government official rank, became “xiangshen” (gentry) when at home. They were local leaders or bosses, who assisted, used, or resisted local government officials. Also, they usually were landowners. In and after the 3rd year of the Yongzheng era (1725), nonpayment of farm rent to the landowner was punished. It was common that when a member of a family or a kin was a jinshi, some other members were shengyuan, and it was also common that a certain generation of a family or kin belonged to the jinshi rank, while another generation of the same family belonged to the shengyuan rank (Hiroshi Okusaki). However, a family line which experienced a much more dramatic change in its social status was not uncommon. Supporting the emperor, the literati always formed the upper social classes throughout the country. They were connected through a network of associations including kinship relations, while being exposed to constant changes in the “membership” of their class. They were different in their form of social existence from the jusha and samurai of Tokugawa Japan, most of whom were separated from the land.

The doctrines of Confucianism were well-suited to the above-mentioned social structure, where the literati combined their culture as individuals with their standing as government officials and local leaders under the rule of the emperor, who, acting under a “mandate from heaven” issued decrees one after another from far above. These situations certainly gave plausibility to the teachings of “the Great Learning,” which urges scholars first to cultivate their own innate nature and then to regulate their families, order well their state and make all under heaven tranquil and happy. Also, they provided persuasive power to the doctrines of Neo-Confucianism, the standard doctrines for the civil examination, which stated that the people could be duly governed and the world could be kept at peace by clarifying the “principles” of things and simultaneously awakening one’s inmost human nature. Meanwhile, the doctrines of Neo-Confucianism were conspicuously advocated by the Qing government, probably because it was the government of the non-Chinese “barbarians,” and hence, it needed powerful ideological legitimation. There was so wide a discrepancy between such highly-admired orthodox thought and political realities that the former seemed liable to bring distrust upon itself. Such was the case with
the examination system. At its outset, the examination system was presumably intended to assess fairly the depth of Confucian culture or self-cultivation, and find persons of high virtue. In reality, however, the examination system ushered in a fierce competition for success with innumerable “commoners” vying for the luck of obtaining wealth and social status. The scene was almost like a parody full of ill will, with laughter directed at Confucianism.

During and after the Song dynasty era, when the examination system was established, it has been said that even Confucius would have had to take the examination to become a government official. Meanwhile “juye,” study for the examination, was often looked at with contemptuous and skeptical eyes. Ji Yun (famous for his compilation of the “Siku Quanshu”) wrote in his “Yueweicaotang-biji,” Vol. I that a ghost saw a beautiful beam of light emanate from the memory of books cherished in the mind of a man when he was sleeping, while also seeing a cloud of black smoke rise from the memory of books hung over the roof of a house where an old student, who had been working hard only for juye, was sleeping. An emperor of the Qing dynasty, therefore, deploring the people as deeply tainted by the tradition of seeking fame and wealth through the examination system, once gave an admonitory instruction urging scholars to return to “learning for self-improvement” as he believed it should be, quoting from Zhu Xi, who had established Neo-Confucianism. His instruction was probably a matter of course, when judged from his position as emperor, but such brazen preaching by him, a conqueror supported by violence and by the manipulation of people’s desire for fame and wealth, seemed to ridicule the very learning he proposed, albeit unconsciously.

Generally speaking (even today), it seems that a system of culture or philosophy, after gaining social prestige and uniting with the political establishment, is obliged to pay continuously heavy prices for that prestige and stature. This is because realities are always far inferior to ideals, and therefore doctrines are always betrayed and considered skeptically. Faith in doctrines is often utilized as a means to pursue power and wealth, and as such the doctrines are liable to lose their vitality in the minds of the people. When the prevailing political authority haughtily persists in promulgating a principle of culture or philosophy that widely disregards reality, bad faith can arise with respect to the culture or philosophy itself. Similar circumstances led to the rise of Wang Yangming, who criticized Neo-Confucianism in the Ming era. It was only too natural that, when the doctrines of Wang Yangming could not save the Ming dynasty from ruin and when the authority of Neo-Confucianism was, quite ironically, mightily upheld by the power of the “barbarians,” ideological groping or escape in a different direction occurred. Qian Mu is persuasive in noting that the hatred of Neo-Confucianism, which had become the subject of the vulgar examination system, caused the rise of the exegetical study of Chinese classics, a study which “attacked (Neo-Confucian) commentaries with (their) commentaries.”

