

which was the Hall of Great Completion, the Dachengdian 大成殿, in which the sacrifice to Kongzi was performed.

The Revolution of 1911, which ended the Qing dynasty and ushered in the modern era in China, created new challenges for the Kongzi cult, which was now “situated within the political space of the nation” (127). Conservatives defended the Kong Temple from attacks by iconoclasts who cast Confucianism as the villain hindering China’s attempts to create a New Culture suitable for the nation-state. Despite its secularizing bent, the Nationalist government confirmed the Kong Duke’s title, recognizing the continued potency of the cult as a symbol of Chinese identity. The temple itself, damaged during the warlord period and ravaged by the Red Guards during the Cultural Revolution years (1966–76) and the anti-Lin (Biao 林彪) anti-Confucius campaign of 1974, made a comeback in the post-Mao era. The Kong cemetery, family mansion, and temple complex have been designated as a World Heritage Site by UNESCO since 1994.

Tourism is the *raison d’être* of today’s Qufu, and the new profit-making ethos is exemplified in the activities of the Kong Mansion Family Industrial Group, which engages in business promotions. Local authorities seek attractions that will keep visitors for longer than the several hours they tend to spend touring the site and viewing the ritual sacrifice to Confucius staged for their benefit. Flath reports that in 2014 an international chain hotel and new Kongzi museum were on the list of future construction projects. His epilogue presents photographs of the new architecture that strives to combine the old and the new in the now commercialized environment that threatens to overshadow the historical monuments.

Flath’s study is full of details that will appeal to specialists of Confucianism and Chinese popular religion, but general readers may require a bit more explanation than he provides. His analysis of the spatial layout of the Kong Temple complex in Ming and Qing times relies heavily on photographs and would have been enhanced by the inclusion of a good map. The reproductions of woodblock prints showing the Kong temple in earlier historical periods are too small to be useful to the reader and lack translated titles. The book has many interesting insights, for example (97–101) the conflict between the Ming/Qing elite’s intention of demarcating a sacred space and the public’s pursuit of convenience, which resulted in the everyday infringement of the frontal courtyards of the temple by townsfolk seeking a shortcut.

Despite an early sixteenth-century attempt to remove sculptural images from Confucius temples around the country, for most of the time after the middle of the sixth century, the Kong Temple featured his “effigy,” attired in kingly robes and headdress, and sculptural images of his followers. In sacrificing before effigies, the Kong Temple was thus a distinct anomaly to the Confucius temples, *wenmiao* 文庙, that were part of the townscape of every administrative seat in late imperial China, which featured tablets but not sculptural images as objects of veneration after 1530.

Maiden Voyage: The Senzaimaru and the Creation of Modern Sino-Japanese Relations. By JOSHUA A. FOGEL. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014. 301 + 10 pp. \$60.

REVIEWED BY R. KENT GUY, University of Washington (qing@uw.edu)
doi:10.1017/jch.2016.14

For several decades now, Joshua Fogel has taught us in the China field what it needs to know about Sino-Japanese cultural relations in well-researched, well-written accounts that sparkle with clear translations of primary sources. *Maiden Voyage: The Senzaimaru and the Creation of Modern Sino-Japanese Relations* is no exception. It is the compelling story of how in 1862 the Japanese of the late Tokugawa period bought a western ship, hired a crew to sail them to Shanghai, spent

two months observing the port, then sailed home to process the information. The book also deals briefly with two subsequent Japanese voyages, and with modern Japanese cinematic treatments of the first voyage. The story is very well told, with all the loving touches of a fine historian absorbed in his craft. We read of the Lloyd's of London Registry records of the ship before it was sold to the Japanese, and the genealogy of the Dutch consular official who served as the unofficial port agent for the ship. But what is most interesting about the book is not the quality of its narrative—which is very high—but the fascinating moment it highlights, a moment when the early modern met the modern, and the Japanese met the nineteenth century.

Fogel is careful to point out that the origins of the mission lay not in the energies of modernizing post-Meiji Japan, but in the older world of the Tokugawa. The organizer of the mission was the Nagasaki magistrate, the senior participants were samurai, the names of the merchants involved all ended in “ya,” a remnant of the Tokugawa caste system. This was an age when the Japanese who went to sea did so on fishing boats, not vessels meant for international voyages, and samurai needed the services of an experienced foreign crew to get them to Shanghai. The interactions Japanese had with the Chinese they met were through traditional “brush conversations,” where each side wrote in the characters common to their languages. Fogel is scrupulous in his account to avoid modernist overtones.

Yet the Japanese identified China on their first sighting as the land where the Opium war was fought, the opening moment of China's modern history. One voyager described his first view of China, along one bank of the Yangzi:

There is a row of cannon emplacements on the southern bank, emerging in an uneven form; at strategic points, one can see that they have been effectively fortified, but there are no cannons in them. The captain said that twenty years ago, not only was this area outfitted with cannon, but the houses were crammed together like sardines. At that time the British wanted to enter the port of Shanghai; because it was being defended, they could not do so. So the British set fire and burned down people's homes and the cannons were snatched up. Now only the emplacements remain. (62)

Normally, contemplating the early modern period is like peering through a dense fog—not unlike the one the *Senzaimaru* encountered on its first day out of Nagasaki—searching for the outlines of something recognizably modern. Here, the situation is reversed: we are seeing post-Opium War modern China, through early modern Japanese eyes.

