

## Book Reviews

Review of *Zhai zi Zhongguo: Chongjian youguan "Zhongguo" de lishi lunshu* (Dwelling Here in China: Reconstructing the History of the Concept of China), by Ge Zhaoguang. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2011. [宅兹中国: 重建有关「中国」的历史论述 / 葛兆光著. 北京市: 中华书局, 2011. RMB 39.00元, 330页]

For more than the past twenty years, Ge Zhaoguang has stood at the forefront of Chinese scholarship. In his two-volume work *Zhongguo si-xiangshi* (Chinese Intellectual History), a work garnering considerable attention, he broke through the traditional great-man approach to Chinese intellectual history and pioneered an intellectual history focused on knowledge and ideas—the common knowledge used by the masses in ordinary society. Having completed this grand opus, he found himself “thoroughly exhausted.”<sup>1</sup> Nonetheless, issues raised by his research in intellectual history led him to delve into a new area without so much as taking a breather. After a few years he produced the present volume, *Zhai zi Zhongguo: Chongjian youguan "Zhongguo" de lishi lunshu* (Dwelling Here in China: Reconstructing the History of the Concept of China). Though this is a small book consisting of only three parts and eight chapters, the issues it discusses are weighty indeed. As the author says in the preface, the issues he takes up concern such great matters as the world, Asia and China, scholarship and politics, self-identification and self-exclusion, individual country histories and regional history, etc. Nearly all these issues do not exist on the same level. As the author stresses, this book is a multilevel history viewed from sundry perspectives. Using issues that he encountered and had considered over the years and drawing on his experience at the National Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies at Fudan University, he promotes the development of Chinese scholarship. Ge Zhaoguang seeks not to contemplate and struggle with issues himself. Rather, he wants Chinese scholarship to develop in new directions and develop new fields. This work can be said to be the author’s program for the new fields he proposes. Hence, evaluating this important work is not an easy task. Here I will merely present my reactions by reading this book with the hope that these comments add to the discussion.

---

1 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, “Zixu” (Preface), p. 1.

### 1. The Multiple Perspectives of This Book

The author, in his Preface, clearly states his purpose, namely, to discuss "how we should adhere to China's position while at the same time transcending China's circumstances to reconstruct the history of the notion of China in the global or Asian context."<sup>2</sup> This scholarly pursuit occupied the author for several years. In fact, these four concepts—China's position, China's circumstances, the global context, and the Asian context—conflict with one another. Finding a consistent position in the face of these conflicts is no easy task. Yet it is this multidimensional perspective that is the distinguishing feature of this book. It is herein that the value of this book lies.

The author first replies to a question raised by the Westerners, namely, What is China? Is China the ever changing nation-culture-polity of Chinese history, or is it a nation-state with clear borders, a citizenry identifying with it, and an unbroken tradition?<sup>3</sup> This is the central topic of the book. In fact, China and the West have several completely different perspectives on how to identify China and Chinese history. The present book, in sorting out and evaluating each of these perspectives, also looks at their usefulness and points out their deficiencies and problems.

First, the received view of the Chinese is that China is a multiethnic state unified from ancient times, namely, the multiethnic state whose main ethnic group is the Han people and whose borders are those of present-day China. This is the assumed view in most Chinese discussions of the past, and it has hardly ever been called into doubt, yet it is a view that the Westerners have raised all sorts of questions about. We have to reply to these questions; we cannot turn a blind eye and a deaf ear toward them. This is an important element of the author's reply to the questions of the Westerners. In politics we must explain, and in scholarship we must demonstrate. Lame arguments and fallacious reasoning only invite opposition and do nothing to move the debate forward. In this book, the author has a subconscious antipathy of such unquestioned assumptions. He does not think that situational demands or political fairness set a standard by which scholarly work is to be judged. Hence, he wants to "reconstruct the history of the notion of China." In this basic assumption lies the unique value of this book, for it enables us to cast aside much of the confusion in past perceptions and to reply more effectively to Western questions.