Furthermore, the divergences among the literati in the Qing era were wider than those in the Song and Ming eras. This was probably due to economic develop-
ment. Yu Yamanoi writes:

In the Qing era, many large-scale book-compilation projects were carried out by the Court, and many local gazetteers and other documents were published by local governments and influential persons. There was good demand for private tutors. Scholars were able to live only by learning, if not as government officials. Scholars in the Song and the Ming eras had stations in life other than learning, while some scholars in the Qing era had no life other than that of learning, and, therefore, they learned for the sake of learning.\(^{15}\)

In fact, none of the typical exegetical scholars of Chinese classics, such as Yan Ruoqu, Dai Zhen or Duan Yuzai, were jinshi. There were some in government service who sought fame as patrons of scholars instead of pursuing learning themselves.\(^{16}\) A social foundation had been established on which learning could be pursued independent of the government. As Yamanoi points out, many scholars in the Qing era, while maintaining Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism as the moral code in daily life, engaged in exegetical studies of Confucian classics.\(^{17}\)

It was difficult for the literati in the Qing era to directly deny the orthodox thought of the Establishment because of their social position. However, they did not want to entirely identify themselves with it. Between these opposite mentalities was established a foundation on which specialized scholars could compete with one another in areas of talent and knowledge, keeping away from any direct commitment to politics.\(^{18}\) These circumstances should be taken into consideration as a background of the history of Confucianism in the Qing era.

3. YANGBAN—IN KOREA

Rule by the Confucian intellectuals was established in Korea during the Yi dynasty, 1392–1910. Confucian culture had overwhelming social prestige in combination with the structure of the government, and in principle the people who had acquired such culture were selected through the civil examination system based on Neo-Confucianism to enter government service. These cultured people were similar to those of China in that they formed upper social classes, and typically were land-owners and local leaders. However, in other respects, they were different from their Chinese counterparts.

First of all, they had a deep-rooted sense of heredity in their status in Korea. Persons considered as Confucian intellectuals were called “yangban,” and below the yangban followed the “chung’in” (middle people), “sangmin,” “yang’in” (common people) and “nobi” (slaves). Distinction in social rank and class was strictly observed. This was in striking contrast to China where there was no distinction of social status by birth, as a matter of common sense.\(^{19}\) Accordingly, the examination system was, in form, open not only to yangban but also to others,\(^{20}\) but, in fact, was generally limited to yangban.\(^{21}\) Almost all government posts were occupied by yangban by birth. In fact, the Saganwon (the ministry for advising the
king) said in 1417, "The standards of our examination system are not only to test capability, but also to identify family line," and the minister of Saganwon and others said in 1431, "It is the traditional way of selecting a person for employment to consider his family line and birth, not to judge him only by his capability."22)

Whether a person was yangban or not was, therefore, a question of family line more than that of the person himself. Only the households of Confucian intellectuals, which had turned out, and would continue to turn out, government officials, were entitled to yangban status.23) Marriage within the same status was a principle. "The descendants of a yangban, who formally married a widow or a daughter of a peasant, were destined to lose almost all the privileges of yangban status, and be shut out of the government service" (Charles Dallet).24) Great importance thus came to be attached to the family line. It was said to be required of a yangban to have at least one high government official among his "four ancestors" (his father, grandfather, and great-grandfather and the father of his mother).25) Yangban status, however, was not automatically given to those who had high government officials among their ancestors. Descendants of famous Neo-Confucian scholars, who were not high government officials for several generations, could be recognized as yangban, and, to the contrary, even descendants of high government officials were in danger of being deprived of yangban status if they lost the culture required of yangban. "He who was born of a yangban family, but who had not been in government service for a long time, was deprived of the title of yangban, and the law court also denied him his privileges as a yangban" (C. Dallet).26) The status of a yangban was judged by his family line, inheritance of learning, success or failure in the examination and eligibility for government service, marital relations, circle of acquaintances, etc..27) "Position within yangban status was determined by the number of successful examinees (especially for civil, not military service) and high government officials whom the family line had produced (Yi Song-mu)."28)

