

The Reimportation from Japan to China of the Commentary to the
Classic of Filial Piety

Laura E. Hess
University of Washington

國 The mid-eighteenth century reimportation of Kong Anguo's 孔安 (fl. 126-117 B.C.) commentary to the Ancient Script version of the Classic of Filial Piety (Guwen Xiaojing Kong [shi] zhuan 古文孝經 孔[氏]傳) is an important part of a greater eighteenth- and nineteenth-century trend reversing the flow of cultural influences from China to Japan, which had until then been largely one way.¹ The Kong commentary was first lost in China in the sixth century during the turmoil at the end of the Liang dynasty. Its sudden reappearance several decades later led Sui-dynasty scholars to question the text's authenticity. Although the Kong commentary remained extant for several hundred more years, it was later lost once again in the tenth century during the Five Dynasties period, and only the text of the Ancient Script version of the classic itself was preserved.

Since a quotation from the Classic of Filial Piety appears in the Seventeen-Article Constitution (Jūshichijō kenpō 十七條憲法) issued by Prince Shōtoku 聖德太子 (573-621) in 604, it is clear that the classic itself had already been transmitted to Japan prior to the Nara period.² The Kong commentary must have reached Japan soon afterwards, because the Taihō Codes (Taihō ritsuryō 大寶律令) promulgated in 701 or 702 made study of both the Kong and Zheng 鄭 commentaries to the Classic of Filial Piety obligatory in official instruction.³ After Tang Xuanzong's 唐玄宗 (r. 712-56) commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety was transmitted to Japan, it replaced the Kong and Zheng commentaries in 860 to become the officially sanctioned commentary for the Classic of Filial Piety, just as it had in China more than a century earlier. Even after this transfer of allegiance, Japanese scholars were still permitted to study the Kong commentary, if they so desired, and even though Tang Xuanzong's Imperial Commentary was used on official occasions, the Kong commentary continued to be popular among the literati and remained in circulation down to the Tokugawa era.

Dazai Shundai 太宰春臺 (1670-1747), a prominent disciple of Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666-1728) and an advocate of "ancient learning" (kogaku 古學), was aware that the Kong commentary was no longer extant in China. Apparently inspired by the fact that the Tokugawa bakufu had sent the Shichikei Mōshi kōbun hoi 七經孟子考文補遺

[Textual Study of the Seven Classics and Mencius, with Supplement] of Yamanoi Konron 山井崑崙 (ob. 1728) to China, Shundai published an edition of the Kong commentary in 1732 and had it sent to China, where it provoked strong reactions in the Qing academic world.⁴ In the mid-eighteenth century, Qing scholars were bound to be suspicious of the authenticity of a text that had already been lost twice, only to reappear yet again after a hiatus of approximately eight hundred years, and this time from Japan. Not surprisingly, the recovery of the Kong commentary from Japan resulted in numerous and often heated discussions of the text's authenticity.

Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary was reprinted in the first collection (ji 集) of the Zhibuzuzhai congshu 知不足齋叢書 [Collection of Reprints from the Studio of Recognizing Insufficiency] by Bao Tingbo 鮑廷博 (1728-1814) in 1776 and was included in the Siku quanshu 四庫全書 [Complete Library of the Four Treasuries]. The Zhibuzuzhai congshu reprint includes prefaces by Lu Wenchao 盧文弨 (1717-96), Wu Qian 吳騫 (1733-1813) and Zheng Chen 鄭辰, and a colophon by Bao Tingbo himself. All of these writings reflect the tremendous excitement that the recovery of the Kong commentary caused in the Qing world of letters. These scholars recognized the value of the Kong commentary as a previously lost work from antiquity and they provided textual evidence demonstrating that the Japanese edition accorded with quotations from the Kong commentary in earlier texts, but they still voiced certain doubts about its ultimate authenticity.

Reactions from other Qing scholars tended to be less generous and, in many cases, exceedingly harsh. Even though the editors of the Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao 四庫全書總目提要 [Annotated General Catalogue for the Complete Library of the Four Treasuries] acknowledged that the Kong commentary appeared to have been transmitted in Japan and could be verified by quotations in earlier texts, they condemned it as a recent Japanese forgery on the basis of its language and style.⁵

