

Confucian Family Ritual and Popular Culture in Vietnam

SHIMAO Minoru

Introduction

The work known as *Zhuzi Jiali* 朱子家禮 (Zhu Xi 朱熹's Family Rituals) is a guidebook for clans and their members outlining norms concerning such rituals as initiation ceremonies, marriage, funerals and yearly festive occasions and was edited and published by the students of that great neo-Confucian scholar based on his own draft of the work [Azuma 2003]. We know from a wide variety of historical sources that the work exerted a great amount of influence on premodern Vietnamese society. For example, according to a treatise on religion in China and North Vietnam written by Adriano di St. Thecla, a Discalced Augustinian missionary active in Vietnam from 1736 to his death in 1765, regarding spirits of the dead, objects like pieces of cloth (*hồn bạch* 魂帛) and tablets (*thần chủ* 神主) were, according to Vietnamese family ritual, used in funereal ceremonies as sacred objects entered into and possessed by those spirits. Thecla also informs us that the rites concerning offerings made to the deceased followed family ritual [Thecla 2002:149–152].¹⁾ According to a gazetteer describing a certain village in Nghệ An Province widely known as the birthplace of many prominent Confucian intellectuals, during the latter half of the 18th century, the ancestral hall (*từ đường* 祠堂) of a local leading family was constructed in accordance with the instructions contained in Zhu Xi's *Jiali*.²⁾ We also find the epigraphy collected in a survey of another northern Vietnam village mentioning the work³⁾; and anthropological reports have traced its existence in contemporary Vietnamese rural society [Suenari 1998:332; Miyazawa 1999].

A large number of commentaries on *Jiali* were compiled in China during the Ming period [Ebrey 1991], and in Vietnam, as well, indigenous versions of the work were compiled from the 17th century on. As will be described in more detail later on in this article, one characteristic feature of the Vietnamese version was its unique family rituals concerning funereal rites. For example, in his comprehensive study of northern Vietnamese funerals at the end of the 19th century, Gustave Dumoutier writes,

Concerning funerals, the three teachings (Tam giáo 三教) [Confucianism, Buddhism, Daoism] are strictly adhered to. The *Gia lễ* (*Jiali*) has by no means been abandoned. There is a copy of the *Gia lễ* in every household and serves as the family's authority on ritual, as an adviser for how proper family members should behave. However, being essentially a work of pure philosophy, the *Gia lễ* does not touch upon such subjects as Buddhas, gods, spirits of the dead, dragons and the like, and as such, fails to fully satisfy the remarkably superstitious mind of the Annamese. While doing their utmost to conform to the dictates of the work, they embellish those dictates with elaborate Daoist practices and Buddhist incantations, in order to mollify their avaricious appetite for such beliefs.

In Tongking, like in the other countries within the sphere of Chinese civilization, there are two matters that need to be considered ethnologically. The first matter is the written set of extremely beautiful norms related to a sense of morality impeccable in every aspect, though rather rudimentary. They are the purest expressions taken from the everlasting works of the great thinkers of ancient China, have been preserved completely intact over the centuries and are still used to mold the minds and hearts of students in the classroom. Secondly, there is the matter of practices that while being host to their influence in every aspect, have not been written down and in general, are diametrically opposed to these norms.

The *Gia lễ* represents the law (*loi*); and the *Tam giáo*, its application (*usage*) [Dumoutier 1902:2].⁴⁾

Dumoutier goes on to offer a rich body of source materials on the religious practices which constitute an amalgamation of Confucian, Buddhist and Daoist liturgy. However, after reading a separate piece written by Dumoutier on the funereal process in northern Vietnam, one gets the impression that he cannot refute the fact that the essential elements of the funeral ceremony, *hôn bạch*, *thần chủ*, *minh tinh* 銘旌 (inscribed banner) and mourning attire, are all handled in accordance with family ritual based on *Gia lễ* [Dumoutier 1908:44–52]. The dilemma that Dumoutier faced stems from the simple dichotomy that he sets up between the *loi* and its *usage*. Moreover, Dumoutier seems to be over-apotheosizing *Gia lễ*, which is a work that functions as a manual for implementing ritual in everyday life. *Gia lễ* is by no means a uniform, perpetual work carved in stone. This fact is true of China as well as Vietnam, where the work was flexibly re-written

under the influence of that country's unique indigenous popular culture. The purpose of this article is to describe exactly how the authors of the Vietnamese version of *Gia lễ* revised the original version introduced from China for the purpose of adapting it to Vietnamese custom. For that purpose, the focus will be placed on the period from the 15th century on and the interrelationships among three sets of actors: the royal court which promoted the spread of Confucianism, Confucian intellectuals who wrote about *Gia lễ* and those within the general public who practiced *Gia lễ* on an everyday basis.

Although it is readily apparent that Zhu Xi's *Jiali* has influenced Vietnamese society and culture in a number of ways, it is also a fact that the research to date on the subject has yet to study the historical process by which the work was introduced to and adopted by Vietnam. There is also no research, at least to the knowledge of this author, on the actual philology of the printed and hand-copied versions of the work. The work done to date on the text of *Gia lễ* consists of only two noteworthy studies: Pere Lesserteur's French translation [1885] and a recent piece by Trần Thị Kim Anh [2003] on the author and date of *Thọ Mai Gia Lễ* 壽梅家禮 (Hò Gia Tân's Family Ritual). Under such conditions, the present article will begin with a basic overview of *Gia lễ* as compiled in Vietnam and a clarification of its relationship to the Chinese original, then turn to the relationship of the work to both the indoctrination policy implemented by the Vietnamese state and popular culture, in order to show the work's unique process of development under Vietnamese custodianship.

1. The Various Vietnamese Versions: A Bibliographical Introduction

Of the versions of *Gia lễ* compiled throughout Vietnam's history, three texts exist today: *Hồ Thượng Thư Gia Lễ* 胡尚書家禮 (Minister of State Ho's Family Rituals), *Tiếp Kính Gia Lễ* 捷徑家禮 (The *Gia lễ* Made Easy) and the above-mentioned *Thọ Mai Gia Lễ*. No other versions were printed, but there is one hand-copied version held by two of the country's public libraries.

1.1 *Tiếp Kính Gia Lễ*

Beginning with the oldest printed version first, *Tiếp Kính Gia Lễ* (aka *Gia Lễ Tiếp Kính*, hereafter *TKGL*) is mentioned in *Thọ Mai Gia Lễ* (hereafter *TMGL*) and a variant of *Vũ Trung Tuy Bút* 雨中隨筆 (Jottings on a Rainy

Day).⁵⁾ It is recorded in *TMGL* that *TKGL* was published by Ngô Sĩ Bình 吳仕評 in the 3rd year of the Vĩnh Thịnh 永盛 Era (1707), but there is no trace of the work in either the card catalog of the Han Nom Institute (Hanoi) or that of the National Library of Vietnam. The Han Nom Institute catalog contains one entry with the title *Gia Lễ* and that is call number AB572 [Trần & Gros 1993:664]. This printed version begins with a page on which the characters 黎朝永盛三年穀日 (An auspicious day of the 3rd year of Vĩnh Thịnh) appear in large print. The printing is unclear and the text is missing in many places; however, it is possible to identify the overall composition. The main text, which focuses mainly on funereal rites, is clearly concluded with the phrase “The End of *Gia Lễ Tang Tế Tiếp Kính*” and is then followed by an addendum containing an explanation of “ceremonies worshiping the gods.” There is a very high probability that this title is a copy of *TKGL*, which is mentioned in *TMGL* and the variant of *Vũ Trung Tuy Bút*.

The first half of the main text dealing with funereal rites contains a large amount of illustrations at the beginning concerning *cửu tộc* 九族 (lit., nine generations; i. e., four past and four future paternal lineage generations centered on the present generation) and *ngũ phục* 五服 (the five levels of mourning), followed by a list of the various rules concerning these two subjects written in Vietnamese (*chữ nôm* 字喃 script). The last half consists of an explanation written in a hybrid style of Vietnamese and classical Chinese concerning etiquette to be followed until the period of mourning is over. The date of compilation, names of the editors and compilation background are all unknown. *Vũ Trung Tuy Bút* mentions only that *TKGL* was compiled by a minor official named Duke Nguyễn 阮公 under the pseudonym Ngô Doãn 吳尹. However, the fact that this version is quoted and mentioned in later works suggests that *TKGL* was a fairly widely disseminated version of *Gia lễ*.

1.2 *Hồ Thượng Thư Gia Lễ*

Hồ Thượng Thư Gia Lễ (hereafter *HTTGL*) was printed in the 5th year of the Vĩnh Hữu Era (1739) and again in the 28th year of the Cảnh Hưng Era (1787). Copies of both printings are held by the Han-Nom Institute under call numbers AB 592 and AB 175, respectively. A copy published in the 24th year of the Cảnh Hưng 景興 Era (1763) is also held by the Keio University Institute of Oriental Classics, and a hand-written version of the work has been reproduced on microfilm brought from l'École française

d'Extrême-Orient to the Toyo Bunko research library (Call No. X-1-7). *HTTGL* is divided into two parts: Part 1 entitled Gia Lễ Quốc Ngữ 家禮國語 is a Vietnamese translation of *Gia lễ*; Part 2 Gia Lễ Vấn Đáp 家禮問答, a question and answer format dialogue. As the title indicates, Part 1 is written in Vietnamese (*chữ nôm* script) and is concerned with funereal rites from the death bed to the end of mourning, while Part 2 is written in classical Chinese and explains a number of problems and issues pertaining to funereal rites. The fact that the work was reprinted at least twice during the same century indicates a fairly broad demand for it from readers. *HTTGL* is frequently quoted in the *TMGL* version and is also mentioned in the variant of *Vũ Trung Tuy Bút*.

Only the EFEO microfilm contains a complete version of the Preface, which ends with the contributor's name and date: 皇朝永佑萬萬年之五, 端陽中浣...朱伯璫 (On the occasion of the Đoan Ngọ festival [5th month 5th day] of the 5th year of Vĩnh Hửu... Chu Bá Đương). *TMGL* mentions this same date as the publication date of *HTTGL*⁶⁾ and also mentions that it marked the first printing. According to the Preface, the work was compiled by Hồ Sĩ Dương 胡士揚, a grand secretary and head of the Penal Department, on the occasion of reviewing the available literature on Confucian rites pertaining to funerals while mourning his deceased mother or father. Hồ found discrepancies among the existing interpretations of funereal rites and decided to translate *Gia lễ* into Vietnamese, while adding a proposal for procedures that would be simple to follow based on Zhu Xi's instructions and a Q&A section to explain the meaning of ritual. Since Hồ had intended to publish his study, but was unsuccessful, Chu Bá Đương, the author of the Preface, obtained a copy of the text and decided to publish it as a tribute to Hồ's initiative and virtue and for the purpose of improving the quality of Vietnamese custom and morality. Chu opens the Preface with the words, “五禮之中, 喪祭爲重” (Of the five categories of ritual, funereal rites should be given the highest importance).

The Preface is followed by a Foreword by Hồ, in which he explains that during the ample time he was granted for his period of mourning, he came to discover certain discrepancies in the conventional wisdom about *Gia lễ* and decided to translate the Chinese version of the work into Vietnamese, to make it easier to read and understand among not only intellectuals of the day, but also the common people and generations to come. Hồ suggests that the reason why *Gia lễ* is not read stems from a penchant in society to eschew reading any literature regarding funereal rites while one's parents are still alive. Consequently, Hồ attributes the fact of

funeral ceremonies not being conducted in accordance with the proper norms of filial piety to insufficient time for reading *Gia lễ* after the death of a parent. He insists that *Gia lễ* should be required reading for anyone who wants to honor his parents, because even men of letters will never really know ritual without reading the work. This goes for the common people as well; and if a reading of this Vietnamese version of the work is deemed to be insufficient, then the reader should proceed to the Chinese version.

