The *Yijing* (Classic of Changes; 易經) in Global Perspective: Some Reflections

Richard J. Smith
Rice University

Paper for the International Conference on Teaching and Learning of World Civilizations, City University of Hong Kong, June 20-22, 2009.

Abstract

During the past three thousand years or so, the *Yijing* has gradually become a global property. Having originated in China as an occult prognostication text that later attained the status of a "classic," its influence gradually spread to other areas within the Chinese cultural orbit—notably Japan, Korea and Vietnam. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Jesuit missionaries brought knowledge of the classic to the West; and today there are several dozen different translations of the *Yijing* in various Western languages. The work has inspired countless derivative books, and is presently used for insight and guidance by millions of people worldwide. How did the *Changes* come to exert such a pervasive global influence and what happened to the book as it moved from its homeland to other countries and cultures? Clearly the "globalization" of the *Yijing* was in part the product of its alluring "special features (tezhi; 特 質 :" its exalted position as "the first of the [Confucian] classics;" its cryptic and challenging basic text; its elaborate numerology and other forms of symbolic representation; its utility as a tool of divination; its philosophically sophisticated commentaries; its psychological potential (as a means of attaining self-understanding); and its reputation for a kind of encyclopedic comprehensiveness. The spread of the *Yijing* was also facilitated by the self-concious strategies employed by those who sought to use it in various environments for their own political, social, intellectual or evangelical purposes. In the process the *Changes* invariably became "domesticated" in ways that are not only intrinsically interesting but also significant to the broader study of world civilizations.

I. Introductory Remarks

The laudable goal of this conference, as I understand it, is to provide a forum for scholars from Europe, North America and China "to exchange views on how to learn and teach World Civilizations," with a particular emphasis on teaching "students with a Chinese cultural heritage." I applaud in particular the notion of exchanging views on "learning" as well as on "teaching," because it is easy to forget that effective teaching involves constant learning—not only about our specific areas of specialization (and the new technologies available for accessing and transmitting various kinds of specialized knowledge), but also about our students and ourselves.

My focus today is on historical processes—in particular, the specific ways that people, products, ideas, technologies and cultural practices circulate within, and especially move beyond, local, regional and national boundaries. I choose to call this process "globalization"—not because it is always literally "global" in scope but because the logic of transborder circulations certainly points in that direction. In any case, my use

of the term "globalization" involves no explicit value judgments—even though the process in modern times (let's say from the 19th century to the present) has certainly had both its defenders and its detractors. I have no desire to engage in the politics of "praise and blame" (*baobian*, 褒貶) to use a long-standing Chinese historiographical category). Rather, my interest is in exploring and analyzing the complex interactions between cultures that have existed from time immemorial, but which have accelerated and expanded dramatically in the last two centuries or so.

It seems increasingly clear to me that we can't fully understand any single part of the world until we understand its relationship to at least some other parts of the world, as well as the way such relationships have developed over time. In speaking of transnational relationships, I'm not just talking about the political, economic and social outcomes of the usual suspects—activities such as war, diplomacy, imperialism, and so forth—although they have certainly played a significant role in shaping the ever-changing contours of the world, past and present. Rather, I have in mind primarily culture change—the kind effected by groups and individuals who transmit texts, artifacts, ideas, commodities, technologies and all sorts of specific cultural practices—from divination to medicine—across sometimes daunting physical barriers, including oceans, mountain ranges and vast deserts.

To be sure, conflicts and conquests carry all kinds of culture with them, but I am interested in more pacific forms of transnational interaction—specifically, the movement, "domestication" and "afterlife" of texts, including sacred scriptures. During the past decade or so a number of stimulating works that deal with these issues have appeared in print; for instance: Stephen Batchelor's *The Awakening of the West: The Encounter of Buddhism and Western Culture* (1994) and James W. Coleman's *The New Buddhism: The Western Transformation of an Ancient Tradition* (2001); J.J. Clark's *The Tao of the West: Western Transformations of Taoist Thought* (2000); David Damrosh's *What Is World Literature?* (2003); Isabel Hofmeyr's *The Portable Bunyan: A Transnational History of The Pilgrim's Progress* (2004), Mark Juergensmeyer's *Global Religions* (2003), Jeffrey Kripal's *The Serpent's Gift: Gnostic Reflections on the Study of Religion* (2007); Robert C. Neville's *Boston Confucianism: Portable Tradition in the Late-Modern World* (2000); and Eric Sharpe's *The Universal Gita: Western Images of the Bhagavadgita* (1985). We also now have transnationally oriented journals such as the *Journal of Global Buddhism* (http://www.globalbuddhism.org/digest.html) and broad-ranging reference works such as Mark Juergensmeyer's *The Oxford Handbook of Global Religions* (2005).