Next, when they raise questions, the Westerners offer theories and perceptions of various forms, which the author sorts out for us. Most Western scholars of China studies are proficient at pointing out theoretical explanatory

models, such as the theory of conquest dynasties of the 1940s, the theory of the tribute system of the 1960s and 1970s, and the regional-characteristics theory of the 1980s and later. Each of these theories exerted a profound and far-reaching influence. Even today, one can still see patent traces of these theories. After these theories came to China, some scholars adopted them wholly, without any analysis. Though this wholesale importation had some positive effect, these theories were of no help in acquiring a clear understanding of the development of the notion of China. The author, while respecting the idea of a search for theories, is unsparing in his criticism of their problems. Use of a theoretical model to explain Chinese history leaves one with the feeling that facts are being selected to fit the theory. Every theory has a degree of suitability, yet it also inevitably has its limitations. In studying and explaining a historical trend, the author does not give priority to theory. Rather, he seeks to return to the original state of history, to adopt the basic historical attitude of reviving the true state of history. Say nothing of John K. Fairbank's impact-response model, tradition and modernity model, or imperialism approach, even Paul A. Cohen's regional or provincial studies, which seek to study Chinese history from a Chinese perspective,<sup>4</sup> are colored with Western ideas. After all, do not urban-history studies, social-history studies, and the methods of historical anthropology come from the West? The author thinks that such Chinese-historical studies within the Western theoretical paradigm, that is to say, views of Chinese history acquired through a comparison of China and the West, are in fact nothing more than a reflection of Western studies, enabling one to see only the surface and general contours of history. They cannot clarify the full sweep of history or allow a detailed view of history. Such studies have their use, but they are not a necessary or sole standard by which to measure our perceptions of Chinese history. Hence, this book implicitly provides a way to reply to Western assertions. This is another important feature of this work.

Third, since one cannot rely on the conclusions of prior Chinese-style scholarship, and since Western theories have their limitations, the author pursues a program of returning to the sequence of the development of Chinese history to discuss in detail the internal and external factors leading to changes in Chinese history, using the East Asian or Asian perspective to probe China's perception of its periphery and the outside world and the periphery's perception of China, and then coming up with his own views. This multidimensional approach, while avoiding the inadequacies of a unitary

2 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, "Zixu," pp. 3-4.

3 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, "Xushuo" (Introduction), p. 4.

4 See "A China-Centered History of China," in Paul A. Cohen, *Discovering History in China: American Historical Writing on the Recent Chinese Past* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984).

approach, enables one to see historical developments in all areas and thereby derive a more realistic apprehension. The results can be said to be a systematic inference, with a totally new perception. As a matter of fact, using China's perceptions of the periphery and the periphery's understanding of China amounts to more than just pursuing a scholarly viewpoint; it expands the scope of research on the history of China, breaking through "discovering history in China" (see n. 4), and thus offsetting its inadequacies. By deciphering the Korean, Japanese, and Annamese courts' understandings and perceptions of China, as well as changes in these understandings and perceptions over time, we can gain insight into some features of Chinese history itself. Regardless of whether there was a common Asian or East Asian identity, since there was an identical or similar historical background, peripheral countries such as Japan and Korea, under the watchful eye of such institutions as Confucianism, Buddhism, and literary Chinese learning, preserved many Chinese sources, and the literati in these countries strongly identified with Chinese history in their thought. Only from the modern age did China, Japan, and Korea take different historical paths. As the author says, through the watchful eyes of neighboring East Asian countries, we can more clearly perceive the fine details of Chinese culture, and thus have a greater probability of approaching historical reality. This is the methodology that the author has vigorously pursued. It is also a field of research that the author has arduously proposed in recent years. And this book provides the guiding principles of research in this field.

In addition, this book also touches on the doctrines of religions and the viewpoints of various regions. The entire book consists of three parts and eight chapters. Part 1, "Understanding China through History," presents the perspective of Chinese history itself. Part 2, "Crisscrossing Asia, East Asia, and China," presents the Asian perspective. And part 3, "A Methodology for Understanding the History of Asia and China," discusses theoretical issues in his methodology for researching Chinese history. He thus covers various levels of history and sundry perspectives on history. Just as a physical object is three-dimensional, so history is multidimensional, multifaceted, and multi-layered. Hence, from multiple perspectives, there naturally are multiple explanations in the elaboration of Chinese history. Accordingly, we must engage in multiple studies of the events of Chinese history and offer multiple explanations. This is perhaps the author's basic point and his original purpose in writing this book.