According to *Đại Việt Sử Ký Toàn Thư* 大越史記全書 (Complete Works of Đại Việt History), Hồ Sĩ Dương was appointed grand secretary in 1663 and acted as an tributary envoy to China during 1673–75, after which he was appointed head of the Department of Public Works. In the 7th month of 1676 he was appointed national history chronicler and prime minister (*tham tụng* 參從) during the 10th month, before his final promotion to head of the Penal Department [Chen 1986:996, 1001, 1007, 1008, 1010].⁷⁾ According to the gazetteer of his home-village of Quỳnh Đôi (*Quỳnh Đôi cổ kim sự tích hương biên* 瓊堆古今事跡鄉編; held by EFEO) compiled during the mid-19th century, Hồ was born in 1622 and died in 1681. While we can confirm the posthumous publication date of this high level bureaucrat's manuscript by Chu Bá Đương as 1739, when he wrote the original text cannot be ascertained.

His home-village (xã 社) of Hoàn Hậu 完厚 (later Quỳnh Đôi 瓊堆), Quỳnh Lưu 瓊瑠 District, Nghệ An 乂安 Province, which is one of Vietnam's leading producers of successful civil service examinees and government bureaucrats, deserves some mention here. The above-mentioned gazetteer of Quỳnh Đôi lists 267 successful examinees and comparable intellectuals in its section entitled "Character and Popularity of Government Appointees," but contemporary Vietnamese translator, Hồ Văn Khuê, has suggested the possibility of many more examination graduates than that number. According to a list of successful regional civil service examinees during the Nguyễn Dynasty period (*Quốc Triều Hương Khoa Lục* 國朝鄉科錄), the 55 examinees from Quỳnh Đôi achieving the academic degree of *cử nhân* rank was second in number only to Hành Thiện 行善 Village, Nam Định 南定 Province [Shimao 2001:39].⁸⁾ During the 17th and 18th centuries, such an excellent academic environment managed to produce three *tiến sĩ* 進士 doctoral degree holders who would go on to be appointed (including while alive and posthumously) heads of government bureaus: Hồ Sĩ Dương (1622–1681), Hồ Phi Tích 胡丕績 (1675–1744) and Hồ Sĩ Đống 胡士棟 (1739–1785). All three were members of the same ex-

tended family, founded by Hồ Kha 胡柯, who came to Vietnam from Wulin 武林, Zhejiang Province, China.⁹⁾ All three also traveled to China as tributary envoys, and Hồ Phi Tích served as chief negotiator concerning borders between the two countries [Chen 1986:1049, 1053, 1059, 1070]. All of these facts suggest the possibility of a rich knowledge of Chinese culture accumulated by the Hồ clan in Hoàn Hậu through direct contact with China. The fact that all the basic elements of Chinese elite society—ancestral hall, lineage genealogy, *Jiali*-based family ritual and a family code of ethics—had already been brought to Hoàn Hậu by that time was by no means accidental. Hồ Sĩ Dương not only authored a Vietnamese version of *Gia lễ*, but also converted his home into his family's ancestral hall; and Hồ Phi Tích compiled a collection of family codes centered around the themes of poverty and prosperity, entitled *Cùng Đạt Gia Huân Tập* 窮達家訓集. Another native of Hoàn Hậu, Hồ Sĩ Tồn, a contemporary of Hồ Phi Tích who chose to eschew a career in public life after his son was granted a *tiến sĩ* degree in 1721, went on to write a family history entitled *Khoa danh trường biên* 科名長編 (Long and Illustrious Record of Successful Civil Service Examinees) and built an ancestral hall in the tradition of Zhu Xi's *Jiali*. This hall was described in the above-mentioned mid-19th century village gazetteer as so sturdily built that it had proved over the centuries to be impervious to the destructive aspects of both man and Nature.

It can be assumed that it was at that same time that the science of *fengshui* 風水 geomancy was ambitiously introduced into the village. According to the gazetteer, Hồ Sĩ Dương had employed the principles of *fengshui* to reinvestigate the locations of the graves of recent ancestors and re-inter them properly. For this purpose, Hồ sought the help of Chinese *fengshui* experts (*bắc sư* 北師) Li Guohuan 李果寰 and Li Bosi 黎伯賜 in selecting the proper locations and also employed a painter to draft a replica of the layout for posterity.

There is another episode describing contact with China enjoyed by the Hồ clan, involving one Hồ Sĩ Anh 胡士英, the father of Hồ Phi Tích and friend of Hồ Sĩ Dương. While serving as the magistrate (*tri huyện* 知縣) of Kỳ Anh 奇花 District, Nghệ An, during a period of famine, a group of locals raided and pillaged a Chinese merchant ship. Receiving a complaint from the merchants, Hồ conducted an investigation and succeeded in returning a large portion of the stolen merchandise. Out of gratitude the Chinese offered to give Hồ half of the returned goods, but he refused. Impressed with the magistrate's virtuous gesture, the Chinese returned later with a *fengshui* expert to help him choose some auspicious

land. While it is uncertain to what extent the incident is factual, the story that circulated about a Chinese merchant ship bringing a *fengshui* expert to Nghệ An is worthy of note. Here we see the natives of the village of Hoàn Hậu playing a maritime role in direct contact with China, in addition to their diplomatic ties overland. However, the activities of *fengshui* experts traveling to Vietnam from China were by no means limited exclusively to the village of Hoàn Hậu. Momoki Shiro has pointed to the frequent appearance of Chinese *fengshui* experts in 18th and 19th century *han nom* literature, surveying and laying out gravesites [Momoki 1998:106–107; 2000:33–37; 2010]. In this sense, we should probably place the village of Hoàn Hậu in the context of pioneering a trend that would spread to all the corners of Vietnam. Later we will return to this trend in discussing its influence on the content of family ritual in Vietnam.

There is one more fact to add concerning the cultural environment of Hồ Sĩ Dương's home region, and that is the aspect of the early Christian missionary efforts in Nghệ An pointed out recently by such historians as Alain Forest and Makino Motonori, describing the construction of a Christian missionary school in Quỳnh Lư District [Forest 1998:160; Makino 2009:9]. The fact that the village gazetteer also mentions Christian households shows that the region was by no means strictly Confucian in its spiritual and moral life.

1.3 Thọ Mai Gia Lễ

There are 13 editions comprising a total of 18 volumes of the *TMGL* version of *Gia lễ* held by the Han Nom Institute (Hanoi). This author has personally perused the text of 16 volumes of all 13 editions. The following is a bibliographical summary of the titles, while it should be noted that there is a good possibility that more printings or editions may exist; however, a description of the Han Nom Institute holdings should sufficiently cover at least the general aspects of the conditions under which this version was published.

- No. 1. Printed, Gia Long 嘉隆 11 (1812). Photocopy (Original could not be checked). Many missing parts prevent ascertaining number of leaves. 7 lines of variable number of characters per leaf. Call No.: AB592.
- No. 2. Printed, Auspicious Day, 8th Month of Tự Đức 嗣德 4 (1851). Hữu Văn Đường 右文堂 Publishing. 19cm × 13cm. 66 leaves. 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.192, VHb.117.

- No. 3. Printed, Auspicious Day, 1st Month of Tỵ Đức 19 (1866). Cẩm Văn Đường 錦文堂 Publishing. 19.5cm × 13.5cm. 66 leaves. 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.116.
- No. 4. Printed, Auspicious Day, 2nd Month of Thành Thái 成泰 9 (1897). Tụ Văn Đường 聚文堂 Publishing. 19.5cm × 13cm. 65 leaves (missing 1 leaf). 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.110.
- No. 5. Printed, Auspicious Day, 2nd Month of Thành Thái 9 (1897). Quan Văn Đường 觀文堂 Publishing. 17cm × 13cm (tops and bottoms of leaves cut off?). 66 leaves. 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.114.
- No. 6. Printed, Auspicious Day, 8th Month of Thành Thái Đinh Dậu 丁酉 (1897). Thịnh Nghĩa Đường 盛義堂 Publishing. 19cm × 13cm. 66 leaves. 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHv.109, AB.898 (photocopy).
- No. 7. Printed, Auspicious Day, 5th Month of Duy Tân 維新 Bính Thìn 丙辰 (1916). Quan Văn Đường Publishing. 19cm × 13cm. 66 leaves. 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.112, VHb.113.
- No. 8. Printed, Auspicious Day, 5th Month of Khải Định 啓定 Đinh Tỵ 丁巳 (1917). Thịnh Văn Đường 盛文堂 Publishing. 18.5cm × 13cm. 65 leaves (missing 1 leaf). 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.108.
- No. 9. Printed, Auspicious Day, spring of Khải Định Canh Thân 庚申 (1920). Phúc An Hiệu 福安號 Publishing. 20cm × 13.5cm. 65 leaves (missing 1 leaf). 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.106.
- No. 10. Printed, Auspicious Day, spring of Khải Định Tân Dậu 辛酉 (1921). Phú Văn Đường 富文堂 Publishing. 18.5cm × 13cm. 66 leaves. 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.111.
- No. 11. Printed, Auspicious Day, 8th Month of Bảo Đại 保大 3 (1928). Thịnh Văn Đường Publishing. 19cm × 13cm. 66 leaves. 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.105.
- No. 12. Printed, Auspicious Day, autumn of Bảo Đại Mậu Thìn 戊辰 (1928). Phúc Văn Đường 福文堂 Publishing. 19cm × 13cm. 66 leaves. 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.82.
- No. 13. Printed, Auspicious Day, spring of Bảo Đại Kỷ Mão 己卯 (1939). Tụ Văn Đường Publishing. 18.5cm × 13cm. 66 leaves. 8 lines of 21 characters per leaf. Call No.: VHb.107.

The Han Nom Institute collection of the *TMGL* version, which contains no editions from the 18th century, is characterized by one group of

titles published from the mid-19th century possessing almost an identical format and another group of early 19th century titles printed in different formats. Ten of the 13 editions were published after the French colonization of Vietnam, seven of them during the 20th century, right up the eve of the Japanese invasion of French Indochina in 1939. All that can be mentioned here about the very complicated subject of character typeface is that there are several differences among the collection, and that there are some typesetting errors, especially in the printings published during the 20th century [Shimao 2006:153–154].

According to version's Preface, *TMGL* was compiled by Hồ Gia Tân 胡嘉賓, a native of “Hải Thượng Đường Trung 海上唐中” who had held the title of Tụ Ban 序班 in the Hồng Lô Tụ 鴻臚寺 (Imperial Ceremony Bureau), but resided without portfolio in Tho Mai. The conventional interpretation has it that the work was compiled by whom we will refer to as Hồ Sĩ Tân-a 胡士賓 of none other than Hoàn Hậu (Quỳnh Đồi) village, Nghệ An and that interpretation continues to be held in some quarters today [Tân 2004:100]. The Quỳnh Đồi village gazetteer states that Hồ Sĩ Tân-a was two generations removed from Hồ Sĩ Dương, the compiler of the *HTTGL* version. The supervising editor of the contemporary Vietnamese version of the gazetteer, Hồ Văn Khuê, has added a note to the work that Hồ Sĩ Tân-a was the compiler of *TMGL* [Hồ & Hồ 2004:162]. However, first, the place name “Hải Thượng” found in the Preface is easily deciphered as an abbreviation of Thượng Hồng 上洪 Prefecture of Hải Dương 海陽 Province, as seen in Hải Thượng Lãn Ông 海上懶翁 [Huard & Durand 1953:263], and secondly, the village gazetteer does not mention Hồ Sĩ Tân-a having any work experience as Tụ Ban in the Hồng Lô Tụ. These two facts themselves should be sufficient to cast doubt on the conventional interpretation.

Recently another interpretation has been offered by Trần Thị Kim Anh [2003] in a contemporary Vietnamese translation of an item mentioned in the variant of Phạm Đình Hồ's *Vũ Trung Tùy Bút* (Vietnam National Library Call No. R1069). This item will be taken up in more detail later on, but Trần concludes that the compiler of *TMGL* was a native of Trung Lập 中立 Village in the district of Đường Hào 唐豪, Thượng Hồng Prefecture, Hải Dương Province, which is abbreviated “Hải Thượng Đường Trung” in the Preface to *TMGL*. Furthermore, from the item mentioning that the edition was presented to Trần Công Xán 陳功燦 while he was serving as deputy prime minister (1784–86), Trần surmises that the work must have been compiled around that time.

According to the item, the compiler of *TMGL*, Hồ Gia Tân, was also known by the name Hồ Sĩ Tân which is probably one reason why the authorship of *TMGL* has been so uncritically attributed to Hồ Sĩ Tân—a of Hoàn Hậu Village, together with the circumstantial evidence to show that Hồ Sĩ Dương of his grandfather's generation compiled the *HTTGL* version and Sĩ Tân's father Hồ Sĩ Tôn 胡士尊 being acclaimed by the village gazetteer as an expert on Zhu Xi's *Jiali*.

