

# School and Confucius Temple in Late Eighteenth-Century Japan: Background and Significance of the Founding of the Kōjōkan in Yonezawa Domain

Robert L. Chard

## Introduction

The current study follows on from two previous ones, which examined the establishment of two prominent Confucius temples in Japan, one the still-active Taku Seibyō 多久聖廟 opened in 1708 in Taku sub-domain (Taku-yū 多久邑), and the second a part of the Meirinkan 明倫館 school in Hagi 萩 (Chōshū 長州) domain established in 1718. Contemporary documents shed light on the reasons for establishing these temples. In both cases, concern over improving social order and public morals in the respective domains was a key reason for founding the temple and school. In the case of Taku, its ruler Taku Shigefumi 多久 茂文 (1669–1711; r. 1686–1711) stated explicitly that he intended his temple to attract attention as a highly visible religious building, which would inspire his subjects to virtuous behaviour and attract them to Confucian study in the associated Tōgen shōsha 東原 庠舍 school. This was more typical of Confucian ritual expressions in seventeenth century Japan, when there was considerable emphasis on defining the correct

forms, which were intended to fulfil an active function in their own right.<sup>1</sup> The case of Hagi, it was argued, was somewhat different, with the temple not visible from outside the school compound, but made an integral part of the school itself, centrally located among the school buildings as a symbolic reminder of the Confucian model which defined what a school was, though in this case a wide range of martial arts and Japanese literary arts was also taught, in addition to Confucian canonical texts and other forms of Chinese learning. This was a pattern more typical of the eighteenth century, in which the school was paramount, and the Confucius temple performed less of a function as a separate entity, for all that it had the trappings of a religious building.<sup>2</sup> Also worth mentioning is the way in which both the Taku and Hagi examples followed the lead of the Bakufu: in Taku under the influence of the fifth Shōgun Tsunayoshi and his establishment of the Yushima Seidō 湯島聖堂, and in Hagi alignment with the eighth Shōgun Yoshimune and his policies to widen access to education, with less of an interest in the function of the Confucius temple itself.

In this study we will examine a case from the second half of the eighteenth century, which manifests a further shift in the function and use of the Confucius temple and school. This is seen in the example of the Kōjōkan 興讓館, the Yonezawa 米沢 domain school founded in 1776 by the reforming daimyo Uesugi Haru-

---

1 See Robert Chard, “Visual Power and Moral Influence: The Taku Confucius Temple and its Chinese Counterparts,” *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要 (*Memoirs of the Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia*) 170 (December 2016), pp. 450–422 (1–29).

2 Chard, “The Meirinkan School Temple in Hagi Domain: Ritual Forms and their Purpose in Confucian Education in Eighteenth Century Japan,” *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要 (*Memoirs of the Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia*) 172 (December 2017), pp. 122–100 (1–23).

norinori 上杉 治憲, better known by his retirement name Yōzan 鷹山 (1751–1822; r. 1767–1785).<sup>3</sup> The establishment of the Kōjōkan was represented at the time as a restoration, since there had previously been a domain-supported Confucius temple and school called the Kanrinden 感麟殿 between 1697 and 1724, in which the temple seems to have been the main focus of attention. The late eighteenth century was a different time, when Confucianism and other forms of Chinese and Japanese civil (*bun* 文) learning had become far more widespread and familiar, and official schools had become an established institution found in a substantial majority of domains. The Kōjōkan of 1776, which included the standard temple, was one component in a comprehensive programme of sweeping economic and social reforms. The pattern of reform paralleled that in many other domains and in the Bakufu, though in this case it seems to have been domains like Yonezawa which led the way, with the Bakufu reforms under Matsudaira Sadanobu and his successors coming a few years later.

Paradoxically, the temples in many of these official schools, including the Bakufu's, were rebuilt and upgraded, and the Sekiten or Sekisai rites to Confucius performed with great precision and solemnity, even as these visible and religious aspects of Confucianism were no longer intended to play a direct role in the propagation of Confucian learning. In the Bakufu, the decline of temple and school was a development which became increasingly apparent during and after the time of Yoshimune – unlike his earlier predecessor Tsunayoshi he did not attend the Sekiten in the Yushima Seidō, though he did promote education, includ-

---

3 In modern scholarship both “Harunori” and “Yōzan” appear, with the latter probably the more widely known. Here “Harunori” will be used, as this was the name he had during the time he was the ruler of Yonezawa. He did not take the name Yōzan until 1802, long after he had retired as ruler in 1785.

ing mandating wide public lectures by Hayashi and Kinoshita Jun'an-school scholars in a sort of competition, but these were discontinued after his death. Moving on to the late eighteenth century, an important theme in the Bakufu as well as in domains such as Yonezawa was a deep sense of crisis at the widespread social and economic problems of the time, and the perception that a key cause of these problems was corruption and moral degeneration among samurai and the general populace. Education at the highest levels was seen as a counter to this, as well as wider education and direct suppression of immoral behaviour such as gambling.

A key methodological theme of the current article is to examine the tradition of Confucianism through its visual and material manifestations, rather than focusing just on its thought. From our modern perspective, it makes sense to speak of Confucianism as a philosophy, and of its followers as thinkers or philosophers. But, if we think historically, and seek to reconstruct what Confucianism was in its original context, it makes more sense to think in terms of teaching and teachers, and of culture and practice. In the current study, the way in which Confucian culture was reproduced and deployed in Japan offers insights into essential characteristics of its culture in China as well. The concept of transculturation, admittedly a rather broadly-used one, is helpful in accounting for this. Rather than thinking in terms of cultural transmission and reception, it is more meaningful to characterize the process as one of reproduction, in which aspects of the originally Chinese tradition of Confucianism were selected and proactively recreated in Japan according to the needs and priorities of the adopters, primarily people in positions of political power.

Obviously such an account must take account of the Japanese historical background, but the ultimate focus of this study is on what the Confucian ele-

ments were and how they were expressed. The specific aspects of the Japanese environment which shaped these Confucian elements will be highlighted, but a comprehensive account of the relevant Japanese history is not possible here, and has already been done by historians of Japan. The founding of the Kōjōkan school took place as part of reforms which parallel others elsewhere at approximately the same time in other domains and the Bakufu, of which the best known are perhaps those of Matsudaira Sadanobu and the prohibition of “heterodox” learning in the newly “nationalized” Bakufu academy a decade or so later. The chief aim of the current study is to shed light on the cultural and material manifestations of Confucianism itself, and how these Chinese cultural elements were reproduced in the different social and political environment of Japan.

#### The Forerunner: the Kanrinden 感麟殿 of 1697

The founding of the Kōjōkan in 1776 with its Confucius temple followed a pattern found elsewhere in the late eighteenth century, as for example in the reconstruction of the Yushima Seidō in 1798, a facility where considerable resources were expended to rebuild school buildings and temple, with the temple used to hold precise and elaborate Sekisai 積業 observances to Confucius, and yet where the temple seems not to have any overt religious function in the same way as its earlier counterparts had, whether in the earlier Hayashi school temple, or in Taku and elsewhere. However, the Confucius temple in the Yonezawa Kōjōkan did have an earlier history which parallels that of Confucius temples and schools elsewhere, which Harunori acknowledged by representing the founding of the Kōjōkan as a restoration of its earlier forerunner, the Kanrinden 感麟殿 temple to Confucius and contiguous school (*gakumonjo* 学問所) of 1697, which had lost its official

status and funding in 1724 in the wake of famine and ongoing financial crisis in the domain. The history of Confucian learning in Yonezawa goes back still earlier yet, and shows that, far from being rather late in establishing a Confucian-based domain school, Yonezawa was one of the early pioneers in Confucian learning. We will therefore start with an account of this earlier history.

An early connection between the Uesugi family and Confucian learning can be found in the person of its eighth family head, Uesugi Norizane 上杉 憲実 (1410–1466), a major benefactor of the Ashikaga School (Ashikaga Gakkō 足利学校), credited with its restoration and later success as a centre for Confucian learning, particularly for *Yi jing* 易經 studies and much-trusted practical divination during the Warring States period.<sup>4</sup> The Yonezawa rulers and those in charge of the Kōjōkan school do not seem to have emphasized this early association with Confucian learning, but the first attempt at a domain-sponsored school, in the Zenrinji 禅林寺 temple established in 1618, had as its head the monk Kuzan Shūyō 九山宗用 (1572–1636), who had been trained in the Ashikaga School.

