Part Six. A Profile of the Unruly Shōgun Yoshimune

Sovereign-Minister Relations in Feudal Society. The influence of television has popularized an image of the eighth shōgun of the Edo period, Tokugawa Yoshimune 徳川吉宗, as an uninhibited, unruly shōgun. In this view Yoshimune seems to rival Tōyama Kinshirō 遠山金四郎 [1793-1855], the famous city magistrate of Edo, who rode over the streets of Edo, revealing the tattoo on his shoulder of snow falling on cherry blossoms. My story may differ somewhat from this image.

Sovereign-minister (lord-vassal) relations in feudal society are extremely difficult for us to understand now with the senses. In Nagori no yume 名たらの夢 (Lingering Dreams) by Imaizumi Mine 今泉みね, daughter of Katsuragawa Hoshū 桂川甫周 [1751-1809], the doctor of Western [lit. Dutch] medicine personally attendant on the shōgun at the end of the Edo period, there are fascinating stories that have nothing whatever to do with the motive forces of history. We read that Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉 had a broad back upon which she would ride and that Narushima Ryūhoku 成島柳北 [1838-84] had a long mien. She also provides independent substantiation for the comic poem, “Oh, the world is turning upside down, for the horse has a rounder face than its rider.” This became the basis for Uehida Hyakkan’s 内田百間 essays, Uma wa marugao 馬は丸顔 (The Horse Has a Round Face). According to Imaizumi, when shogunal officials visited her father’s residence, before offering a personal greeting the head of the household would say, “I hope the shōgun (uesama 上様) will continue to be well.” Then, guest and host would together say: “May your good fortunes continue unabated.” Only then would their conversation commence. In conferring salutations for the new year, the officials would gather at the palace and as a group offer their best wishes, while the shōgun would reply with the single word, medetō 未来. When I learned that this was omedetō [the ordinary term for “congratulations”] minus the honorific, I had to reassess the meaning of honorific language itself. Such was the world of that time, and tales concerning one’s lord, one’s shōgun, and one’s daimyōs seem to have taken on great significance.

Muro Kyūsō 室嶋巢 [1658-1734], who had become tutor to the shōgun in 1711, Shōtoku 1, on the recommendation of his fellow student Arai Hakuseki 新井白石 [1657-
1725], recorded episodes concerning the shōgun here and there in his *Kenzan hissaku* 兼山秘策 (Kenzan’s Secret Plan), a collection of his letters to Aochi Saiken 青地齋賢 (Kenzan 兼山) and his younger brother Aochi Reikan 青地禮幹 (Reitaku 麗澤) of Kaga domain. After the sickly sixth shōgun Ienobu 家宣 and the premature death of the young seventh shōgun Ietsugu 家宣, an adult shōgun [i.e., Yoshimune] succeeded to the position of head of the Tokugawa house after a long period of time, and naturally the regime began to show signs of vitality once again. Among the letters of Muro Kyūsō, one can see this image of a roughneck shōgun. Once when he was lord of Kishū, he personally shot and killed head on with a firearm a huge wild boar that required fourteen or fifteen men to carry, on another occasion he went to Takano and “my lord fell into a nightsoil tub, his entire body becoming covered in filth”; and on yet another occasion, after he became shōgun, at the time of a fire on the 23rd day of the first lunar month of Kyōhō 2 [1717], as the flames spread to the inner citadel, he put on a Japanese fire coat, stuck a hood in his belt, and by himself removed a large door, propped it up, climbed up it to the roof, and from there was able to survey the fire. “Unlike the shōguns before him, there are occasions when he looks rather undignified. Sometimes he says the strangest things. You should be aware of this.” Thus, clearly this aspect of his personality appears to be real. Yet, on the subjects of Yoshimune and scholarship, Yoshimune and texts, and Yoshimune and China, his assertive nature produced considerable results.

**Yoshimune and the Office of Book Inspections.** On the first day of the fifth month of Shōtoku 6 (1716), Tokugawa Yoshimune, daimyō of Kii 紀伊, succeeded to becoming head of his family. The reign name was changed to Kyōhō on the 22nd day of the sixth month. On the thirteenth day of the eighth month, he received the appointment as shōgun from the emperor. More than accounts such as the *Yūtoku in jikki furoku* 有德院實紀附錄 (Records of Shōgun Yoshimune, with Appendices) which are records of the shogunate describing his activities, I found it much more interesting to read of his actions in the *Bakufu shomotsukata nikki* 幕府書物方日記 (Record of Books of the Shogunate). As I noted earlier, this work is the daily working accounts of the administrator of books who supervised the Momijiyama Bunko 紅葉山文庫, the shogunal library. Even today it continues to be published as one part of the *Dai Nihon kinsei shiryō* 大日本近世史料 (Historical Materials on the Early Modern Period in Japan). At the start of the Kyōhō era, it was known as the *Oshomotsukata tomechō* 御書物方留帳 (Account Book of the Administrator of Books). The first year of the Kyōhō reign was an intercalary year, and as such following the second month came an intercalary month; from the start of the year through the second day of the sixth month was already a full six months. However, the accounting in the record book for this period of time gives only a total of 21 days. As the text notes, “today everyone appeared for duty and we aired out the new warehouses.” The majority of information concerns such things as receiving ten palm hemp brooms to help in the airing out or cleaning, twenty feather dusters, and 60 bordered mats; the number of entries concerning books is much fewer. From the third day of the sixth month, though, there is a
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full daily accounting, and records of receipts and disbursements are much more frequently noted.

It all began when Administrator of Books Yoshida Kinpee 松田金兵衛 was summoned by Junior Councilor Ōkubo Nagato no kami 大久保長門守 and was ordered to present a list of books in the shogunal library. The following day the presentation of fifteen items—including Keichō irai gohatto 慶長以来御法度 (Laws since the Keichō Reign), Onei no 御年譜 (The Shogunal Genealogy), Oden 御傳 (Biographies of the Shōguns), Yumiwaka no sho 弓鹰書 (On Archery and Falconry), and Sekigahara shimatsu 關原戦記 (Record of the Battle of Sekigahara)—was sought. Thereafter, texts were ordered in the following order: those concerned primarily with the family of the shōgun, such as Gosoku ki 御即位記 (Record of Investitures of Rank), Gosandai ki 御參内記 (Record of Nikkō Visits), Shōgun senge ki 將軍宣下記 (Record of Investitures into the Position of Shōgun), and Nikkō gosankei ki 日光御参詣記 (Records of Pilgrimages to Nikkō), followed by texts concerned with the imperial family and other aristocratic families, such as Honchō kōin shōun roku 本朝皇胤縁錄 (Records of the Accession of Our Imperial Descendants), Sonpi bunmyaku 尊卑脈脈 (Lineages High and Low), and Shikimoku 式目 (Legal Codes), followed by family biographies of daimyō families, maps and sketches of the domains and castle towns, notes on retainers for the Three Collateral Families, and notes on retainers (hatamoto 旗本), and thereby accumulated the common knowledge of the shōgun. By the conclusion of Kyōhō 4 [1719], he had still not purchased the books from Nagasaki. This would have been unimaginable under Yoshimune later.