Turning to the content of *TMGL*, the Preface also states:

Of all Confucian ritual, funereal rites, while performed all of the time, are very complicated ceremonially and the invocations very deep and eclectic, resulting in a great deal of misunderstanding. Consequently, the author of the present work, based on the original rites contained in the literature, has deemed to add what should be added and omit what should be omitted, translate into Vietnamese what should be translated, and include the invocations and verse in order to provide a concise version of *Gia lễ*. This is a straightforward and concise account that conforms to the basics of ritual and may be followed whenever it is deemed unnecessary to preform the rites with the ideal impeccable detail and grace. For those who desire to perform the ritual in its entirety, there are no better references than the thorough treatments to be found in Zhu Xi's *Gia Lễ* itself and *Hồ Thượng Thư Gia Lễ*.

Here we find that the purpose of writing *TMGL* was to provide a popular readership with a manual on Confucian funereal ritual enabling the complex and confusing rites to be “correctly” performed with ease.

The work consists of a main body and addendum, the former divided into chapters entitled *Gia Lễ Tế Nghi Tập* 家禮祭儀集 (Collection of Family Rites and Ceremonies), but dealing exclusively with funereal ritual, and *Gia Lễ Phục Chế Ký* 家禮服制記 (Note on Mourning). The addendum touches upon *Gia lễ*-related rites, such as marriage, but also festivals worshiping village gods, etc., unrelated to what would be strictly defined as “*Gia lễ*.” The 66-leaf printing of *TMGL* that became uniform from the Tự Đức Era (1848–83) on consists of *Gia Lễ Tế Nghi Tập* from the front of leaf 3 to the back of leaf 41, *Gia Lễ Phục Chế Ký* from the front of leaf 42 to the back of leaf 55 and an Addendum notably larger than the above two versions from the front of leaf 56 to the back of leaf 66.

Tế Nghi Tập presents an explanation of the ceremonial aspects and

rules of etiquette pertaining to the funereal process. While the work generally emulates the rites laid down by Zhu Xi's *Jiali*, since the Preface tells us that the author has recompiled it in his own style, the process does not completely follow that of *Jiali*, nor is emphasis placed on the same points. Also, in order to make this chapter an easy-to-use manual, both the procedures and the invocation documents appear one by one. Those ceremonies that do not appear in Zhu Xi's *Jiali* include the Hạ Tiết summer, Trung Nguyên midyear and Tuế Trừ year end festivals, the Chung Thất (49th day) and Bách Nhật (100th day) commemorations for the recently deceased, and the Khâm Tặng Phần Hoàng Nghi Tiết celebration for new government appointees, during which the good news is written on yellow paper and burned in order to inform the appointee's deceased ancestors. Phục Chế Ký is a note laying out eleven easy-to-apply items in order to explain the *cửu tộc ngũ phục* system of kinship relations and levels of mourning in a list of 93 articles explaining how each family member should mourn the deceased.

TMGL is written in a unique style blending classical Chinese and Vietnamese in *chữ nôm* script. This style lies in contrast to both the *TKML* and *HTTGL* versions, where only a few Vietnamese sections appear in the former and whole chapters in the Vietnamese and classical Chinese style make up the latter. Rather, the author of *TMGL* narrates freely in both styles throughout the work and may represent a new trend in written Vietnamese.

1.4 Văn Công Gia Lễ Tồn Chân

The manuscript entitled *Văn Công Gia Lễ Tồn Chân* 文公家禮存真 (The True Intent of Zhu Xi's *Jiali*; Han Nom Institute Call No. VHv. 272 and National Library Call No. R429) begins with a Preface written in the 8th month of the *canh ngọ* 庚午 year of the Tự Đức Era (1894) by Đỗ Huy Uyển 杜輝琬. The first half of the Preface presents a critique of the conventional literature dealing with family ritual, including the *TMGL* version, from the standpoint of the necessity to return to Zhu Xi's original work. The second half, which explains the circumstances under which the present work came to be compiled, states that when Đỗ decided to delve into the literature on funereal rites while he himself was in mourning, investigating the pros and cons, similarities and differences of such classics on ritual as the *Yi-li* 儀禮 and *Li-qi* 禮記, he thought about writing his own treatise on the subject, but had no time for such an endeavor. Later on, he hap-

pened into a discussion with someone on the subject of ritual and became so animated that he ordered his son Liệu 璫 to reedit and revise Zhu Xi's *Jiali* to make its funereal and celebratory rites easier to perform, including items in the later versions that conformed to the times without defying the sacred past. Liệu included an addendum entitled Khảo Chính 考正 (Observations and Corrections) which raised doubts about the classics on ritual and aimed criticism at the currently “vulgar” manner in which Confucian ritual was being performed. The work was not to be published but rather handed down through generations of the Đỗ family in the hope that they would appraise the situation, avoid being confused by vulgarity and not lose the true intent of Văn Công 文公 (Zhu Xi). The Preface also tells us that the purely classical Chinese text was completed by Đỗ Huy Uyển and his son Liệu in the 23rd year of Tự Đức (1870) as the official ritual of their family.

According to the record of successful civil service examinees entitled *Quốc Triều Hương Khoa Lục*, Đỗ Huy Uyển was born in La Ngạn 羅岸 Village, Đại An 大安 District, Nam Định Province, passed the *cử nhân* level in 1840 and was conferred with a *tiến sĩ* degree the following year. His father Cảnh passed the *cử nhân* level in 1819 and his son and co-author Liệu was conferred with a *tiến sĩ* in 1879. It was only natural that a family of intellectuals with such academic credentials would be unable to stomach what they considered to be watered-down popularized versions of Confucian ritual.

1.5 Other Compilations

The entry for Trần Tú Hiên 陳秀顯 in Volume 29 of the Nguyễn Dynasty collection of biographies entitled *Đại Nam Chính Biên Liệt Truyện Nhị Tập* 大南正編列傳二集 mentions that among his written works there was a family ritual. During fieldwork conducted by this author in 2005 in Ninh Bình Province, a work entitled *Chu Văn Công Gia Lễ Tứ Đại Bổ Chính Diễn nghĩa Quốc Ngữ* 朱文公家禮四大補正演義國語 (Vietnamese Rendering of Zhu Xi's *Jiali* with Four Significant Revisions) was discovered in the archives of a long-standing local family. Unfortunately, there was no time to photocopy the text, so the details of its content are unknown, but the fact that the work is a Vietnamese translation of Zhu Xi's *Jiali* is certain.

2. The Adoption of Chinese Family Ritual in Vietnam

Although there is no concrete evidence as to exactly when Zhu Xi's *Jiali* was introduced into Vietnamese society, there is the distinct possibility that Vietnamese intellectuals got their first glimpses of the work in the collection of Chinese thought entitled *Xingli Daquan* 性理大全, which was introduced when Vietnam briefly came under Chinese rule during the reign of Ming Dynasty Emperor Yongle.¹⁰⁾ The possibility of Ming period origins is bolstered by the fact that the 17th and 18th century Vietnamese compilers of *Gia lễ* were referring not only to the original *Jiali*, but also to commentaries on the work done by Ming authors.¹¹⁾ The present section will study in what manner the text of *Jiali* was received and read in Vietnam at that time.

The various Vietnamese *Gia lễ* cite the following rituals of Chinese families. The *HTTGL* version quotes from “*Vương Thế Trinh Bổ Di* 王世貞補遺” and “*Chính Hành* 正衡 (or *Chính Hành Tăng Bổ* 正衡增補)” and mentions the name of Ming period *Jiali* commentator Yang Shengan 楊升庵 (Vol. 1:39b-40b, 42a; Vol. 2:11b, 13b, 14b-15b). The *TMGL* version also mentions “*Chính Hành Tăng Bổ* 正衡增補” (3a, 10b, 13b, 16b, 38a). The Preface to *Văn Công Gia Lễ Tồn Chân* mentions Yang Shengan and *Chính Hành* compiler Shen Gelao 申閣老 and quotes from “*Dương Nghi Tiết* 楊儀節.” There is no doubt that the “*Dương Nghi Tiết*” quoted here is *Wengong Jiali Yijie* 文公家禮儀節, a work on *Jiali* procedures compiled by Yang Shen 楊慎, whose common name was Yang Shengan. The printed edition of the work (National Archives of Japan's Cabinet Library Call No. 274-98) which was completed by Yang Shen in 1530 begins with an introduction to *Jiali* (Jiali Xu 家禮絞) then presents the preface of Qiu Jun 丘濬's *Wengong Jiali Yijie* written in 1474. Next, “*Vương Thế Trinh Bổ Di*” seems to be the work *Jiali Huowen Xuzhi* 家禮或問須知, a list of questions and answers pertaining to *Jiali*, since the latter contains the quoted text worded a bit differently [Shimao, to be published:note 5]. There are two copies in the National Archives of Japan (Call Nos. 274-94, 274-100) and the Sonkeikaku Library holds a Ming period edition of the work. The work was compiled by Wang Shizen and his younger brother Shimao 世懋 and then edited and written by Zheng Bizhao 鄭必著. Furthermore, the Q&A format of Volume 2 of *HTTGL* could very well have been inspired by the Wang brothers' work.

Concerning the work “*Chính Hành*” and its compiler Shen Gelao, this is probably Peng Bin 彭濱's *Chonke Shen Gelao Jiaozheng Zhu Wengon Jiali*

Zhengheng 重刻申閣老校正朱文公家禮正衡 (Reprinted and Revised Zhu Xi's *Jiali* According to Shen Gelao). The two copies held by the National Archives of Japan (Call Nos. 經 13-7, 274-97) have exactly the same content, but different publishers and titles. 經 13-7's title is abbreviated *Jiali Zhengheng* 家禮正衡, but includes the full title at the head of each volume. We are told at the end that the work was published in 1599. 274-97 is titled *Wengong Jiali* 文公家禮, but includes the full title (*sans Zhenheng*) at the head of each volume. The publication date is unknown because the final part of the work was destroyed. Why the same text was published under two different titles is unclear, but we can probably assume that it had to do with the wide demand that existed for the work. The National Archives of Japan also holds the title Zhou Yingqi 周應期's *Jiali Zhengheng* dated 1637, but it had no influence on family ritual in Vietnam.

The *HTTGL* version mentions that it was *Chính Hành* that first included the mid-year (Trung Nguyên 中元) festival in family ritual. It is also included in Peng Bin's work, but neither Zhou Yingqi nor Yang Shen mention it. Therefore, the *Chính Hành* referred to here is probably Peng Bin's work. The relationship of Peng Bin to the *TMGL* version is much clearer, since the quotations appearing there from *Chính Hành* can be found in Peng's work [Shimao 2010:note 10]. We can conclude from these facts that Peng Bin was widely read in Vietnam between the 17th and 19th centuries and that his work exerted a great amount of influence on the development of family ritual there. Since there is no doubt that the printed versions of the work that circulated in Vietnam contained the word *zhengheng* in the title, this article will adopt the title of 經 13-7, *Jiali Zhengheng*.

There are a few more noteworthy points about the relationship between Chinese and Vietnamese family ritual. For example, the ceremonies for the 49th and 100th day commemoration of the deceased, which were already part of the Ming period family rituals, are not included in the *HTTGL* version, while the *TKGL* and *TMGL* versions adopt them. We find them also in the *Jiali Zhengheng* of both Peng Bin (Vol. 6:2ab) and Zhou Yingqi (Vol. 6:2b-3a). Also found in *TMGL*, but not in Zhu Xi's original *Jiali*, are the Tué Trừ year end festival and the Phần Hoàng appointee celebration. We find an invocation for the year end festival in Peng Bin's *Jiali Zhengheng* (Vol. 7:8a) and one for the appointee celebration not only in Peng Bin (Vol. 8:23a-22b), but also Zhou Yingqi's *Zhengheng* (Vol. 8:15b-16b) and Yang Shen's *Wengong Jiali Yijie* (Vol. 7:26b-28b). The appointee celebration appears widely in Ming period Chinese family ritual and had already appeared in Vietnamese ritual during the 17th cen-

tury, as exemplified by *HTTGL*, suggesting a process of Vietnamese ritual being modeled after the current Chinese customs. As indicated by the Đổ Family ritual *Văn Công Gia Lễ Tôn Chân*, in the rules laid out in Peng Bin's *Zhengheng*, a celebratory invocation was read even before the rite for inscribing the name of the deceased on a *senchu* tablet (or *tizhu* 題主) was performed. However, in the original ritual, the invocation would not be read until the completion of *tizhu*. All three Vietnamese versions of the *Gia lễ* followed the directions given by Peng Bin.