As mentioned above, although yangban status was hereditary, maintaining yangban status nevertheless depended greatly on the achievements of each generation of the family and on mutual social recognition among yangbans. Different from the samurai in Tokugawa Japan, whose family status, stipend and post were automatically balanced, yangban status was structurally unstable. A yangban could maintain his status only by constantly demonstrating and making people recognize his suitability to the status of yangban. This could result in a significant difference between a self-styled yangban and a generally-accepted one. This is why some people say the yangban represented 3% of the whole population and others say 30%.29) It is said, for instance, that in Taegu-bu (present-day Taegu City, Kyongsang-pukdo, and its surroundings) the number of yangban households represented 9.2% of the total number in the census register in 1690, increased to 18.7% around 1730, to 37.5% in the 1780's, and as high as 70.3% in 1858.30) Thus, by 1858, the census register indicated that the majority of the population had risen to the privileged status. These circumstances resulted in an increased necessity among yangban to demonstrate that they were authentic yangban. Failure by a yangban in such
efforts would be a blow not only to himself, but also to his ancestors and descen-
dants, and, therefore, a yangban was urged to make efforts to become 100% yangban if others were 90% yangban, and 120% yangban if others were 100% yangban, in order to secure his yangban status.

Furthermore, an authentic yangban was not supposed to engage in labor. The State prohibited yangban from engaging in "menial occupations" (farming, manufacturing and commerce).

Yangban who engage in farming, manufacturing or commercial occupations will surely encounter difficulties with acquaintances, marriage and entrance into government service. People will first say that the yangban has been reduced to a commoner, and then will despise him and sever acquaintance with him because they are afraid their own prestige will be damaged ("Samin-chongron" in U-so, Vol. 1 by Yu Su-won).31)

In actuality, however, it seems that lower-class yangban engaged in farming out of sheer necessity; however, commerce and manufacturing were probably out of the question for yangban.32) Yangban who intended to remain authentic would not engage in any "menial occupation," even if they starved. Unlike in China, it was ordinarily impossible for brothers to be government officials and merchants, or for the son of a merchant to become a high government official. It could very well bring about the ruin of a family for a family member to give up pursuing the rank of scholar, and instead engage in commerce.

Furthermore, the authentic yangban had to demonstrate his suitability to the status in his manner and lifestyle.33) The nucleus of this demonstration was to practice proper manners and rituals in accordance with the Confucian classics. With regard to the increasing influence of the "Wengong Jiali" (Household Rituals of Zhu Xi; said to have been written by Zhu Xi) in and after the early days of the Yi dynasty, Hideki Kajimura writes, "It had come to be considered as a demonstration of the suitability to the yangban status 'to perform a funeral service in accordance with "Jiali."' And there had come to appear those who performed funeral services in accordance with "Jiali" in order to acquire a reputation as authentic yangbans, thus mistaking the means for the end."34) Ceremonial occasions came to be utilized as opportunities to demonstrate a family's suitability to the yangban status.

This situation of yangban status made it more difficult than in China to distance oneself from Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism, which was the learning for the government and the yangban classes. Furthermore, in the Yi dynasty, during which Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism had been held in high esteem since its foundation, "sarim" scholars (yangbans out of office), proud to have been the orthodox school of Neo-Confucianism, challenged the privileged yangbans in power ("hun'gu") at the end of the 15th century and were victorious in the 16th century.35) In the 17th century, when the Manchurians, or "northern barbarians," invaded Korea and then ruled over the Chinese mainland, there arose and became established a self-consciousness of being the sole people in whom the orthodox Chinese civilization was
embodied.\textsuperscript{36} The Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism supported both the pride of Korea vis-à-vis foreign countries and the prestige of the governing class vis-à-vis the people.

