

Filial Piety and Loyalty in Tokugawa Confucianism: Nakae Tōju (1608-48) and His Reading of the *Xiaojing* (Classic of Filial Piety)*

Wai-ming Ng

Chinese University of Hong Kong

The relationship between loyalty (*zhong* 忠) and filial piety (*xiao* 孝), two fundamental virtues in Confucianism, has been a subject of concern among Confucian scholars in East Asia for many centuries. Many modern Japanese scholars believe that the main difference between Japanese Confucianism and Chinese Confucianism rests with their preference between loyalty and filial piety, suggesting that Japanese Confucianism puts loyalty before filial piety, whereas Chinese Confucianism prefers filial piety to loyalty.¹ While there is some truth in it, this view is simplistic and ahistorical.² As a matter of fact, in pre-modern China and Japan, Confucians never reached a consensus on this issue. The myth about the preference for loyalty over filial

* This paper is derived from a research project on *The Classic of Filial Piety* in Tokugawa Japan, funded by the Sumitomo Foundation to which the author wishes to express his gratitude.

¹ Advocated by nationalist ideologues in prewar Japan, this view argues that Japan had a better national polity (*kokutai* 国体) than that of China. See Nishi Shinichirō 西晋一郎, *Chūkōron* 忠孝論 (Discourse on loyalty and filial piety) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1931); Hirano Harue 平野春江, *Chūkō no saikōsatsu* 忠孝の再考察 (A reexamination of loyalty and filial piety) (Tokyo: Shingidō shuppanbu, 1934); and Mori Shinzō 森信三, *Chūkō no shinri* 忠孝の真理 (Truth about loyalty and filial piety) (Tokyo: Meguro shoten, 1935). This view is still influential in postwar Japanese scholarship. See Terao Yoshio 寺尾善雄, *Chūgoku bunka denrai jiten* 中國文化伝来事典 (A dictionary of the importation of Chinese culture) (Tokyo: Kawate shobō, 1982), pp. 446-48. For a criticism of this view, see Kaji Nobuyuki 加地伸行, “Kōkyō keimō no shomondai” 孝經啓蒙の諸問題 (Questions about the *Kōkyō keimō*), in Yamanoi Yū 山井湧 and Yamashita Ryūji 山下龍二, et al., eds., *Nakae Tōju* 中江藤樹, *Nihon shisō taikei* 日本思想大系 (hereafter NST), vol. 29 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1974), p. 420.

² For a comparison of the discourse on the relationship between loyalty and filial piety in Chinese and Japanese thought, see James McMullen, “Rulers or Fathers? A Casuistical Problem in Early Modern Japanese Thought,” *Past and Present* 116 (August 1987), pp. 56-97. Regarding the conflict between loyalty and filial piety in Chinese thought, see Heiner Roetz, *Confucian Ethics of the Axial Age* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), pp. 93-100. See also Lee Cheukyin 李焯然, “Zhongxiao bu liangquan” 忠孝不兩全 (The incompatibility of loyalty and filial piety), in *Jiuzhou xuekan* 九州學刊 4.2 (July 1991), pp. 35-47. For a brief comparison between the concept of filial piety in China and Japan, see Ogata Yū 尾形勇, *Chūgoku kodai no ie to kokka* 中国古代の家と国家 (Family and nation in ancient China) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1979).

piety in Japanese tradition was only forged in the 1930s and 1940s by rightwing writers to provoke nationalist ideology in Japan. Whether this moral and intellectual preference for loyalty over filial piety existed in Japanese Confucianism during the Tokugawa period (1603-1868) or not is highly debatable. This essay examines the discourse on the relationship between filial piety and loyalty among Tokugawa Confucians through a case study of Nakae Tōju 中江藤樹 and his reading of the *Xiaojing* 孝經 (Classic of filial piety) from historical and textual perspectives. It deepens our understanding of the formation and limitation of Tokugawa state ideology and the adoption and naturalization of Chinese Confucian ethics within the Tokugawa political and intellectual framework.