As previously mentioned, the five levels of mourning (*ngũ phục*), which are dealt with in detail in both *TKGL* and *TMGL*, were influenced in their descriptive styles by Ming period family ritual collections. While Zhu Xi's *Jiali* does touch upon the subject, the descriptive styles of *TKGL* and *TMGL* are markedly different. Zhu Xi approaches the subject by introducing the durations of the five levels—*zhanshuai* 斬衰 (3 years), *qishuai* 齊衰 (3 years, 1 year, 5 months, 3 months), *dagong* 大功 (9 months), *xiaogong* 小功 (5 months) and *sima* 總麻 (3 months)—then describes which family members are required to observe which level vis-a-vis their relationship to the deceased. Works such as *Ming Ling* 明令 (Ming Dynasty Legal Codes) and *Xiaoci Lu* 孝慈錄 (Rules for Filial Piety and Parental Affection) follow the same line; but in contrast, the Vietnamese family rituals create several categories for mourners and “mournees” and then assign each group to a level of mourning. This is done by first establishing categories based on *cửu tộc*, then categories involving other kinds of kinship relation. However, this method is not uniquely Vietnamese, since we already find it in Peng Bin's *Zhengheng*, and like in other aspects, Peng Bin's influence probably looms large. That being said, differences, albeit more subtle, do exist between Peng Bin's instructions and the Vietnamese versions of *Gia lễ*. This will be taken up in the next section. In conclusion to this section, the presence of various elements in Vietnamese family ritual not found in the essential rules of Zhu Xi was not a Vietnamese invention, but rather an attempt to conform to and mimic the Ming Period works on the subject that were being read in Vietnam at the time of compilation.

3. Family Ritual in Relation to Indoctrination Efforts by Various Vietnamese Dynasties

The promotion of Confucian education in Vietnam began during the Chinese annexation of the early 15th century. At that time, an extremely detailed “public notice on edification” was issued for the express purpose

of “correcting public morality” (易俗移風).¹²⁾ During the Thánh Tông 聖宗 Era of the Lê Dynasty, a 24-article directive was drawn up and promulgated during the 2nd year of Cảnh Thống 景統 (1499).¹³⁾ This and other directives at that time do not touch directly upon the topic of family ritual *per se* and would not until the last half of the 17th century, after the “revival” of the Lê Dynasty.

3.1 Indoctrination Directives of the Late 17th Century

It was the Trịnh 鄭 Family regime which in the 1st year of Cảnh Trị 景治 (1663) began to promote moral indoctrination based on Confucian ideas with the issuance of a 47-article ordinance drafted by Phạm Công Trứ 范公著 [Chen 1992]. The ordinance, which fiercely attacked popular belief based on Buddhist ideas and shamanism, was re-issued in the 12th year Cảnh Hưng (1751), but it is said that the people greeted it with indifference and disregard.¹⁴⁾ There is no doubt about the existence of an intellectual elite in 17–18th century Vietnam who attempted to spread Confucianist norms among the people. Article 41 of the ordinance orders, “Family ritual [*Gia lễ*] is to be observed regarding families in mourning during the mid-year festival. Boisterous singing is forbidden under the pretext of showing respect for the dead” (喪家中元節, 當循家禮. 不得托以吊挽, 竟爲歌唱). Zhu Xi’s *Jiali* contains no instructions concerning the relationship between the mid-year festival and funereal rites; however, the work’s directives on family mausolea in a discussion of the general principles of ritual (*tongli* 通禮) does mention the event, along with the spring events of Qingming 清明 and Hanshi 寒食, the summer occasion of Chongwu 重午 and fall festival of Chongyang 重陽.

It was at the exact time the ordinance was issued that a debate had arisen about the relationship of the mid-year festival to family ritual. Hồ Sĩ Dương, the author of *HTTGL*, who was 41 years old in 1663 and had during the second month of that year been promoted to the post of grand secretary, may have been involved in the issuance of the 47-article ordinance during the 7th month, but we cannot tell if he had compiled his family ritual yet. In either case, Part 1 of *HTTGL* does mention mausoleum-related ceremony and invocations for the mid-year festival after a section on the cessation of wailing ceremony (*tốt khóc* 卒哭) performed a few days after burial, and then takes up the subject again in the question and answer discussion of Part 2 as follows.

Question: You do not generally ascribe to the interpretation offered by *Chính Hành Tăng Bồ*. However, it was *Chính Hành* that first supplemented family ritual with a discussion of the mid-year festival. Why have you adopted that particular part?

Answer: It was not Zhu Xi's intent to include the mid-year festival in family funereal rites, although we do find its mention in his discussion of the general principles of ritual. There is no mention of it in the discussion of funereal rites. It is my understanding that the first such inclusion of the mid-year festival in funereal rites was made in *Chính Hành*. This inclusion was followed and eventually spread throughout our kingdom, and is now a long-standing practice among the people. Consequently, it would be very difficult to suddenly change the practice. In other words, although continuing such a stupid custom is difficult to tolerate, I have decided to accept the will of the people.

It was in this way that the Vietnamese Confucian elite was forced to recognize the rules for the observance of the mid-year festival in funereal rites as outlined by Peng Bin's *Zhengheng*, which was circulating throughout Vietnam at the time. Therefore, in order to control the festival, which had been widely celebrated as a Buddhist event, the Confucian version was adopted by the state and incorporated into its indoctrination policy.

The mid-year festival (*Zhongyuan* 中元) is recognized even today in Vietnam as the day on which offerings are made to the dead in the Buddhist tradition. The 15th day of the seventh month of the lunar calendar is known as the day of “xá tội vong nhân” (redeeming the sins of the dead). Under the Lý Dynasty, which ardently promoted Buddhism, a Buddhist Yulanpen 盂蘭盆 ceremony was held on that day for royal family members who had died over the past year (equivalent to the Confucian period of mourning) [Chen 1986:258, 259, 271, 577]. According to Ōnishi Kazuhiko 大西和彦, the practice spread to the general public during the Trần Dynasty period, and in the early Lê Dynasty period, the latter half of the 15th century in particular, the mid-year festival became entrenched in Vietnamese society as a gala event of the autumn season. In response to this situation, the Confucian state at that time attempted to regulate this kind of Buddhist custom, by concentrating mainly on families in mourning. Come the 17th century, as exemplified by the above statement by Hồ Sĩ Dương, although a Confucian ceremony was available for celebrating the festival, enmity existed towards it among a portion of the Confucian elite; however, since the ceremony had already been recognized within

the family ritual of Ming China, it had become impossible to absolutely refute the practice on Confucian grounds. In sum, it was better for families in mourning to try and suppress the Buddhist aspects of the observance of the mid-year festival rather than discourage Confucian ceremonies geared to that day. In this author's opinion, it was in such a way that these newly adopted rules pertaining to family ritual were utilized as a means of state control and indoctrination. In other words, the provisions of the 47-article indoctrination ordinance, while following the moral policy of the early Lê Dynasty, also adopted the rules of family ritual, including those pertaining to the mid-year festival, with the aim of taking the festival away from the Buddhist sphere and placing it in the Confucian fold.

Next let us turn briefly to the question of how the mid-year festival was dealt with in Vietnamese family ritual later on. With regard to mid-year festival ritual, the *TKGL* version of *Gia lễ* (42a-43a¹⁵) contains both procedures and invocations, including three kinds of celebratory invocations to be read during the preparation of the banquet seats to be occupied by souls of the deceased (*linh tọa* 靈座) and three more for the offering of food to the souls of the family ancestors. The *TMGL* version (18ab) also contains mid-year festival procedures and the invocations. Here we observe absolutely none of the reservations expressed by Hồ Sĩ Dương in his compilation. On the other hand, the Đỗ Family's *Văn Công Gia Lễ Tôn Chân*, the purpose of which was to revive the true intention of Zhu Xi's *Jiali*, contains no ritual concerning the mid-year festival and specifically addresses the subject as follows.

If a family intends to be faithful to *Gia lễ*, it goes without saying that it not conduct rites belonging to Buddhist liturgy, but limit itself to the ceremony for preparing offerings in the family mausoleum (奠祭). The conventional popular celebration of the three summer festivals, the 49th day commemoration of the deceased and the mid-year festival all involve making offerings to Buddha and offering alms to Buddhist priests, acts which express adherence to superstitions about the existence of Hell and thus disinherit Confucian ritual traditions.

3.2 Efforts to Regulate Morality in Rural Vietnam During the 19th Century

It was during the 3rd year of the Gia Long Era (1804) that an ordi-

nance concerning everyday norms was issued in rural northern Vietnam in order to morally control the way of life there.¹⁶⁾ Then in the 7th year of Tự Đức (1855), a royal court assembly established a protocol on dress, funerals and marriage, which reaffirmed the Gia Long ordinance, and the following year established new austerity provisions based on the protocol.¹⁷⁾ Concerning funerals, the Gia Long ordinance stated, “Funereal ceremony and gift-giving will be conducted based on Zhu Xi’s *Jiali*. The wealthy will be made to know their limits and not be permitted displays of extravagance; the poor will not be forced to obey established popular customs.”

The “popular customs” referred to included,

When a funeral is held in the home, it is the custom to feast many times over and serve many delicacies in the name of filial piety (*báo hiếu* 報孝). However, in reality it amounts to incurring debt from mourners (*khấu trái* 口債). This practice has come down through the centuries and become a rural way of life. The wealthy ignore proper ritual and strive to surpass their social status with elaborate displays of extravagance, while the poor lose their wealth through indebtedness to mourners and become wage servants. Or rather, the true mutual aid spirit of funerals is in danger of being completely lost.

The new provisions of 1856 included similar remonstrations: “Funerals should be conducted in accordance with the wealth of the family and based on mutual assistance among neighbors. Families of the deceased should not be required to provide feasts of beef, pork and wine as local customs (*hương lệ* 鄉例) demand.” The phenomenon of *khấu trái* was also criticized as an “old habit” in the above-mentioned 47-article ordinance issued earlier in the century, but it did not base its argument on *Jiali*. Phạm Đình Hổ (1766–1832), the strictly orthodox Confucian intellectual of the early 19th century who wrote *Vũ Trung Tùy Bút*, reiterates the same criticism in the work’s section on mourning.

- Following the ceremony to make offerings to the deceased, neighbors assemble at the mourners’ home to eat and drink to their heart’s content.
- This has become an established rural practice which has resulted in families of mourners having to sell their fields in order to pay for the feasting. Prohibitions have been frequently issued, but they are never

obeyed.

- Because on the days when funereal attire is worn there are great amounts of offerings available, neighbors gather for what will become a sumptuous banquet.

Phạm also laments.

- The only people who mourn for the whole three years are high level civil bureaucrats, while military officers and lower level civil servants casually return to work.
- Rites regarding the dead are no longer conducted based on the original system of ritual, but rather now derive from Buddhism.

Despite the publication of concise, easy-to-follow manuals on Confucian family ritual during the 18th century, it is clear that such rules of etiquette never really caught on in practice.

The *Đỗ Family Ritual Văn Công Gia Lễ Tồn Chân* section entitled “Observations and Revisions” also takes up the issue of feasting. After referring to the fact that Zhu Xi’s *Jiali* instructs that before the post-burial repose of the soul ritual (Ngu tế 虞祭), offerings are provided but no celebration is to be conducted, and the offerings should consist of usual everyday food and drink, the author laments that people today do not understand the gravity associated with the moment of death and are content to make the funerals of their kin into occasions for banquets of good wine and delicacies, feasting to all hours, thus losing the real meaning of grief. The obligation to wine and dine on the occasion of mourning deaths in the family was a deep-rooted element of Vietnamese rural culture. Although the Dynasty and strictly orthodox Confucians attempted to restrict such practices by applying the decorum ordered by *Gia lễ*, those efforts were by no means universally effective. As late as the 1910s the same criticism of such long-standing habits would be leveled by modern intellectuals citing the same problem of indebtedness to mourners [Phan 1991:176–178].