In Korea, especially in and after the 16th century, Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism was more dominant than in China. Philosophical speculation and argument within the range of Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism had come to be deeper and more refined than in China and, of course, in Japan (for instance, the controversy concerning the relationship between “the four beginnings” and “the seven emotions,” and controversy concerning “the nature of man and things.”\textsuperscript{37}) This seems to have constituted the most striking feature of Korean Confucianism, even if the emergence of practical learning (“sirhak”) is taken into consideration.\textsuperscript{38} This speculation and argument may be accounted for by the peculiarities of the Yangban status and the historical process of domestic and foreign politics.\textsuperscript{39,40}

4. PLURALISM OF CULTURE—JAPAN IN THE TOKUGAWA ERA

Tokugawa Japan was not a regime where a specific kind of culture conferred prestige on the government. In this sense, Japan in the Tokugawa era was greatly different from China, Korea and Islamic countries during the corresponding period. When the long civil war ended, and after the samurai had established a political structure to rule over the imperial court and courtiers and Buddhist temples and Shinto shrines, the samurai were not in a position to claim superiority for any culture except military arts. Therefore, they did not direct or force others to obey their own cultural ideals. As a natural consequence, various kinds of arts and teachings, refined and vulgar, freely vied with and influenced one another, giving a spectacular quality to the age. In 1645, Miyamoto Musashi (a master of martial arts) wrote in his “Gorinsho” that there were various kinds of arts and teachings such as Buddhism, priesthood, medical science, poetry, tea ceremony and archery in addition to military arts, all of which people pursued each in their own way.\textsuperscript{41} In the Kyoho period (1716-1736), a daimyo (local lord) classified the then popular arts and teachings into Confucian learning, calendar calculation, calligraphy, learning of court practices, Shintoism, haiku poetry, and kabuki, and listed the masters of the day of such arts and teachings (Ogyu Sorai and Ito Togai were listed for Confucian learning, Matsuki Tantan for haiku poetry, and Ichikawa Danjuro for kabuki in the book named Keienzatsuwa.)\textsuperscript{42} It was the same with merchants and farmers. Ihara Saikaku wrote about a merchant proud of varied artistic accomplishments who learned calligraphy, tea ceremony, poetry, literature, haiku poetry, Noh play, hand drum, football, the game of Go, bamboo clarinet, bunraku, dancing, etc. and “sought after truth under Ito Genkichi (Jinsai)” (“Nipponeitaigura” published in 1688).\textsuperscript{43}

For the wealthy among samurai, merchants and farmers, the above-mentioned culture was a part of the pleasure of life and, at the same time, necessary accomplishments befitting their social standing. It helped them in their social inter-
course. There were perhaps some people who sought such "culture" out of sheer snobbery. In these circumstances, teaching various "yugei," (performing arts) became a profession, and the master-family (Iemoto) system of art schools was established.\(^{44}\) The Hayashi (Razan) family, the Ito (Jinsai) family and the Moto’ori (Norinaga) family were each a kind of art school master family.

Every kind of art including learning could be "addictive" and thus would interfere with one's occupation unless the teaching of performing arts was itself one's occupation. "Hagakure" warns, "Performing arts may be useful if they are learned with due care and for the purpose of using them for military and other public service. However, people are liable to become addicted to them. Literature is especially dangerous in this respect."\(^{45}\) As performing arts became popular among merchants and farmers, such admonitions as follows were heard more often: "People should not be addicted to learning so much that they forget their family occupation" (Oe Tadasuke's "Shonin Koganebukuro (Merchant's Purse)" (1775)).\(^{46}\) "Literature is good in itself, but merchants and farmers should not be addicted to it" (Ohkura Tadatsune's "Minka Sodategusa (How to Develop Commoners)" (1827)\(^{47}\) and "An ordinary person, who is addicted to reading, will be negligent of his occupation, not to speak of drawing and writing, flower arrangement, tea ceremony, etc." (Ozeki Tametaka's "Fuki-jizai-shu (To Get Rich and Noble Easily)" (1838)).\(^{48}\)

5. **CONFUCIANISM AND JAPANESE SAMURAI**

Confucianism is different in character from other performing arts. Confucianism originated as teachings for self-cultivation rather than for culture, and it claims to be more than a means for enjoying leisure hours, providing social inter-course, or displaying skill. Furthermore, Confucianism insists that it is indispensable to rulers. Meanwhile, although excellence in both literary and military arts was encouraged in the Samurai Regulations ("Buke-shohatto"), samurai had no opportunity to use their military arts during the peaceful Tokugawa period, and they gradually became more like civil officials. Hence, the learning most suitable for samurai was Confucianism, with its doctrines of civil morality and government.