My curiosity was aroused while reading the diary in which was recorded only that books had arrived or been returned. Frankly, I had had the impression that Yoshimune behaved like an adult. The administrator of books was thrown into something of a panic. One by one the orders were extremely detailed: “Aren’t there any other book lists besides this one?” “Make a notation for books that you’ve taken out of the library and not yet returned.” “From now on when you bring me a book, remove the camphor first.” Inasmuch as only one book list was presented, there was no duplicate to be found in the library. Correspondence of the following sort transpired: “If there’s no book list in the library, then return it quickly because it poses a hindrance to official business.” “If you write it down, make a duplicate.” “In general, copying out the listing of works in the shogunal library for one’s personal use is not done. However, I shall consult with my colleagues.” Thus, the Ming codes that Arai Hakuseki had borrowed, the Xingming ge daquan 墨命格大全 (Great Collection on Patterns for Predicting the Stars), and the Da Ming yitong zhi 大明一統志 (Comprehensive Geography of the Great Ming Dynasty) borrowed by Shibukawa Harumi 瀬川春海 [1639-1715], and the like were returned, and preparations for the library continued apace.

**Chinese Punishments.** Yoshimune’s began actively collecting books and being broadly concerned with scholarship from Kyōhō 5 [1720]. Until that time, it appears that he queried the feudal lords as necessary and accumulated knowledge accordingly. For example, in Kyōhō 3 [1718] he questioned Matsura Atsunobu 松浦兼信, Lord Sōei 松英公, daimyō of Hirado, about “the advantages and disadvantages of our ships and Chinese ships.” I will discuss this exchange in a subsequent chapter. Here I would like to
introduce the *Liuyu yanyi* 六諭衍義 (The Extended Meaning of the Six Edicts) which involved one of the more well known stories surrounding him.

A manuscript entitled "Chūka no gi ni tsuki mōshiage sōrō oboe" 中華之儀＝付申上候覺 (Memorandum on my statement concerning China) can now be found in the library of Tokyo University. There are similar texts, but the Tokyo University manuscript is the most complete one that I have seen. At the end of this text it reads: “After requesting [the original] from the aforementioned Matsudaira Satsuma no kami Yoshitaka 松平薩摩守吉貴, this copy was made under the auspices of Toda Yamashiro no kami Tadazane 戸田山城守忠真.” The date given for this document is the third month of Kyōhō 4. At the very beginning it reads: “Because I have received a report that the lord has ordered that I ask a man from Ryūkyū about the current laws of the great Qing dynasty and other matters, what follows is my response.” At the end it reads: “The above is what was said to me by a man from Ryūkyū who had traveled to China and was a member of last year’s embassy [to Edo].” Thus, in Kyōhō 3 Shimazu Yoshitaka 島津吉貴, in compliance with Yoshimune’s will, filed a report based on his questioning of a Ryūkyūan who visited Japan concerning the ways in which the Qing dynasty at present carried out punishments. Yoshimune enjoyed legal matters and was particularly interested in methods of punishment, as we shall see below. Yoshitaka’s reply covered 34 items concerned with punishment, such as the first which follows:

* There are six categories of punishment in China. These are given in a woodblock-printed text in one stringbound volume entitled *Liuyu yanyi* Liuyu yanyi brought by a Ryūkyūan who had traveled to China last year. In it can be found various methods of punishment.

In others words, for information on Chinese punishment, read the *Liuyu yanyi*, and he naturally appended this work to his official report. In addition, he touched on numerous other topics, including the times when Ryūkyūan emissaries visited China, Chinese cities, martial arts, imperial scrolls given to the filially pious, the mountains, rivers, waterways, flora and fauna, and styles of clothing, among others.

**The *Liuyu yanyi***: There was a general trend in the Edo period whereby anyone might question a man of intelligence and then publish the questions and replies. For example, there is the text known as the *Shin-Ya mondō* 新野問答 (Arai-Nonomiya dialogue; also known as the *Hak-Kō mondō* 白黃問答, the *Kō-Haku mondō* 黃白問答, and the *Nonomiya dono mondō* 野宮殿問答) based on the questions put to Nonomiya Sadamoto [1669-1711] by Arai Hakuseki; there is also the *Soyū jūji* 濃遊從之 (Queries and Replies) which is comprised of Ōta Nanpo’s 大田南畝 [1749-1823] questions to Kimura Kōkyō 木村孔恭 (Kenkadō 蒺藜堂 [1736-1802]) and the latter’s responses. This genre of writing--known in Japanese often as *mondō sho* 問答書 or works in dialogue form--are of scholarly value sometimes for the questions themselves, whereas in other cases only the answers have been recorded. These do not necessarily always provide a high level of scholarly knowledge, for sometimes they ask merely for observations which may become the basis for learning later. Knowledge concerning foreign lands during the period of seclusion was all obtained in this manner: the *fusetsugaki* 風説書 (reports) in which the Chinese ship masters and the Dutch captains
were interrogated for international news. The latter are probably more appropriately called *kikigaki* (verbatim account) rather than *mondōsho*.

The so-called “Six Edicts” (*liuyu* 六) was a kind of educational rescript that the Shunzhì Emperor (Shizu 世祖) of the Qing dynasty promulgated in 1652 (Shunzhì 9) for the Manchu Eight Banners and all the provinces of China. They are instructions to the common people which establish six categories of virtue: obey one’s parents, honor one’s superiors, be at peace in one’s home, educate one’s descendents, be comfortable in one’s livelihood, and do not do what it is wrong to do. They were also known as the *Shengyu liutiao* 聖諭六條 (Six August Edicts), the *Shengyu liuxun* 聖諭六訓 (Six August Edicts), the *Qinding liu yuwen* 欽定六諭文 (Six Imperial Edicts), and the like. Later, in the Kangxi 康熙 reign, a man by the name of Fan Kuang 范礬 from Kuaiji expounded and explained these precepts so as to spread them to the populace.

Shimazu Toshitaka’s phrase, “a woodblock-printed text brought by a Ryūkyūan who had traveled to China last year,” refers to a private printing carried out at Rouyuan 柔遠 station, Fuzhou at the expense of Cheng Shunze 程順則 who was paying tribute to the Qing in Kangxi 47 (1708) as vice tribute emissary. Cheng Shunze was a famous scholar in the Ryūkyū Kingdom, said to be a teacher of Nago 名護 and popularly known as the teacher at the “collection of the ancient wing.” Early in life he had studied in China, and this particular trip when he had the *Liuyu yanyi* printed was his fourth there. There is now standing in the city of Nago a figurine of him.