4. *Gia Lễ* and Popular Culture

As we have seen in the preceding pages, the compilers of Vietnamese versions of Zhu Xi’s *Jiali* were influenced by the Chinese works on family ritual written during the Ming period, and the Vietnamese ruling class also focused a great deal of attention on *Gia lễ* as a means of moral indoc-

trination. However, we have also found that the Vietnamese renditions of *Gia lĩ* neither duplicated the Chinese versions in their entirety nor coincided with every effort at indoctrination attempted by the government. This section will take up the issue of exactly how the Vietnamese compilers of *Gia lĩ* chose to adapt its original content to the social and cultural trends developing around them.

4.1 Geomancers and Reburial: The Relationship Between *Gia Lĩ* and *Fengshui*

Regarding the attitude of Chinese works on *Jiali* with respect to choosing the gravesite of the deceased, generally speaking there were two viewpoints. The first argued that a safe place should be sought due to the importance of the remains of one's parents, while the second argued that extreme care should be taken in one's choice due to the fact that interring one's ancestors in an auspicious place would enable their similarly auspicious successors to possess the same *qi* 氣 (material force) in common with ancestors to obtain prosperity and ensure that ancestors would be worshiped in perpetuity. However, there is a difference of opinion about the degree of importance given to the latter opinion. On the other hand, the same works were critical of the popular trend to postpone burial indefinitely by people who had been befuddled by geomancers into believing that fame and fortune would only come if they buried their parents in auspicious ground. Although Zhu Xi himself takes the flexible stand that choosing auspicious gravesites may be done according to the customs of the time, he also introduces the views of Sima Guang 司馬光, who is critical of *fengshui* geomancy and Cheng Yi 程頤, who denies the importance of worrying about the auspiciousness of such aspects as geophysical features and timing.¹⁸⁾ Peng Bin's *Jiali Zhengheng*, which we have established as exerting a great deal of influence on the Vietnamese interpretation of family ritual, does not directly broach the subject of geomancy, but does criticize those who had put their faith in geomancers who try to persuade them not to bury their parents. Peng also agrees with Zhu Xi's favorable view that by securing the remains of one's ancestors and the repose of their souls, sons and grandsons will prosper and their worship will never end.¹⁹⁾ Notwithstanding, the authors of Vietnamese *Gia lĩ* were favorable towards geomancy (but of course opposed to avoiding burial based on it) and introduced *fengshui* and its experts in the pages of their compilations. What follows is first a confirmation of the actual circumstances surround-

ing geomancy in Vietnam during the 17th century, followed by an analysis of comments about it appearing in the Vietnamese *Gia lễ*.

As mentioned previously, a great deal of interest existed among 17th century Vietnamese intellectuals concerning *fengshui* and its Chinese experts in determining the location of family gravesites; and the author of the *Hồ Thượng Thư Gia Lễ* was no exception. Concerning the popularity of geomancers at that time, two Westerners, Samuel Baron and Alexandre de Rhodes mention the way in which the Vietnamese selected their burial sites [Dror & Taylor 2006:267, 280–281; Rhodes 1994:51–53]. Both observed that the ideas and practices of *fengshui* were universally employed in the process. Baron describes the participation of sorcerers, fortune tellers and “*tay de lee*” (evidently *thầy địa lý*, the Vietnamese word for *dilishi* 地理師 (geomancer)) in funereal rites, defining the role of *tay de lee* as the selection of the best burial site to ensure good luck for the deceased’s living kinsfolk, a process that could take years to complete. Rhodes explains that *fengshui* experts were engaged because “of the obviously idiotic belief that all types of good fortune, including wealth, prestige and good health, depend on how a deceased person is put in the ground.” He also mentions that if the deceased’s descendants suffer misfortune, the remains will be re-interred under the direction of a sorcerer.

In the first part of *HTTGL* there are two places where an expert “to observe the lay of the land” is mentioned (20a, 27a). The Vietnamese terminology is “*thầy tướng địa* 柴相地,” a phrase that is not found in any texts other than *Gia lễ*. In the section regarding the choice of burial site, the reader is instructed about how to choose a site by employing an expert “to observe the lay of the land.” However, the section explains only that the ideal site should be located on high arid ground and has not been polluted by “*ngũ hoạn* 五患” (the “five afflictions”), and does not go in to other aspects of *fengshui*, such as *long mạch* 龍脈, the flow of *khí* (qi) 氣 (material force). Next the text explains that after the coffin has been lowered into the open grave, the expert “to observe the lay of the land” will make a well thought out re-determination of the direction. The *TMGL* version merely offers a rough outline of what is contained in Zhu Xi’s *Jiali* concerning the choice of burial site and does not specifically mention experts “to observe the lay of the land,” but it does follow *HTTGL* by repeating what will happen after the lowering of the coffin, while the *TKGL* and *Đỗ* Family versions also fail to mention any expert “to observe the lay of the land.” Here we can confirm the appearance of experts “to observe the lay of the land” (no doubt versed in the art of *fengshui*)

participating in Vietnamese family ritual at its stage of development in the 17th century, whose intellectuals showed great interest in the knowledge offered by *fengshui*, and the continuation of that knowledge in 18th century family ritual. Of course, not every Vietnamese version of *Gia lễ* indicated interest in *fengshui*, but at least none of them show any hostility to the art of geomancy. The *TMGL* version (40a) also includes rules for re-interment, which are based on *fengshui*, indicating the appearance of a new idea among Vietnamese *Gia lễ* and additional proof that the art had clearly been incorporated into the body of family ritual. *HTTGL* does touch upon re-interment, but merely mentions which kind of funereal attire to don, giving no instructions about how to decide on whether or not to re-inter or how to choose a new location.

Here is what *TMGL* states about making the decision to re-inter. Citing the *Qingniao Jing* 青鳥經, the section lists five reasons for re-interment: 1) The burial site has been destroyed by natural causes, 2) the flora on the burial site has withered and died, 3) the family has been accused of promiscuous behavior or there are members who have died young, been orphaned, widowed, etc., 4) family members, male and female alike, have been victims of insanity, blackmail, murder, injurious assault, illness due to epidemic, etc. and 5) the family has suffered from abandonment by its members, dissipation of its wealth or continuous legal action.²⁰⁾

Such criteria for re-interment were at odds with the official views of the Vietnamese dynasties. For example, the above-mentioned ordinance on austerity issued to rural northern Vietnam in 1804 criticizes the cultural trend towards continuous re-interment due to blind faith in *fengshui*, arguing that, indeed, the choice of an auspicious burial site for one's parents is the culmination of filial piety and the location should be chosen with the utmost care, but arid, high ground and avoidance of the "five afflictions" are sufficient criteria for that purpose.²¹⁾ However, if a family should encounter any of those afflictions, it should report the situation to their local government agency, then after an official investigation into the matter and consequent issuance of a permit, re-interment may be performed. Such an opinion based on peace and order at the burial site itself being disturbed is far different from the opinion of *TMGL*, which is also based on misfortune suffered by descendants of the deceased. Despite the difference, *TMGL* continued to be reprinted throughout the Nguyễn Dynasty period, suggesting that the Dynasty's official view of *fengshui* was by no means taken to heart by all of its subjects.

4.2 Death Bed Ritual: *chiêu hô* and *hồn bạch*

In funereal rites concerned with the time just before and after the moment of death, we observe clear differences between Chinese and Vietnamese family ritual. According to Zhu Xi's instructions, immediately after death, servants of the deceased are to remove the deceased's clothing, take it up to the roof, face north and pray "[Name of deceased], come back!" three times. The relationship of this ritual to the souls and spirits of the dead is not mentioned here, nor in the Ming period works on *Jiali*. After this incantation, the coffin is to be prepared, the body of the deceased washed, and cooked rice and coins placed in its mouth (*fanhan* 飯含). After the corpse is prepared, a place is set for its soul to be seated (*lingzuo* 靈座), the cloth figure to be possessed by its spirit (*hunbo* 魂帛) made, then the corpse is to be wrapped in cloth (*xiaolian* 小斂 and *dalian* 大斂) and placed in the coffin.

The *hunbo* spirit cloth, which is made from white silk, is the embodiment of the deceased, which sits in the *lingzuo* seat during the day and is put to rest at night in the *lingchuan* 靈床 bed, during the time that the coffin remains situated in the home. The cloth (*hồn bạch*) serves the same purpose in Vietnamese family ritual, but is prepared in a slightly different way. In contrast to the cloth being prepared in Chinese ritual after the coffin and corpse are set in order, Vietnamese family ritual (including *HTTGL* and *TMGL*) instructs that the cloth be prepared before the moment of death. This difference seems to reflect a view of life and afterlife indigenous to Vietnamese culture. *HTTGL* (3b-4a) contains the following provision.

When the dying person is about to take his last breath, an approximately five-foot (尺) long piece of white silk is to be placed on his *nuong long* 娘龍 to create his *hồn bạch*. Head and ears are to be fashioned and corners of the cloth suspended as legs to form a human shape, into which his life force will be summoned. If no expiration remain, the anticipated inspiration will not be forthcoming.

係欺尋匱侯搵唏，料裊縷晷倣甃尺，抵蓮娘龍尋麻結魂帛，蔑頭仁聰，乘ハ雙足，如形人，傳召氣尋欺羣生氣買特聲靈。

Here is what *TMGL* has to say about the matter.

When the dying person is about to breathe his last, while he is still alive, an approximately seven-foot long piece of white silk is to be placed on his *nuong long*. When he expires, the *hòn bạch* is to be fashioned with a head and both arms and the rest cut into legs to form a human shape.

係欺尋包侯搵唏，裊縷臬度醜醜楚經，抵蓮娘龍尋，嚟欺尋羣生氣，如體氣絕，仕結魄帛，蔑頭仁舁，餘ハ雙足，用肖人形。

While slightly differing in such details as the length of cloth to be used, shape and timing of manufacture, both Vietnamese *Gia lễ* explain the preparation of the *hòn bạch* in the same way. According the Han Nom Institute's dictionary, the term *nuong long* indicates the area around the chest and abdomen [Viện Nghiên Cứu Hán Nôm 2006].²²⁾ The text suggests a concept in Vietnamese culture that when a person's breath expires, his life force escapes through the abdomen; moreover, from the fact that the compilers of that culture's *Gia lễ* would deem to alter the content of Zhu Xi's original to include a rite that accomodates such a concept would lead one to believe that it would have had necessarily become deep-rooted in popular culture.

This amendment providing for the creation of the *hòn bạch* on the death bed in order to capture the dying person's last breath raises the question of what exactly is being summoned in the *chiêu hô* 招呼 rite that is to follow. Indeed, the compiler of *HTTGL* seems to have encountered some difficulty in establishing a context for *chiêu hô* from the instruction before a detailed description of the rite,²³⁾ stating at the end of the section on *hòn bạch*, "If there is no time to obtain the silk, substitute the *chiêu hô* method." Furthermore, given such a context, *chiêu hô* would be performed on the death bed in order to imbue the *hòn bạch* with the recovered life force as soon as the silk was procured. Although this procedure is not clearly described, it seems that if the *hòn bạch* was secured before the moment of death, the *chiêu hô* rite could be dispensed with. *TMGL* fails to explain any relationship between the two rites and places the explanation of *chiêu hô* before that of *hòn bạch*, in apparent reverse order of performance. However, the explanation of *hòn bạch* still instructs that the cloth be prepared to capture the escaping last breath before the *chiêu hô* rite is performed, which places the significance of *chiêu hô* under of shroud of ambiguity.

That being said, historically speaking, *chiêu hô* would gradually be-

come more significant within the actual practice of conducting the funereal ritual. Although basically a translation of *TMGL*, the research done by Lesserteur on Vietnamese funereal rites is a free translation with a text designed to reflect how contemporary Vietnamese were actually implementing the instructions contained in the work. One example of this translation style is the description of *chiêu hô* [Lesserteur 1885:9]. Lesserteur states that in practice the *chiêu hô* rite did not involve merely calling out the name of the deceased, but rather calling his three *âmes* (souls) and seven (nine in the case of a woman) *esprits vitaux* (vital spirits). This also reflects a unique Vietnamese view of the spirits and souls of the dead. Also in the ethnography on funereal ritual during the early 20th century, we find descriptions of calling upon the “Three *hồn* [Lesserteur’s *âmes*] and nine *via* [*esprits vitaux*]” at the time the last breath expires [Diguet 1906:147; Cadiere 1957:190].²⁴ This concept of multiple souls and spirits was already universally held in northern Vietnam as early as the 17th century [Cadiere 1957:191],²⁵ but exactly when it was articulated with *chiêu hô* is unclear. The contemporary Vietnamese version of *TMGL* also has the *chiêu hô* rite calling upon “the three *hồn* and nine *via*.”²⁶ On the other hand, Lesserteur does not translate the part instructing that the *hồn bạch* is to be created while there is still breath and the meaning of laying the cloth on the abdominal area is left fairly ambiguous.