The reprinting of the Kong commentary in both the Zhibuzuzhai congshu and Siku quanshu meant that a great many scholars now had access to a text previously unavailable. More than a few Qing scholars, including such figures as Sun Zhizu 孫志祖 (1737-1801), Zhang Zongtai 張宗泰 (1750-1832), Ruan Yuan 阮元 (1764-1849), Zhou Zhongfu 周中孚 (1768-1831), Qu Zhongrong 瞿中溶 (1769-1842), Ding Yan 丁晏 (1794-1875), Zheng Zhen 鄭珍 (1806-64) and Li Guangting 李光廷 (1812-80), raised the question of the text's authenticity and were unanimous in their condemnation of it. Especially important among these writings are the detailed essays by Ding Yan and Zheng

Zhen, who both argue for the spuriousness of the Kong commentary, with Ding Yan going so far as to identify Wang Su 王肅 (195-256) as the forger.⁶ In this respect, Ding Yan's views are unusual among the various discussions of the authenticity of the Kong commentary because he attributed the forgery not to a Japanese, but to a Chinese. Since Qing scholars were for the most part unfamiliar with Japanese historical texts, they were not aware that the textual transmission of the Kong commentary in Japan was in fact well-documented. Even though they may have known from the Shichikei Mōshi kōbun hoi, which was also included in the Siku quanshu, that the Kong commentary had originally been transmitted in Japan, sheer ethnocentricity and blatant prejudice prevented most of them from acknowledging that the text Shundai edited, published, and had sent to China could actually be the same Kong commentary that had been extant in China from the Sui dynasty through the Five Dynasties period.

In 1778, just two years after Bao Tingbo reprinted Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary, three copies of the Zhibuzuzhai congshu reprint were brought to Japan by a Qing merchant. In 1781, the prefaces by Lu Wenchao, Wu Qian, and Zheng Chen, and the colophon by Bao Tingbo that had been written for the Zhibuzuzhai congshu reprint of the Kong commentary were published in Japan as a separate volume, together with a preface by the eminent scholar and bibliophile Kimura Kenkadō 木村蒹葭堂 (1736-1802) lauding Shundai for having his work transmitted to China and reprinted there. The following year, the publisher Sūzanbō 嵩山房, which had published most of Shundai's works in his lifetime and continued to reprint them after his death, reprinted the Zhibuzuzhai congshu version of Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary, together with a preface by Ōshio Gōsho 大鹽整渚 (1717-85), one of Shundai's disciples.

The publication of these two works had a profound effect on the Tokugawa academic world. Prior to this, because of the popularity of Shushigaku 朱子學 ("the teachings of Zhu Xi" 朱熹 [1130-1200]), the Four Books [Sishu 四書] were firmly at the core of the academic curriculum. Before Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary was reimported from China, even if the Classic of Filial Piety was used in schools, it was usually not Tang Xuanzong's commentary or the Kong commentary that was studied, but Zhu Xi's Xiaojing kanwu 孝經刊謬 [Emendation of Errors in the Classic of Filial Piety], a radical revision of the text into a one-section classic and a fourteen-section commentary, together with Dong Ding's 董鼎 (Yuan dynasty) Xiaojing dayi 孝經大義 [General Interpretation of the Classic of Filial Piety] and Wu Cheng's 吳澄 (1249-1333) Xiaojing dingben 孝經定本 [Definitive Edition of the Classic of Filial Piety], works that

both follow Zhu Xi's approach.

Shundai's edition of the Classic of Filial Piety was able to reverse this trend for a number of reasons. Not only was Shundai himself well known, but also his teacher, Sorai, was extremely popular and influential, even after his death in 1728. Still more important, Shundai's work had reached China, where it was incorporated into two major collections, the Zhibuzuzhai congshu and Siku quanshu. The reimportation of Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary resulted in the Kong commentary's being reprinted numerous times all over Japan, to the point that it soon became the most popular Edo period edition of the Classic of Filial Piety.

This led to numerous studies and critical essays on the Kong commentary written by a host of Japanese scholars, with both favorable and unfavorable reactions to the work. These reactions reflect the spectrum of Tokugawa scholarship, including that of both kangakusha 漢學者 (Sinologists) and kokugakusha 國學者 (nativists), as well as other aspects of the diverse intellectual milieu of that era. Particularly noteworthy among the studies of the Kong commentary that Shundai's work prompted are Katayama Kenzan's 片山兼山 (1730-82) Kobun Kōkyō hyōchū 古文孝經標註 [Ancient Script Version of the Classic of Filial Piety with Marginal Notes] and Kobun Kōkyō sanso 古文孝經參疏 [Sub-Commentary to the Ancient Script Version of the Classic of Filial Piety], published in 1772 and 1789, respectively. Katayama Kenzan was a scholar of the so called "eclectic school" (setchūha 折衷派), which rejected factionalism and consciously drew from a variety of schools of thought. The Kobun Kōkyō hyōchū contains marginal notes that identify the source of quotations in the Kong commentary, explain some of the obscure terms, and list textual variants. Scholarly reactions in Japan provide a marked contrast to those in China, where animated discussions about the authenticity of the Kong commentary precluded any general recognition of the text's value and created a climate in which no one seriously considered undertaking further study of the work.