The Zenrinji temple in Yonezawa was founded by Naoe Kanetsugu 直江 兼統 (1560–1620), a high vassal (*karō* 家老) who served both the powerful Sengoku-era lord Uesugi Kenshin 上杉 謙信 of Echigo 越後 (1530–1578; r. 1548–1578) and his successor Uesugi Kagekatsu 上杉 景勝 (1556–1623; r. 1601–1623), first daimyo of Yonezawa.<sup>5</sup> As personal advisor to Kagekatsu, Kanetsugu won the latter's com-

---

4 See the classic study of the Ashikaga school in Wajima Yoshio 和島 芳男, "Ashikaga Gakkō shinron jō 足利学校新論上," *Kōbe Jogakuin Daigaku Ronshū* 神戸女学院大学論集 8.1 (1961), pp. 1–22, and Wajima, "Ashikaga Gakkō shinron ge 足利学校新論下," *Kōbe Jogakuin Daigaku Ronshū* 8.2 (1961), pp. 1–9. Wajima demonstrates that Norizane did not establish the school, as some scholars have argued, but did transform it into the form it had subsequently.

5 See Imafuku Tadashi 今福 匡, *Naoe Kanetsugu* 直江兼統 (Tokyo: Shinjinbutsu

plete trust, and played a key role in designing the administration and infrastructure of the new domain under difficult circumstances in the aftermath of the battle of Sekigahara, when the Uesugi family were punished for being on the wrong side at Sekigahara by being moved to the new and smaller domain of Yonezawa and downgraded to 300,000 *koku*.<sup>6</sup> Kanetsugu was not only a capable military commander but also a scholar, renowned for his broad range of learning, from the arts of war to the natural world, economy, statecraft and poetry, much of it acquired from monks in Kyoto, in particular Nanka Genkō 南化 玄興 (1538–1604), abbot of the Myōshinji 妙心寺 temple in Kyoto from 1573.<sup>7</sup> Kanetsugu was an avid collector of swords, and also Chinese books, many of which he acquired as spoils of war in Japan and, in 1598, also Korea. His Southern Song-dynasty edition of the Chinese text *Shi ji* 史記 from the late twelfth century is of high quality, and remains one of the most famous early copies of this work.<sup>8</sup> He also arranged for the printing and circulation in Japan of the *Wen xuan* 文選, *Lun yu* 論語, and *Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan* 春秋左氏傳, known as the “Naoe editions” (Naoe ban 直江版) of these texts.

Kanetsugu founded the Zenrinji 禪林寺 in 1618 (it was renamed Hōsenji 法泉寺 in 1690, the name it still bears), and appointed the monk Kuzan as its head. He had previously met Kuzan by chance, and it was he who sponsored the monk

---

Ōraisha, 2008).

6 See the account of these arrangements by Kanetsugu and others after the move in Yamagata-ken 山形県 comp., *Yamagata kenshi* 山形県史 vol. 2 (Yamagata: Yamagata-ken, 1985), pp. 113–19.

7 For Kanetsugu’s relationship with Nanka see Sasao Tetsuo 笹尾 哲雄, “Kuzan Shūyō to, sono monryū 九山宗用と, その門流,” *Zen bunka* 禪文化 170 (1998), pp. 18–21.

8 As described on the Japanese government website <http://bunka.nii.ac.jp/db/heritages/detail/213519>, accessed 21 August 2018.

to study at the Ashikaga School. Kanetsugu's book collection went into the new temple (the Zenrin Bunko 禪林文庫), and it also served as a school (*gakumonjo* 學問所) for domain samurai, where Kuzan taught according to the Ashikaga Gakkō tradition.<sup>9</sup> Kanetsugu died in 1619, the following year, and Kuzan subsequently left to become abbot of the Myōshinji, and there seem to be no further records of teaching there after his departure.<sup>10</sup> In 1648 a special building, the Monjudō 文殊堂, was built to house the book collection, a structure which survives today inside the Hōsenji grounds. Modern histories regard Kanetsugu and the Zenrinji as the early forerunner of the Kōjōkan school.<sup>11</sup>

The second Yonezawa ruler Uesugi Sadakatsu 上杉 定勝 (1604–1645; r. 1623–1645) seems to have maintained an interest in Confucian education to some extent. He was the son of Kagekatsu and Yotsutsujishi 四辻氏, a collateral wife who died three months after Sadakatsu was born. Sadakatsu was then raised by Kanetsugu and his wife Ofune no kata お船の方, and we may speculate that Kanetsugu's interests and learning would have had an effect on him. As a ruler Sadakatsu is credited with personal frugal habits and for promulgating regulations enforcing austerity, to deal with the continuing economic difficulties in the wake of the reduction of the domain to 300,000 *koku* in the wake of the battle of Sekigahara.<sup>12</sup> Sadakatsu also appointed Sano Seijun 佐野 清順 (or Genyo 玄譽, 1576–

---

9 Sasao Tetsuo, "Kuzan Shūyō," p. 19.

10 *Yamagata kenshi* vol. 2, p. 959.

11 *Yamagata kenshi* vol. 2, pp. 681, 959; Matsuno Yoshitora 松野良寅, *Kōjōkan jinkoku-ki: Yonezawa Kōjōkan Hangaku Sōsetsu 300 nen kinenshi* 興讓館人国記: 米沢興讓館藩学創設三百年記念誌 (Yonezawa: Yonezawa Kōjōkan Hangaku Sōsetsu 300 nen kinen Jigyō Jikkō I'inkai 米沢興讓館藩学創設三百年記念事業実行委員会, 1998), pp. 17–18.

12 For a general account of the regulations governing the lives and behaviour of the populace of the domain throughout its history, including those of Sadakatsu, see *Ya-*

1650) as advisor (O-Togishū 御伽衆) in 1636. Seishun had by then a long association with the Uesugi rulers. Sano had originally been a practitioner of Shugendō 修験道, and Naoe Kanetsugu made him Haguro Sanshu 羽黒山主 in the late Tenshō 天正 period (1573-1590). He went from Echigo to Yonezawa when the domain was restructured after Sekigahara. There he continued his religious activities, before returning to secular life and using the name Sano Genyo 佐野 玄譽. He lectured on Confucian and military texts.<sup>13</sup>

Sadakatsu's son and successor Uesugi Tsunakatsu 上杉 綱勝 (1639-1664; r. 1645-1664) is also recorded as having appointed one Kitajima Zuihaku 北島 瑞伯 as Confucian and physician (*ju* 儒医) in 1650, but nothing else is known about him.<sup>14</sup>

Tsunakatsu died suddenly in 1664 at the age of 27 *sai*.<sup>15</sup> Tsunakatsu had been married twice, once in 1654 to Haruhime 媛姫 (1641-1658), daughter of Hoshina Masayuki 保科 正之 (1611-1673), but she died without children in 1658, mistakenly poisoned at age 18 by Masayuki's second wife O-Man no Kata 於万の方, who had intended to kill Haruhime's sister, out of jealousy at the latter's impending marriage to Maeda Tsunanori 前田 綱紀 (1643-1724; r. 1645-1723),

---

*magata kenshi* vol. 2, pp. 492-8.

13 Daijōji Ryōichi 大乘寺 良一, *Heishū sensei to Yonezawa* 平洲先生と米澤 (Yonezawa: Heishū sensei to Yonezawa Kankōkai 平洲先生と米澤刊行會, 1958), p. 201.