For daimyo (local lords), however, ignorance of Confucianism was not shameful. Fujii Ransai, a jusha, poses a question in his essay (1715), "Why is it that many of the state and county lords who once liked to learn Confucianism give up their study of it before long?" He answers, "because self-control is painful," "because various desires would be unsatisfied," "because of the fear that the shogunate government will hear of an unusual method of administration," "because the majority of retainers dislike it," and "because of the fear that military affairs seem to be neglected."\(^{49}\)

In and after the middle of the 18th century, however, domainal schools established by daimyo for their retainers increased in number. According to Matsutaro Ishikawa, the number of daimyo who established schools for samurai was 50
during the Horeki and Temmei periods (1751-1788), 87 during the Kansei and Bunsei periods (1789-1829), and 50 during the Tempo and Keio periods (1830-1867). Of course, the main curriculum at these schools was Confucianism. Some daimyo personally encouraged their retainers “to pursue learning.” The shogunate government also established the Shoheizaka Institute of Learning based on the private school of the Hayashi family as a part of the political reform in the Kansei period, and started to give examinations called Sodoku-gimmi reading examination and Gakumon-gimmi learning examination.

Confucianism, though it was often regarded as one of the performing arts, began to be accepted by the samurai class, especially in the later part of the 17th century, and finally came to have special prestige in both the shogunate and daimyo governments. This did not mean that the existence of other kinds of culture was denied. Nor did it mean that a particular Confucian school censored other thought (what was called the prohibition of heterodox Confucianism in the Kansei period was not such censorship of thought). Nor did it mean that there was a big change in the organizational principles of the samurai class. Confucianism, however, came to be considered as an accomplishment to be acquired by the ruling classes, at least to some degree.

6. JUSHA (CONFUCIANIST)

The jusha were the professional bearers of Confucianism as a unique kind of culture. As mentioned above, in China and Korea, “scholar” originally designated the elite of the society who could be rulers. In a society that had no civil examination system and was ruled over by the samurai class, scholars were in a sense teachers of a specific art, though they always regretted it. Cho Tosai writes in his “Master Tosai’s Diary,” “Scholars are worth no special mention, if they are enjoying themselves serenely, but they are the same as blind street musicians as far as earning their living by their art.” There was even a comment that went so far as to say, “The scholar is a tradesman who sells his learning” (“Yasomeiwa” by Tokiwa Tanboku). In this sense, scholars were outside the ordinary social classes of the samurai, merchants and farmers. Their unique social standing was reflected in their personal appearance, especially in their hairstyle. Some jusha in the early Tokugawa era had their heads shaved like the Ikenobo master of flower arrangement, the Hon’imbo master of the game of Go and medical practitioners. Hayashi Razan and his son, Gaho were two examples. After the end of the 17th century, the hairstyle changed to the “sohatsu” style (topknot style with the “Sakayaki” forehead not shaved). Medical practitioners at that time usually had their hair done up in this manner.

In keeping with their unique social standing, jusha were diverse in their original social origins. Some were hereditary jusha, and many others were from families of medical practitioners, priests, merchants or farmers. Ronin (master-less samurai) were a significant source of jusha supply. It seems that the past status of a
jusha mattered little once he established himself as a jusha. Jusha openly used their family names, even if they had been a merchant or a farmer originally. Samurai usually did not hesitate to honor as their teachers jusha who had been merchants or farmers. In some cases, a daimyo held in high esteem as his teacher a jusha who had not been a samurai before. Letters exchanged between jusha reflect no obvious attention to past social standing. This fact is probably attributable to jusha social standing, which is outside of the ordinary social classes.