What are the specific virtues of a transnational or global approach to the circulation of texts? First and foremost, the complex web of interactions, connections and exchanges involved in such circulations reminds us of the need to go beyond so-called "national" histories in explaining processes of historical and cultural change. This awareness, in turn, helps us to resist simplistic models of "impact" and "response," which have adversely afflicted Asian Studies in particular for far too long. It may also encourage us to question some of the sharp and somewhat misleading dichotomies that are often made in the field of literature, such as between "Asian literature" and "Asian-American literature." I think it's worth asking, at least on occasion, "What's in a hyphen?"

Second, a emphasis on transnational circulations reminds us that when texts travel across time and space they change, whether within the boundaries of a country or beyond them. This obvious point is too often forgotten in our effort to determine the "origins

and/or “basic meaning” of a document or, for that matter, a cultural practice. One need not be a post-structuralist to recognize that texts have been, and will always be, moving targets—perpetually shifting and unstable. This is particularly the case, of course, when documents migrate to cultures far removed from the environment that first produced them. We all know proverbially that translators are traitors, but there are different forms of literary treason, and different motives that lie behind them.

It is also important to remember that interpretive communities in the environments where texts travel are not empty vessels to be filled. Isabel Hofmeyr’s book on the transmissions, translations and transmutations of *The Pilgrim’s Progress* in Europe, India and especially Africa provides an outstanding example of the creative ways that indigenous populations domesticated Bunyan’s text, illuminating important issues of colonialism and social class in the bargain. At the same time Hofmyer underscores the contradictions and unintended consequences that attended the multilayered and multivalent process of translation (*The Pilgrim’s Progress* has been translated into some two hundred languages worldwide).

A third virtue of a transnational or global approach to the circulation of texts, and the one I want to emphasize today, is that it provides a wealth of fruitful comparative possibilities. Any number of questions may be asked about the process: By what criteria and for what purposes might we compare the transmission of two or more important sacred (or secular) texts from their respective points of origin to other parts of the world? What insights might be gained from a systematic comparison of the hermeneutical activities of Jesuit missionaries in seventeen and eighteenth century China, Japan, Korea, Vietnam and India—or the translation practices of Protestant missionaries in these same areas in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

As historians it is almost impossible to avoid comparisons of one sort or another, not least because we all seek answers to questions inspired by what we already know. And as authors and teachers, we are constantly forced to find equivalents for terms and concepts that will be comprehensible and meaningful to our audiences—a problem that translators of texts struggle with all the time. From the standpoint of teaching courses in particular, it is clear that our students need to be exposed to different ways of world-making in order to expand their mental horizons. As Clifford Geertz reminds us, the greater the reach of our minds—that is, the broader the “range of signs we can manage somehow to interpret” in our effort to understand the cultural ways of “other” people—the more expansive and rich our own “intellectual, emotional and moral space” will become.”

At the same time, sympathetic engagement with the “other” defamiliarizes what may appear to our students to be normative. That is, an honest effort to appreciate the way “alien” cultures see the world provides us with fresh perspectives on our own society. The more we can understand what it is like to be the “other,” the more likely we are to understand ourselves. My former colleagues, George Marcus and Michael Fischer, put the point this way: “Cross-cultural [comparisons]... have an important role to play in carrying out projects of repatriated ethnography, in defining novel approaches to taken-for-granted domestic phenomena, in framing questions, and in suggesting alternatives or possibilities among domestic subjects that are only revealed by comparative contrast with other cultural material.”

But an uncomfortable question remains: Are valid and meaningful cross-cultural comparisons actually possible? Opinions differ.