## 2. The Multifaceted Nature of the Author's Research Topics

A multiple perspective aims at a multifaceted history. The author points out that understanding Chinese history requires knowledge of three areas,

namely, history, culture, and politics. "From the viewpoint of history, China is an entity whose spatial borders change. From the point of view of cultural identity, China is a community with a clear and stable culture in its core region, though the boundaries of the periphery may be somewhat fuzzy. From the point of view of the political system, 'China,' as many people use the name, refers to a dynasty or a government, but this dynasty or government, in terms of political significance, is not the same as China the country, and is certainly not the China mentioned in historiography."<sup>5</sup> The author thus clearly divides China studies into three areas. This division enables us to return to the long flow of history and see Chinese history as a dynamic process of development, and also see the multifaceted issues of Chinese history. Hence, this book asserts that to understand Chinese history, we need to study different levels of history, with a special focus on the level of the history of ideas and the history of thought.

The historical viewpoint emphasizes regional shifts in China. That is, we cannot entirely rely on the borders of a given time to understand the borders of the historical China, since the borders of China in every dynasty were different. The borders of China during the Han dynasty were completely different from those of the Tang dynasty, and those of the Yuan dynasty were completely different from those of the Ming dynasty. We have to adopt a historical attitude. If we ignore the peculiar features of particular historical periods and rely entirely on our present understanding, we will end up with one-sided views of other ages' perceptions and evaluations of Chinese historical issues brought about by shifting borders. Part 1, "Understanding China through History," seeks the special features of the different ages of Chinese history from a historical viewpoint. On the formation of the state, the West has consistently maintained that the nation-state is a modern phenomenon. This viewpoint comes, of course, from Western society and history. Using this theory to explain Chinese history gives rise to many problems, such as a problem that Western Sinologists delight in discussing. As these Sinologists view matters, throughout Chinese history there have only existed such dynasties as the Han, Tang, Song, Yuan, Ming, and Qing; there has never been a truly modern China. This view in fact involves placing theory before evidence and selecting facts to fit the theory, since using this point of view to explain Chinese history and the formation of the Chinese nation has severe limitations. After extensively analyzing Song historical circumstances, the author points out, "Historically, a state that has borders has a definite territory, and a state that has territory constitutes a nation-state with international relations. Owing to pressure from other increasingly powerful states, China

5 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, "Xushuo," Appendix 1, p. 35.

gradually formed from the Song dynasty on. Chinese firmly identified with the culture of this nation-state, and its historical tradition already had a solid foundation. Moreover, ethical living in China was uniform and widespread, and the sphere of governmental administration was quite definite. Hence, the Chinese nation-state is not necessarily connected with Western 'modernity,' either spatio-temporally or in terms of subject matter."<sup>6</sup> Thus, Western modernity is conceptually ill-suited for explaining the Chinese nation-state, because "China did not develop from an empire into a nation-state. Rather, in the awareness of a borderless 'empire' was the concept of a limited 'state,' and in the cognizance of the limited 'state' was preserved the image of the 'empire.'"<sup>7</sup> This argument is quite important. It not only frees us from such theoretical interference from the West, but also provides an important conclusion obtained from the concrete details of Chinese history. It also puts on display the author's extraordinary penetration and strong theoretical constructiveness. By freeing ourselves of the Western theoretical control, taking as our point of departure the details of Chinese history, and elucidating the special features of Chinese history, we have eclipsed the relevant Western theories.

Though historically the dynasties of China had shifting borders, this in no way affected the clear and stable identification of the people of the central regions with Chinese culture. This is the central point of the present work. Be it shifting borders or rising and falling dynasties, or even the division and unification of Chinese territory or the movement of peoples—no such events determined the standard of judgment for Chinese history: identification with the culture. Precisely because there was this identification with the culture, we have in Chinese history this historical regularity of long division leading to unity (*fen jiu bi he*), as well as the Mongol Yuan dynasty and Manchu Qing dynasty unifying the country. More than four centuries of division during the Wei, Jin, and Northern and Southern Dynasties period led to the thriving and prosperous Sui and Tang dynasties. Any theory that denies identification with Chinese culture and favors another level of explanation is unreasonable and inapt. This cultural identification found expression within historical China and without as well, that is, in China's relations with the periphery. In parts 1 and 2, the present work explores the profound influence of this cultural identification. Whether it be Chinese perceptions of peripheral regions prior to the

6 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, "Xushuo," "Houxiandai lishixue: Cong minzuguojia zhengjiu shenme lishi?" (Postmodern Historiography: What Type of History Should We Save from the Nation-State?), pp. 25-26.