14 *Ibid.*

15 *Yamagata kenshi* vol. 2, p. 682. There was suspicion that he had been deliberately poisoned by his infamous brother-in-law Kira Yoshihisa 吉良 義央, since his condition worsened after he visited Kira's home, but this has been discredited by modern scholars, who have determined that the cause of death was more likely a perforated ulcer. Kira's status had been substantially enhanced by his marriage connection with the Uesugi family.

fourth daimyō of Kaga. Tsunakatsu's second wife was Tomihime 富姫, daughter of Yotsutsuji Kimisato 四辻 公理 (1610–1677), but she also had no children when Tsunakatsu unexpectedly died. Under normal rules, a domain without a natural or adopted successor should have been abolished on the death of its ruler, but Hoshina Masayuki, who had always deeply regretted the death of his daughter Haruhime and its effect on Tsunakatsu, intervened. He proposed Mitsunosuke 三之助, infant son of Kira Yoshihisa 吉良 義央 (1641–1703) and Tsunakatsu's sister Tomiko 富子, and thus Tsunakatsu's nephew, as a suitable candidate for adoption by Tsunakatsu's natural mother Shōzen'in 生善院, Sadakatsu's collateral wife. The Bakufu approved this arrangement against the normal rule, and the child became the new ruler, the future Uesugi Tsunanori 上杉 綱憲 (1663–1704; r. 1664–1703), but the districts of Shinobu 信夫 and Date 伊達 were taken away, so that Yonezawa domain was left with only the territory of Okitama 置賜, which reduced the domain by half, from 300,000 *koku* to 150,000.<sup>16</sup>

After the adoption, the Kira family maintained close relations with the Uesugi. In the twelfth month of 1664, the month after Tsunanori became ruler, Yoshinaka's father Kira Yoshifuyu 吉良 義冬 (1607–1668), along with Yoshinaka and several other notables, visited Hayashi Gahō 林 鷲峯 (1618–1680) to show him a collection of valuable documents owned by the Uesugi family. These included an edict from the Ming-dynasty Wanli Emperor bestowing an official appointment on Uesugi Kagekatsu at the time of the first invasion of Korea in 1592, documents from Hideyoshi, and another jointly signed by the council of six lords set up to protect Hideyoshi's son and heir at the time he died.<sup>17</sup> The fact that the Kira fami-

---

16 For details of the succession and the reduction of the domain, see *Yamagata kenshi* vol. 2, pp. 681–7.

17 As recorded by Gahō in his diary, see *Kokushikan nichiroku* 国史館日録, Yamamoto

ly had such precious documents at their disposal suggests that they had stepped in to take an important role in the management of Uesugi affairs. Later on, when Yoshinaka had no more sons, Tsunanori gave him his second son Haruchiyo 春千代 for adoption as the Kira heir in 1689, later renamed Kira Yoshichika 吉良義周. The Uesugi family also gave the Kira a range of assistance and subsidies, including the funds to rebuild the Kira residence in Edo when it burned down. More than half of the Kira family budget was covered by Yonezawa, to the dissatisfaction of some Yonezawa vassals.<sup>18</sup>

Tsunanori nominally became daimyo from infancy in 1664, but did not formally take up his rule until 1679. In the previous year he had married Eihime 榮姬 (Enkō'in 円光院) daughter of Tokugawa Mitsusada 光貞 (1627–1705, r. 1667–1698), second lord of Kishū 紀州 (or Kii 紀伊); she was thus the older half-sister of the eighth shogun Yoshimune, who was born in 1684. The reduction of Yonezawa from 300,000 to 150,000 *koku* had further exacerbated the already difficult finances of the domain. The domain government was forced to drastic measures, such as stipend cuts and forced borrowing for the over-large contingent of samurai, and austerity measures and coercive taxes for the wider population. Agriculture became increasingly uneconomical, peasants fled their land, and the domain suffered depopulation and a shrinking tax base.<sup>19</sup>

There was some dissatisfaction at the time with Tsunanori, who was criti-

---

Takeo 山本 武夫 ed. and comp., vol. 1 (Tokyo: Zokugunsho Ruijū Kanseikai 続群書類従完成会, 1997), p. 55.

18 *Yamagata kenshi* vol. 2, p. 686.

19 See the detailed account of this in various sections of *Yamagata kenshi* vol. 2. See also Mark Ravina, *Land and Lordship in Early Modern Japan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), Chapter 3.

cised for his excessive spending, on projects such as the domain Confucius temple and school described below, refurbishment of the Zenrinji and its Monjūdō book repository, and also on personal extravagances, such as ostentatious *sankin kōtai* 参勤交代 processions to Edo, rebuilding his Edo residences, and laying on sumptuous Nō drama performances. Yet in later generations he was portrayed as a successful ruler, praised for policies promoting education, changing customs (though sometimes through harsh punishments, including mandating the death penalty for gambling in 1683), reorganising the bureaucracy, and commissioning histories of the Uesugi ancestors Kenshin and Kagekatsu.<sup>20</sup> And, it is under Tsunanori that we begin to find clear and more detailed evidence of increasing Confucian influence.

A key figure in the founding of the Kanrinden is the physician and Confucian scholar Yaoita San'in 矢尾板 三印 (1640–1705). His great-grandfather had been a Castellan (*jōdai* 城代) in Echigo under the Uesugi, and his grandfather had chosen to remain in Echigo rather than following the Uesugi to Yonezawa, but then he died, and the surviving family took refuge in Yonezawa, where Yaoita San'in was born. He went to Kyoto to study under Noma Sanchiku 野間 三竹 (1608–1676), and was appointed domain physician for Yonezawa and Attendant (*kinju* 近習) to Tsunanori in 1669, based at first in Edo, at a salary of seventy *koku*, raised to 100 *koku* in 1679 when he was also entrusted with the task of com-

---

20 See *Yamagata kenshi* vol. 2, pp. 678–9 for the repressive regulations against gambling and drinking; p. 681 for the promotion of education and the establishment of the Confucius temple and school in 1697. Much later, when the ninth daimyo Harunori was criticised for poor policies by seven dissident vassal families, they looked back to Tsunanori's successful rule as a contrast to what they regarded as Harunori's failures; Yokoyama Akio 横山 昭男, *Uesugi Yōzan* 上杉鷹山 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1968), p. 64.

piling the chronological history of Kenshin and Kagekatsu. Most importantly, San'in started his own private Confucius temple in Yonezawa, where he performed the Sekiten rite to Confucius, and it was this that in 1697 was rebuilt by Tsunanori into the official domain Kanrinden 感麟殿 Confucius temple with a new school attached, the forerunner of the eighteenth-century Kōjōkan.<sup>21</sup>

Important to understanding San'in's Confucian background, and in particular his knowledge of the Sekiten ceremony, is his main teacher, Noma Sanchiku. Sanchiku was Bakufu physician (Okuishi 奥医師) and Confucian scholar, a man of remarkable accomplishments who would have been the main intellectual influence on San'in early in life.<sup>22</sup> Sanchiku was born in Kyoto, and studied Confucianism with the Confucian teacher Matsunaga Sekigo 松永 尺五 (1592–1657). Sekigo, a student of Fujiwara Seika 藤原 惺窩 (1561–1619), is not usually considered a major figure in the intellectual history of early modern Japan, but in his day he was one of the most influential Confucian teachers in Kyoto, reputedly with thousands of students. He was socially and politically well connected, mixing with the Kyoto cultural elite and enjoying the patronage of the emperor. He taught Confucian texts to imperial relatives and courtiers, and was also on good terms with Ita-

---

21 Most of what is known about Yaoita San'in is in the biography in Mombushō 文部省 comp, *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* 日本教育史資料 vol. 5 (Tokyo: Monbushō Sōmukyoku, 1891, pp. 72–3.

22 A useful chronology of Sanchiku's life, assembled from a number of contemporary sources, is in Itō Yoshitaka 伊藤 善隆, "Noma Sanchiku nenpu kō 野間三竹年譜稿," *Shōhoku Kiyō* 湘北紀要 29 (2008), pp. 1–16. In this and other articles he differs from other scholars in placing Sanchiku's year of birth in 1615, but in a later piece he acknowledges that the year should in fact be 1608; see his explanation in Itō, "Kinsei zenki Kangakusha hisseki shiryō goten 近世前期漢学者筆跡資料五点," *Shōhoku Kiyō* 35 (2014), p. 2.

kura Shigemune 板倉 重宗 (1586–1656), representative of the Bakufu (*shoshidai* 所司代) in Kyoto; in 1637 Shigemune gave him funds and a plot of land for a new school, the Kōshūdō 講習堂, which the next year received a plaque reading “Kōshūdō” written for him by the (female) emperor Meishō 明正 (r. 1629–1643). In 1648 the next emperor Go-Kōmyō 後光明 (r. 1643–1654) gave Sekigo a plot of land directly next to the palace for a new school hall, the Sekigodō 尺五堂, which became the source of the name “Sekigo” by which he was later best known. In this hall Sekigo performed the Sekisai observance to Confucius twice yearly, said to have been the first time the ritual had been performed in Kyoto since the Daigakuryō 大学寮 Sekiten had been discontinued centuries earlier. Sekigo took great care in formulating his Sekisai, seeking technical assistance from the Chinese émigré Chen Yuanyun 陳元贊 (1587–1671); the outline of Sekigo’s ceremony is preserved in his collected works, including *katakana* renderings of the stages of the ceremony in Chinese pronunciation.<sup>23</sup> Sanchiku had also interacted directly with Chen Yuanyun; he asked for a preface from Chen in Kyoto in 1641, which suggests that they already knew each other and very likely met when he made his request.<sup>24</sup>

---

23 For a detailed discussion of Sekigo and his school, see Zenan Shu, “Cultural and Political Encounters with Chinese Language in Early Modern Japan: The Case of Kinoshita Jun’an (1621–1698),” D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2009, pp. 33–41; his Sekisai ceremony is discussed on pp. 42–52. Shu points out that Sekigo’s second school hall, the Kōshūdō established in 1637, was on a site believed by some (wrongly) to have been that once occupied by the ancient imperial academy, the Daigakuryō 大学寮, discontinued after a fire in 1177, and argues that the emperor’s support might suggest that the Sekigo-dō 尺五堂, even though a private school, was seen as an unofficial restoration or latter-day counterpart of the Daigakuryō, and the Sekisai a continuation of the ancient Sekiten.