The forms of social existence of the jusha as professionals may be classified into "practicing jusha ('machi'-jusha)" and "honorable jusha ('o'-jusha)" (in the same way as physicians may be classified into "practicing physician" and "court physician"). The practicing jusha ran a private school in town (usually at his residence) where he lectured on Confucian works, taught reading and writing of Chinese prose and poetry, and preached "moral principles." He made a living on school fees. Yanada Zeigan, who ran a private school in front of the gate of Shiba Zojoji Temple, wrote in his "Letter to Kei Saigan" in 1706 that he received school fees from his dozens of students, and was barely fed and clothed. Inoue Kinga (1732-1788) "sold his lectures" in Edo (the present-day Tokyo). His schooling system was to collect a specific amount of admission fee for each lecture. Some say that he collected 30 "mon" (the old Japanese monetary unit) from each of his one hundred and fifty or sixty students daily, and "finally came to be well-off" ("Sentetsu Sodan" (stories of the past scholars) Vol. 2, by Tojo Kindai). Generally speaking, however, practicing jusha were not well-off. Ota Kinjo (1765-1825) discusses in his "Meikai Bundan" the fact that "Scholars are poor." The proverb says, "Physicians do not feel cold, but jushas do." It is said that when Ito Jinsai, a son of a merchant of Kyoto, made up his mind to be a jusha, "People advised him to be a medical practitioner because a medical practitioner would earn more money than a jusha" ("Letter sent to Kataoka Sojun when he returned home to Yanagawa." In fact, many jusha were concurrently medical practitioners, and were called "jui" (Confucian medical practitioners). The Japanese jusha were in striking contrast to the Korean yangban of that day in that the latter were strictly separated from the "chung'in" who served as medical practitioners, interpreters or lawyers. In Japan, too, some jusha declined to serve concurrently as medical practitioners, but it was common sense in Japan that these two similar jobs, both of which required the ability to read and understand the classical Chinese language, would be concurrently performed.

According to Isoo Munemasa, in and after the Kasei period in the 19th century the number of people in Kyoto who came from remote districts to learn under "machi" jusha (practicing jusha) greatly decreased. Munemasa attributes this phenomenon to an increase in the number of domainal schools. The public system of Confucian education suppressed the management of private schools. Ikeda Soan wrote in 1843, when he left Kyoto, "I had been studying in Kyoto since the age of twenty, and was determined to live there as a teacher until the end of my life, but several years ago I was compelled to return to my native province, because it had
come to be difficult to stay in Kyoto as a teacher."\textsuperscript{64)

However, not all practicing jusha who ran private schools had trouble earning their livelihood. Hirose Tanso (1782–1856) was a typical case of the successful practicing jusha. He opened a private school in Hita, Buzen Province, his native town, in his twenties, and developed it into a large operation. His schooling system had distinctive features in its clearly oriented curriculums, numerical system of merit-evaluation, and a promotion system based thereon for the purpose of developing, step by step, the students' ability to read, understand and write Chinese prose and poetry. This system might have some problems, when considered from the viewpoint of teaching "moral principles." Nevertheless, the system seems to have been fit to satisfy the large demand of that day. It is said that students of his private school, "Kangien," amounted to as many as five thousand from all over the country.\textsuperscript{65)

"O"-jusha (honorable jusha), the other type of jusha, served the shogun or daimyo and received a stipend. It was exceptional to climb the social ladder based on the merit system in that age, when there was rigid discriminatory treatment by birth. "A jusha's stipend ranged from that of eighteen to two hundred 'koku'" (Tokiwa Tanboku's "Yasomeiwa," 1773).\textsuperscript{66) A 'ronin' was employed for a stipend of one hundred and fifty koku, and promoted to a managerial post ('yonin') with a stipend of four hundred 'koku'" (in 1789) and thus people said "There is no better business than jusha these days." (Mizuno Tamenaga's "Yoshino Sasshi.")\textsuperscript{67)

However, probably because a jusha was different from an ordinary samurai in his attitude toward his lord, it was not a rare occurrence that a jusha served several different lords. They sometimes helped their lords in learning, and sometimes wrote prose and poetry by order, and gave lectures to the retainers. These lectures in some cases were systematized into the teachings of domanial schools. As a type of jusha midway between practicing jusha and honorable jusha, some jusha gave lectures from time to time to their lords and received stipends while running their own private schools.