7 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, "Xushuo," "Ru he zai Zhongguo lishi zhong lijie lishi Zhongguo" (How Should We Understand Historical China in Chinese History?), pp. 28-29.

arrival of Matteo Ricci or Korean or Japanese perceptions of China after the seventeenth century, the central issue is identification with Chinese culture. Hence, this perception of and connectedness with Chinese culture is an important standard for understanding Chinese history and an important perspective for grasping the premodern East Asian world. This cultural identification not only found expression in the tribute system and in depictions of foreign lands; it was also reflected in maps. The author points out that premodern Chinese descriptions of foreign lands "were not based on contemporary individuals' knowledge of actual reality but rather were imaginative creations about 'China' and the 'four barbarians' of the world as understood through the tribute system."<sup>8</sup> This is a profound conclusion. One can see that the author construes the issue of cultural identification as an important measure of the multifaceted nature of historical development and as the central research topic of this book.

The third level of historical research is research on political history, and the author, of course, sees this level of research as important. But the present work stresses that if we ignore cultural identification in Chinese history and identify China with a particular dynasty or government, the results will appear very biased. The author thus firmly denies such Western theories as the theory of conquest dynasties, the theory of nationalism, etc. He especially denigrates the tendency in the West to separate off from Chinese history the Yuan and Qing dynasties, dynasties founded by minority nomadic peoples, rashly rending the holism of Chinese history and ignoring the core issue of Chinese cultural identification in Chinese history. For in Chinese history, race and ethnicity were never a criterion for judging Chinese history, whereas culture and cultural identification were. This fundamental viewpoint of the present work, a new perspective for the new age, derives from and develops Chen Yanke's "race and culture" thesis and Tu Weiming's theory of "cultural China." Some Western Sinologists are satisfied with fragmentary knowledge and partial understanding of Chinese history and are incapable of seeing the total picture of Chinese history and its overall characteristics, and this leads them to introduce distortions. Hence, this book emphasizes that research in Chinese history requires knowledge of three complementary and interconnected areas. Only by adopting a multilevel, multiperspective method of elaborating Chinese history and understanding the connections of these three areas can we grasp the nature of China and Chinese history. If we grasp one aspect without knowing the rest, we will be unable to see the obvious and

8 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, chapter 2, "Shanhaijing, zhigongtu he luyouji zhong de yiyu jiyi" (Recollections of Foreign Lands in *The Classic of Mountains and Seas*, Tribute Paintings, and Travelogues), p. 83.

will find ourselves lost in a labyrinth of bias and narrow perspective. Hence, though a linear, complex history can explain some aspects of Chinese history, it can hardly grasp the overall characteristics inherent in Chinese history. The author emphasizes a multidimensional perspective, the three most important levels of which are the perspectives of history, culture, and politics.

Yet geographical borders cannot define the scope of research on Chinese history. When systematically researching the thread of internal development of Chinese history, by looking at perceptions in the periphery—especially Korea, Japan, and Southeast Asia—we can supplement the deficiencies of an exclusive interest in Chinese history by itself. This approach is not only superior to researching Chinese history under the Western paradigm; it also expands the scope of research on Chinese history and gives expression to the special features of multifaceted research in this area. In this work the author—whether discussing Japanese peripheral studies at the turn of the twentieth century or advocating a comprehensive research methodology of taking into account everything from the western regions to the eastern seas—displays this multifaceted, multiperspective, multidimensional manner of research. It appears in his perspectives, is reflected in his source materials, and finds expression in the research topics he discusses. Thus, the great contribution of this book lies in its breaking through received judgments and definitions to open up entirely new vistas and directions for development.