The compilers of Vietnamese *Gia lễ* utilized the idea of *hunbo* appearing in the Chinese family ritual in a creative way so as to capture the life breath that was attempting to escape from the deceased, and in doing so, revised Chinese tradition to meet Vietnamese needs. On the other hand, the view of spirits and souls of the dead embodied in “three *hồn* and seven (nine) *via*” may have been widely held in northern Vietnam, but such a view was completely foreign to Confucian family ritual. However, in the practical aspects of funereal ritual at the end of the 19th century, we see an attempt to incorporate that view into the *chiêu hô* portion of the ritual by summoning the “three *hồn* and nine *via*.” It seems that the modern Vietnamese “translation” of *TMGL* was done more in conjunction with Vietnamese reality than strict adherence to the original text.

4.3 Revisions to the Five Levels of Mourning

As mentioned previously, both the *TKGL* and *TMGL* versions of *Gia lễ* devote a great deal of space to the subjects of the nine paternal generations (*cửu tộc*) and the five levels of mourning (*ngũ phục*), in an attempt

to incorporate Chinese rites of mourning into the Vietnamese scheme. Both works follow the descriptive order found in Peng Bin's *Zhengheng*. In terms of style, in addition to classical Chinese we find sections of *chữ nôm* script attempting to make the complicated rules of family ritual as easy to remember as possible. As to content, we also find unique provisions attempting to accommodate social relationships indigenous to Vietnam.

For example, both Vietnamese versions and *Zhengheng* are in agreement about the provision stating that the period of mourning for one's father should be three years at the *trăm thôi* (*zanshuai*) level and that for one's mother should be three years at the *tê thôi* (*qishuai*) level; however, the two Vietnamese versions add a supplementary provision that if the mother dies after the father, three years at the *trăm thôi* level should be observed for her as well.²⁷) It can also be confirmed that *TMGL* is following the lead of *TKGL* in including that particular provision. Content-wise, this provision seems to be attempting to accommodate a unique Vietnamese idea concerning child-bearing wives who survive their husbands. According to the research done by Makino Tatsumi 牧野巽 [1944: 221–222], within the rules of inheritance during the Lê Dynasty period, when one spouse dies prior to the other, the surviving spouse takes over management of the family wealth and none of that wealth is distributed among the children at that time. Therefore, the reason for raising the level of mourning for child-bearing widows may be that such a mother was seen as performing the role of a father as the manager of the family estate.²⁸)

Also regarding the level of mourning for the parents of one's wife, the Chinese custom of three months at the lowest level of *sima* is not mentioned in the text of *TKGL*, (4b–5a), but only in the figure captioned “夫爲妻親服圖” (Case of a husband mourning his wife's parents) with a critical comment: “Contrary to Ming China, since in our kingdom land is inherited equally by men and women, adhering to such a provision would be considered a disgrace to humanity.” *TMGL* (50b) deliberately devotes only a mere two lines to the same provision, recommending one year at the *tê thôi* level. Raising the level of China's lowest level of mourning to second highest seems to be an indication that women in Vietnam, who are entitled to inheritances equal to men, and the parents that bore them were given much more respect than their Chinese counterparts. The order of the mourning provisions in *TMGL* also prioritizes the case of brides mourning their own parents (51a) in comparison to the Chinese order, but the level of mourning, one year at *tê thôi*, is the same. Therefore, what has been revised here is only the degree of moral obligation husbands

are expected to assume regarding the parents of their wives, by raising the level of mourning for husbands to exactly that of their wives. While the wealth inherited by the wife from her family was not considered community property, but rather part of the wife's personal belongings without direct benefit to the husband, it, nevertheless, comprised a very significant part of the total household budget. Another possibility is rather than being a matter of gratitude for material largess, there may have been intellectuals who were of the opinion that upon the death of parents of brides, who enjoyed deep relationships with their daughters, husbands sharing their wives' grief equally should be observed as a part of the indigenous Vietnamese sense of humanity.

4.4 The Critique of *Thọ Mai Gia Lễ*

Given the above discussion, one can only conclude that the compilers of Vietnamese *Gia lễ* had no qualms whatsoever about revising the original instructions to accommodate unique aspects of Vietnamese culture and society, no doubt contributing to the spread of Confucian ideas and practice throughout their homeland. On the other hand, there were strict Confucians who were dissatisfied with such revisions, which they thought diverted too far from orthodoxy. Vietnamese intellectuals by no means represented a single bloc of consensus. The present section will focus on such diversity of opinion in discussing at what point revision deserves to be characterized as “deviant” and the criticism that was leveled at such deviation from the norm.

Let us begin with the variant of *Vũ Trung Tùy Bút* (R1069), whose section on “How to Prepare a Hand Sink” contains some criticism of *TMGL*. R1069, which contains text hand-copied by one Hảo Nhân Trai 好仁齋 in the 18th year of the Thành Thái Era (1906), is the only version of the work that does criticize *TMGL* and for that reason needs further investigation into whether or not it should be attributed to the authorship of Phạm Đình Hồ. In either case, here we will treat the comments concerning *TMGL* as proof that there existed prior to 1906 certain reservations about that particular version of *Gia lễ* among at least one portion of Vietnam's Confucian intellectuals. The comments may be summarized as follows.

- The author of *TMGL*, Hồ Sĩ Tân, was born in Trung Lập Village, Đường Hào District, Thượng Hồng Prefecture, Hải Dương Province and successfully passed the regional civil service examination.

- The motivation behind Hồ's compiling the work was monetary profit.
- Hồ presented the work to Trần Công Xán, who served as Bồi Tụng during 1784–86 and granted a request by the author to praise the work in a public forum.
- However, there were those who were opposed to such a public display of affirmation.
- Due to its ineptly and clumsily written content, no serious intellectual would refer to the work, but there are those thinkers deeply embedded in rural society who have been greatly influenced by it.

Even if this critique is not that of Phạm Đình Hổ, or even something completely fabricated to criticize *TMGL*, the information about the compiler and the date of completion have to be based on some factual information. Furthermore, no one has yet to come across any reason why the description would defy the facts.

Turning to the critical comments contained in the description, which deeply regrets the adoption of the work by Vietnamese society, *TMGL* is depicted as shallow and lowbrow (譏陋鄙猥), overtly sensational and nothing but a hodgepodge of trivia (創格出奇, 拾摭屬之唾餘). Its rules for banquets are criticized as merely a way of raising a racket by doing this, that and the other thing (談樽俎之禮節, 去此適彼, 羣吠紛紜), while its rules for worshipping the gods are halfhearted and frivolous (曾不思祠神禮節). The criticism of the work as a hodgepodge of miscellany is probably directed at the Addendum, which goes into explanations about a number of essentially unrelated topics ranging from invocations for yearly events, ceremonies and rituals, rules of etiquette and the definition of auspicious and inauspicious days. In other words, the brunt of the criticism is being leveled not at the main text on family ritual, but rather at the Addendum and at any rural intellectual who would take that content at face value. Indeed, it is a fact that *TMGL* was read not only as a treatise on family ritual, but also as a manual on all kinds of unrelated events and ceremonies [Shimao 2009].

TMGL also comes under attack by Đỗ Huy Uyển, co-author of his family's ritual, *Văn Công Gia Lễ Tôn Chân*, for being disrespectful (尤失其禮之甚者) with unrefined, countrified celebratory invocations and verse (壽梅祝文·對句, 鄙俚無論), unable to distinguish between celebratory and solemn rites (已至若吉凶不辨), and confusing Buddhist and Confucian liturgies (儒釋相參).²⁹ Đỗ argues that the reason why *TMGL* was widely

disseminated is mainly historical. That is to say, in comparison to the concise, easy to implement style of Zhu Xi's *Jiali*, Ming period compilers like Yang Shengan and Shen Gelao added superfluous commentary and ritual, which not only ended up diverting from the true core of *Jiali*, but also made its implementation very difficult. Consequently, *TMGL* became the only alternative. The failure by Đổ to mention either the earlier *HTTGL* or *TKGL* versions quoted by *TMGL* probably stems from the fact that at that point in time, those earlier works had already been discarded in favor of the *TMGL* version. Finally, on the present state of funereal rites, Đổ states in his Preface that reading family ritual regarding funerals while ones parent(s) are still alive should not be avoided, since when death does occur, one is plunged into grief and the heart becomes miserable and confused, willing to entrust the village elders with making arrangements and conducting rites and ceremonies that may not be proper.

It would be fair to conclude from the kind of criticism leveled at *TMGL* that the situation facing family ritual in Vietnam during the 18th and 19th centuries was marked by the dissemination of a practical manual to meet the demand of rural intellectuals for easy-to-implement family and local rituals, but was met by a backlash on the part of orthodox Confucian scholars demanding stricter ritual standards.

In Lieu of a Conclusion: A Chronological Outline

Northern Vietnam during the latter half of the 17th century has been characterized as having had put a civil war behind it, now striving to reconstruct its political and moral order on the strength of revitalized Confucian literati [Taylor 1987]. One of the first steps was the issuance of a 47-article ordinance dealing with education, authored by government officials loyal to the principles of Confucianism. In this ordinance we find a provision urging families in mourning to abide by the instructions contained in Zhu Xi's *Jiali* for celebrating the mid-year festival, instead of the customs derived from Buddhist liturgy. Although the original *Jiali* contains no instructions regarding the behavior of mourners at mid-year, there was a protocol in Peng Bin's *Jiali Zhengheng* which had been adopted throughout Vietnam. This Ming period version of *Jiali* would exert a great amount of influence on those Vietnamese scholars who attempted to compile their own versions.

One central figure in the government during the promulgation of the 47-article ordinance was none other than Hồ Sĩ Dương, who compiled

one of those Vietnamese versions, although we do not know whether it was completed before or after the ordinance was issued. We do know he was born and raised in the village of Hoàn Hậu, Nghệ An Province, a progressive center of learning that produced many successful civil service examinees, high ranking bureaucrats and Confucian intellectuals. Hồ was one of three villagers who would rise to top government posts, where they would all act as diplomats to China. The village was characterized by all the elements of China's elite society, including an ancestral hall, lineage genealogy, family precepts and gravesites selected by Chinese experts in *fengshui* geomancy. This scene can be assumed to have been a part of direct contact with China via maritime trade.

Hồ's compilation of *Jiali* (*Gia lễ*) was not only influenced by the works of Peng Bin, but also included new material as well. One unique aspect was a Vietnamese translation in *chữ nôm* script of *Jiali*-based funereal rites, in the hope of making their rather complex rules and procedures easier to understand. The work introduced an original rite for capturing the life breath of one on his deathbed onto a *hunbo* (*hòn bạch*) cloth, based on Vietnamese popular tradition, and also urged its readers to have an expert "observe the lay of the land" at the time of burial.

The 18th century was marked by the first printing and publication of the Vietnamese versions of *Jiali*: *Tiếp Kính Gia Lễ* in 1707 and Hồ's version in 1739. There are a great many unclear points regarding the former, but the part concerning the five levels of mourning written in a list format rendered in *chữ nôm* script is an important section showing a unique Vietnamese custom concerning levels of mourning for widows and wives' parents differing from the Chinese instructions. There is also an addendum discussing how to conduct village-level ceremonies other than those related to family ritual. Although *TKGL* is considered to be a popularized version of *Gia lễ*, the fact that the *HTTGL* version was reprinted in the late 18th century after the publication of the *TKGL* version demonstrates a demand in Vietnamese society for more detailed instructions on family ritual.