In Japan, just as in China, there were scholars who wrote reprovingly of the Kong commentary. In the Kinbun gūhitsu 近聞偶筆 [Desultory Notes on Various Recent Matters], a collection of Yoshida Kōton's 吉田篁墩 (1745-98) writings published after his death, Yoshida Kōton, a disciple of Inoue Kinga 井上金峨 (1732-84) and a member of the so-called "eclectic school," noted a number of problems with Shundai's text and warned scholars to be careful when using it.⁷ In 1788, Fujita Yūkoku 藤田幽谷 (1774-1826), a scholar of the Mito 水戸 school, which drew primarily from the tenets of Zhu Xi, wrote an essay in which he discussed a number of problems with the Kong

commentary that, in his view, made the text's authenticity highly suspect.⁸ In 1811, Asakawa Zen'an 朝川善庵 (1781-1849), the son of the Xiaojing scholar Katayama Kenzan, who undoubtedly inspired his son's interest in the classic, and a disciple of the "eclectic school" scholar Yamamoto Hokuzan 山本北山 (1752-1812), published the Kobun Kōkyō shiki 古文孝經私記 [Personal Notes on the Ancient Script Version of the Classic of Filial Piety], which contains essays on the authenticity of both the Ancient Script version of the classic and the Kong commentary. Although Asakawa Zen'an believed that the Ancient Script version of the classic was authentic, he provided extensive evidence to bolster his argument that the accompanying Kong commentary was a forgery.

One of the most intriguing aspects of the Japanese reactions to the Kong commentary was that there were scholars who used the opportunity of criticizing Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary to launch a personal attack on Shundai himself. In a long essay on Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary, Morokuzu Kindai 諸葛琴臺 (ob. 1810) provided extensive evidence showing that the Kong commentary was, in his view, a Six Dynasties forgery.⁹ He also berated Shundai for careless scholarship and condemned him for failing to recognize the text's spuriousness. The eminent kokugakusha Hirata Atsutane's 平田篤胤 (1776-1843) Ibukinoya hissō 氣吹舎筆叢 [Collected Writings of Ibukinoya (i.e., Hirata Atsutane)] includes entries both on the Classic of Filial Piety itself and on Shundai's preface to his edition of the Kong commentary.¹⁰ In these entries, Atsutane criticized Shundai for failing to discern that both the Classic of Filial Piety and the Kong commentary were forgeries. He also condemned Shundai and his fellow kanagakusha for their uncritical adulation of all things Chinese and for their consequent disdain for and debasement of their own country. It is clear from these writings that although Shundai's reputation in Japan benefited greatly from the exportation to China of his edition of the Kong commentary and its subsequent reimportation to Japan, it also suffered as he became the target of renewed criticism.

More than six decades after Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary was first published in Japan, another edition of the Kong commentary was reprinted in Japan and sent back to China. In 1798, Hayashi Jussai 林述齋 (1768-1841), a disciple of Ōshio Gōsho, who was himself one of Shundai's students and who wrote the preface to the Sūzanbō reprint of the Zhibuzuzhai congshu edition of the Kong commentary, published an edition of the Kong commentary in the first volume of the Isson sōsho 佚存叢書 [Collected Reprints of (Books) Lost (in China) But Preserved (in Japan)]. Hayashi Jussai's edition

of the Kong commentary is particularly valuable, because he reproduced a Japanese manuscript from 1279. Since he was both head of the Bakufu Academy and an ardent advocate of the teachings of Zhu Xi, his attention to the Kong commentary demonstrates the broad general acceptance that the text had come to enjoy by the late eighteenth century.

We know that Hayashi Jussai's Isson sōsho reached China soon after its publication, because Ruan Yuan's 1822 Siku weishou shumuyao 四庫未收書目提要 [Catalogue of Books Not Included in the Complete Library of the Four Treasuries] includes entries on ten of its works, although the Kong commentary does not happen to be one of them.¹¹ This constitutes a second reimportation from Japan to China of the Kong commentary. The Isson sōsho was reprinted in China in 1882, but this time the reappearance of the Kong commentary was not noted by Qing scholars, undoubtedly because of shifting concerns in the Chinese scholarly world.