### 3. Questions

At first glance, the present work's theoretical stance does not seem very strong in comparison with other works, but a close reading leaves one feeling that this book reveals a broad research perspective, opens up entirely new vistas in research in Chinese history, and offers a vast theoretical framework based on a solid foundation of specialized research. Within this theoretical paradigm, it is worthwhile to reevaluate many theses, and restudy many issues, in Chinese history. Precisely for this reason, the excellent guidance and superior scholarship contained in this work are well worthy of careful study. Any work, of course, has its strong points as well as its deficiencies. Especially in a work of broad theoretical import like this, it is difficult for even the most knowledgeable author to avoid one slip among a thousand concerns. That said, here I will raise a few doubts that occurred to me in the course of reading this book.

In the preface, the author explains that “Zhai zi Zhongguo” (Dwelling Here in China [the Central Kingdoms]) in the title comes from the inscription on the He Zun, a Western Zhou bronze wine vessel discovered in 1963 in Baoji, Shaanxi, thereby hinting at his reverence for the Western Zhou dynasty (11th cent.-771 BCE). For sure, Western Zhou had the most important influ-

ence on China, for Western Zhou played a crucial role in the formation of the Chinese people and in the establishment of China's institutions and ideas. The history of China as a relatively integrated whole began with the Shang (16th-11th cent. BCE) and Zhou (11th cent.-256 BCE) dynasties. The book's subtitle is “Chongjian youguan ‘Zhongguo’ de lishi lunshu” (Reconstructing the History of the Concept of China). This gives the reader the impression that the work discusses historiography on the whole of Chinese history. But the whole book mainly focuses on Chinese history from the Song period (960-1279) on. It is a response to relevant Western, mainly American, Sinological theses. Though the book occasionally mentions historical and related theses pertaining to periods prior to the Song period, in general it does not systematically discuss them. It builds on a foundation of specialized research and is somewhat different from the general run of monographs. Hence, this criticism is perhaps a bit of nitpicking, but when I look at the title of this book, I always feel that the contents of the book have not lived up to the billing of the title. Hence, if in the future the author were to supplement his work by considering pre-Song history and relevant theses so as to make it cover all of Chinese history, the theory of this work would be improved and the reader would have a deeper understanding of the whole of Chinese history.

The author is an important scholar of Chinese intellectual history, and the present work comes out of his research of that history. In this work the author greatly stresses ordering the history of scholarship and understanding intellectual history. The three areas that the author emphasizes in China studies—history, culture, and politics—all ultimately matter in terms of identification, that is, identifying with Chinese history, identifying with Chinese culture, and identifying with Chinese politics. This in some sense is a development of the author's approach to research in the history of Chinese thought, and in fact, this whole book is quite relevant to Chinese intellectual history. This can be clearly seen in the titles of some of the chapters, such as chapter 1, “The Origin of an Awareness of China in the Song Period: Early Sources of Nationalism in the Early Modern Age”; chapter 2, “Recollections of Foreign Lands in *The Classic of Mountains and Seas*, Tribute Paintings, and Travelogues: Sources of, and Changes in, Chinese Awareness of Foreign Lands before and after the Arrival of Matteo Ricci”; and chapter 3, “Old Maps as Artifacts in the History of Ideas.” These titles all clearly express approaches to research in the history of Chinese thought. This relevance to Chinese intellectual history is a feature of this book. Thus, the author, in reconstructing the history of the notion of China, does so from the point of view of intellectual history. This is an important point, for this approach gives rise to many new conceptions. Though R. G. Collingwood (1889-1943) once

said, "All history is the history of thought," the level of intellectual history cannot take the place of the level of the actual happenings of history. Hence, only paying attention to intellectual history and ignoring the actual happenings of history can give rise to problems.