It was also the late 18th century that saw the publication of *TMGL*, a more concise work compiled by Hồ Gia Tân. The most noteworthy characteristic is what seems to be a new style mixing together classical Chinese and Vietnamese *chữ nôm* script. The varied, miscellaneous content offered incorporates the revisions added by both the *HTTGL* and *TKGL* versions. However, it does not only follow *HTTGL*'s suggestion about experts "to observe the lay of the land," but also supports the idea in *fengshui* that the gravesites of ancestors can determine the fortunes of their descendants.

TMGL contains a more substantive addendum of ritual going beyond *Jiali* and even local ceremonies, thus deviating into a all-in-one manual of liturgy.

Then during the 19th century the *TKGL* and *HTTGL* versions disappeared from the ritual landscape, leaving only *TMGL* to be disseminated among rural Confucian intellectuals waiting with open arms. It was also during that time that the Nguyễn Dynasty promoted the strict observance of Zhu Xi's *Jiali* as a set of norms that would restrict the extravagant decoration and luxurious feasting that had become the norm during mourning. The Dynasty also denounced the custom of continuously re-interring ancestors due to obsession with *fengshui* beliefs, arguing that danger to gravesites was posed only by the "five calamities" affecting the actual sites themselves. Although the provisions about re-interment in *TMGL* contradicted Dynasty policy, the latter did not dwell on the issue, and that version continued to be reprinted. Criticism of *TMGL* would come from another source, 19th century orthodox neo-Confucians angered that the profit motive behind publishing the work violated the true spirit of Zhu Xi and that its content constituted a collection of simplified, lowbrow trivia. Nevertheless, the version of *Gia lễ* holding such views, *Văn Công Gia Lễ Tồn Chân*, was never printed, demonstrating a failure to attract the demand among Vietnamese readers enjoyed by the popularized version.

Notes

- 1) From the records of Samuel Baron, who was born in the mid-17th century to a long time Dutch resident of Hanoi and his Vietnamese wife, traveled frequently between Europe and Asia and was involved in commercial dealings in northern Vietnam for the British East India Company, it is clear that funeral rites in the north were already being influenced by Confucian liturgy, but the source of that influence cannot be identified as *Jiali*. Furthermore, there was also a marked penchant to include non-Confucian practices and ideas [Dror & Taylor 2006:74–83, 265–269].
- 2) Hồ Phi Hội 胡丕繪, *Quỳnh Đồi Cổ Kim Sự Tích Hương Biên* 瓊堆古今事跡鄉編 (l'École française d'Extrême-Orient archives). Concerning the Vietnamese ancestral mausoleum, see [Shimao 2009].
- 3) References to *Gia lễ* can be seen in epigraphy collected from Thành Lợi Village, Vụ Bản District, Nam Định Province. See [Sakurai 2006].
- 4) Concerning Dumoutier's career, see [Daritigues 2005:384–385].
- 5) *TMGL*, 17b–18a.
- 6) *Ibid.* 8a.
- 7) Hồ Sĩ Dương not only participated in compiling chronicles, but also in such historiographical projects as *Lam Sơn Thực Lục* 藍山寔錄 [Yao 2004].

- 8) Detailed bodies of village law were already being drawn up at early as the 17th century and continued to be frequently revised [Vũ 1985].
The career of popular poetess Hồ Xuân Hương 胡春香 remains very enigmatic, but at least we know that she was also a native of the village, as was Phạm Đình Toái 范廷倅, who revised and reedited the dramatic collection *Đại Nam Quốc Sử Diễn Ca* 大南國史演歌 and compiled *Quyển Lưu Tiết Phụ Truyện* 瓊瑠節婦傳.
- 9) *Quyển Đồi Cổ Kim Sự Tích Hương Biên*, 「家世科場」: *Đại Nam Chính Biên Liệt Truyện Sơ Tập* 大南正編列傳初集, vol. 36:27ab.
- 10) See [Azuma 2003:chap. 1]. Proof of the influence exerted by this collection on intellectuals of the Lê Dynasty's Thánh Tông Era comes from mention being made in civil service examinations of the time of several works appearing in its first section [Đinh 2009:299].
- 11) Li Tana [2001] has argued that many books were imported into northern Vietnam from Ningbo during the 17th and 18th centuries and that Ming period works exerted a great amount of influence on the Confucian scholars of Vietnam. This article supports those arguments with concrete examples.
- 12) *Annam Zhiyuan* 安南志原, vol. 3: 詩文條.
- 13) *Khâm Định Việt Sử Thông Giám Cương Mục* 欽定越史通鑑綱目, 正編, vol. 24:Cảnh Thống 景統 2年秋7月條.
- 14) *Ibid.*, 正編, vol. 41:14a.
- 15) This alphanumeric pagination scheme was added later by hand.
- 16) *Đại Nam Thực Lục Chính Biên* 大南寔錄正編, 第一紀, vol. 23:7a-11b.
- 17) *Bản Triều Thứ Chính Tập Biên* 本朝庶政襍編, Tự Đức 嗣德 8年新議嚴禁條款.
- 18) Sima does state that land should be chosen which has not been dug up or flooded. Cheng, while recognizing that the burial of ancestors in auspicious ground and the resulting repose gained by spirits of the dead will bring about prosperity for descendents to the same extent as the *qi* (material force) of those ancestors, holds that rather than selecting burial sites based on auspicious geographical coordinates and timing, one should avoid five physical dangers, laid out in two sets: 1) road construction, walled city construction, ditch construction, confiscation by rulers and agrarian cultivation; 2) land invaded by irrigation ditches, roads, settlements, wells or holes.
- 19) Peng Bin 彭濱, *Jiali Zhengheng* 家禮正衡, vol. 6:9b-10b. Yang Shen 楊慎, *Wengong Jiali Yijie* 文公家禮儀節, vol. 5:37ab. Zhou Yingqi 周應期 ed., *Jiali Zhengheng*, vol. 6:7b-8b.
- 20) Quoting *Yangxing Bian* 庸行編, Fengshui Lei 風水類, *TMGL* states that it is not necessary to re-inter if the grave is opened and an auspicious sign appears (*ibid.*, 40b). Quotations from *Qingniao Jing* have also been taken from *Yangxing Bian*, a copy of which can be found in the Japanese National Archives.
- 21) Here land on a mountain top, near a water source, around a mausoleum, on a battlefield and in town is cited as being “afflicted” (*Đại Nam Thực Lục Chính Biên*, 第一紀, vol. 23:7a-11b). The bureaucratic manual entitled *Sĩ Hoạn Tu Tri* 仕宦須知 (Toyo Bunko microfilm A216 [EFEO], X-2-73) includes *Tân San Hình Bộ Tiểu Sách Toàn Tập* 新刪刑部小冊全集, a collection of books on penal administration compiled in Tự Đức 12 (1859). The ordinances contained in

the manual regarding funerals earmarked for punishment anyone deferring burial for long periods of time due to obsession with *fengshui* prohibitions and then cites the outline of a local ordinance of Gia Long 3 (1804) concerning funerals. There is also a protocol dated Tự Đức 8 (1855) regarding the subject. This manual allows us to reconfirm the point that re-interment was permitted when faced with only the “five afflictions,” but was limited in frequency to two reburials. This ordinance quotes penal law and precedents from *Hoàng Việt Luật Lệ* 皇越律例, vol. 9 禮律, 儀制 (44a–45b). Incidentally, *Quốc Triều Hình Luật* 國朝刑律, which was compiled during the Lê Dynasty period contains no prohibitions related to *fengshui*.

- 22) According to Pigneaux de Béhaine’s *Dictionarium Anamitico Latinum* 1772–73, the meaning of *nuong long* is flank (*cạnh sườn*).
- 23) The rite to be performed on the roof is an essential feature of *Gia lễ*, but the three repetitions of the name are supposed to be done facing heaven, facing earth and facing forward, respectively. The custom of everyone acting as if they are searching for something that has left the corpse but is still near the house somewhere is not found in either the original *Jiali* or the Ming period compilations, and *TMGL* does not include it either.
- 24) However, in the actual examples introduced by Diguët, *hồn bạch* plays an important role in capturing the fleeing spirit.
- 25) In terms of the actual implementation of *Gia lễ*, the addendum to the mid-19th century Đỗ Family *Gia lễ* mentions the following custom. When the corpse is to be washed, a special kind of water (*tam kỳ thủy* 三岐水) is purchased by the men for 7 錢 and the women for 9 錢. After boiling incense (*ngũ vị hương* 五味香) and green peas with it, the water is then used to wash the corpse. Bath water scented with *ngũ vị hương* incense is also called for in the *HTTGL* and *TMGL* versions, but does not appear in the original *Jiali* or the Ming compilations, suggesting some local creativity in that country’s own *Gia lễ*. The price of the water at 7 for males, 9 for females shows popular numerology at work.
- 26) To this author’s knowledge, there are two different translations of *TMGL*. One is contained in a pirated version purchased from a street vendor sometime between the 1990 and the early 2000s. The translator and publisher remain unknown. We can only guess that it was done during the French colonial period and continued to be printed without authorization. The copy in this author’s possession, which was obtained on Tràng Tiền Street, Hanoi, contains the phrase “質盛 [河內行棧庸一百十五號] 發行零沽” in the cover design, leading one to assume that it was being sold by a bookstore on Hàng Gai Street in colonial Hanoi. On page 4 there is mention of summoning the “three *hồn* and seven (nine) *via*.” The other translation of *TMGL* is a recent work by a known translator and publisher being sold in bookstores throughout the country, which renders the above text as “Shouting at the spirit to come back.”
- 27) The *TKGL* version (9ab) states,

When mourning one’s natural father wear the headdress and clothing

designated for three years at the *trăm thôi* level. The cane is to be made of bamboo. For one's natural mother, headdress and clothing designated for three years at the *tê thôi* level. The cane is to be made of paulownia. If the mother dies after the father, one may wear headdress and clothing designated for *trăm thôi*.

The *TMGL* version (43a) states,

Upon the death of the natural father, three years at *trăm thôi*. The cane is to be made of bamboo. For the natural mother, three years at *tê thôi*. The cane is to be made of paulownia. If the mother dies after the father, one may wear headdress and clothing designated for *trăm thôi*, but the cane should remain the same.

- 28) Incidentally, in the Chinese ritual reforms implemented during the Hongwu Era of the Ming period, the level of mourning for mothers was changed to three years at *zhanshuai*, because a mother's and father's devotion was considered equal. Peng Bin's *Zhengheng* does not heed this change, choosing to follow the traditional rule [Inoue 1999]. The custom of equal inheritance for men and women as seen in the *Quốc Triều Hình Luật* penal code has been a long standing topic of discussion [Miyazawa 1999; Yu 1990; Ta 1984; Tran 2006].
- 29) The subject of invocations and memorial addresses related to *Gia lễ* will be taken up in a forthcoming publication.