24 Itō, “Noma Sanchiku nenpu kō,” p. 5.

Sanchiku also became acquainted with Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583–1657) in Kyoto, as evidenced by poems they exchanged, and they later continued their association in Edo. Razan began performing the Sekiten in his temple to Confucius in Shinobugaoka 忍岡 in Edo in 1633, and the ceremony was continued by his son Gahō 鷺峯 (1618–1680), whose efforts to perfect it are described in his writings. Sanchiku was on good terms with Gahō, and with Gahō's elder son Baidō 梅洞 (1643–1666). Gahō's diary records that Sanchiku met both of them regularly. It is fair to assume that Noma Sanchiku would have had considerable knowledge of the Sekisai ritual, having witnessed those held by his teacher Sekigo while he was a student, and he was familiar also with the Hayashi family's ceremonies. Gahō records one occasion in 1665 when Sanchiku came to visit, and that they read collections of poetry related to the Sekisai and other sacrifices together; this was at a time when Yaoita was a student with Sanchiku in Edo.<sup>25</sup>

Sanchiku was San'in's teacher in both medicine and Confucian learning, according to the latter's biography in the *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō*, which says that Yaoita went "a second time" to study in Kyoto in 1667 before returning to Edo to take up his first post for Yonezawa in 1669. It appears that the relationship between teacher and student was a close one: the name "San'in" was chosen for him by Sanchiku, with the shared "San" a sign of high regard, presumably because he regarded San'in as a capable student, perhaps his best one. We may assume that Sanchiku's considerable experience of the Sekisai was passed on to San'in, and that San'in might well have witnessed Gahō's performance of it during the times when he and Sanchiku were in Edo.

San'in was appointed Attendant (*kinju*) to Tsunanori in 1669, based in Edo.

---

25 *Kokushikan nichiroku*, vol 1, p. 90.

At this time San'in was thirty *sai* and the young lord seven, and we may speculate that he had considerable influence on the boy at a formative stage. This must have been a factor in Tsunanori's later interest in Confucianism, leading up to his implementation of the domain Sekiten and and Confucian school later in his rule.

An important act by San'in outside his official duties was his setting up a private school and Confucius temple in his own residence, where he performed the Sekiten twice a year. His detailed knowledge of the ceremony must have derived from Sanchiku, and through him the Kyoto and Edo ceremonies of Sekigo and Gahō respectively. It was San'in's temple that Tsunanori had rebuilt and converted into the official domain temple, the Kanrinden 感麟殿 with its associated school in 1697.<sup>26</sup> We can assume that Tsunanori was motivated in part by his own inclinations after his early exposure to Confucian learning with San'in, but we see also the influence of Tsunayoshi's Yushima Seidō founded in 1691, which inspired many domains to establish temples of their own, as was the case in Saga and Taku.

The inaugural Sekiten in the Kanrinden was held in 1698. A text titled *Seidō senzashi* 聖堂遷座誌 preserved in the Yonezawa City Library gives a detailed account of the ceremony. San'in officiated with Tsunanori in attendance; after the main rite he lectured on the *Lun yu*, and his son In'eki 允易 lectured on the "Da-xue/Daigaku 大學". At the end of the proceedings poems were read, followed by a banquet. The rite was quite similar to that performed when moving the Shinobugaoka gods to the new Yushima Seidō in 1691.<sup>27</sup>

Tsunanori died in 1703, but his successor Uesugi Yoshinori 上杉 吉憲 (1684-

---

26 See the account of San'in's Sekisai and its official conversion in *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* vol. 5, p. 73, and in Sudō Toshio 須藤 敏夫, *Kinsei Nihon Sekiten no kenkyū* 近世日本積奠の研究 (Kyōto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2001), pp. 192-6.

27 Sudō, pp. 193-5 reproduces parts of this text, including a list of the participants.

1722; r. 1703–1722) is recorded as having been equally keen on promoting civil education, and he continued the twice-annual Sekiten rite. In 1705 San'in died, and within a few months Yoshinori appointed a replacement, Katayama Mototaka 片山元倚 (1663–1723) as domain physician and Confucian scholar, with a salary of 200 *koku*. Mototaka was an unemployed samurai from Edo, whose teacher seems to have been Hitomi Yūgen 人見友元 (also known as Chikudō 竹洞 and Kakuzan 鶴山, 1638–1696).<sup>28</sup> Yūgen was a Mito Confucian who studied under Hayashi Gahō and joined his *Honchō tsugan* 本朝通鑑 history compilation project. He was later appointed Bakufu Confucian scholar under Tsunayoshi together with Hayashi Hōkō 林鳳岡 (or Nobuatsu 信篤, 1644–1732) and Kinoshita Jun'an. He was on good terms with the Chinese émigré Zhu Shunshui after the latter arrived in Edo in 1665, and with his Mito contacts would have been familiar with the rehearsals for a Mito domain Sekisai organized by Zhu in the Mito residence in Edo, which went on for several months in the summer and autumn of 1773.<sup>29</sup> As a student of Yūgen, Katayama Mototaka would have come from an intellectual and cultural milieu in Edo similar to that of his predecessor Yaoita San'in, and through that had knowledge of the Sekiten/Sekisai ritual. The stipend of 200 *koku*, the same level as the highest reached by San'in in 1703, suggests that he was accomplished and highly regarded. He is the author of a text, the *Dōkan sakki* 童觀剖記, containing a wide range of practical, technical, literary, and medical knowledge.<sup>30</sup>

---

28 Sudō, p. 210, note 12 says that his teacher was one Hitomi Kizan 亀山, but there is no record of anyone by that name in Edo. It appears that “Kizan” 亀山 is an error for “Kakuzan” 鶴山, perhaps in the sources consulted by Sudō.

29 As described by Gahō in the *Kokushikan nichiroku* vol 5 (Tokyo: Zokugunsho Ruijū Kanseikai 続群書類従完成会, 2005), p. 96.

30 A manuscript copy is preserved in the Kyoto University Library.

The official school and Sekiten ceremonies in the Kanrinden continued until 1724, when they were suspended under Yoshinori's successor Uesugi Munenori 上杉 宗憲 (1714-1734; r. 1722-1734). There had been serious famine in 1720, and the overall financial crisis in Yonezawa had become so severe that official funding for the school and Sekisai could no longer be maintained. It is perhaps no coincidence that Katayama Mototaka had died in 1723. His son Isshin 一真 (nd) had taken over, and from 1725 continued the school and Sekisai ceremonies privately, eventually succeeded by Issin's son Isseki 一積 (nd), for a total of more than five decades, until the founding of the new Kōjōkan and Confucius temple by Harunori in 1776, in which Isseki played an important part.<sup>31</sup> The intervening Yonezawa rulers Munenori, Munefusa, and Shigesada 重定 continued to lend moral support to the Katayama's Sekisai rite, and provided gifts for the sacrificial offerings. The abandonment of the official temple and school parallels the decline of the Bakufu's Yushima Seidō after Hayashi Hōkō died (1732) and the Shōgun Yoshimune retired (1745), when the buildings fell into disrepair and student numbers dropped.<sup>32</sup>

## The Kōjōkan and its Background

The Kōjōkan was very much the product of its times, and as such was no less an

---

31 For a listing of the Katayama lineage from Mototaka onwards see Nagao Naoshige 長尾 直茂, "Yamagata-ken Kangakusha sōran kō 山形県漢学者総覧稿," *Yamagata Daigaku Kiyō: Jinbun Kagaku* 山形大學紀要・人文科學15.4 (2005), p. 238 (81).