For example, in discussing identification with East Asia, the author states, "If there really was identification with East Asia, it occurred before the mid-seventeenth century."<sup>9</sup> This assertion creates two problems. First, what is identification with East Asia? Is it identification with Confucian culture? Or is it political identification or identification with an economic community? The truth is that at different levels, we should give different responses. With the diversification of culture since the start of the modern age, identification with East Asia has become more complicated, but economically the region is becoming increasingly interconnected day by day. Receiving greater emphasis today in the East Asian community are economic and geographical factors. Hence, East Asian debates of the present and East Asian debates prior to the seventeenth century logically should be on different levels and from different vantage points. Second, prior to the mid-seventeenth century, was there any identification with East Asia? In answer to this question, we have a later time limit, but not an earlier time limit—an issue that the book does not clearly discuss much. We know that prior to the seventeenth century the Ming dynasty made efforts to establish a Chinese world with the Ming court as its center. It was this order that people identified with in East Asia. But what were the circumstances in dynasties before the Ming, such as the Yuan, Song, and Tang dynasties? This is a topic worthy of detailed investigation.

The present work also states, "During the Ming and Qing periods, Japan, Korea, and China, in transitioning from being one cultural family to going their separate ways, reflected the final collapse of the Orient, that is, an East Asian identification based on the culture of China. This gradual going of separate ways seemed to embody a great internal breakup of the Oriental culture."<sup>10</sup> This perception is a grasp of some features of intellectual history, but it is hardly a statement of all the features of history, since this breakup was not all that perspicacious. Though there were some cultural rifts, they hardly amounted to a breakup. The elements of division were insufficient to rupture the great East Asian network of Confucian culture. Rather, they were only enough to raise doubts and rebellions against East Asian unity, but because the influence of the West was still quite uncertain, nothing new came of these rebellions. Indeed, Nishijima Sadao's four pillars of the East Asian

9 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, "Xushuo," p. 12.

10 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, chapter 4, "Xifang yu Dongfang, huozhe shi Dongfang yu Dongfang" (West and East, or East and East), pp. 152-153.

world—Chinese characters, Confucianism, Buddhism, and the Chinese traditional legal system—were still in place, as before, and though there were fissures in East Asian identification, with the result that the East Asian world was not as unified as under the Ming dynasty, still this cultural sphere persisted. And from the mid-eighteenth century, these fissures gave way to revival of pre-sixteenth century unity. Thus, in the early nineteenth century, both Japan and Korea, when first confronted with Western attacks, adopted a policy of national seclusion, and China, Japan, and Korea all remained committed to Confucian culture. To take Korea as an example, perhaps Korea did not identify with Qing China as much as it identified with Ming China, but this does not imply that Korea totally lacked identification with Qing China. Though early in the Qing period Korea harbored strong rebellious sentiments against the Qing court, by the late Qianlong period (1736-1795), it started to change. While in its discourse it continued to call the Qing court "barbarians" (*yidi*), in terms of actual actions, it greatly changed how it regarded the Qing court, which it now regarded as a suzerain. Hence, when in the modern period Korea faced invasion from the West and Japan, Korea turned to the Qing court for support. And the Qing court lived up to its duty to protect Korea to the point where war broke out between China and Japan (the First Sino-Japanese War) in 1894-1895 when their interests collided. From this one can see that history never follows a straight line, nor does it totally develop in one direction. There are many reversals and complications.

The present work points out, in relation to the above, that some Koreans thought, "What came after the Ming dynasty was not China."<sup>11</sup> This is one of this book's most important perspectives. This perspective relies mainly on an essay by Kim Chong-hu (1721-1780) challenging Hong Tae-yong (1731-1783), pioneer of the Northern School, in which he criticizes Hong Tae-yong for his association with the Qing scholar Yan Cheng (1732-1767). While this line of thinking represented the thought of some Koreans of the time, as Hong Tae-yong said in response to this criticism, this line of thinking is not practical. Hong Tae-yong criticized Koreans who thought of themselves as a "little China," as engaging in parochial arrogance. He forcefully stated the matter thus: "We in the east are the barbarians! . . . Why call for such a taboo?"<sup>12</sup> That is to say, quite a number of people did not think that Korea was culturally superior to Qing China. After all, Koreans were called

11 Ge Zhaoguang, *Zhai zi Zhongguo*, chapter 4, "Xifang yu Dongfang, huozhe shi Dongfang yu Dongfang," p. 153.

12 Hong Tae-yong, "Utae Chikchae sŏ" (Another Reply to Kim Chong-hu), in *Tamhŏn sŏ* (Collected Works of Hong Tae-yong) (Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Ch'ujinhoe, 1999), vol. 3, p. 67.