The transmission to China of Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary led to an event of great significance--the reintroduction from Japan to China of the equally controversial Zheng commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety [Xiaojing Zheng zhu 孝經鄭注], sometimes attributed to Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127-200), which had also been lost in China during the Five Dynasties period, but had later been reimported to China from Japan during the Song dynasty only to be lost once again.¹² Although the Zheng commentary did not survive intact in Japan, it was preserved in an abridged form in the ninth juan 卷 of the Qunshu zhiyao 群書治要 [Essentials of Ruling Selected from a Multitude of Texts], a Tang-dynasty compilation that had been lost in China for hundreds of years, but was preserved in Japan. In the Qunshu zhiyao the author of the commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety is not identified.

When the Qunshu zhiyao was reprinted by the ruler of Nagoya han in the Tenmei period (1781-89), scholars involved in the collation work realized that the commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety included in the Qunshu zhiyao was in fact the Zheng commentary. Although he was not the first person to publish an edition of the Zheng commentary after this realization, Okada Shinsen 岡田新川 (1737-99), a scholar involved in the Tenmei period publication of the Qunshu zhiyao, published an edition of the Zheng commentary in 1794 and had it sent to China in the hope that, like Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary, it too would be included in the Zhibuzuzhai congshu, which it eventually was.

The reimportation of the Zheng commentary similarly caused great excitement in the Qing academic world, where some scholars defended

the authenticity of Okada Shinsen's text and others condemned it as a Japanese forgery. Like the Kong commentary, the authorship of the Zheng commentary had been questioned in China during the first millennium A.D., a history that explains, in part, the doubts expressed by some Qing scholars. Ignorance of the textual history of the Qunshu zhiyao and ethnocentric biases also contributed to these skeptics' views, just as similar considerations had affected their attitudes toward the Kong commentary. Interestingly enough, in marked contrast to Shundai's edition of the Kong commentary, the news that Okada Shinsen's work had been transmitted to China and reprinted in the Zhibuzuzhai congshu did not create a sensation among Tokugawa scholars, primarily because, unlike Shundai, Okada Shinsen was neither a controversial figure nor a member of the Sorai school.

The Kong and Zheng commentaries to the Classic of Filial Piety are just two of a number of Chinese texts that had been lost in China but preserved in Japan and that were reimported from Japan to China during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Other works include the Lunyu yishu 論語義疏 [Exegetic Commentary to the Analects of Confucius], Qunshu zhiyao, and the various Chinese texts included in the Isson sōsho. The Japanese scholars who produced editions of these works conceived of themselves as actively contributing to the culture of China in their role as textual transmitters and editors. Further study of the reimportation from Japan to China of these texts and the repercussions that this reimportation had in the academic worlds of both nations is necessary to help us better understand the nature of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholarly contacts between Japan and China, as well as the beginning of the process of reversing the flow of cultural influences from China to Japan, a process that expanded greatly in the Meiji period (1868-1912) and that has continued down to the present day.

Notes

1. This paper was originally given orally at the national meeting of the American Oriental Society held in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, in April 1993. It represents a summary of the author's dissertation, "The Reimportation from Japan to China of the Kong Commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety." The author wished to express her gratitude to the Japan Foundation, under whose auspices she spent a year doing research at Osaka University.

2. See Nihon shoki 日本書紀 [Chronicles of Japan], [Shintei

zōho] Kokushi taikei [新訂増補] 國史大系 [(Newly Revised and Supplemented) Series of National Histories] (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1967), vol. 1B, 22.142-43.

3. See Ryō no gige 令義解 [Exegesis and Explanation of Ordinances], [Shintei zōho] Kokushi taikei (Tokyo: Yoshikawa ko-bunkan, 1966), vol. 22, 3.130.

4. For a discussion of Shundai's work, see Hayashi Hideichi 林秀一 "Dazai Jun no Kōkyō Kō den kōkan to sono eikyō" 太宰純の孝經孔傳校刊とその影響 [The Collation and Publication of Dazai Jun's (Shundai) Edition of the Kong Commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety and Its Influence], which appears as the fourth appendix to Hayashi's Kōkyō 孝經 [Classic of Filial Piety] (Tokyo: Meitoku shuppansha, 1979), pp. 158-79. The definitive article on the Shichikei Mōshi kōbun hoi is Kano Naoki 狩野直喜, "Yamanoi Kanae to Shichikei Mōshi kōbun hoi" 山井鼎と七經孟子考文補遺 [Yamanoi Kanae and the Textual Study of the Seven Classics and Mencius, With Supplement]. See his Shinagaku bunsō 支那學文叢 [Literary Preserve of Sinological Studies] (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1927), pp. 178-209.