32 Herman Ooms, *Charismatic Bureaucrat: A Political Biography of Matsudaira Sadanobu, 1758-1829* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), pp. 125-9, which includes statistics on declining student and teacher numbers on pp. 126-7.

example of transculturation than its predecessors, if in a rather different way. In the 1697 Kanrinden and Yaoita San'in's private observances before that, the contemporary records give greater prominence to the Confucius temple and Sekisai ceremony, and less to the attached school. This suggests that the former was regarded as somehow more significant in the minds of the people of the time. In the case of the Kōjōkan, the situation was reversed: the school was preeminent, and the temple was given much less attention. The records suggest that the inclusion of the temple was by no means a foregone conclusion during the planning stages of the school, and may only have been included because a decision was made to rebuild the Katayama school rather than starting a separate facility, which meant that their private temple and ritual expertise were already there. In the end the temple was upgraded as part of the school, and the Sekisai ceremony was revamped and performed seriously, a pattern found elsewhere at around the same time, most notably in the Bakufu's Shōheizaka Gakumonjo 昌平坂学問所.

Behind the Kōjōkan school was an accelerating wave of political and economic reforms in the Bakufu and domains during the second half of the eighteenth century, of which Yonezawa was one of the best known and ultimately most successful examples. Widespread financial hardship and social unrest worsened throughout Japan in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and a sense of crisis grew, spurring strong movements for reform. Historians have studied different aspects of the latter eighteenth-century Yonezawa reforms in considerable depth, particularly from the perspective of economic and intellectual history.<sup>33</sup> A

---

33 The economic and financial aspects of the reforms are covered in Ravina, *Land and Lordship*, Chapter 3. The intellectual background is studied in Koseki Yūichirō 小関 悠一郎, "Meikun" no kinsei: *Gakumon chishiki to hansei kaikaku* (明君) の近世: 学問・知識と藩政改革 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2012), which includes examination of

significant dimension of the reforms was education, training young samurai to be effective administrators, and also the wider promotion of education to counter what was perceived as a serious decline in public morals at all levels of society. The number of schools, both private and official, increased substantially throughout Japan during this time, in which Confucian teaching was usually prominent. Perhaps the best-known example was the Bakufu itself, with the reforms driven by Matsudaira Sadanobu 松平 定信 (1759–1829), during which the Bakufu took direct control of the Hayashi family's Yushima Seidō as its official academy and Confucius temple in 1790, renamed the Shōheizaka Gakumonjo, and in 1798 substantially rebuilt and enlarged the temple.<sup>34</sup> The function of Confucian ritual

---

the writings of people most closely involved in designing the reforms. A highly detailed account of all aspects of Yonezawa history is contained in the history of Yamagata prefecture, see *Yamagata kenshi* 山形県史 vol. 2, and vol. 3 (Yamagata: Yamagata-ken, 1987). Also good is a classic general biography of Harunori, Yokoyama Akio 横山 昭男, *Uesugi Yōzan* 上杉鷹山 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1968). For the current study a particularly useful source has been Daijōji Ryōichi 大乘寺 良一, *Heishū sensei to Yonezawa* 平洲先生と米澤 (Yonezawa: Heishū sensei to Yonezawa Kankōkai 平洲先生と米澤刊行會, 1958); this source reproduces a great many primary documents, many of which were collected privately by the author and seem no longer to be available.

34 Sadanobu and his reforms have been widely studied; see for example I. J. McMullen, “Ogyū Sorai, Matsudaira Sadanobu and the Kansei Worship of Confucius,” *Asia Japan Journal* 6 (2011), pp. 61–82; Herman Ooms, *Charismatic Bureaucrat: A Political Biography of Matsudaira Sadanobu, 1758–1829* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975); a series of three articles by Robert Backus, “The Relationship of Confucianism to The Tokugawa Bakufu as Revealed in The Kansei Educational Reform,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 34 (1974), pp. 97–162, “The Kansei Prohibition of Heterodoxy and Its Effects on Education,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 39.1 (1979), pp. 55–106, and “The Motivation of Confucian Orthodoxy in Tokugawa Japan,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 39.2 (1979), pp. 275–338; Kiri Paramore, “The Nationalization of Confucianism: Academism, Examinations, and Bureaucratic Governance in the

forms in temple and school had changed from its earlier counterparts in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, but illustrates the phenomenon of transculturation just the same. The Kōjōkan fulfilled the needs of its time, particularly the aims of those in political power, in creating an emblematic institution for education in both practical skills and the moral transformation of society. In a time when Confucian learning had become widespread and familiar, it was no longer necessary for the temple to appeal to the populace as a religious building, as in Taku, or to assert the hegemony of domain Confucians over the school, as in Hagi. The temple was an integral part of the school compound that was expected to be there, but its special significance as a religious building had faded to a considerable extent, and yet was still expected to be there, and sometimes – in the case of the Yushima Seidō and Kōjōkan at least – was made larger and more elaborate than ever before.

The establishment of the school Kōjōkan in 1776 by the ninth lord of Yonezawa Uesugi Harunori 上杉 治憲 (or Yōzan 鷹山, 1751–1822; r. 1767–1785) came as part of a set of domain reforms that were ultimately quite successful. In his own time and even more subsequently, Harunori was held up as an exemplar of the “enlightened ruler” (*meikun* 明君, or 名君), credited with the wide-ranging financial and social reforms which by 1823 had led to the complete elimination of Yonezawa’s crippling domain debt.

There is no doubt that Harunori played the role of the exemplary ruler well, for example in his personal frugality – wearing cotton clothes, eating only one bowl of soup and one bowl of vegetables twice a day, and reducing his personal stipend from 1500 *koku* to 209. However, it is important to stress that at the out-

---

Late Tokugawa State,” *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 38.1 (2012), pp. 25–53.

set this role had been carefully crafted for him by a group of capable young reform-minded men: in particular the domain vassals Takenomata Masatsuna 竹俣当綱 (1729-1793), Nozoki Yoshimasa 荏戸善政 (1735-1804), and Warashina Shōhaku 藁科松伯 (1737-1769), and also the Confucian teacher Hosoi Heishū 細井平洲 (1728-1801). These people, though still relatively young, were older and more experienced than Harunori, who became a daimyō when he was only seventeen *sai*. These older mentors and officials encouraged and assisted him in assuming the role of the perfect ruler, with strong influence from Confucian teachings, and it is hardly surprising that a Confucian school was a conspicuous part of Harunori's reforms.

Harunori's predecessor in Yonezawa was the eighth lord Uesugi Shigesada 上杉重定 (1720-1798; r. 1746-1767). He had expensive tastes, and during his tenure the economic and social crisis in Yonezawa steadily worsened. Domain finances could only be maintained through continued heavy borrowing from samurai and other vassals, which from 1750 onwards became a permanent levy of half their stipends.<sup>35</sup> Shigesada at first had no natural sons, and in 1760 adopted Matsusaburō 松三郎 (or Naomatsu 直松), later Harunori, natural second son of Akizuki Tanemitsu 秋月種美 (or Tanemi; 1718-1787, r. 1734-1760), sixth lord of Takanabe 高鍋 domain, himself also judged an exemplary ruler, a *meikun*, of many accomplishments. Shigesada had a son of his own soon afterwards, but retained Harunori as heir.<sup>36</sup>

After arriving in the Uesugi residence at Sakurada 桜田 in Edo on his adoption in 1760, Harunori received the education and training of a domain heir,

---

35 Ravina, *Land and Lordship*, p. 75.

36 Yokoyama, *Uesugi Yōzan*, pp. 4, 330.

which included Confucian and other texts of Chinese learning. A central figure in his education was Warashina Shōhaku 藁科 松伯. Shōhaku, who claimed descent from the Ōe 大江 family, was a young man of intelligence and wide learning, described as having a phenomenal memory. He became an accomplished physician at an early age, and in 1759, at twenty-eight *sai*, he was appointed personal physician to Shigesada. He was also an excellent scholar of Confucian learning, and started his own school in Edo, the Seigakan 菁莪館.<sup>37</sup> Shōhaku arranged for one of his most talented students, Jinbo Tsunatada 神保 綱忠 (1743–1826), to be a “study companion” (*gakuyū* 学友) to Harunori.<sup>38</sup> Tsunatada was later to play an important role in the Kōjōkan school; eight years older than Harunori, he would inevitably have exerted an influence on him.