The treatment accorded to honorable jusha and their degree of participation in the actions of government depended greatly on the intentions of their lords. Generally speaking, however, they rarely participated in government activities. The following comment by Yokoi Shonan on Hayashi Razan, who served four shogun including Tokugawa Ieyasu, seems to be accurate:

"With due respect I may say that Shogun Ieyasu was not convinced of the teachings of the ancient sages. Scholars were retained by him as advisors to report to him on things Japanese and Chinese and things ancient and modern, when asked. With regard to government affairs, he placed reliance on Buddhist priests rather than on scholars. Some Buddhist priests such as Tenkai and Nankobo took part in secret councils inside and outside the shogunate government, and were like prime ministers in black."\textsuperscript{68)

Scholars who served daimyo were in similar conditions. Yanada Zeigan (1672–1757) deplored the situation, saying, "The powers of the government are in the
hands of the samurai and petty officials. Jusha, who are wise and serviceable and who should be put in their right place as an important asset of the state, engage in such less important jobs as the examination of precedents and lecturing on books, and are ranked equal to medical practitioners" ("Batsukeikokushu")69), and Kaiho Seiryo wrote in his "Keikodan" (1813),70) "Jusha now seldom take part in the government, and are regarded as those who can read difficult Chinese characters."

The spread of Confucian culture must be distinguished from Confucian scholars' political participation. Hashimoto Sanai (though a medical practitioner himself) wrote about a jusha in his "Statement of Views on the Schooling System71)" as follows:

After all, he is obliged to pursue learning because it is his family occupation, or because he is incapable of engaging in an ordinary business other than learning due to his physical handicap. He talks in large terms about government and statesmanship, but he has no guts and insight for practical acts. He feels entrapped with his words, which are mere imitations of the styles of old masters. His accomplishment, therefore, is only the parrot-like art of mimicry.

While Confucian books were widely read and even some popular "sharebon" (gay-quarter novelettes) imitated the style of Confucian classics, jusha themselves were often ridiculed. A 'kyoka' satirical poem (in the "Manzai Kyokashu" published in 1783)72) reads, "Jusha, while looking down upon the general public as if they were body wastes, have become mere nobodies themselves" and a 'senryu' satirical poem ("Haifu Yanagidaru," Vol. 5, published in 1766)73) says, "A teacher of the 'Rongo' (the Analects of Confucius) is humiliated because he is behind in his rent."

There continued to be a stubborn image that jusha were proud but useless, argumentative but powerless and impractical.

There were a few cases, in the first half of the Tokugawa era, however, of jusha taking active part in state government. Arai Hakuseki (1657–1725) was the most conspicuous figure of these. According to his memoirs "Oritaku-shiba-no-ki," he gave lectures to Tokugawa Tsunatoyo (who became the 6th shogun Ienobu later) for 1,299 days in total during the nineteen years he served his lord. His "Tokushi Yoron" is a book compiled of his manuscripts for such lectures. While Ienobu was a shogun, Hakuseki was given the status of 'hatamoto' (direct retainer of the shogun) rather than honorable jusha, participated in the administration of the shogunate government, and acted as the leader of a series of reforms in the Shōtoku period. "Seven or eight out of my ten proposals were accepted and implemented" ("Letter to Takebe Takuminokami").74) The Samurai Regulations ("Buke Shohatto") enforced by the Ienobu Administration were drawn up by Hakuseki. In the opening sentences of the Regulations, the following provisions are found: "The samurai shall master literary and military arts, clearly demonstrate morality, and improve the people's morals," and "Each samurai shall devote himself to the administration of the state, county and household, and be careful not to earn vassals' and commoners' ill will." The duties of the daimyo and hatamoto (direct retainer
Jusha, Literati and Yangban

of the shogun) were redefined from Confucian viewpoints. This was a daring reform.

Hakuseki’s power of political influence was based solely on the shogun’s personal confidence in him. His power of influence had neither a constitutional nor institutional foundation. His power of influence, therefore, disappeared soon after Ienobu died; Shogun Ietsugu, the young successor, died after three years in office. (The Samurai Regulations were reamended to the former regulations.)