“barbarians” (*yi*). Compared to Kim Chong-hu, Hong Tae-yong represented a new generation of literati coming to the fore. This new generation of literati took the former remote identification with China and gradually aligned it closer to Qing China. With the appearance of the Northern School and under the leadership of such men as Yi Tök-mu (1741-1793), Pak Che-ka (1750-1805), and Pak Chi-wön (1737-1805), Korean literati cast their lot with Qing China and positively interacted with Qing scholars. At the height of such interaction, their dealings greatly exceeded Korean dealings with Ming scholars. Hence, Kim Chong-hu’s statement “What came after the Ming dynasty was not China” was no more than a statement; it did not reflect the reality of history at all.

SUN Weiguo  
College of History, Nankai University



Review of *Kinsei Higashi Ajia kaiiki no bunka kōshō* (Cultural Interactions in Maritime East Asia during Premodern Times), by Matsuura Akira. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2010. [近世東アジア海域の文化交渉/松浦章著. 京都: 思文閣出版, 2010, ¥9,000, 448頁]

This book, with copious illustrations and maps, ample quotations from Chinese and Japanese primary sources, and detailed analysis, is a masterful treatment of the cultural contacts among East Asian countries during the Ming and Qing periods. It makes a major contribution to the development of a promising new discipline: cultural interaction studies. Departing from the traditional approach, which examines international relations from the viewpoint of a single country or two countries, this new discipline treats East Asia as a complex and multilayered cultural entity. It pays attention to the formation of culture and its spread to other countries. But more important, it also attempts to answer the fundamental question of how different cultures within East Asia were transformed when they encountered one another.

The book under review is a collection of sixteen articles published from 2002 to 2009. The author has carefully revised these articles before incorporating them into this collection. He has also organized the articles into four parts, each examining a specific topic.

The four articles in part 1 deal with issues concerning cultural contacts between Qing China and Japan. There are detailed discussions of the Qing court’s changing policies toward maritime activities and how these changes affected Tokugawa Japan, which lacked formal diplomatic relations with China and secluded itself from international contacts. Yet Japan at that time did not live in total isolation from the outside world. Although the Japanese shogunate officially banned Japanese commoners from maritime trade, it allowed Chinese merchants to trade at Nagasaki, which served as a window for Sino-Japanese cultural exchanges. When Japan eventually opened its door to the outside world, the Japanese government established a shipping line between Japan and Shanghai as a channel for trade, transportation, and communication with Qing China. The Qing court tried to open a similar line to be operated by its own steamboats, but the Japanese government blocked that effort.

Part 2 of the book, also consisting of four articles, focuses on cultural interactions between Qing China, Korea, and Ryukyu. These articles reveal that interactions between two countries could also take place in a third country. In 1534 envoys from Korea and Ryukyu visited the Ming court. They took the opportunity to know not only their host, but also one another. Moreover, cultural interactions were the business of both officials and commoners. In the case of China, people from coastal Fujian Province played an important role. Detailed discussions of the economic backgrounds of these people offer a convincing explanation for their motive in leaving home to seek a new life overseas.

Part 3 of the book touches on how cultural interactions were conducted between Qing China and Tokugawa Japan. The first case is that of Ichikawa Kansai (市河寛齋), a late-Edo period poet who authored *Zuien shishō* (隨園詩鈔 Selected Poems from Suiyuan). When compiling his work, Ichikawa did not simply transcribe all the poems from the original Chinese work, *Suiyuan shihua* (隨園詩話), by Yuan Mei (袁枚). Instead, he acquired the *Xiao Cangshan fang shichao* (小倉山房詩鈔), another work by Yuan Mei, and selected from it only certain poems for inclusion in his own work. Ichikawa’s practice indicates that when introducing Chinese literary works to Japan, Japanese scholars did not embark on wholesale cultural importation from China. Rather, they were selective when borrowing from China. This was a very important aspect of Sino-Japanese cultural relations.

Participants in cultural interactions were not confined to intellectuals in China and neighboring countries. Commoners with minimum education in China were also a part of this process. Asian sailors on the high seas sometimes suffered shipwreck. When they were rescued by local authorities in China, Korea, Japan, Ryukyu, or Vietnam, they would stay for a short period