In 1764 Shōhaku introduced to Shigesada the prominent Confucian teacher Hosoi Heishū 細井 平洲, who was retained to deliver regular lectures in the Uesugi residence and become Harunori’s teacher. Intellectual historians classify Heishū as “eclectic school” (*Setchū gakuha* 折衷学派), adhering exclusively neither to the pure Cheng-Zhu teachings nor to Sorai, but for purposes of this study it is not particularly helpful to identify any particular ideological bent, but rather to highlight his vision of the practical application of Confucian teachings, particular the importance of the ideal ruler to effective governance.<sup>39</sup> Heishū was a native of Owari domain, and after an early Buddhist education he began studying

---

37 See the description of Shōhaku in Daijōji, *Heishū sensei to Yonezawa*, pp. 3–4.

38 See the biography of Jinbo Tsunatada in *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* vol. 5, p. 73. This source says that he became Harunori’s study companion when Tsunatada was seventeen *sai*, which would have been in 1759 before Harunori was adopted; 1760 would seem more likely.

39 For a discussion of Heishū’s thought, see Ravina, *Land and Lordship*, pp. 90–93.

with the Confucian teacher Nakanishi Tan'en 中西 淡淵 (1709–1752), also classified as an “eclectic”, in Nagoya in 1744 at the age of seventeen *sai*. At Tan'en's encouragement, he went to study Chinese language (Tō'in 唐音) in Nagasaki in 1745, where he remained for over two years, returning to Nagoya in 1747 when his mother fell ill.<sup>40</sup> He seems to have achieved a fair level of proficiency in spoken Chinese, sufficient to be able to interpret for the Ōbaku Zen master Taihō 大鵬 in 1758.<sup>41</sup> In 1751 Heishū went to Edo to join Tan'en, and began teaching students there, and eventually started his own private school, the Ōmeikan 嚶鳴館.<sup>42</sup>

When Heishū was asked to become Harunori's teacher, as Heishū himself later described it, Shigesada told him that the boy was unusual, destined to revive the Uesugi house, and asked Heishū to teach him with this in mind. Heishū was deeply moved, and said that the general appraisal of Shigesada as dissolute and dedicated to luxury was wrong; the only reason why he failed to manifest the virtue of a ruler was that he had lacked able ministers to teach and guide him.<sup>43</sup> This remark reflects Heishū's view of the importance of good ministers in fashioning the exemplary ruler. Shigesada had failed due to the lack of such ministers; now Heishū himself, and those under his influence, had taken on the re-

---

40 Daijōji, *Heishū sensei to Yonezawa*, pp. 17–21; Kitō Yūichi 鬼頭 有一, *Hosoi Heishū: (fu) Nakanishi Tan'en* 細井平洲・(附) 中西淡淵 (Tokyo: Meitoku Shuppansha, 1977), pp. 20–22. See also the biography of Heishū in *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* vol. 4 (Tokyo: Monbushō Sōmukyoku, 1891), pp. 451–2.

41 See Hosoi Keiko 細井 啓子, “Manpukuji ni tadoritsuikite omou koto: Taihō Zenji to Hosoi Heishū, Soshū Zenji to Hekitan Oshō ni tsuite 萬福寺にたどり着きて思うこと——大鵬禪師と細井平洲, 楚州禪師と碧潭和尚について,” *Ōbaku bunka* 黄檗文華 118 (1998), p. 48.

42 Daijōji, *Heishū sensei to Yonezawa*, pp. 23–4; *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* vol. 4, p. 452.

43 Daijōji, *Heishū sensei to Yonezawa*, pp. 40–41.

sponsibility to ensure that the young Harunori would become the exemplary ruler that Yonezawa domain needed to renew itself.

The texts Harunori studied are worth noting, as they reflect the wide range of Heishū's (and Warashina Shōhaku's) teaching and its practical value rather than any particular ideological bent, and are probably best characterized as representing wider Chinese learning rather than just Confucianism. These texts included the early Chinese historical text *Guoyu* 國語, Ogyū Sorai's *Bendō* 弁道, the *Shishuo xinyu* 世說新語, the Chinese military texts *Qi shu* 七書, the *Zuo zhuan* 左傳, and the *Xunzi* 荀子.<sup>44</sup> Such a list seems directed less at ideals and abstract values, and more at the practical enterprise of politics and rulership.

Heishū contributed substantially to Harunori's conception of his own role as domain ruler. He propounded the Confucian teaching that the ruler existed for the populace, and was responsible for their moral improvement, which required that he set a perfect example for them in his own person and conduct. As far as possible this should be based on reality, but the ruler needed to be guided by his ministers, and if necessary they should conceal his faults in order to maintain the image.<sup>45</sup> This explains the what Mark Ravina termed the "beatification" of Harunori, the idealized image created for him during his lifetime, resulting in a "hagiography" which was perpetuated through the late Edo, Meiji, and especially pre-war periods, when he was highlighted in school textbooks as a model of virtue and self-discipline, rescuing Yonezawa from its desperate economic and social crisis.<sup>46</sup> When Harunori was thrust into his role of domain lord at the age of seventeen *sai*, Heishū, Masatsuna, and his other followers, older and more experi-

---

44 List from Yokoyama, *Uesugi Yōzan*, p. 13.

45 Ravina, *Land and Lordship*, pp. 91-2.

46 Ravina, pp. 91-3, see also the introduction to Yokoyama, pp. 1-3.

enced, guided him along a path they had prepared for him. His legend may not quite have been matched by reality, and it is true that the real success of his reforms only became apparent in the 1790s after he had stepped down, but he was certainly no puppet. He seems to have been fully in agreement with their agenda, and deserves credit for having the dedication and competence to play his role well. He certainly did not hesitate to impose severe austerity on himself, as Shigesada had never been willing to do.

Warashina Shōhaku was until his early death in 1669 a central figure in the ideology underlying the reforms and the education of Harunori, and he played an equally important role in the politics leading up to Harunori's reforms. He worked closely with the high domain vassals Takenomata Masatsuna 竹俣 当綱 and Nozoki Yoshimasa 菟戸 善政 in formulating plans for reform. Masatsuna was from the Takenomata family, the highest-ranking of the vassal families under the Uesugi, and in 1761 he became a domain *karō*, stationed in the domain residence in Edo.<sup>47</sup> In terms of rank he was the leader of the group, and was later to play a chief role in implementing the early phase of the domain reforms, but Shōhaku, though younger, seems to have been the one to provide the main intellectual and strategic direction until his death. Masatsuna, Yoshimasa, and a number of others often met at Shōhaku's Seigakan school to discuss Confucian canonical texts and the need for reform in domain governance, and their group was known as the Seigasha 菁莪社, or Seiga shachū 菁莪社中.<sup>48</sup> They all welcomed Heishū as their teacher.

The Seigasha group was deeply dissatisfied with the state of affairs in Yone-

---

47 Yokoyama, p. 330.

48 Daijōji, p. 4; Koseki, *Meikun no kinsei*, p. 12.

zawa domain, and exerted pressure on Shigesada to curb his extravagant personal expenditure and implement reforms. When Shigesada failed to respond, the Seigasha took drastic measures. The first of these was the assassination of Shigesada's main domain administrator Mori Heiemon 森平右衛門 (or Toshizane 利真, 1711–1763). The idea was proposed by Shōhaku, and carried out by Masatsuna, who took several compatriots with him to Yonezawa, summoned Mori to a meeting, read out a list of accusations, then killed him.<sup>49</sup> Modern historians are less harsh on Mori, who actually seems to have been quite capable, having risen quickly from relatively humble origins to become the chief administrator in the domain. He attempted reforms that were plausible enough, but his tenure coincided with floods, famine, and violent unrest from peasants and lower-ranking samurai, and also a Bakufu levy for a major building project in Edo in 1753.<sup>50</sup> Many of his measures, such as awarding powerful merchants domain titles and fiefs, were detrimental to the interests of the domain elite, and aroused their keen resentment.<sup>51</sup>

Makitsuna's precipitous killing of Mori was not without repercussions, but accusations of disloyalty were deflected by a *karō* from Owari, Naruse Hayatonokami 成瀬隼人正, who declared that the killing of a menace to the domain had been perfectly justified.<sup>52</sup> The connection between Owari and Yonezawa was an important one, which ensured that Hayatanoshō's intervention was heeded. Shigesada's principal wife was Toyo-hime 豊姫, daughter of the ninth lord of

---

49 Daijōji, pp. 4–5; Yokoyama, Kitō Yūichi, *Hosoi Heishū: (fu) Nakanishi Tan'en*, p. 118. Daijōji reproduces a *kanshi* poem composed by Shōhaku celebrating the event as a momentous military victory.

50 For an account of Mori's rise and fall see Yokoyama, *Uesugi Yōzan*, pp. 27–35.

51 Ravina, pp. 83–7.

52 Kitō, *Hosoi Heishū: (fu) Nakanishi Tan'en*, p. 118.

Owari, Tokugawa Munekatsu 徳川 宗勝 (1705–1761; r. 1739–1761), and sister to the then-reigning tenth lord Tokugawa Munechika 宗睦 (1733–1800; r. 1761–1799).