Tōju as Filial Son or Disloyal Subject?

Nakae Tōju established himself as a respectable figure in his own times for setting a high moral standard.³ Modern Japanese scholars regard Tōju as a Japanese sage, a paragon of filial piety, and the founder of the Wang Yangming school (*Yōmeigaku* 陽明学) in Japan. The life of Tōju was indeed controversial, and the most noteworthy event in this life was perhaps his abandonment of a samurai post in Ōzu 大洲 domain in Shikoku to return to his native village in Ōmi 近江 (near Lake Biwa 琵琶湖) to look after his aging mother.

Tōju's image as a filial son is well-documented. According to the *Tōju sensei nenpu* 藤樹先生年譜 (Annals of Master Tōju; by a Tōju's disciple named Okada 岡田), Tōju already showed his preference for filial piety over loyalty at the age of twelve. Tōju said:

One day when I was eating, I could not help thinking about this question: "To whom am I indebted for daily meals?" [I concluded that] in the first place, it was the blessing of my parents. Secondly, it was the blessing of my grandparents. Thirdly, it was the blessing of my lord. From that time onward, I swore that I would never forget my indebtedness to them.⁴

Tōju implied that he owed his parents and grandparents more than his lord and felt much closer to his native village in Ōmi than his work place in Ōzu domain. Although he began to serve his lord in Ōzu as a low-ranking samurai at the age of nineteen, his heart remained with his family in Ōmi. At the ages of twenty-two and twenty-five, Tōju took leave of his post to visit his mother in Ōmi and repeatedly asked her to join him in Ōzu, but in vain. At the age of twenty-six, he composed a poem to express his wish that he could quit his post in order to care for his aging mother. In 1634, at the age of twenty-seven, Tōju wrote a letter to his lord to ask for a long-term leave and promised to resume his duty after the death of his mother. He wrote:

³ Regarding the appreciation of Nakae Tōju in modern Japanese scholarship, see Murai Gensai 村井弦齋, *Ōmi seijin* 近江聖人 (The sage of Ōmi) (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1892) and Uchimura Kanzō 内村鑑三, *Daihyōteki Nihonjin* 代表的日本人 (Representatives of Japan) (Tokyo: Keiseisha shoten, 1908).

⁴ *Tōju sensei nenpu*, in *Nakae Tōju*, NHT, vol. 29, pp. 283-84.

It is my [moral] duty to take care of four of my family members [grandparents and parents], but three of them died when I was small. Now, only my mother is still alive. My mother is relying on me, her only son.⁵

When his letter received no replies, Tōju made the most dramatic move in his life that earned him the reputation as a filial son. He simply abandoned his samurai duty, leaving Ōzu domain and returning to Ōmi without permission. It was no easy task for him to choose between loyalty and filial piety. He felt bad about leaving his lord but had no alternative for the sake of fulfilling his filial duty. As a gesture of apology, Tōju left some money and crops in Ōzu as a token of return of one year's stipend. Nevertheless, judging from Tokugawa samurai ethics and legal codes, Tōju committed an illegal and disloyal act. According to samurai ethics, under no circumstances should a samurai betray his lord. A samurai who does not fulfill his duty should commit *seppuku* 切腹 (cutting one's belly, suicide). The *Hagakure* 葉隠 (Hidden leaves, 1716), the Bible of samurai, records a story that a samurai went into battle against his parents' will, showing that loyalty to one's lord was regarded as a higher virtue than filial piety to parents.⁶ Tōju lost his samurai status and could have faced a death sentence if arrested. Having returned to his native village, he sold his sword to show his determination to live a new life as a commoner and earned a living by selling wine, lending money, and lecturing. He became a disloyal and disgraced samurai.