It is important to keep the chronologies of the story straight because, as Fogel argues in the last chapter of the book, twentieth-century treatments of the event have not always done so. The best example here is the case of the Taiping. As military men, the samurai on the *Senzaimaru* mission were interested in warfare going on just outside Shanghai at the time of their visit, battles between the Taiping general Li Xiucheng 李秀成, and the western-led Ever Victorious Army. A bit more might have been said about the battles, as the history of the Ever Victorious Army is fairly well known. But this is not crucial, for as the historical record and Fogel make very clear, the men of the *Senzaimaru* never saw a battle, or met with either Taiping or Ever Victorious Army leaders. This did not prevent a movie made during World War II from depicting a meeting between the leader of the *Senzaimaru* group, Takasugi Shinsaku, and a leader of the Taiping. In the movie an alliance is formed between the samurai and the Taiping leader, an opponent of a corrupt and decadent Qing dynasty barely propped up by foreign powers. In the last scene, both Takasugi and his erstwhile Taiping friend deliver a statement in their native tongue, as the other murmurs “I understand.” Fogel comments tartly: “The thrust of this comment is exactly the opposite, as if to say ‘I actually don't understand a word of what you have just uttered, but what I now understand to be truly important is that Asians band together against the Western invader’” (182). That such a bizarre meeting occurred could only be believed in a movie shaped by wartime propaganda.

As Fogel argues, the Japanese on the *Senzaimaru* wanted to learn about China and the west. But actually, what they encountered in Shanghai was neither Chinese nor western, but a hybrid more characteristic of the period than of either country. The growth of large port cities, sustained by sea-borne trade (whether propelled by wind or steam), with resident diplomatic representatives was characteristic not just of the China coast, or of Asia, but of the entire world in the nineteenth century, as Jurgen Osterhammel has argued in his *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*. The nineteenth century had arguably not yet come to Japan, but was very much in evidence in Shanghai, and Japanese reactions suggested patterns of what was to come. The Japanese were amazed at the “forest of masts” they encountered in Shanghai harbor; they were sympathetic, if a bit disdainful, of the humiliation the Chinese suffered at the hands of the west. They observed western arrogance, but found the western diplomatic system useful and found themselves admiring the cleanliness and order of the western concessions. It was through the assistance of western diplomats that they obtained an interview with the Shanghai Daotai. Like time-travellers from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, the Japanese on the *Senzaimaru* had a vision of what was to come.

All in all, the Japanese did pretty well in Shanghai. They did not sell all the goods they had brought with them, but they learned much of what there was to know about Shanghai. And through meticulous research and careful presentation, we learn what there is to know about the trip in *Maiden Voyage*.

China's Transition to Modernity: The New Classical Vision of Dai Zhen. By MINGHUI HU. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2015. 298 pp. \$50.00.

REVIEWED BY MATTHEW MOSCA, University of Washington (mosca@u.washington.edu)
doi:10.1017/jch.2016.10

Twentieth-century appraisers of Dai Zhen 戴震 discovered elements in his thought, for instance “early modern individualism and objective methodology” (3), that seemed to transcend the High Qing and reveal some form of incipient modernity. Though he does not reject these familiar judgments, Minghui Hu deliberately sidesteps them to investigate instead Dai’s quest to place his powerful technical methodology in the service of the “reconstruction of the classical world” (5). This project was founded on a “utopian vision” of that world, the conviction that in its totality it “demonstrated a cohesive whole of cosmological and political order” (9). This “new classical vision” is the conceptual thread on which the chapters of this book hang.

To provide context, Hu paints on a broad canvas. His story begins long before Dai’s birth with the introduction to China of Jesuit mathematical astronomy, concentrating on the attack launched against it by Yang Guangxian 楊光先 in 1664 and its recovery upon the commencement of Kangxi’s personal rule. As its influence expanded, Jesuit astronomy produced at court the problem of “reconciling an increasingly quantified view of the sky with the need to trace all truth back to the ancients” (52). In other words, how did the new astronomy relate to classical learning? In the next chapter, Dai’s outlook is contrasted with two others, more parochial, that stood in mutual opposition. One belonged to the eccentric Fr. Joachim Bouvet, who thought that the wisdom of the *Yijing* was not specifically Chinese but rather once common throughout the post-diluvian world. Mei Wending 梅文鼎, one of the first Chinese scholars to master the mathematical astronomy of the Jesuits without being their protégé, thought by contrast that missionary knowledge had originated in ancient China and only later diffused westward—an opinion he shared with Kangxi. Although Hu later tells us that Dai too held this view (129), he emphasizes here that unlike Bouvet