The Seigasha group pressed ahead with their reform agenda, and enjoyed substantial support among the domain bureaucracy, but Shigesada's extravagant habits were a persistent obstacle, and he became their next target. From 1663 the reformers pressed him to retire in favour of his adopted heir. In the end Masatsuna proposed to Shigesada that the domain was in such desperate condition that he should step down and return Yonezawa to the Bakufu, so as to relieve the people's suffering. The Owari *karō* joined in these urgings, and in 1767 Shigesada finally relented and stepped down in favour of Harunori, then only seventeen *sai*.<sup>53</sup>

Harunori became lord of Yonezawa at a time of economic hardship and social unrest probably unmatched at any previous time in the domain's history. He and his Seigasha-group officials wasted no time in launching their vigorous programme of reforms, which included two important aspects. The first was economic, monitoring and rationalising agricultural production, encouraging cash crops such as lacquer trees, and implementing measures to reverse rural depopulation by encouraging peasants not to flee their land. Not all of these were immediately successful, but they did eventually lead to improved policies and the complete elimination of the domain's enormous debt by 1823.<sup>54</sup> The second as-

---

53 Yokoyama, pp. 25–7; Ravina, pp. 87–8.

54 See Ravina's account, which argues that the economic reforms at first had limited effect, and only became genuinely successful under Nozoki Yoshimasa, who shifted the emphasis away from moral suasion of the populace and toward the legitimation of profit (pp. 97–103) and inducing samurai to take up income-earning occupations, including farming and weaving (pp. 103–110).

pect of the reforms was moral and educational. This included austerity measures, particularly for domain retainers and samurai, and in this Harunori led the way, first imposing a strict regimen on himself, including two meals a day of one bowl of vegetables and one bowl of soup, reducing his annual personal stipend from 1500 *koku* to 209, and wearing only plain cotton clothes, before extending this to others. Other measures were designed to modify public morals, laws to prohibit social ills such as gambling (punishable by death), and also the promotion of education at all levels of society, of which the founding of the Kōjōkan would eventually form a part.<sup>55</sup>

In 1769, when Harunori entered Yonezawa for the first time, Hosoi Heishū composed for him a statement of encouragement and advice, which centred around the virtues of *jin* 仁, ‘kindness’, *chi* 智, ‘intelligence’, and above all *yū* 勇, ‘courage’ or ‘boldness’. Heishū said, “A lord presiding sternly is like God and Heaven, and he extends his sincerity to govern things; what is so [difficult] about boldness?” (夫君臨之嚴，如帝且天，而推誠制物，於勇何有) This seems something of a tangent from classical Confucian teachings, in which *yū* was a seldom-discussed secondary virtue, but was well targeted as far as coping with Harunori’s immediate challenge was concerned.<sup>56</sup> The stringent austerity rules inevitably caused discontent, and in 1773 the incident of the “seven families” occurred (the *shichike sōdō* 七家騒動), when the heads of seven high-ranking families confronted Harunori with a list of dissatisfactions. With support from the retired lord Shigesada, Harunori responded harshly, eventually executing Warashina Ryūtakū 藁科立沢 (no relation to Shōtoku), the main instigator of the resistance. Heishū

---

55 Yokoyama, pp. 104–12.

56 Original *kanbun* text as reproduced in Sudō Toshio 須藤 敏夫, “Yonezawa Kōjōkan no sōritsu 米沢興讓館の創立,” *Kokushigaku* 国史学 74 (1960), pp. 48–9.

and his influence on domain reform were a particular point of dissatisfaction.<sup>57</sup>

Featuring prominently in the reforms was the founding of the Kōjōkan domain school. The foundation and organization of the Kōjōkan have been studied in considerable detail by modern scholars; here it will suffice to summarize some of the highlights relevant to the themes of the current study.<sup>58</sup> In 1770 Takenomata Masatsuna proposed opening a domain school,<sup>59</sup> and in the same year Harunori consulted Katayama Isseki 片山 一積, grandson of Katayama Mototaka and the current Katayama family head (the Katayama family having maintained the Kanrinden temple, Sekisai sacrifices, and school on a private basis since the official domain support for the complex had been withdrawn in 1724), to consult with him on how to promote civil learning (*bungaku* 文学).<sup>60</sup> In 1771 Harunori also visited the Katayama Confucius temple.<sup>61</sup>

In 1771 Harunori invited Heishū to Yonezawa, and housed him in the Shō'ōkan 松桜館, where he began teaching a select group of twenty students, sons of samurai and officials; Katayama Isseki's son Ikkō 一興 was one of those attending.<sup>62</sup> Harunori's earlier study companion, Jinbo Tsunatada, Warashina

---

57 Daijōji, pp. 183-97; Yokoyama, pp. 58-69, 127-9.

58 A detailed account, with many relevant original sources reproduced, is in Daijōji, pp. 201-246. See also *Yamagata kenshi* 山形県史 vol. 3 (Yamagata: Yamagata-ken, 1987), pp. 964-73; Yokoyama, pp. 112-21; Matsuno Yoshitora 松野 良寅, *Kōjōkan jinkokuki* 興讓館人国記, pp. 17-20; the physical structure is described in Kido Hisashi 城戸 久 and Takahashi Hiroyuki 高橋 宏之, *Hankō ikō: Edo jidai no gakkō kenchiku to kyōiku* 藩校遺構: 江戸時代の学校建築と教育 (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō 相模書房, 1975), pp. 71-7.

59 See the chronology appended at the end of Matsuno, *Kōjōkan jinkokuki*, p. 1.

60 Yokoyama, p. 112.

61 Sudō, *Kinsei Nihon Sekiten no kenkyū*, p. 201.

62 Daijōji records that Heishū taught the Chinese text *Guoyu* 國語, and lists those in attendance, pp. 115-8. Also see Kido and Takahashi, *Hankō ikō*, p. 72, and Yokoyama,

Shōhaku's student who had from 1759 studied with Heishū, accompanied Heishū to Yonezawa and served as his assistant. Heishū's stay in Yonezawa ended prematurely in 1772 when his house in Edo burned down in the great fire that year, which also destroyed the two Uesugi residences there, and he returned to Edo. When Heishū departed, Jinbo Tsunatada was made head of the Shō'ōkan.<sup>63</sup>

When the Kōjōkan was opened in 1776, the organization reflected its dual origins in the informal Shō'ōkan teaching project under Heishū and Jinbo Tsunatada on the one hand, and the Katayama family's private temple and school on the other. Both Jinbo Tsunatada and Katayama Isseki were appointed as teaching heads (*teigaku* 提学). The Shō'ōkan project had trained small numbers of young samurai and retainers to be domain officials, and this pattern was continued in the Kōjōkan. Virtually nothing is known of the Katayama private school, which in itself suggests that the students studying there were not people of any great importance in the domain. But there was a school there, and Harunori made the decision to rebuild this as the Kōjōkan, and the Katayama family, who had been residing there, were moved to new quarters alongside.

Another significant component of the original Katayama site was the Confucius temple, the same Kanrinden where official regular Sekisai ceremonies had been held from 1697 to 1724 under Tsunanori and Yoshinori, and this was also rebuilt as a part of the Kōjōkan, and the Sekisai observances continued. Though the complex now was thoroughly rebuilt and reorganized under a new name, Harunori described the project as a "restoration" (*saikō* 再興) of Tsunanori's original temple and school.<sup>64</sup>

---

pp. 123–6.