I need to clarify one point further at this point. There are people who believe, using the transmission of the *Liuyu yanyi* as proof, that Chinese texts came to Japan from the Ryūkyūs. However, the transmission of this text was a unique case due to the conditions noted above, and it would thus be a mistake to conclude that Chinese texts frequently came to Japan via the Ryūkyū-Satsuma route.

After Yoshimune saw the *Liuyu yanyi*, he realized that it was a fine book for moral teachings and could efficiently be spread to the populace. Thus, he decided to have it punctuated, translated into Japanese, and published. He had Ogyū Sorai 萩生徂徕 [1666-1728] punctuate the text and Muro Kyūsō 畑季貞 translate it, but this belongs to a later episode.

**Order for the *Da Qing huidian***. Yoshimune’s educational policies began to be enacted in 1720 (Kyōhō 5). The first evidence for this was the release in part of a banned book concerning Christianity in the first lunar month of the year.³ Then, in the fifth month the Nagasaki Administrator, Ishikawa Tosa no kami Masanori 石川土佐守政郞, who was then in Edo, learned of the wishes of the shōgun from Chamberlain Kanō Tōtōmi no kami 坂井加納遠江守, and Ishikawa notified Kusakabe Tanba no kami Hirosada 前下方部丹波守博貞 who was at work in Nagasaki.

Inasmuch as [the shōgun] enjoys such works as the *Dingli cheng’ān* 定例成案 (Cases by Fixed Precedent) and the *Da Qing huidian* 大清會典 (Collected Statutes of the Great Qing Dynasty), when books are brought in fulfillment of the shōgun’s order, we shall pay in silver as promised. The *Da Qing huidian* is a rare work, particularly valued in foreign realms. Thus, tell the Chinese merchants to bring such works in future.

The texts referred to here as *Dingli cheng’an* is the *Dingli cheng’an hejian xuzeng* 定例成案合鑒續增; it is a collection of court judgments compiled by Sun Lun 孫織 of the Qing. Together with the *Da Qing huidian*, it arrived in Japan aboard an autumn vessel in Kyōhō 4. By the beginning of the following year, Yoshimune was able to peruse it in Edo. Yoshimune loved books concerned with law. This is conveyed through a wide variety of materials, such as the *Yūtoku in jikki furoku* which contains such phrases as: “He was always reading books like the Ming legal codes”; and “He especially liked the *Engi shiki* 延喜式 (The Engi Code)\(^4\) and frequently copied out excerpts; many was the time that he made personal effects on the basis of the ancient laws within it.” When we see what sort of books he collected, this tendency of his will become even clearer.

When books brought from China to fill orders from the shōgun arrived, they notified the ship owner who would sell the books at a special price. Evidence for this arrangement can be found in the *Nagasaki Tōkata basho oboegaki* (A Memorandum concerning a Book in Nagasaki about Chinese Methods of Horsemanship) which is cited in the *Kōsho koji* 好書故事 (Stories of Favorite Books) of Kondō Seisai 近藤正斎 [1771-1829].

In the twelfth month of Kyōhō 7 (1722 [or early 1723]), Shi Yiting 施翼亭 of the Number Nine vessel received a book order for works concerning veterinary surgery for horses which was presently in use. In the eleventh month of Kyōhō 9 (1724), Shi returned with the *Yuanxiang liaoma ji* 元享療馬集 (Yuanxiang Collection for Curing Horses). Also, in Kyōhō 8, Li Yixian 李亦賢 of Number Two vessel took an order for a book on horse medicine, and in the second month of Kyōhō 10 [1725], Zhu Yunguang 朱允光 of vessel Number Six brought the book on Li’s consignment. In both instances, Shi and Li both received three pieces of silver as rewards. Without a doubt this prize was given because the men had successfully transported books ordered by the shōgun of the ship masters.

Yoshimune’s interest in the Ming legal code was, of course, a personal predilection, but perhaps also he was influence by the popularity of Ming legal studies in Kishū domain where he was raised.

**Studies of the Ming Legal Code in Kishū Domain.** For some time past study of the Ming code had been all the rage in Kishū domain. During the era of the first daimyō Yorinobu 賴宣, Li Yishu 李一恕, who had been taken prisoner during the Wênlu 文祿 war when the armies of Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 invaded the Korean peninsula, as well as Zhu Shushui 朱舜水 [1600-82], Chen Yuanbin 陳元賓 (or Chen Yuanyun [1587-1671]), and Wu Renxian 吳仁顯 [1606-78], who had all escaped to Japan during the tumult at the end of the Ming, were all summoned by Yorinobu, because he wanted to study the Chinese colloquial language—then known as *hakuwa* 白話 or *Towa* 唐話—which was necessary for research on the Ming legal codes. It seems as though Sakakibara Kōshū 柿原篁洲 [1656-1706] who later distinguished himself in Ming legal research studied colloquial Chinese with Wu Renxian. Similarly, Li Yishu’s relative Li Yiyang 李一陽 was learned in the Ming code, and he served the second daimyō Mitsusada 光貞,
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\(^4\) The Engi reign period ran from 901 to 923.
while Torii Shuntaku 鳥井春澤 whom Mitsusada employed had received instruction in the Ming code from Li Yiyang. Yoshimune was Mitsusada’s son, and Mitsusada enjoyed legal studies. In the ninth month of Genroku 3 (1690), he ordered Sakakibara to compose the *Dai Min ritsurei genkai* 大明律例譯解 (Colloquial Explanation of the Statutes and Laws of the Great Ming Dynasty); a draft of the work was completed in the fifth month of Genroku 7 (1694), and it was officially completed on the fifth day of the eleventh month. It fills 30 *kan* (fascicles) with one additional *kan* for a list of books. While the Ming legal code was a popular subject for study in the Edo period, the result of these studies was a rendering of the legal texts into Japanese, with Japanese readings of the Chinese characters and Japanese punctuation for the Chinese text, a complete translation into Japanese of the legal code, and explanations of terms difficult to understand. The earliest of these works, Sakakibara’s “colloquial explanation,” contained a Japanese reading for the Chinese characters, explanations of individual terms, and a full translation. During the era of Mitsusada, Takase Gakuzaemon 高瀨學山 [1668–1749], a disciple of the Hayashi 林 family in Edo, rose to prominence as a scholar of the Ming code, and we should note that he served as a doctor.