In contrast, in the eye of Chinese Confucian ethics, Tōju was a filial son who sacrificed his career and even jeopardized his life and good name for his mother. In fact, throughout Chinese history, many Confucian scholars chose filial piety over loyalty if compelled to make a choice. Giving up the official post to take care of one's parents was not uncommon or unacceptable among Confucian officials in China. Tōju's act could have found support in the *Ershisi xiao* 二十四孝 (Twenty-four filial acts, by Guo Jujing 郭居敬 of the Yuan dynasty), an illustrative small book on filial acts in Chinese history. It was one of the most popular and influential Chinese readings among Tokugawa intellectuals, reprinted many times by the bakufu and commercial publishers and adapted into popular dramas, art, and literature.⁷ The most noteworthy thing here is that two of the exemplary filial acts in the *Ershisi xiao* concern filial sons quitting their official posts for the sake of their parents, setting the precedents for later generations. The first story is about a Northern Song official who gave up his post to look for his lost mother, whereas the second story is about a regional official of the Southern Qi 南齊 (479-502) who quit his post to look after his ailing father.⁸ Although these two stories in the *Ershisi xiao* had

⁵ Ibid., p. 290.

⁶ See Yamamoto Tsunetomo 山本常朝, *Hagakure* 葉隠, trans. William S. Wilson (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1983), p. 109.

⁷ For a review of the impact of the *Ershisi xiao* on Tokugawa literature, see “Kanshō no shiori” 鑑賞のしおり (Suggestions on appreciation), in *Honchō nijū fukō* 本朝二十不孝 (Twenty unfilial acts in my country), in *Saikaku zenshū, gendaigoyaku* 西鶴全集, 現代語訳 (Modern translation of the complete works of Saikaku), ed. Teruoka Yasutaka 暉峻康隆 (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1976), vol. 8, pp. 3-8.

⁸ These two stories are in the episodes 15 and 16 in the *Ershisi xiao*. See Zhu Xuedong 朱學東, et al., eds., *Baihua ershisi xiao tushuo* 白話二十四孝圖說 (Illustrative explanation of the *Ershisi*

intellectual implications that were not always in agreement with Tokugawa samurai ethics, the bakufu and domains promoted the *Ershisi xiao* without reservations, and Tokugawa Confucians did not raise any objection against these two stories. This attitude shows that the bakufu did not forge a clear and rigid state ideology that promoted loyalty at the expense of filial piety and the conflict between filial piety and loyalty was a “gray area” in Tokugawa thought.

In Japan, records about this filial piety-loyalty dilemma are rare, and Tōju’s case serves as a good example to deepen our understanding of the nature of Tokugawa ideology and the naturalization of Chinese Confucian ethics. The tension between filial piety and loyalty in Tokugawa thought indicates that Chinese Confucianism did not always fit in the Tokugawa *bakuhan* 幕藩 (shogunate-domain) system and there was a conflict between indigenous Japanese traditions and imported Chinese ethics.⁹ Although Tokugawa ideology tended to prefer loyalty, it allowed ambiguity in this issue. The bakufu and domains usually did not interfere or ban various views suggested by intellectuals regarding the relationship between filial piety and loyalty as long as the discussion carried no anti-bakufu implications.

Neither the bakufu nor Ōzu domain showed any keen interest in pursuing the Tōju’s case, and thus Tōju was given an opportunity to live a new life in his native village as a commoner. Not even Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657), a pro-bakufu ideologue and a critic of Tōju, used this case to attack him. No one labeled Tōju a disloyal subject and many actually praised him as a filial son. For example, Fujii Raisai 藤井懶齋 (1618-1709), a scholar of the Kimon school 崎門学派 (founded by Yamazaki Ansai 山崎闇齋, 1618-82), included Tōju in his best-selling *Honchō kōshi den* 本朝孝子伝 (Biographies of filial sons in my country). All of these demonstrate that the *tennosei* 天皇制 (emperor-centered) ideology and *bushidō* 武士道 (way of the samurai) ethics were not fully developed and institutionalized in the Tokugawa period, and the preference for loyalty over filial piety never dominated in Tokugawa thought. When there was a conflict between filial piety and loyalty, the choice was left to the individual. Generally speaking, Zhu Xi school 朱子学派 scholars tended to favor loyalty, whereas Wang Yangming scholars preferred filial piety. There was no consensus reached among Tokugawa Confucians on this issue, but voices for loyalty increased throughout the Tokugawa period following the rise of the nationalist discourse in Tokugawa thought.¹⁰