63 Yokoyama, p. 114; *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* vol. 5, p. 73.

64 Daijōji, p. 203; Yokoyama, p. 113.

Nozoki Yoshimasa was in charge of formulating the plans for the new school, and Harunori put him in overall control of the project when it began. Jinbo Tsunatada travelled to Edo to consult with Heishū on compiling the regulations for teaching content and methods in the new school. Nozoki Yoshimasa also consulted Heishū in a letter in which he stated a preference for practical teaching, as opposed to rote reading of canonical texts and practicing flowery poetry.<sup>65</sup> It was also Heishū who chose the name “Kōjōkan”, an allusion to a passage in the canonical text “Daxue/Daigaku” 大学 describing the importance of promoting virtue and avoiding arrogance, within the wider context of a ruler setting a model for his people.<sup>66</sup> The main purpose of the school was to train the sons of samurai and retainers for the improvement of domain administration, and when the school was opened in 1776 twenty students of the appropriate background were chosen to live and study there, according to the same pattern as the previous Shō’ōkan project.<sup>67</sup> Heishū came to Yonezawa for the second time in the ninth month of 1776, helped teach in the school, and also travelled about the countryside lecturing to ordinary people, returning to Edo in the fourth month of 1777.<sup>68</sup>

For purposes of the current study, it is the treatment of the Confucius temple in the new school that is of chief concern. Accounts of the earlier Kanrinden of 1697, and the private temple and Sekisai instituted by Yaoita San’in which preceded it, suggest that the focus of attention at that time was on the temple, which had a school attached to it. This is much like the pattern of the Taku temple, and

---

65 Daijōji, pp. 206–9; also summarized in Yokoyama, pp. 113–5.

66 Daijōji, pp. 209–15; Yokoyama, p. 117.

67 The names of the staff and students in the first and second cohorts are listed in Daijōji, pp. 221–8; see also Yokoyama, p. 117.

68 Yokoyama, pp. 129–32.

to some extent also the Yushima Seidō in Edo as founded by Tsunayoshi; in the latter the temple and school together were referred to as the “Seidō”, which properly speaking was the temple. Such a pattern suggests that the implementation of Confucianism was expressed first and foremost through visible ritual forms, a signal to the world of something new and different, though of course Confucian textual study in a school was linked to it. In the Kōjōkan the emphasis was very much on the school, and we must consider why the temple was retained. Its earlier function as a visible, religious-seeming manifestation of Confucianism was very much attenuated. The temple structure itself seems to have been quite small, judging from a more recent version of it which was purchased and moved to a Buddhist establishment, and in the Kōjōkan school compound it was located at the far northern edge, albeit in a position of honour (facing south), but not conspicuous at the centre of the grounds as was the case elsewhere, such as in the early eighteenth-century Meirinkan in Hagi.<sup>69</sup> Despite the unprepossessing size and location of the temple, the Sekisai sacrifice performed in it was taken quite seriously, judging by a record of the ceremony that survives, a manuscript titled *Sekisai gyōji* 釋菜行事, held in the Yonezawa City Library.<sup>70</sup> Its substantial length (132 half-side pages) and detailed contents, including three diagrams, are reflective of the care taken in planning and executing the ritual. The technical details of the Sekisai as reflected in this document have been covered in detail in

---

69 See two photographs of the surviving structure in Kido and Takahashi, pp. 76 and 77, also a diagram of the school layout on p. 74. They note that the date of the surviving building is not known; though newer than other surviving structures from the school, it may well preserve the scale and design of the early Kanrinden. See also the illustration of the Kōjōkan compound in Yokoyama, p. 116, and the map and layout on the second page of the illustrations at the start of Matsuno, *Kōjōkan jinkokuki*.

70 Shiritsu Yonezawa Toshokan, call no. Rinsen Bunko 林泉 217.

previous scholarship, but there are aspects worth emphasizing here, primarily because they demonstrate the importance accorded to it.<sup>71</sup>

The document is dated autumn of 1777. It is identified at the end as having been based on the ceremony conducted by the head teacher (*teigaku*) Katayama Isseki, and written by Senzaka Yoichi 千坂 與市 and Isseki's son Katayama Ikkō 片山 一興. The overall sequence of the ceremony covers a period of twenty-one days, seven preparatory stages from twenty days before to the day preceding, the events on the day of the ceremony itself, and the day after. The conductor of the ceremony (*shiki* 指揮) is listed as Katayama Isseki, the current head of the Katayama family, and one of the two head teachers of the school. The other head teacher, Jinbo Tsunatada, did take part in the ceremony, but Isseki's leading role as master of ceremonies suggests that when it came to the Confucius temple and the Sekisai, he was the expert, the one in charge of this aspect of the Kōjōkan's activities. Not that this is surprising, given that he was heir to family knowledge from his grandfather Katayama Mototaka, and through him and his teacher Hitomi Yūgen, back to the Sekisai as performed in Edo by Hayashi Gahō more than a century previously.

The Confucius temple and the Sekisai may not have been a high priority for Harunori, Heishū, and the reformers, but it was retained as a significant feature of the Kōjōkan nonetheless. Such a feature is typical of some other schools and temples in the late eighteenth century, though by this time only a minority of domain schools retained Confucius temples as separate independent buildings, approximately twenty percent according to one study, though the figure rises to more than seventy percent if those schools which displayed permanent or tempo-

---

71 See in particular Sudō Toshio, *Kinsei Nihon Sekiten no kenkyū*, pp. 191–213.

rary images of Confucius, or performed the Sekisai, are included.<sup>72</sup> The Yonezawa Kōjōkan displays certain parallels with its more famous counterpart, the Yushima Seidō of 1798. In contrast to earlier domain Confucius temples such as those in Taku and Hagi, which followed developments in Edo under Tsunayoshi and Yoshimune respectively, the Kōjōkan was ahead of the curve compared to the Baku-fu. The Kōjōkan temple and school were upgraded in 1776; the Yushima Seidō was rebuilt on a grand scale only in 1798, more than two decades later, this after an earlier refurbishment in 1787 simplifying and downgrading what it had been before.<sup>73</sup> A pattern of certain domains like Yonezawa leading the way in reforms is clear, likely due to their being more exposed to social and economic crisis.<sup>74</sup> The Yushima Seidō was politically contentious in ways that the Kōjōkan was not, especially with Sadanobu's prohibition of teachings other than Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism, but we still see a pattern where the choice of whether or not to have a Confucius temple was dictated less by the religious-seeming qualities of the temple itself, as it had been earlier in the Edo period, and more by the intended function of the school. Sadanobu himself, in his own domain school in Shirakawa, was one of those with a Shinto-based shrine, and no representation of

---

72 Kido and Takahashi, p. 20. This figure is based on a survey of the *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō*, which may not always represent the most up-to-date research on domain schools, but the statistics are still accurate enough to be useful.

73 See Iida Sugashi 飯田 須賀斯, “Edo jidai no Kōshibyō kenchiku 江戸時代の孔子廟建築,” in Tokugawa kōkeisō shichijūnen shukuga kinenkai 徳川公継宗七十年祝賀記念会 ed., *Kinsei Nihon no jugaku: Tokugawa kōkeisō shichijūnen shukuga kinen* 近世日本の儒学: 徳川公継宗七十年祝賀記念 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1939), pp. 956–8.

74 Harunori was one of those consulted by Matsudaira Sadanobu when he was formulating proposals for Bakufu reform in 1784; see Takazawa Noriharu 高澤 憲治, *Matsudaira Sadanobu* 松平定信 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2012), p. 57.

Confucius at all.

## Conclusion

We must of course be cautious about making generalizations about the deployment of Confucian ritual forms in domain schools from a single example, whether in the late eighteenth century, or at any time during the Edo period. Studies of the architecture and layout of domain schools and temples emphasize that they vary greatly according to the aims of those in positions of political power who built them. Still, one can argue that the case of the Yonezawa Kōjōkan does reflect wider changes in the significance of the Confucius temple and Confucian Sekiten/Sekisai ritual by the late eighteenth century. In the absence of explicit statements about the purpose of the temple of the sort composed by Taku Shigefumi for his temple in 1708, it is difficult to form clear conclusions about what it meant in the context of Yonezawa. The temple and Sekisai were religious in form, but not explicitly intended to perform a religious function. Yet it did retain a symbolic purpose deemed important enough to be worth costly architectural enhancement by a domain government of limited financial means. The founders of the Kōjōkan must have thought this symbolic purpose contributed to their educational aims, and was worth the expense, to incorporate a ritual expression of the legitimacy of the school.

Another point to make is that the Sekisai maintained by the Katayama family had a certain cultural momentum of its own, ever since its establishment by Yaoita San'in nearly a century before. One can cite the example of the Taku temple and Sekisai, which took on sufficient meaning in the local area that it has been continued right down to the present day, long after the associated school ceased

to function. We do not know how much the Katayama Sekisai involved the wider community, but it did mean a great deal to the family itself; Isseki is said to have been “delighted” when Harunori visited the temple in 1771, an event which suggests that the young ruler wished to signal his interest in the temple, and learn more about it.<sup>75</sup> In any event, it does seem likely that it held a symbolic significance that in the end fitted in well as a visible symbol of education and moral transformation, not unlike the carefully-crafted image of the ideal ruler, and thus was worth the cost and effort to upgrade it.

---

75 Sudō, *Kinsei Nihon Sekiten no kenkyū*, p. 201.