5. See Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1933), 7:647-48.

6. Ding Yan's "Riben Guwen Xiaojing Kong zhuan bianwei" 日本古文孝經孔傳辨偽 [An Argument for the Spuriousness of the Japanese Edition of the Kong Commentary to the Ancient Script Version of the Classic of Filial Piety] can be found in his Xiaojing zhengwen 孝經徵文 [Authenticated Text of the Classic of Filial Piety], in the Huang Qing jingjie xubian 皇清經解續編 [Continuation of Classical Exegeses of the August Qing Dynasty] (Nanjing shuyuan, 1888), 847:15A-19A. For Zheng Zhen's "Bian Ribenguo Guwen Xiaojing Kong shi zhuan zhi wei" 辨日本國古文孝經孔氏傳之偽 [An Argument for the Spuriousness of the Japanese Edition of Mr. Kong's Commentary to the Ancient Script Version of the Classic of Filial Piety], see his Chaojingchao wenji 巢經巢文集 [Collected Literary Writings of Chaojingchao (i.e., Zheng Zhen)], 1:3A-5A, Chaojingchao ji 巢經巢集 [Collected Writings of Chaojingchao (i.e., Zheng Zhen)], Sibu beiyao 四部備要 [Complete Essentials of the Four Categories].

7. See Seki Giichirō 階門儀一郎, comp., Zoku Jurin sosho 續儒林叢書 [Continuation of Collected Reprints of Confucian Scholars] (Tokyo: Tōyō tosho kankōkai, 1930), vol. 1, 1:3-4.

8. Fujita's "Kobun Kōkyō Kō shi den o yomu" 讀古文孝經孔氏傳 [On Reading Mr. Kong's Commentary to the Ancient Script Version of the Classic of Filial Piety], which was written in 1788, appears at the beginning of a 1790 manuscript copy of the Kōkyō chokkai 孝經直解 [Direct Exegesis of the Classic of Filial Piety], housed in the archives of the National Diet Library in Tokyo.

9 Morokuzu expressed his views on the authenticity of the Kong commentary in a three-part essay entitled "Dazai shi kotei-suru Kōden Kōkyō o yomu" 讀太宰氏校定孔傳孝經 [On Reading the Kong Commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety, Collated by Mr. Dazai (Shundai)], which is included in his Shinpatzu sanjin shū 貞齋山人集 [Collected Writings of Shinpatzu sanjin (i.e., Morokuzu Kindai)], an undated manuscript copy of which can be found at the National Diet Library in Tokyo.

10. See the entries entitled "Kōkyō" 孝經 [Classic of Filial Piety] and "Kobun Kōkyō no jo" 古文孝經の序 [Preface to the Ancient Script Version of the Classic of Filial Piety] in Hirata Atsutane zenshū 平田篤胤全集 [Complete Collected Writings of Hirata Atsutane] (Tokyo: Itchidō shoten, 1911), vol. 2, 1:23-26.

11. See Siku weishou shumu tiyao (Shanghai: Shangwu yishuguan, 1955), 1:1, 1:2, 1:12-13, 2:28, 2:34, 3:43-44, 3:51, 4:76-77, 4:76-77 and 4:85 for entries on the Zhouyi xin jiangyi 周易新講義 [New Discourse on the Meaning of the Zhou Dynasty Book of Changes], Taixuan yizhuan 泰軒易傳 [The Taixuan Commentary to the Book of Changes], Yueshu yaolu 樂書要錄 [Essential Records of the Book of Music], Liangjing xin ji 兩京新記 [New Annals of the Two Capitals], Chengui 臣軌 [Rules for Vassals], Nanjing jizhu 難經集注 [Collected Commentaries to the Classic of Difficult Issues], Wuxing dayi 五行大義 [General Interpretation of the Five Agents], Yutang leigao 玉堂類稿 [Classified Drafts from the Jade Hall], Xiyuan leigao 西垣類稿 [Classified Drafts from the Western Wall], and Wenquan cilin 文館詞林 [Forest of Fine Phrases from the Literary Institute], respectively.

12. For a detailed discussion of the publication of the Zheng commentary in Japan, see Hayashi Hideichi's Honpō ni okeru Tei chū Kōkyō no kankō ni tsuite 本邦に於ける鄭註孝經の刊行について [The Publication of the Zheng Commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety in Japan], Kanbungaku kōza 漢文學講座 [Lectures on Chinese Literary Studies] IV (Tokyo: Kyōritsusha, 1933).