

The volume concludes with a brief “Afterword: Rethinking Western printing with Chinese comparisons” by Ann Blair, a distinguished scholar of European printing and publishing. I do not detect any major rethinking of her understanding of Western printing, and in fact I doubt that any is possible without quite a lot of reading and thinking about both histories, much of it on contexts not often discussed in specialized works on printing and publishing.

The two volumes here reviewed are major contributions to our understanding of these specialized histories in China, indispensable reading not just for scholars of printing and publishing but for all students of China in their periods. Editing and scholarly apparatus are exemplary in both. I have suggested that more could have been said about wider contexts in many of the essays. Readers coming from other specialisms will see more such openings, and make these remarkable works of erudition and interpretation stepping stones to new points of view and comparisons far beyond their apparent topics.

**John E. Wills, Jr.**

University of Southern California (emeritus)

SEBASTIEN BILLILOUD:

*Thinking through Confucian Modernity: A Study of Mou Zongsan’s Moral Metaphysics.*

(Modern Chinese Studies.) 247 pp. Leiden: Brill, 2012. ISBN 978 90 04 21553 5.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X12001371

Despite the inherent complexities and difficulties, it has never ceased to be an intriguing and tantalizing task to reflect on the academic achievements of the great Confucian minds which emerged in the second half of the twentieth century, among whom Mou Zongsan (1909–95) is indisputably among the outstanding figures who perpetuate Confucian tradition in the radically turbulent social context of modern China. The questions he has raised both to the Confucian tradition and to its relevance to modernity continue to inspire scholars and students in Confucian studies and beyond. Although numerous books on him have been published over the last few decades in various languages, this newly released monograph by Sebastien Billioud, with a particular focus on Mou’s moral metaphysics, has brought fresh impetus to this field and signified new scholarship in the study of Mou Zongsan, skilfully revealing the author’s own thinking and research on Confucian modernity.

Given the all-embracing nature of Mou’s system as well as his abundant intellectual output (32 volumes in total), a discerning eye is necessary to find the crux of the matter. Billioud’s preference for the subject of “moral metaphysics” has undoubtedly provided the reader with a clear entrance to the innermost part of Mou’s system – philosophical speculation and conceptual construction – and enabled us to glimpse Mou’s massive project as a whole.

The question of moral metaphysics constitutes the core of Mou’s philosophical thinking and, to a large extent, exemplifies his method and writing style. Based on his understanding of both Mou Zongsan and Kant, Billioud demonstrates that the term “moral metaphysics” in Mou’s context has an origin in Kant’s “metaphysics of morals” but evidently forms a sharp contrast to the latter. Thus an insightful thesis is put forward in this book, which can be summarized as follows: Inspired by

Kant, Mou intends to anchor his thinking in the realm of the noumenal; but unlike Kant who aims to seek the metaphysical principles or non-empirical conditions for morals, Mou assigns to his “moral metaphysics” a rather different task, namely to formulate within Confucian tradition a practical approach to self-accomplishment that is simultaneously performing in the dimension of metaphysical, cosmological or ontological reality.

Unsurprisingly philosophical discussion dominates this book, and in-depth philosophical analysis is what the author intends. Instead of delineating an overall account of Mou’s moral metaphysics, Billioud confines his research to the pivotal concepts that have constituted and also characterized Mou’s thought on this issue, namely, “autonomy of the moral subject”, “intellectual intuition” and “thing in itself”. These three topics are dealt with respectively in chapters 1, 2 and 3. Mou obviously falls back on Kant when it comes to philosophical speculation. However, he is merely “borrowing” Kantian conceptions to serve his own theoretical purposes, which is to reconstruct or even rewrite the intellectual history of Confucian tradition. Put more bluntly, Mou is, intentionally or otherwise, using Kantian conceptions to undermine Zhu Xi’s orthodox status, and he may never have meant to conceptualize his own thinking in the vein of Kant. Such a stance explains Mou’s failure in many respects from the perspective of Kantian philosophy and his somehow ambiguous position in speculating on a new philosophical system. As revealed in this book, Mou’s adoption of Kantian concepts is overly problematic and his knowledge of Kant is far from complete. This cannot of course be regarded as a new discovery, but Billioud does much more than simply disclose the defects of Mou Zongsan’s philosophy. The unique contribution of this book lies in making use of large quantities of primary and secondary resources. In addition, Billioud examines in detail the excerpts from Mou’s comments, in the context of the excerpts from Kant’s original text and of the most up-to-date research on particular topics. The latter, often given in footnotes, covers a wide range of new studies carried out by scholars of diverse backgrounds, Chinese, English, French and German.