On the one hand, there are those who doubt that “any conceptual tools exist to understand and interpret human behavior and meaning in ways that are intersubjectively valid.” Scholars such Edward Said steadfastly assert that all representations of, and generalizations about, the “Other” are distortions, because we are all inescapably the products of—and, in fact, the prisoners of—our own particular languages, cultures, institutions, and politics.[1] On the other hand, there are those who seem to believe that cross-cultural understanding can best be attained by an effort to apply “universal” standards of rationality and “truth” to the analysis of individual societies. Political scientist Andrew Nathan argues, for example, that “for a [cross-cultural] dialogue to occur it is necessary to accept the existence of other views,” but he goes on to assert that “acceptance [of these views] is not relativism and need not weaken a conclusion that one view is superior.”[2]

Zhang Longxi, for his part, advocates a middle position. In a number of his stimulating writings—including *Mighty Opposites: From Dichotomies to Differences in the Comparative Study of China* (1999) and *Unexpected Affinities: Reading Across Cultures* (2007)--he maintains that there should be room between cultures for “mutual illumination and enrichment,” a conceptual space comparable to what Hans-Georg Gadamer has called a “fusion of horizons.” As one example, he draws upon the famous exchange between the Chinese philosophers Zhuangzi and Hui Shi on a bridge over the Hao River (in which the former claims that although he is not a fish he can still “know what fish enjoy”), Zhang suggests that meaningful cross-cultural understanding “can come from a genuine appreciation of the equal capabilities of different individuals, peoples and nations.”[3]

In *The Implied Spider: Politics and Theology in Myth* (1998), Wendy Doniger advocates a two-stage approach to cross-cultural understanding. First, she claims, we should assume “the self in the Other;” in other words we should look for common denominators—fundamental similarities and affinities. But then, she says provocatively, we should “go over to the other side,” ending up with difference. The key point, Doniger emphasizes, is that “similarity must not be allowed to become normative.” She writes:

> The challenge [of meaningful cross-cultural comparisons] lies in choosing as the Other in whom we assume an initial likeness an Other as other as possible, as different from us as possible, perhaps one we don’t like or understand at all at first and have to work hard to like or understand. The comparison that chooses an Other in which the initial likeness is more immediately apparent is more ethnocentric; it is easier, and ultimately it proves less.[4]

---

[1] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon, 1978, esp. 272-273. Cf. Arif Dirlik, "Chinese History and the Question of Orientalism," *History and Theory*, 35.4 (December, 1996), passim, esp. 96.

[2] See David D. Buck's introduction to the "Forum on Universalism and Relativism in Asian Studies,"
Journal of Asian Studies, 50.1 (February, 1991), 29-34.

[3] I have discussed these issues and the problem of "Orientalism" at some length in a chapter on pedagody for Richard Bowring and Noel Pinnington, eds., *Teaching About Japan in Japan* (Fukuoka, Japan: Kyushu University Press, 2001).

[4] Wendy Doniger, *The Implied Spider: Politics and Theology in Myth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 34.

I am not at all sure that cultural comparisons can ever "prove" anything, but the idea of using radical difference as a tool to achieve a greater understanding of the "other" is intriguing and worth pursuing.

In the Doniger spirit, then, I would like to suggest a few of the ways that the radically "other" Chinese work known as the *Yijing* or *Classic of Changes* can be employed as a tool of cross-cultural analysis. For additional ways, please consult the website that appears in your two-page handout as an appendix to my short article, "The *Yijing* (Classic of Changes) in Global Perspective: Some Pedagogical Reflections" (http://www.aasianst.org/eaa/smith.htm). If I had more time, I would suggest why and how the evolution of the *Changes* can profitably be compared with that of other great classic works—a topic that I have treated in the conclusion of my recent book, *Fathoming the Cosmos and Ordering the World: The Yijing (I-Ching, or Classic of Changes) and Its Evolution in China* (2008).[5]

II. A Brief Overview of the *Changes*

Let me begin with a paradox: Although for more than two thousand years—into the 20th century—the *Classic of Changes* was the single most important book in the Chinese cultural tradition, most contemporary Chinese know very little, if anything about what it says or how it works—probably even less than most Westerners know about the actual contents and function of the Bible. There are reasons for this, as I shall suggest in a moment. But what I want to emphasize now is that the "otherness" of the *Yijing* is not a problem for non-Chinese alone.