As Confucian culture among samurai matured, however, new situations arose. Typical of such situations was the case of the Mito Tokugawa family during and after the beginning of the 19th century. A group of scholars with their stronghold at the Shōkokan where “the Great History of Japan” was being compiled—the so-called Mito Learning scholars—participated directly in the government. Fujita Yukoku, a leader of the Mito scholars, and the son of a used-clothes dealer, was appointed ‘gun-bugyo’ (county governor), serving concurrently as the president of the Shōkokan. In 1829, Toko, who was a son of Yukoku, Aizawa Seishisai, who was a follower of Yukoku, and others successfully backed Tokugawa Nariaki to become the new lord of the Mito domain. Under Nariaki, Toko was appointed ‘soba-yonin’ (secretary) and Seishisai was appointed his ‘koshogashira’ (chief page). The Mito scholars, who were concurrently samurai, took the lead in the domain’s government. It was unprecedented in history that a domain functioned as a stronghold for the learning named after itself. Mito learning had great political significance during and after the last days of the Tokugawa regime.

Furthermore, under the changing circumstances of the last days of the Tokugawa regime, the jusha in some cases had a strong voice and exerted great political influence. Probably most remarkable was the case of Yokoi Shonan, a jusha of the Kumamoto domain. He was invited to the Echizen domain in 1858, and helped Matsudaira Yoshinaga, its lord, in formulating the detailed guidelines of government for the domain (“Kokuze Sanron (Three Treatises on the Guideline of Government)”). Different from Arai Hakuseki, who was quite helpless among ‘hatamoto’ (direct vassals of the shogun), Shonan was supported by retainers who held him in high esteem. Shonan’s experience illustrates how the spread of Confucian “culture” caused great changes in samurai attitudes toward philosophical ideas.

7. CONFUCIANISM IN THE TOKUGAWA ERA

The forms of social existence of the jusha (Confucianists) and Confucianism in Japan in the Tokugawa era and the changes therein exerted a strong influence on the contents of their “learning.”

The most significant feature is the emergence of numerous schools of “learning.” Essentially, under a regime not affiliated with any specific kind of culture or learning, jusha, teachers of a “performing art,” had no reason to hold fast to a specific orthodoxy or to demonstrate their loyalty to it, although they were concern-
ed about the reaction of their lords, disciples, audience and readers. There was no social pressure urging people to adopt Confucian manners and rituals in daily life, nor were perfect Zhu Xi Neo-Confucians always held in high social esteem. On the contrary, they might be subjected to the ill feelings or ridicule of others. Unlike Neo-Confucianism in China and Korea, in Japan there were earnest devotees on the one hand, and, on the other, unreserved criticisms (serious or not). Such criticism did not necessarily indicate a critical attitude toward the Tokugawa regime.

The bearers of learning were not only government officials and other similar persons, but were varied in their social standing and mode of life. Accordingly, Confucianism in the Tokugawa era was also varied in its uses. Sometimes it was intended to provide guidelines for the lives of individual samurai, sometimes to provide learning needed to govern and sometimes to approach the feeling of merchant life. It was sometimes highly moralistic, sometimes political, sometimes very philosophical, and sometimes a non-political performing art. Confucianism clearly became more and more diversified as Confucian culture spread among the people.

After the middle period of the Tokugawa era, there was an increasing competition among scholars who argued over minute differences in interpretations of Confucian classics. On the other hand, some wrote commentaries on non-Confucian Chinese classics. Furthermore, some jusha instructed students in reading and interpreting Shiuhu-chuan, a popular novel in Ming China. Some followed the exegetical studies in Qing China (but, different from the Chinese exegetical scholars, it was not necessary for them to maintain outward loyalty to Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism in daily life). They were, in fact, sinologists rather than Confucianists. While the commonsensical morality in Japan at that time merged or coexisted with Confucianism in many cases, in some cases revolts were suggested (for example, by Yamagata Daini) or actually started (for example, by Oshio Chusai) based on the Confucian view of politics.

The diversification of Confucianism in the Tokugawa era, which sometimes seemed to be frivolous, spawned various tides of thought including National Learning and Dutch Learning, and led to the further diversification and interaction of these various forms. In this process, the ideology of revering the emperor as the center of political unity, while learning from Western civilization to the extent necessary, gradually emerged, based on Confucian concepts.
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