Tokugawa Yoshimune was first lord of the Sabae 鮫江 castle in Echizen. Because following the death of Mitsusada in the Kishū ruling family, his elder brothers Tsunanori 繼教 and Yorimoto 頼職 died one after the next, Yoshimune succeeded to the Kii branch of the Tokugawa family. In Shōtoku 2 (1712), Yoshimune ordered Takase Gakuzaemon to insert Japanese reading punctuation into the *Da Ming lü zhijie* 大明律直解 (A Straightforward Explanation of the Great Ming Code), and the following year a textually collated edition of the *Dai Min ritsurei genkai* was produced by Sakakibara Kashū 榮遠震洲 (son of Koshū) and Torii Shuntaku. In Hōei 3 (1706), the year after Yoshimune became daimyō, Koshū died of illness and was replaced by his eldest son Kashū. I surmise that the reason Yoshimune ordered the collated edition of the *Dai Min ritsurei genkai* was that he was not especially happy with the *Dai Min ritsurei genkai* itself.

Furthermore, the *Da Ming lü zhijie* to which Takase Gakuzaemon added Japanese reading punctuation was a Korean edition, printed in 1395. The early Yi-dynasty official Cho Chung 趙浚 had ordered Ko Sagyŏng 高士 æ and Kim Kî 金祇 to prepare a literal explanation of the Ming legal code, and to this was added certain rhetorical flourishes by Chŏng Tojŏn 鄭道傳 and Tang Sŏng 唐誠 to produce a Korean edition of the Ming code. The text Gakuzaemon worked on was in the library of the Hayashi family and now remains extant in the Naikaku Bunko. We have here a case of Korean-Japanese scholarly interaction, though there are other instance in which Korean printings of Chinese writings were conveyed to Japan in the early Edo period. If I might just offer one further example in the realm of legal texts, there are two works concerning the Ming legal code among the those given by Tokugawa Ieyasu—the so-called “bestowal of books at Suruga”—to his ninth son Yoshinao 義直 who was enfeoffed at Owari: a Ming edition of the Hu Qiong’s 胡瓊 collected explanations [of the Ming code] together with the commentary of Hu Xiao 胡孝, and the Korean edition of the *Da Ming lü zhijie*. He also gave him a copy of the

5 In Korean: *Tae Myŏng nyul chikhae*.
6 I was unable to find this character in any dictionary, including the *Dai Kan-Wa jiten* 大漢和辭典 (Great Chinese-Japanese Dictionary), comp. Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋徹次. If any reader can
Da Ming hui'dian (Collected Statutes of the Great Ming Dynasty), and it too was a Korean edition of the text. This is a concrete example of the flow of culture among China, Korea, and Japan.

Despite all the editorial work by Kashū and others that went into the Dai Min ritsu genkai, Tokugawa Yoshimune still seems to have been unhappy with it. On the fifth day of the seventh lunar month of Shōtoku 5 (1715), he again ordered Takase Gakuzan to prepare a colloquial explanation for the Ming code, and in this work Sakakibara Kashū was also ordered to participate. On the first day of the fifth month of the following year, before a full year had passed, Yoshimune suddenly left Kishū to assume the post of shōgun with the death of Ietsugu.

Meika sōsho. Takase Gakuzan’s work on the Ming law code was entitled Dai Min ritsurei yakugi (Translation of the Statutes and Laws of the Great Ming Dynasty). Although it was not printed, there are a fair number of manuscript copies extant. A note in the text reads: “Respectfully, I received your instructions and began work at the beginning of the second month and completed my work in the middle of the twelfth month. It is the fifth year of the Kyōhō reign [1720].” He states here that, upon receiving orders from the shōgun in the second lunar month of Kyōhō 5 and completed the work in the twelfth month of the same year. Probably, Yoshimune, having become shōgun, was preoccupied accustoming himself to this post, and when he eventually settled into this position he again ordered a colloquial explanation of the Ming legal code which he had earlier in Shōtoku 5 [1715] ordered while serving as daimyō of Kii domain. It would thus appear as though Takase Gakuzan was on duty during this period in Edo as the Edo representative of Kii domain. I looked for the reason for this in the Kiboku kō 朴考 in the 36th stringbound volume of the Meika sōsho (Collection of Famous Authors). The collection runs to 78 stringbound volumes in all; its cover is light green, and the title is written in rough characters (directly on the book, not on paper attached to it) at the edge of the binding thread at the lower right on the cover. There is a title page attached to the cover on which is written people’s names with the character kō 考 next to it, such as Fukami kō 深見考, Hayashi kō 林考, Ogyū kō 萩生考, and Kiboku kō 喜朴考. According to Fukai Tamotsu 福井保, a cover of this color indicates that the original text dates to the Kanpō period (1736-43); before then, the text and the cover would have been made of the same paper. When they attached a cover of colored paper to spruce up the appearance, they pasted the former cover on the inside front cover. When we now read through the transparent covers that had been glued on and since fallen off or looking from the inside, we can still detect characters inscribed on the original title page; for example, on Fukami kō was written either the term “Kudayū” 久大夫 or “Shinbee” 新兵衛, by Ogyū kō was written “Sōshichi” 萩七, and by Hayashi kō was written “Daigaku no kami” 大學頭 (head of the shogunal college). Each handwriting specimen had distinctive characteristics, apparently representing each person’s distinctive hand. The authors included in the collection included: Asai Tomomasa 阿部為盛, Namikawa Ei 並河永 (Seisho 謹所), Kada no Arimaro 荷田有滿 [1706-51], Shimoda

help supply corroboration for this reading or a correction for it, the translator would greatly appreciate it.
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Morofuru 下田師古, Aoki Atsubumi 林信充, Nakamura Koreyoshi 中村之歎, Katsurayama Yoshiaki 桂山義樹, Narushima Shinden 成島信遍, Ogyū Nabematsu 上村端松, Ogyū Kan 上村觀, Takase Gakuzan. One look at this list of names reveals that they were all either close associates of Yoshimune or men learned in Japanese and Chinese studies who, it is reported, received special requests from Yoshimune himself. Without a doubt, this collection was tied up with Yoshimune.

Takase Gakuzan. The "Kiboku" in Kiboku kō was Takase Gakuzan’s name. Although the length of the various entries in the collection vary, all follow the same form of one question-one answer—first a question is posed, and then the answer begins one character lower than the question. For example:

When a father kills his son over a trivial matter, should the father be executed?

The law concerning fistfighting reads as follows: If a child or grandchild violates the law and a parent or grandparent beats him to death, then he shall receive 100 heavy blows of the cane. The collected commentaries add: If the child is without blame and he is killed, then the murderer shall receive 60 heavy blows of the cane and one year of penal servitude. See fixed precedents for cases more serious than this.