Bibliography

- Azuma Jūji 吾妻重二. 2003. *Shuki "Karei" no hanpon to sisō ni kansuru jissihōteki kenkyū* 朱熹『家禮』の版本と思想に関する實證的研究 (Positive research on texts and thought of Zhu Xi's *Jia-li*, family rituals). Heisei 12 nendo-14 nendo kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kiban kenkyū (C)(2) kenkyū seika hōkokusho 平成12年度-14年度科學研究費補助金・基盤研究 (C) (2) 研究成果報告書 (Report of the results of Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C)(2) during 2000-02).
- Béhaine, Pierre Pigneaux de. (Hồng Nhuê, Nguyễn Khắc Xuyên, tr.) 1999. *Từ Vĩ Annam Latinh* (Dictionarium Anamitico Latinum). TPHCM: Nhà Xuất Bản Trẻ.
- Cadiere, L. 1957. *Croyances et pratiques religieuses des Vietnamiens*. Tome III. Paris: EFEO.
- Chen Chingho 陳荊和, ed. 1986. *Kōgōbon: Daietsu shiki zensho ge* 校合本 大越史記全書 (下) (A critical edition of the Dai Viet Su Ky Toan Thu, part 3). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo fuzoku Tōyōgaku bunken sentā 東京大學東洋文化研究所附屬東洋學文獻センター.
- . 1992. Rechō no kyōka jōritsu 47 jō ni tsuite 黎朝の教化條律四十七條に就いて (The forty-seven articles of moral education during the Le dynasty). *Sōdai Ajia kenkyū* 創大アジア研究 (The journal of Institute of Asian Studies, Soka

- University) 13:91–99.
- Diguet, Colonel. E. 1906. *Les Annamites*. Paris: Librairie Maritime et Colonial.
- Dror, Olga & Taylor, K. W. 2006. *Views of Seventeenth-Century Vietnam: Christoforo borri on Cochinchina and Samuel Baron on Tonkin*. Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asian Program Publications.
- Dumoutier, G. 1902. *Le rituel funéraire des Annamites: Étude d'ethnographie religieuse*. Hanoi: Imprimerie Typo-Lithographique F. H. Schneider.
- . 1908. *Essais sur les Tonkinois*. Hanoi-Haiphong: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient.
- Daritigues, Laurent. 2005. *L'Orientalisme française en pays d'Annam 1862–1939*. Paris: Les Indes savantes.
- Đình Khắc Thuần. 2009. *Giáo dục và Khoa cử Nho học thời Lê ở Việt Nam qua Tài liệu Hán Nôm* (Education, civil service examination and confucian ideas during the Lê dynasty period: A survey of the *Han Nom* sources). Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất bản Khoa học Xã hội.
- Ebrey, Buckley. 1991. *Zhu Xi's Family Rituals*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Forest, Alain. 1998. *Les missionnaires français au Tonkin et au Siam (XVIIe–XVIIIe siècles)*. Livre II, *Histoires du Tonkin*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Hồ Gia Tân, Phan Hà Sơn & Trương Thị Thủy, eds. 2009. *Thọ Mai Gia Lễ*. Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Hà Nội.
- Hồ Phi Hội & Hồ Trọng Chuyên. (Hồ Đức Lĩnh, tr. Hồ Văn Khuê, ed.) 2004. *Quỳnh Đôi Cổ Kim Sự Tích Hương Biên* (Records of the past and recent accomplishments of Quỳnh Đôi Village). Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Lao Động.
- Huard, Pierre & Durand, Maurice. 1953. Lan-Ong et la médecine sino-vietnamienne. *Bulletin de la Société des Étude Indchinoise de Saigon*, n.s. 28:1–73.
- Inoue Tōru 井上徹. 1999. Minchō ni yoru fukusei no kaitei: “Kōjiroku” no hensan 明朝による服制の改定：『孝慈録』の編纂 (The modification of five mourning grades by the Ming dynasty: The edition of “*Xiao-ci lu* 孝慈録”). *Tōyō gakuho* 東洋學報 (The journal of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko) 81 (1): 36–66.
- Lesserteur, Pere. 1885. *Le rituel domestique des funérailles en Annam*. Paris: Imp. Chaix.
- Li Tana. 2011. The imported book trade and Confucian learning in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Vietnam. In *New Perspectives on the History and Historiography of Southeast Asia*, ed. Michael Arthur Aung-Thwin & Kenneth R. Hall, 167–182. London & New York: Routledge.
- Makino Tatsumi 牧野巽. 1944 [1934]. Annan no Rechō keiritsu ni arawareta kazoku seido : toku ni sono kasan seido ni tsuite 安南の黎朝刑律にあらわれた家族制度：特にその家産制度について (Family institutions as seen in the penal code of Annam's Lê dynasty). In *Shina kazoku kenkyū* 支那家族研究 (Studies on the Chinese family), 687–724. Tokyo: Seikatsusha 生活社.
- Makino Motonori 牧野元紀. 2009. 18 seiki izen no Pari gaikoku senkyōkai to Betonamu hokubu senkyō: shūdōkaikei senkyō dantai oyobi genchi seiken tonon kankei wo chūshin ni 18世紀以前のパリ外國宣教會とベトナム北部宣教：修道會系宣教會團體および現地政權との關係を中心に (The evangelical ef-

- forts of the Paris Foreign Mission Society in Northern Vietnam prior to the 19th century). Fuji Zerokkusu Kobayashi Setsutarō kinen kikin Kobayashi ferōshippu 2000 nendo kenkyū josei ronbun 富士ゼロックス小林節太郎記念基金小林フェローシップ2007年研究助成論文 (Research funded by the 2007 Fuji-Xerox Kobayashi Setsutarō Memorial Fund Fellowship).
- Miyazawa Chihiro 宮澤千尋. 1996. Betonamu hokubu ni okeru josei no zaisan jō no chii: 19 seiki kara 1920 nendai matsu made ベトナム北部における女性の財産上の地位：19世紀から1920年代末まで (Women's property right in the northern part of Vietnam from the 19th century to the late 1920s). *Minzokugaku kenkyū* 民族學研究 (The Japanese journal of ethnology) 60 (4): 330-341.
- . 1999. Betonamu hokubu no fukei shinzoku shūdan no ichi jirei: jukyō teki kihan to jittai ベトナム北部の父系親族集團の一事例：儒教的規範と實態 (Patrilineal kinship groups in a village of Northern Vietnam: The Confucian rule and its deviation). *Betonamu no shakai to bunka* ベトナムの社會と文化 (Society and culture of Vietnam) 1:7-33.
- Momoki Shirō 桃木至朗. 1998. Kinsei hokubu betonamu no fūsui to kōben no chirisho 近世北部ベトナムの風水と高駢の地理書 (Geomancy in early modern Northern Vietnam and Gao Pien's book of geomancy). *Hyakkoku sha tsūshin* 百穀社通信 (Bách Cốc newsletters) 8:104-22.
- . 2000. Kinsei Betonamu ōchō ni totteno "waga kuni" 近世ベトナム王朝に
とつての「わが國」 ("Our Country" from the standpoint of late premodern Vietnamese dynasties). In *Nihon Betonam kankei wo manabu hito no tammeni* 日本・ベトナム關係を學ぶ人のために (Towards a better understanding of Japan-Vietnam relations), ed. Kimura Han 木村汎, 18-39. Tokyo: Sekai sisōsha 世界思想社.
- . 2011. Nation and Geo-Body in Early Modern Vietnam: A Preliminary Study through Sources of Geomancy. In *Southeast Asia in the Fifteenth Century: The China Factor*, ed. Geoff Wade & Sun Laichen, 126-153. Hongkong: Hongkong University Press.
- Ōnhi Kazuhiko 大西和彦. 1984. Betonamu ni okeru chūgensetsu gyōji no enaku ni tsuite ベトナムにおける中元節行事の沿革について (On the history of the function of *Tết trung-nguyên* (中元節) in Vietnam). *Ōtani daigaku daigakuin kenkyū kiyō* 大谷大學大學院研究紀要 (Research report in the Graduate School of Otani University) 1:223-242.
- Phan Kế Bính. 1991. *Việt Nam Phong Tục* (Vietnamese customs). TPHCM: Nhà Xuất Bản Tổng Hợp Đồng Tháp.
- Rhodes, Alexandre de. (Hong Nhue, tr.) 1994. *Lịch Sử Vương Quốc Đàng Ngoài* (History of the Kingdom of Tonkin). TPHCM: Tủ Sách Đại Kết. (Second-hand translation through Henri Albi's French version)
- Sakurai Yumio 櫻井由躬雄. 2006. *Rekishi chiikigaku no kokoromi Bakku Kokku* 歴史地域學の試み バックコック (Bach Coc, a trial of historical area studies). Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku daigakuin jinbun shakaikei kenkyūka Minami Ajia Tōnan Ajia rekishi shakai kenkyūshitsu 東京大學大學院人文社會系研究科南・東南アジア歴史社會專門分野研究室.
- Shimao Minoru 嶋尾稔. 2001. Genchō: "nanboku ikka" no keisei to sōkoku 阮

- 朝：「南北一家」の形成と相克 (The Nguyen dynasty: The formation of and struggles within a unified northern and southern house). In *Iwanam kōza Tōnan Ajiashi* 岩波講座 東南アジア史 (Iwanami lecture Southeast Asian studies series), vol. 5, *Tōnan Aji sekai no saihei* 東南アジア世界の再編 (Reorganization of the Southeast Asian World), ed. Saitō Teruko 齊藤照子, 25–48. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- . 2006. “Ju Bai Ka Rei” ni kansuru kisoteki kōsatsu 『壽梅家禮』に関する基礎的考察 (Family rituals in Vietnam from the 17th century to the early 20th century: A preliminary study of Ho Gia Tan’s *Tho Mai Gia Le*). *Keiō gijuku daigaku gengo bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 慶應義塾大學言語文化研究所紀要 (Reports of the Keio Institute of Cultural and Linguistic Studies) 37:141–158.
- . 2009. “Ju Bai Ka Rei” ni kansuru kisoteki kōsatsu. Pt. 4. *Keiō gijuku daigaku gengo bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 40:247–257.
- . 2009. The Sinification of Vietnamese Village: Family Genealogy and Ancestral Hall. In *The Changing Self Image of Southeast Asian Society during the 19th and 20th century*, ed. Ishii Yoneo, 54–86. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.
- . 2010. Betonam no karei to minkan bunka ベトナムの家禮と民間文化 (Vietnamese family ritual and popular culture). In *Ajia no bunjin ga mita minshū to sono bunka* アジアの文人が見た民衆とその文化 (Culture and the masses as seen by Asian literati), ed. Yamamoto Eishi 山本英史, 101–143. Tokyo: Keiō Gijuku daigaku shuppankai 慶應義塾大學出版會.
- . Forthcoming. *Betonam ni okeru karei no jūyo to kaihen: shukubun wo chūsin ni* ベトナムにおける家禮の受容と改変：祝文を中心に (The adoption and modification of Zhu Xi’s Family Ritual in Vietnam as seen from celebratory texts).
- Suenari Michio 末成道男. 1998. *Betonamu no sosen saishi: cho kyoku no shakai seikatsu* ベトナムの祖先祭祀：潮曲の社會生活 (Social life and ancestors in a Vietnamese village on the outskirts of Hanoi). Tokyo: Fūkyōsha 風響社.
- Ta Van Tai. 1984. Women and the Law in Traditional Vietnam. *The Vietnam Forum* 3:23–54.
- Tân Việt. 2004. *Một Trăm Điều Nên Biết Về Phong Tục Việt Nam* (100 facts that one should know about Vietnamese customs). Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Trẻ.
- Taylor, Keith. 1987. The Literati Revival in Seventeenth-century Vietnam. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 18 (1): 1–22.
- Thecla, Adriano di St. (Dror, Olga, tr.) 2002. *Opusculum de Sectis apud Sinenses et Tunkinenses (A Small Treatise on the Sects among the Chinese and the Tonkinese): A Study of Religion in China and North Vietnam in the Eighteenth Century*. Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asian Program Publications.
- Trần Nghĩa & Gros, François. 1993. *Di Sản Hán Nôm Việt Nam: Thư Mục Để Yếu* (Catalogue des livres en Hán Nôm). 3 vols. Hà Nội: Nxb.KHXH.
- Tran Nhung Tuyet. 2006. Beyond the Myth of Equality: Daughters’ Inheritance Rights in the Le Code. In *Viet Nam Borderless Histories*, ed. Nhung Tuyet Tran & Anthony Reid, 121–144. Madison: The University of Wisconsin pres.
- Trần Thị Kim Anh. 2003. Ai Soạn “Thọ Mai Gia Lễ” (Who compiled *Tho Mai Gia Lễ*?). *Nguồn Sáng Dân Gian* (Light of popular culture) 1: 61–63, 68.
- Viện Nghiên Cứu Hán Nôm. 2006. *Tự Điển Chữ Nôm* (Chữ Nôm dictionary). Hà

Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Giáo Dục.

Vũ Duy Mên. 1985. Vài nét về quá trình điều chỉnh và bổ sung hương ước Quỳnh Đôi (Some views on the revision and expansion of the bylaws of Quỳnh Đôi Village). *Nghiên Cứu Lịch Sử* (Historical studies) 225:45-55, 82.

Yao Takao 八尾隆生. 2004. Ramuson kigi to “Ramuson jitsuroku” hensan no keifu : hayazaki no Vetonamu “minzoku shugi” 藍山蜂起と『藍山實録』編纂の系譜 : 早咲きのヴェトナム「民族主義」(The Lam Son uprising and the trace of the compilation of the *Lam Son Records*: Early-flowering “nationalism” of Vietnam). *Rekishigaku kenkyū* 歴史學研究 (Journal of historical studies), no. 789:42-51.

Yu Insun. 1990. *Law and Society in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Vietnam*. Seoul: Asiatic Research Center Korea University.