Filial Piety as the Leading Principle in Confucianism

Tōju was a respectful reader of the *Xiaojing* and an advocate of filial piety. His ideas of filial piety can be found in two of his major writings—*Kōkyō keimō* 孝經啓蒙

xiao in modern Chinese) (Beijing: Zhongguo zhi gong chubanshe, 1994), pp. 214-18, 234-38. In addition, support can also be found in Chinese history. For instance, Zeng Shen 曾參, a disciple of Confucius, refused to accept a post so that he could look after his parents; and Zeng Guofan 曾國藩 (1811-72), a Qing minister, left the battlefield to attend his mother’s funeral.

⁹ See Watanabe Hiroshi 渡辺浩, *Kinsei Nihon shakai to Sōgaku* 近世日本社会と宋学 (Early modern Japanese society and Song learning) (Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku shuppankai, 1985).

¹⁰ James McMullen, “Rulers or Fathers? A Casuistical Problem in Early Modern Japanese Thought,” p. 93.

(An introduction to the *Classic of Filial Piety*, 1642) and *Okina mondō* 翁問答 (Questions and answers of an old man, 1640). Tōju saw filial piety as something more than a Confucian ethic, more on the order of some kind of religion. To him, everything in the universe was subject to the principle of filial piety.

As a matter of fact, although many generations have passed, filial piety in the universe has no beginning or end. There is not a single motion in which filial piety is not in action. There is nothing in the world over which filial piety does not prevail.¹¹

His reading of the *Xiaojing* made him believe that all Confucian virtues including loyalty were derived from filial piety.

Filial piety is the summit of virtue and the essence of the Way in the three realms of heaven, earth, and man. What brings life to heaven, earth, man, and all things is filial piety.¹²

He also held:

The virtue of filial piety can be applied to everything in the world. The ways of brothers, married couples, and friends are included [in the virtue of filial piety]. This also explains the meaning of serving the ruler at the end of the *Xiaojing*.¹³

Whenever discussing filial piety and loyalty together, Tōju always put filial piety ahead of loyalty. For instance, he used the term *kōchū* 孝忠 (filial piety and loyalty) instead of the more popular term *chūkō* 忠孝 (loyalty and filial piety) in his writings, discussing things such as *kōchū no kokoro* 孝忠の心 (heart of filial piety and loyalty), *kōchū no ichiuro* 孝忠の一色 (harmony of filial piety and loyalty), *kōchū jingi* 孝忠仁義 (filial piety, loyalty, benevolence, and righteousness), and *kōkō chūsetsu* 孝行忠節 (filial act and loyal manner).¹⁴ Tokugawa Confucians were divided over the issue regarding the order of filial piety and loyalty in terminology. The bakufu's documents and the writings of Zhu Xi school scholars usually used *chūkō* 忠孝 and not *kōchū* 孝忠. For example, the *Shoshi hatto* 諸士法度 (Regulations for retainers) of 1636 mentions loyalty and filial piety in its first rule.¹⁵ Likewise, scholars of the Hayashi school and the Kimon school placed loyalty before filial piety. For example, Hayashi Razan and Matsunaga Sekigo 松永尺五 (1592-1657) stated that loyalty to the ruler was a natural principle that every subject must obey.¹⁶ Tōju's use of *kōchū* does not represent a mainstream practice, but it

¹¹ *Okina mondō*, in *Nakae Tōju*, NHT, vol. 29, p. 25.