The reason this question concludes with "no gokoto" (lit., the honorable matter of) is that it was posed by the shōgun. The Kiboku kō brings together eight groups of these questions and answers: “ne shigatsu” 子四月 (fourth month, year of the rat), “ne shigatsu jūhachinichi” 子四月十八日 (eighteenth day, fourth month, year of the rat), “ne shigatsu nenrokinichi” 子四月念陸日 (26th day, fourth month, year of the rat), “gogatsu shohachi” 五月初八 (first eight days, fifth month), “gogatsu yōka” 五月八日 (eighth day, fifth month), “gogatsu jūshichininichi” 五月十七日 (seventeenth day, fifth month), “jūgatsu yokka” 十月四日 (fourth day, tenth month), and “jūgatsu shotōka” 十月初十日 (first ten days, tenth month). Thus, there are three collections for the fourth month, three for the fifth month, and two for the tenth month—eight in all; those from the fourth month were from the year of the rat. The passage cited above appeared in the “eighth day, fifth month” collection which also includes Dingli cheng’an. Among the responses in this very collection, one finds the following notation: “The Ming legal code is recorded in the Da Ming huidian 大明會典 (Collected Statutes of the Great Ming Dynasty), and the great Qing code should be available in the Da Qing huidian.” The questions and answers in the “seventeenth day, fifth month” collection cite the Da Qing huidian to the effect of “it says in juan 107 of the Da Qing huidian.” This would indicate that Gakuzan had still not seen the Da Qing huidian on the eighth day of the fifth month, but by the seventeenth day of that month was able to see it. Also, by the eighth day of the fifth month, he had seen the Dingli cheng’an. Thus, when the Nagasaki Administrator Ishikawa Tosa no kami wrote in a document dated the fifth month of Kyōhō 5 [1720] that the shōgun enjoyed such texts as the Dingli cheng’an and the Da

The text is first in Kanbun, followed by the same in literary Japanese. Only the final sentence appears solely in Japanese.
Qing huidian, we can see that Yoshimune had shown these two newly arrived texts to Takase Gakuzan. Kyōhō 5 was a year of the rat, and thus the fifth month mentioned in Kiboku kō is the fifth month of the year of the rat. Furthermore, Gakuzan composed the Dai Min ritsurei yakugi over the period between the second and the twelfth month of this year, and it was during this period that he was frequently replying to queries from the shōgun. Hence, Gakuzan must have been in Edo, and clearly it was he who was serving since their time in Kishū as advisor to Yoshimune in legal studies.

Yoshimune Orders Study. A letter of Muro Kyōsō of Kyōhō 6 (1721) conveys the fact that Yoshimune assigned a task to Kyōsō and another scholar in residence (yorai jusha 寄合儒者) who served the shōgun and sought from them a report on its results. Kyōsō was ordered to translate into Japanese the Liuyu yanyi. The letter was dated the thirteenth day of the intercalary seventh month. In a letter from Kyōsō to Aochi Zōjin 青地藏人 the 24th day of the tenth month, he explained this situation in greater detail.

He states here that first Hayashi Nobatsu 林信篤 (1644-1732) and his son, Hayashi Nobumitsu, both titular heads of the shogunal college, were ordered to prepare a commentary of the Utaishō 詞抄 (Selection of Songs); Hitomi Yūhee 人見又兵衛 (Noriyuki 美至), Hayashi Mataemon 林又右衛門 (Nobuyuki 信如), and Hitomi Shichirōemon 人見七郎右衛門 (Noriari 美在) were ordered to prepare punctuated editions of the Ryō gige 令義解 (Explanation of the Meaning of the Codes) and the Ryō shige 令集解 (Collected Commentaries on the Codes); Ogyū Sōemon 袏生懸右衛門 (Sorai) was ordered to prepare a punctuated edition of the Liuyu yanyi; and Fukami Shin’emon 深見新右衛門 and his son were ordered to translated the Da Qing huidian into Japanese. Although rumor had it that soon after Yoshimune became shōgun, Gion Yoichirō 荘園与一郎 (Nankai 南海 [1676/7-1751]) and other long-time Confucian officials in Kishū were called together, such an incident had not taken place; long-time officials continued to be employed as in the past and were ordered to carry on with their lectures and inquiries. Yoshimune’s demands were apparently extremely strict.

As concerned the Utaishō, Kyōsō wrote: “Hayashi [Nobatsu and Nobumitsu], father and son, heads of the shogunal college, were recently ordered to prepare a commentary on the Utaishō; they did a perfunctory job and presented it to the shōgun. After so doing, it was so poor that the shōgun rejected it and returned it ordering them to redo it. Even now it has not been completed.” It would thus seem that they had submitted their work once, but Yoshimune had not accepted it and they were then redoing it. In the Reishin hissaku (Reishin’s Secret Plan), a collection of letters edited by Aochi Saiken, there is a heading “The Matter of the Appraisal of the Japanese Text of Hayashi Nobatsu and His Son.” There one finds the story of Iseya Kichibee 伊勢屋吉兵衛 (Shigenobu 重羽).

Hakura Saigū. According to this story, the feudal domains had been ordered in recent years to collect lost Japanese books, and from Kaga domain the entire text of the Hōsō ruirin 法曹類林 (Categorized Account of the Law) and a part of the Ruijū koku shi
(Categorized History of the States) had been presented to the government, as had other works from other states. The Hayashis were then commanded to examine these works for errors, and when the "most accurate work" emerged, it was to be placed in the shogunal library. However, there were some spurious works among those deemed accurate by the Hayashis, as well as some accurate works among those judged to be bogus. Because Lord Yoshimune's doubts had still not been dispelled, in the third month of Kyōhō 7 [1722] when Imperial Messenger Nakanoin Dainagon Michimi appeared at court, he dispatched Nakajō Yamashiro no kami, shogunal ambassador to the imperial court, to show a written work to a man by the name of Shimoda Kōdaiyu, one of the secretaries of the imperial messenger, to evaluate the document. He reported that after returning to the capital, he would investigate the matter and inform the shōgun of his views. It seems this was due to the fact that there was no knowledge of things Japanese beneath that of Nakanoin.

Yet, Yamashiro no kami told Kōdaiyu that he was close to a man by the name of Hakura Saigū, who had been a Shinto priest from Kyoto's Inari Shrine; at present he had passed his shrine duties to his younger brother and came to Edo on occasion. Hakura was a man of extraordinary learning in Japanese studies; he was presently in Edo, so perhaps, Yamashiro no kami suggested, they should consult with him. They then informed Lord Yoshimune and repaired to Yamashiro no kami's residence to investigate. The majority of the Hayashis' work was in error, and all agreed to have Saigū offer a judgment. Thereupon, Lord Yoshimune told Dainagon Nobutsu that he was getting old and summoned Head of the Shogunal College Nobumitsu to service, and he had him meet with Kōdaiyu and had Kōdaiyu ask Nobumitsu about the issue of evaluation. However, because things were still unclear Yoshimune had Nobumitsu write a letter in response to various questions. At that time, the head of the shogunal college overheard a conversation between Chamberlain Arima Hyōgo no kami and Kōdaiyu. They were arguing loudly: "This is a matter of my family's prestige. Not only must I send a report on the pros and cons of this affair, but for you to say that I cannot even read something like this is unbearable beyond reproach!" After Lord Yoshimune got wind of this disturbance, he no longer permitted the Hayashi family to make such determinations in cases involving Japanese works. Hakura Saigū remained in Edo through the fifth month of the year, reporting on his investigations of authenticity of works. Many of the works that the Hayashis had determined to be genuine turned out to be spurious, the reason being that these works were frequently those contributed by their friends and relatives, and they had simply passed on these works as genuine without investigating them. It was clear that their determinations had been influenced by material gain.