From chapter 4 onwards the focus shifts to Mou’s reconstruction of Confucian tradition. Chapter 4 presents an overall analysis of Mou’s so-called fundamental ontology, which serves as a transitional phase to close Mou’s dialogue with the Western tradition and to open up his reinterpretation of his own tradition. Billioud then examines Mou’s insights concerning two typical Confucian conceptions, namely, moral emotion and self-cultivation, which make up chapters 5 and 6. Being equipped with the Western philosophical concepts and rooted in the Confucian tradition, Mou’s exegeses of these conceptions involve a mixture of the Western and Confucian terms; for instance, “intellectual intuition” is blended with “retrospective verification” (逆覺體證)(p. 205). That, however, is not a problem for Mou and his enterprise, because to him philosophical speculation serves to illuminate or elucidate the perfect Confucian teaching, whose authenticity lies in moral practice and whose aim is beyond the scope of any type of intellectual operation.

Mou’s moral metaphysics is splendidly unfolded in this book. If there is one weakness, it is its lack of awareness of the same mentality that underlies Mou’s dialogue with Western philosophies and with Confucian traditions. Mou not only maintained a “deliberate silence” (p. 82) on intellectual development in the West which is highly relevant to his thinking, but was also “deliberately oblivious” to the similar sources in the Confucian intellectual tradition, which is particularly obvious in his treatment of Zhu Xi. Further, the book does not elaborate on Mou’s anti-intellectualism, which is closely associated with the aforementioned mentality, in Yu Yingshi’s phrase, “arrogance of the inner knowledge” (良知的傲慢) in contrast

to “arrogance of intellectual knowledge” (知性的傲慢). There are a number of typos in the Chinese language, for example, p. 48 這會(回)事; p. 53 真是(實); 放(妨)礙; p. 72 人隨(雖)有限; p. 80 見聞(聞)之知; p. 141 隨(雖)是; p. 215 險組(阻); p. 228 聖竟(境).

**Shuhong Zheng**  
King's College London

ANDREW L. MASKE:

*Potters and Patrons in Edo Period Japan: Takatori Ware and the Kuroda Domain.*

(The Histories of Material Culture and Collecting, 1700–1950.) xxi, 273 pp. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011. £65. ISBN 978 1 4094 0756 0.  
doi:10.1017/S0041977X12001383

Historians and art historians are apt to be nervous when confronted with books on ceramics. Their authors can soon lose readers in issues of clay and slip and features of vessels that elude the interest of all but experts. But starting with Louise Cort in the USA and Oliver Impey (to whom this book is dedicated) in the UK, a new generation of ceramicists began to reconstruct their field in a way that opened it up to any dedicated reader, and offered insights to a wide range of interested parties. Recently we have had the pleasure of Morgan Pitelka's work on Raku ware, *Culture: Raku Potters, Patrons and Tea Practitioners in Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005), and now we have Andrew Maske's similarly illuminating book on Takatori.

Maske maintains that this ware, though of considerable importance in history and also in modern collecting, has been omitted from standard writings on Japanese ceramics. If so, this is a pity, since the story as we learn it here is dramatic enough. Takatori ware also evinces objects of considerable aesthetic appeal.

Like many types of Japanese ceramics, Takatori is in fact Korean, at least in origin, insofar as it was first created by Korean artisans brought, in all likelihood forcibly, to Japan. This was the enduring legacy of Toyotomi Hideyoshi's vain invasion of the Korean Peninsular (en route, as he hoped, to China) which ended in his death in 1598. A Korean potter by the name of Palsan from Ido was scooped up in this manner and duly found himself in Japan. He changed his name to Shinkurō and, with his son, Hachizō, began working for the local warlord and Korean veteran Kuroda Nagamasa, whose lands around Fukuoka included the port of Nakatsu. Shinkurō's descendants would work (though not quite continuously) for Nagamasa's descendants for the next 250 years.

Takatori ware takes its name from the place where, after some unsuccessful experiments, Shinkurō found a suitable clay. He would himself be given the surname Takatori. It was Kuroda Tsunamasa, around a century later in the fabled Genroku Period (1688–1704), who showed most interest in the production and gave personal rewards to the Takatori family head, Hachirō. Tsunamasa is known as an art lover, and quite a passable painter too, and he conferred honour on the ware by painting on vessels himself, which he handed to his staff as rewards (rather cheaper than increasing their stipends). In 1704, Tsunamasa's aged father, Mitsuyuki, living in retirement, suddenly ordered demolition of the kiln and cessation of firing. The reason is given as punishment for an inferior item ordered by the governor of Nagasaki and delivered to him, to the shame of the Kuroda house, but