¹² Quoted in Tsunoda Ryusaku, Wm. Theodore de Bary, and Donald Keene, eds., *Sources of the Japanese Tradition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 375.

¹³ *Okina mondō*, in *Nakae Tōju*, NHT, vol. 29, p. 28.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 114-16.

¹⁵ Herman Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology: Early Constructs, 1570-1680* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), p. 56.

¹⁶ See Wai-ming Ng, *The I Ching in Tokugawa Thought and Culture* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000), pp. 59-60.

was still used by many other Tokugawa intellectuals such as Fujita Tōko 藤田東湖 (1806-55).

Tōju's faith in filial piety can also be seen from his view of the five relations (*wulun* 五倫 or *wujiao* 五教: father and son, ruler and subjects, husband and wife, elder and younger brothers, and between friends). Many Zhu Xi school scholars (such as Hayashi Razan, Yamaga Sokō 山鹿素行 [1622-85], Kaibara Ekken 貝原益軒 [1630-1714], Miyake Shōsai 三宅尚齋 [1662-1741], and Asami Keisai 淺見綱齋 [1652-1711]) as well as Mito school scholars (such as Aizawa Seishisai 会沢正志齋 [1782-1863]) in the Tokugawa period put the ruler-subject relationship prior to that of the father-son bond.¹⁷ However, there were a substantial number of Tokugawa Confucian scholars (such as Muro Kyūsō 室鳩巢 [1658-1734]) who regarded father and son as the first relationship among all social relations, following the common Chinese practice.¹⁸ Tōju unambiguously made father and son the number one tie:

Filial piety is the source of all human virtues and the most important principle in human relations. In the five relations created by the sages, the filial love between father and son is the number one teaching.¹⁹

According to Tōju, the main difference between father-son and ruler-subject relations is that the former is a natural blood relationship, whereas the latter is an artificial bond.²⁰

Tōju reiterated the Chinese saying that one could only find loyal subjects among filial sons.²¹ He saw loyalty as an extension of filial piety, because filial sons served the ruler in order to bring comfort and glory to their parents. In other words, loyalty became a means to fulfill filial piety. This view adds an utilitarian dimension to this discourse. As he explained:

The purpose of making our career and pursuing the truth is to bring glory to our parents. This is why the *Xiaojing* reads: "In the beginning, we serve our parents and then we

¹⁷ See Martin Collcutt, "The Legacy of Confucianism in Japan," in Gilbert Rozman, ed., *The East Asian Region: Confucian Heritage and Its Modern Adaptation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 133-34. Regarding Razan's discussion of the five relations, see Maruyama Masao, *Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*, trans. Mikiso Hane (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. 195-96, 212-13. On Ekken's view, see Mary E. Tucker, *Moral and Spiritual Cultivation in Japanese Neo-Confucianism: The Life and Thought of Kaibara Ekken* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), p. 404.

¹⁸ For instance, the *Mengzi* 孟子 (Book of Mencius) places the father-son relationship before that of ruler and subject. However, this order is reversed in the *Zhongyong* 中庸 (Doctrine of the mean). Most Chinese Confucians including Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200) followed the *Mengzi*. See *Confucian Ethics of the Axial Age*, p. 93.

¹⁹ *Okina mondō*, in *Nakae Tōju*, NST, vol. 29, p. 33.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

²¹ This theme can be found in noh drama. For example, a play called *Nishikido* portrays the loyalty of Izumi to Minamoto Yoshitsune 源義経 (1159-89) in which Izumi sacrificed his life to keep his promise to his father to support Yoshitsune. See Mae J. Smethurst, *Dramatic Representations of Filial Piety: Five Noh in Translation with an Introduction* (Ithaca: Cornell University, East Asia Program, 1998), pp. 147-63.

serve the ruler.” Here “the beginning” and “then” show the priority in carrying out the Way.²²

His position was opposite to *bushidō* advocates in the Tokugawa period who included filial piety within loyalty.²³