In the Shōun kō Hayashi ke ôfuku shokanshū (Collection of Letters between Lord Shōun and the Hayashi Family) held in the Kaetsunō Bunko in the Kanazawa Municipal Library, we find correspondence in which Head of the Shogunal College Hayashi inquires about the Ruiju koku shi in the collection of Maeda Tsunanori. Lord Shōun presents the text to him. We see here one aspect of Yoshimune's private book collecting. The story of

---

8 A massive work by Sugawara no Michizane, the acclaimed statesman of the ninth century.
Iseya Kichibee, though, is a fascinating episode hidden from view at the time. The circumstances surrounding the employment of Hakura Saigû enable us to see that, while Yoshimune recognized the feudal position of the Hayashi family, for questions he could not resolve himself he sought assistance from courtiers in Kyoto to ordinary scholars; and he used Muro Kyûsô and the school of Kinoshita Jun’ an 木下順庵 [1621-98] to criticize the Hayashis. This clearly demonstrates the great advances made in scholarship in the early Kyôhô era under the influence of Yoshimune’s strength.

The Japanese Translation and Punctuation of the *Liuyu yanyi*. Muro Kyûsô who was ordered to prepare a Japanese translation of the *Liuyu yanyi* presented a work written in *kana* in three stringbound volumes. Yoshimune read it himself and had it read aloud to his entourage. He thereupon said: “This translation is good, but quite long. Try and extract its essence by using just one of the six maxims. Furthermore, those of low status will need this work as well, so it would be best if condensed into one stringbound volume.” Muro Kyûsô completed his task on the 27th day of the ninth lunar month.

Yoshimune had wanted also to publish an edition of the *Liuyu yanyi* in the literary Chinese original, but because of the mixture of colloquialisms in the original, it would have been unreadable to anyone unfamiliar with such colloquialisms. He asked Muro Kyûsô if he could recommend an appropriate person, and Muro suggested Okajima Enshi 岡島援之 (Okajima Kanzan 岡 島 崇山). Okajima was born in Nagasaki. He first served the Mori 毛利 family in Hagi as a translator, later returning to Nagasaki to pursue his studies of physiology. He lived as well in Edo, Osaka, and Kyoto and had numerous acquaintances and disciples. He was renowned for his ability in the spoken Chinese language—“a Chinese guest in the midst of Japan”—and had particularly close contact with Ogyû Sorai’s Ken’en 蒐園 school. He had numerous works to his name. He wrote textbooks on the Chinese language, such as *Tôka ruiyô* 唐話類要 (Categorized Elements of the Chinese Language), *Tôka sen’yô* 唐話纂要 (Compiled Elements of the Chinese Language), and *Tôka ben’yô* 唐話便要 (Textbook of Chinese), as well a Japanese translation—entitled *Tsûzoku kô-Min eiretsu den* 通俗 明 本 續 軍 (Biographies of Heroes of the August Ming Dynasty in Japanese Translation)—of the *Yunhe qizong* 雲合 奇 踵 (Marvelous Vestiges amid the Clouds) of Xu Wei 徐 澤 的 Ming, a Japanese-punctuated edition of *Chûgi suikoden* 忠義 水 滔 (Water Margin of Loyalty and Righteousness), a Japanese translation of it entitled *Tsûzoku Chûgi suikoden* 通俗 忠義 水 滔 (The Water Margin of Loyalty and Righteousness in Japanese Translation), and a punctuated work entitled *Kôki tei ishô* 康 熙 帝 遗 詔 (The Last Will of the Kangxi Emperor). He even translated the Japanese *Taihei ki* 太 平 記 (Chronicle of Peace) in Chinese as *Taiping ji yanyi* 太平記演義 (Romance of the Chronicle of Peace).

The Japanese edition of the *Liuyu yanyi*, however, was probably proposed by Ogyû Hokkei and given to Ogyû Sorai to complete. On the basis of such texts as the *Yanagisawa Gunzan kafu* 柳沢郡山家譜 (The Family Geneology of Yangisawa Gunzan) and the *Ken’en zatsuwa* 蒐園雑話 (Tales of the Ken’en School), Mr. Ishizaki Matazô 石崎 又造 has surmised the following scenario. Hayashi Hôkô was ordered to prepare a punctuated edition of the text, but his punctuation was not elucidating, so they sought out a man with exception skills in the Chinese language. On the fifteenth day of the ninth month of Kyôhô 6, Sorai was summoned to appear at the residence of Councillor Toda
Yamashiro no kami Tadazane where he received his orders to prepare a punctuated edition of the text; on the twentieth he presented the finished work at the Toda residence; and on the 23rd he was beckoned a third time to write a preface for the publication of this work. We should note that Sorai did not directly meet the shōgun.

**A Japanese Edition of the Da Qing huidian** In the correspondence of Muro Kyūsō, we find mention of a Japanese edition of the *Da Qing huidian*: “Fukami Shin’emon and his son were commanded to prepare such a work, and at the same time they were additionally charged with translating this large work known as the *Da Qing huidian.*” He goes on to say:

This is a text known as the *Da Ming huidian*. Until the Qing period, it has been added to and subtracted from. There are no other copies of this [book] among the newly arrived books. I have actually seen the *Da Ming huidian*. It is extremely difficult to read. Shin’emon and his son seem to be having a great deal of difficulty with this translation. Thus, Shin’emon’s heir, Kudayū, says that he put in a request to the effect that he would like to travel to Nagasaki soon to meet with Chinese there and investigate the matter. This was an extremely difficult job, and it seems as if he is going to be spending all next year there.

Fukami Shin’emon also went by the name Fukami Sadatsuna 深見貞恒 and used the styles Gentai 日天 and Tenki 天麟 as well; since he was the grandson of the Chinese Gao Shoujue 高壽覺, he was known also as Gao Xuandai 高玄岱. In 1709, Hōei 6, on the recommendation of Arai Hakuseki, he had been elevated from the ranks of the Chinese interpreters to a scholar in residence. Kudayū was Gentai’s third son; he went by the names Tanken 建賢 and, later, Shinbee 新兵衛 and Arichika 阿積. After the early death of his elder brother, he succeeded to the head of the Fukami family in Nagasaki, and with the retirement of his father Gentai in 1718, Kyōhō 3, he was appointed scholar in residence and proceeded to Edo. Because he was a descendent of Chinese, he spoke Chinese well, and Hakuseki frequently came to Gentai with questions about Chinese. To the Fukamis, father and son, came the order to translate the *Da Qing huidian* into Japanese. However, because it was so difficult, Kudayū went to Nagasaki to seek the advice of Chinese there and thus carry out the translation smoothly.