Unlike the Legalists (*fajia* 法家) in China, Tōju did not see filial piety and loyalty as two conflicting virtues, and he tried to include loyalty within filial piety. To him, “loyalty is the application of filial piety to serve the ruler.”²⁴

Loyalty is originally one aspect of filial piety. A retainer can apply reverence that people hold for their family and father to serve his ruler. The *Xiaojing* reads: “Applying filial piety to serve the ruler is loyalty.”²⁵

Tōju believed that the ruler could rule the nation by means of filial piety (*xiaoji* 孝治), whereas subjects could apply the same principle of filial piety to serve their ruler.²⁶ He suggested that the ruler should set an example of filiality by worshipping heaven and should build an environment for the people in which to practice filial piety.²⁷ Like the ruler, noblemen, administrators, and samurai should also apply the principle of filial piety to fulfill their political duties.

Tōju attempted to harmonize filial piety and loyalty whenever possible. Asked whether a man should go to battle for the nation or stay home to preserve his body as a gift of his parents, Tōju replied that preserving virtue was more important than body and the man should go to battle in order to achieve true filial piety.²⁸ Some ambiguity remains but his attempt to narrow the difference between these two virtues is obvious. The important thing here is not the action itself but the reasons behind it. According to Tōju, the ultimate concern of a filial son is always his parents or family rather than the emperor or state. Hence, both going to war and staying home are two different ways of achieving the same goal of fulfilling filial piety.

Tōju had a preference for the new-script edition (*jinwen* 今文) of the *Xiaojing*, showing that his view of filial piety and loyalty was more liberal than many of his contemporaries. The old-script edition (*guwen* 古文) of the *Xiaojing* was more popular than the new-script edition in the Tokugawa period. The bakufu promoted the old-script edition which puts emphasis on the political implications of filial piety and the absolute authority of the ruler.²⁹ The preface of the old-script edition underscores the absolute authority of the ruler and father over the subject and son.³⁰ Hence, it is by no means

²² *Kōkyō keimō*, in *Nakae Tōju*, NST, vol. 29, p. 190.

²³ Robert Bellah, *Tokugawa Religion* (New York: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 90-94.

²⁴ *Kōkyō keimō*, in *Nakae Tōju*, NST, vol. 29, p. 197.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 198, 207.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 211-18.

²⁸ *Tokugawa Religion*, p. 82.

²⁹ Hayashi Hideichi 林秀一, trans., *Kōkyō 孝經* (Tokyo: Meitoku shuppansha, 1984), pp. 146, 177.

³⁰ Kaji Nobuyuki, “Kōkyō keimō no shomondai,” in *Nakae Tōju, Nihon shisō taikei*, Vol. 29, p. 443.

coincidental that Tōju was critical of the old-script edition of the *Xiaojing* and he preferred the new-script edition, in particular Ming commentaries on it. Tōju's position was altogether different from Hayashi Razan who promoted the old-script edition in his *Kobun Kōkyō genkai* 古文孝經諺解 (Colloquial explanation of the *Xiaojing* in the old-script text). Tōju did not uphold the idea of absolute loyalty and filial piety that many Neo-Confucian scholars in China and Japan advocated, stressing that parents should show mercy to their children, whereas rulers should hold their subjects in high esteem.³¹ He argued that filial sons and loyal retainers should not endorse or follow the wrongdoings of their parents and rulers and should try everything possible to reason and warn their parents and rulers.³² Tōju himself set an example as a filial but self-conscious son. When his mother asked him to divorce his wife simply because she was ugly, Tōju did not obey and tried to reason with his mother.³³

Regarding filial piety as a prerequisite for loyalty, Tōju condemned people who served the ruler wholeheartedly and forgot their parents:

[The *Xiaojing* reads:] “To love others and not one's own parents is against morality; to respect others and not one's own parents is against proprieties.” Not to love and respect parents here refers to people who do not use the method of mind (*shinpō* 心法) to hold their father with reverence. “Others” refer to ruler and subjects, husband and wife, brothers, children, and grandchildren, as well as friends.³⁴