The *Da Qing huidian*—in Yoshimune’s era it was known as the Kangxi huidian 康熙會典 (Collected Statutes of the Kangxi Emperor)—was an immense work altogether filling 162 stringbound volumes, and it was sufficiently difficult to read that even Muro Kyūsō and Fukami Gentai found it hard. For Yoshimune who loved the law, however, it was a work whose contents he was keen to know. Thus, the order to translate the work into Japanese was issued.

Muro Kyūsō had said that the *Da Qing huidian* was recently arrived from China. To see how this work was treated in Japan, we need to look at the *Bakufu shomotsukata niki* and other materials.

**Two Sets of the Da Qing huidian.** According to the listing of books in the Kano Bunko 狩野文庫 at Tōhoku University, the *Da Qing huidian* was delivered to the Momijiyama Bunko on two occasions, in Kyōhō 5 (1720) and in Kyōhō 7. The first time
that the title Da Qing huidian appears in the Bakufu shomotsukata nikki is in an entry for the tenth day of the fourth lunar month of Kyōhō 7. On this day there is a note from Chamberlain Arima Hyōgo no kami that mentions the title: “The books on this [list] include those that became part of the library yesterday. Thus, a note needs to be added here when the book list is drawn up. The books will be sent along later.” Then he notes the titles of five works, and the Da Qing huidian in 141 stringbound volumes is included among them. The books “that became part of the library yesterday” indicates “books that arrived from Nagasaki” and “books presented by Gashū 賀州”--the latter refers to Maeda Kaga no kami Tsunanori. I shall discuss the books presented by Tsunanori in a subsequent of this book.

The five books noted by Arima were among the works arrived from Nagasaki that had entered the library the previous day. Despite the fact that the Da Qing huidian had been sent on by Arima, it did not reach the office of the Book Administrator for some time. Under this work’s title on the Bakufu shomotsukata nikki, there is a note that reads: “Arrived, the sixteenth day of the fifth month, year of the sheep.” It finally entered the Momijiyama Bunko on the sixteenth day of the fifth month of Kyōhō 12 [1727], a full five calendar years later. “The Da Qing huidian, 141 stringbound volumes, fourteen covers, locked in one box,” according to the Bakufu shomotsukata nikki. “Fukami Kudayū took it with him to Nagasaki, but he has been ordered to return it, and he handed it over to Ōshima Unpei 大嶋雲平.”

In an entry for the sixth day of the tenth month of Kyōhō 7, however, it is noted that the Da Qing huidian was to be used for shogunal use. A marginal note adds: “Returned from Nagasaki and placed the work in the library on the 25th day of the ninth month.” Although the name of the work is not recorded for the 25th day of the ninth month, it does note that the work was received from Nagasaki and placed in the library. Its special characteristics are given as: “Da Qing huidian, 141 stringbound volumes, green cloth covers, Chinese work, yellow binding, white binding thread, manuscript, textured binding.” Thus, two sets of the Da Qing huidian appear in the Bakufu shomotsukata nikki for Kyōhō 7.

Fukami Kudayū Goes to Nagasaki. We can now establish just what transpired above. In the fifth month of Kyōhō 5, the ship masters received an order to transport the Da Qing huidian from the aforementioned Ishikawa Tosa no kami. Most of them were carrying licenses which permitted them to enter port in Kyōhō 7, the year of the dragon. Thus, they were expected to return that year. The Da Qing huidian which was placed in the Momijiyama Bunko on the 25th day of the ninth month came to Japan in Kyōhō 7. Hence, the Da Qing huidian which appears in the notation for the sixteenth day of the fifth month is the work that Fukami Kudayū brought to Nagasaki, the first set of this text that arrived in Japan in Kyōhō 5. Yoshimune thus had a copy of the Da Qing huidian between Kyōhō 5 and 7. Also, the edition that arrived in Kyōhō 7 was significantly an unprinted manuscript. Inasmuch as legal works of this sort were difficult to come by, the Chinese ship masters who contracted to bring them would, it seems, if they were unable to find a printed edition, have a manuscript copied and transport it.

According to the Jushoku kakei 儒職家系 (Family Lines of Confucian Officials), Kudayū (Arichika) received an order in the tenth month of Kyōhō 6 (1721) of “state
business concerning the Chinese and the Dutch,” and he left Edo, arriving in Nagasaki in
the twelfth month. At this point in time, there is no way he could have yet been carrying
the Da Qing huidian. After the second manuscript copy arrived in Nagasaki in Kyōhō 7,
or after it arrived in Edo, probably then the first copy was sent to Nagasaki. This reason is
that until this point there had only been one set of the text in Japan. Muro Kyūsō’s
estimate that Kudaiyō “should remain for one year” in Nagasaki fell far short, for he was to
spend five years there before returning to Edo in the second month of Kyōhō 12.

Ogyū Hokkei. Let us return now to Kyōhō 7. The second Da Qing huidian text
that was placed in the Momijiyama Bunko on the 25th day of the ninth lunar month, as
noted earlier, left the collection on official business on the sixth day of the tenth month.
According to a note in the Bakufu shomotsukata nikki for the sixteenth day of the eleventh
month, two works, the Da Qing huidian and the Jicheng beikao 集成備考 (Collected
References) were “loaned out,” and there was a communication to the effect that these
texts were not subject to the thirty-day rule.

An investigation on the thirtieth day was a rule established by Yoshimune. On the
thirtieth day after delivering a book from the shogunal library, an inquiry was launched to
see if the borrower was finished with it. If it was still needed, its use could be extended; if
not, it was returned to the library. The idea was that, because the shōgun was a busy man
and might inadvertently forget a lent book, the Book Administrator would be able to call
attention to it without restraint. This allows us a window into both how the shōgun dealt
with people as well as to his acumen in handling public affairs.