In this respect, Tōju criticized two of Fujiwara Seika's 藤原惺窩 (1561-1619) disciples, Suga Gendō 菅玄同 (1581-1628) and Hayashi Razan, for receiving the Buddhist tonsure. The early Edo bakufu granted Buddhist honorific titles to Confucians as a recognition of their services. Tōju criticized tonsured Confucians for breaking a fundamental teaching in the *Xiaojing* that “[b]ody, hair and skin are all from our parents and should not be damaged. This is the beginning of filial piety.”³⁵ Tōju's position was that disrespecting parents was a more serious offense than disobeying the ruler.

Tōju's view of filial piety and loyalty had a strong impact on Wang Yangming school scholars in the Tokugawa period such as Kumazawa Banzan 熊沢蕃山 (1619-91) and Ōshio Heihachirō 大塩平八郎 (1793-1837). Like Tōju, Banzan privileged filial piety over loyalty, stressing that loyalty should be based on filial piety. Banzan criticized rulers who advocated loyalty at the expense of filial piety. Banzan said:

[Rulers] admonish their ministers to be loyal to themselves and to render good service, and neglect the teachings of filial piety and fraternal respect in the districts and villages. Therefore, loyal ministers are scarce. Those who serve do so only out of interest in their own promotion and for profit.³⁶

³¹ *Kōkyō keimō*, in *Nakae Tōju*, NST, vol. 29, p. 247.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 244-46.

³³ *Tōju sensei nenpu*, *Nakae Tōju*, NST, vol. 29, p. 293.

³⁴ *Kōkyō keimō*, in *Nakae Tōju*, NST, vol. 29, p. 221.

³⁵ *Anshō shii Gendō ron* 安昌弒玄同論 (On Anshō's murdering Gendō, 1630) and *Hayashishi teihatsu juiben* 林氏剃髮受位弁 (On Hayashi receiving tonsure to acquire official status, 1631), in *Nakae Tōju*, NST, vol. 29, pp. 8-17.

³⁶ Quoted in James McMullen, *Idealism, Protest and the Tale of Genji: The Confucianism of*

Likewise, Heihachirō, in his *Zōho Kōkyō kaichū* 増補孝經匯注 (Additional annotations on the *Xiaojing*), attributed loyalty and all virtues to filial piety and disagreed with people who advocated loyalty at the expense of filial piety. Through the case of Tōju, we understand that the existence of a voice for filial piety in Tokugawa Confucianism is undeniable, and the myth that Japanese Confucianism has a preference for loyalty over filial piety is problematic and simplistic at least in the historical context of Tokugawa thought and culture.

Concluding Remarks

Chinese Confucian ethics was not always in agreement with the samurai-ruled society, and thus how to accommodate Chinese ethics within the Tokugawa system was a common concern among Tokugawa Confucians. It seems that (in particular Zhu Xi school scholars) added Japanese elements to Chinese Confucian ethics, whereas others (such as Wang Yangming school scholars) preserved more Chinese elements in the adoption of Chinese Confucianism. This tug-of-war can be seen from the Tokugawa discourse on the relationship between filial piety and loyalty. Although Tōju's action and thought were not always in agreement with samurai ethics or nativist discourse, they were not banned or censored and indeed appreciated by Tokugawa officials and scholars. It demonstrates that the bakufu did not have a powerful and rigid state ideology and the naturalization of Chinese Confucian ethics was not complete. On the issue of the relationship between filial piety and loyalty, Tōju's position was close to the majority of Chinese Confucians and differed from many of his countrymen. The coexistence of various views of the relationship between piety and filial piety in Tokugawa thought serves as a footnote on the tension and disharmony between Chinese learning and Japanese reality and the limitation to the Japanization of Chinese Confucianism.

Kumazawa Banzan (1619-91) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), p. 253.