These works, then, were lent out by the shōgun to someone, but we do not learn
to whom they were lent from the Bakufu shomotsukata nikki. A hint as to who may have
borrowed them can be found in the Meika sōsho. The Ogyū kō in volume 65 of this work
is by Ogyū (Sōshichirō 育 士郎) Hokkei, although the title he gives is “Shūsei bikō
sokurei ruihen sokurei sensho 集政備考則例類編則例全書考.” The content of
this work was a selection of legal terminology with explanations excerpted from three
[Chinese] works—Jizheng beikao 集政備考 (Examination of Government), Zeli leipian
則例類編 (Classified Essays on the Laws and Practices), Zeli quanshu 則例全書
(Complete Writings on the Laws and Practices)—according to the Six Ministries. The
terminology included such terms as kenpō 憲法 (C. xianfa, constitution), shōho 陞補
(C. shengbu, promotion), kyodō 舉動 (C. judong, deportment), kōbatsu 降罰
(C. xiangfa, punishments), and rimin 離仁 (C. liren, leaving one’s post). He thus had produced a kind
of legal dictionary. The Jizheng beikao which was “lent out” of the shogunal library was
among the works he used. It left the library on the 25th day of the ninth month of Kyōhō
7, two other works—Benchao zeli leibian 本朝則例類編 (Classified Essays on the Laws
and Practices of Our Dynasty) and Benchao liubu zeli quanshu 本朝六部則例全書
(Complete Writings on the Laws and Practices of the Six Ministries of the Our Dynasty)—
were lent out earlier, on the nineteenth day of the eighth month. These three works were
returned together on the tenth day of the twelfth month of the same year. Thus, we
considered this together with the texts in the title of the “Ogyū kō” in the Meika sōsho,
the “out” of “lent out” means Ogyū Hokkei’s home. We can surmise that Hokkei
compiled his dictionary of legal terminology between the late eighth month and the early
twelfth month of Kyōhō 7.
The *Da Qing huidian* and Ogyū Hokkei. By the same token, the *Da Qing huidian* which was “lent out” left the Momijiyama Bunko on the sixth day of the tenth month and was not returned for over six months until the 29th day of the fourth month of Kyōhō 8. Furthermore, soon thereafter another request to borrow it was presented on the eighth day of the fifth month, and it was kept for over five months until the 21st day of the tenth month on official business. When it went out a third time, it was not returned until the 29th day of the fifth month of Kyōhō 9. In these cases the thirty-day rule was enforced in only a perfunctory manner.

Of the long periods, six and five months, that this work was lent out of the shogunal library, we have sound sources to corroborate especially the six-month figure; one can see that someone was working on something using this text in the same way as the *Jizheng beikao*. An examination of the *Meika sōsho* which was a collection of reports to Yoshimune reveals several concerning the *Da Qing huidian* can found among Ogyū Hokkei’s reports: “Min Shin kaiten ribu kō” 明清会典吏部考 (Analysis of the *Da Ming huidian* and *Da Qing huidian*, Ministry of Personnel), nos. 68, 69; “Dai Shin kaiten 48 (reibu 9)” 大清會典四十八 (禮部九) (*Da Qing huidian* 48, Ministry of Rites 9), no. 71, and “Shinchō kanshoku” 清朝官職 (Bureaucratic Positions in the Qing Dynasty), nos. 72-78. The “Min Shin kaiten ribu kō” is a translation of this section on the Ministry of Personnel from the codes, and the “Dai Shin kaiten 48 (reibu 9)” is a punctuated edition of the section on decorum, ceremony, and clothing from juan 48 of the *Da Qing huidian*. Within the “Shinchō kanshoku,” number 77 was originally titled “Dai Shin kaiten heibu kō” 大清會典兵部考 (Analysis of the *Da Qing huidian*, Ministry of War) and contains a punctuated edition of the section of the text on the Ministry of War. The other sections were translations of the bureaucratic posts for various regions of China: “Civil and Military Officials in the Capital,” no. 75; “Additional, One. Eight Banners, Zhili, Shengjing,” no. 72; “Additional, Two: Jiangnan, Zhejiang, Jiangxi,” no. 76; “Additional, Three: Huguang, Guangdong, Guangxi,” no. 73; “Additional, Four: Shanxi, Shandong, Henan,” no. 78; “Additional, Five: Shaanxi, Sichuan, Yunnan, Guizhou,” no. 74. From this we can see that the core of Yoshimune’s interest in the *Da Qing huidian* was the bureaucratic system at the center and in the localities. Hokkei’s “Shinchō kanshoku” was not something thrown together in a few days. Thus, I believe that in fact the person to whom the *Da Qing huidian* was “lent out” was Ogyū Hokkei. And, it seems that it was none other than Ogyū Hokkei who was in Edo to answer Yoshimune’s queries about the text.

Ogyū Hokkei, posthumous name Kan 觀, style Shukutsu 叔逵, was commonly known as Sōshichirō 盛七郎 or Shichirō 七郎 for short. His elder brother was the famed Ogyū Sorai. In the present scholarly world in Japan, Sorai enjoys a fine reputation and no one is ignorant of his name. Hokkei is not so well known. Yet, at the time, Hokkei was better known in the field of legal studies. In my efforts to find out whatever I could about Tokugawa Yoshimune’s learning, I have come to know the extraordinary level of contributions Hokkei made in this area. After the scholarly contributions to Yoshimune made by Takase Gakuzan in Kyōhō 5, Ogyū Hokkei holds center stage. I am of the opinion that the thorniest problem in evaluating Ogyū Sorai is how one can ever discount Sorai’s own boastful stories about himself. Sorai wrote and published a great many
works. Hokkei, by contrast, left few works. Yet, the Meika sōsho which we have frequently mentioned in this chapter contains many writings by Hokkei, and these are all but completely unknown. While examining the Meika sōsho, I had the following ideas as to why this might have been the case.

After Ōgyū Sorai resigned from service in the Yanagisawa family, he received no stipend. However, as a local Confucian scholar [i.e., without official post], he was in a free position. Hokkei served the shōgun as scholar in residence; it was his job to respond to the shōgun’s queries. Accordingly, he was not supposed to do anything else. The difference in the two brothers’ status appears bluntly in the respective bureaucratic titles given in the texts each published on orders of Yoshinune, Sorai’s punctuated edition of the Linyu yanyi and Hokkei’s punctuation edition of the Ming legal code. In the introduction to the Japanese edition of the Linyu yanyi, we find: “Eleventh day of the tenth month of Kyōhō 6 [1721]. Written by Butsu Mokei 物茂卿, retainer of Kai domain, who salutes, bows down, and respectfully receives your instruction.” It also bears two stamps reading: “Scribe of Kai domain” and “Seal of Butsu Mokei.” By contrast, in Hokkei’s afterward to his edition of the Ming code, we find: “Tenth month of Kyōhō 7 [1722]. Afterward by Butsu Bukan 物部観, [style] Shukutatsu, Confucian lecturer of the Eastern capital [Edo].” In the difference between “retainer of Kai domain” and “Confucian lecturer of the Eastern capital” lies the influence necessary to have the freedom to publish one’s own writings. When I wrote of “sovereign-minister relations in feudal society” as the start of this chapter, it is this that I had in mind.

Unlike a purely academic evaluation, when we assess scholars in feudal society, we have to take into account their position in that society. One would not say that someone was brilliant because they were of high station. In fact, it would be just the opposite in cases in which someone of high status only did not leave scholarly accomplishments to posterity. In any event, what happened to Fukami Arichika who carried a copy of the Da Qing huidian with him to Nagasaki? This topic we will take up in the next chapter.