Fortunately for Westerners, who would otherwise be in an interpretive double bind, serious study of the *Yijing* or (also known as the *Zhouyi* or *Zhou Changes*) is no longer the monopoly of China specialists. Thanks to a spate of recent period-sensitive translations of the *Changes* by individuals such as Richard Kunst, Richard Rutt, Richard John Lynn, Edward Shaughnessy, Wang Dongliang and others (see my handout),[6] as well as to the ongoing efforts of these and many other dedicated and talented researchers, both East and West, we now have enough high-quality *Yi*-related books and articles in Western languages to enable non-specialist scholars and students to do interesting, broad-ranging and solid work on the *Changes* without having to read Chinese or Japanese.[7]

---

[5] The several Asian-language glossaries for this book (more than sixty single-spaced pages in all) can be found only online at: http://asia.rice.edu/yijing.cfm. These glossaries include the characters for all Chinese and Japanese names, terms and titles of books and articles, including all those cited in this paper.

[6] Richard A. Kunst, "The Original 'Yijing:' A Text, Phonetic Transcription, Translation, and Indexes, with Sample Glosses" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1985; available from UMI Diss. Services/ProQuest); Richard Rutt, *Zhouyi: The Book of Changes* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002); Richard John Lynn, trans., *The Classic of Changes: A New Translation of the I Ching as Interpreted by Wang Bi* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994); Edward L. Shaughnessy, trans. *I Ching: The Classic of Changes*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1996; and Dongliang Wang, trans., *Les signes et les mutations: Une approache nouvelle du Yi King histoire, pratique et texte* (Paris: L'asiathèque, 1995); Groupe de travail du Centre Djohi. *Le Yi King mot à mot* (Paris: Editions Albin Michel, 1994). An older, but still useful translation, is Richard Wilhelm's *The I Ching or Book of Changes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950; translated by Cary Baynes), originally published in German as *I Ging: Das Buch der Wandlungen* (Jena: Diederichs, 1924).

[7] For a historically and topically organized list of Western-language works on the *Changes*,

see the "Topical On-line Bibliography" at http://www.aasianst.org/eaa/smith.htm. As indicated above, this bibliography is part of the appendix to Richard J. Smith, "The *Yijing* (Classic of Changes) in Global Perspective: Some Pedagogical Reflections," *Education About Asia* 8.2 (Fall 2003): 5-10.

Of particular value for research and study by Westerners is a reference work by Bent Nielsen titled *Companion to Yi jing Numerology and Cosmology* (2003), which is far more interesting, intellectually sophisticated and stimulating than its title might suggest.[8]

Ironically, however, the more we know about the *Yijing* the more problematical the document seems to become. The relatively recent discovery of several different versions of the so-called "basic text" has only complicated matters. Even Chinese scholars cannot agree on the fundamental "nature" of the *Changes*. Some consider it to be nothing more than a divination manual, a quaint relic of China's "feudal" past. Others have described it as a book of philosophy, an historical work, an ancient dictionary, an encyclopedia, an early scientific treatise, and a mathematical model of the universe.[9] To some scholars, the *Yijing* is a sacred scripture, not unlike the Christian *Bible*, the Jewish *Torah*, the Islamic *Qu'ran*, the Hindu *Vedas* and certain Buddhist sutras.[10] To others it is a work of "awesome obscurity," teetering on the brink between a "profound awareness of the human mind's capacities and superficial incoherency."[11]

How do we account for such divergent views? One of the principal arguments of *Fathoming the Cosmos and Ordering the World:* is that the *Yijing* mirrors the mentality of its adherents.[12] In other words, there are as many versions of the *Changes* as there are readers of the document and commentators upon it.[13] According to the editors of late imperial China's most important literary compilation, the *Complete Collection of the Four Treasuries* (*Siku quanshu*; hereafter, the Four Treasuries), interpreting the *Yijing* is like playing chess, no two games are alike, and there are infinite possibilities.[14]

Different perspectives naturally yield different understandings, whether they are the product of religious or philosophical affiliations, scholarly fashions, politics, social status, gender, personal taste, or other variables of time, place and circumstance.[15] For those who take the *Changes* seriously, and approach it with intellectual depth and psychological insight, the text proves to be profoundly stimulating and endlessly

---

8 Bent Nielsen, *A Companion to Yi jing Numerology and Cosmology: Chinese Studies of Images and Numbers from Han 202 BCE–220 CE) to Song (960–1279 CE)* (London, New York, etc.: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

9 See, for example, YJYY, 1: 13 ff.

10 I have offered a few tentative comparisons between the *Yijing* and these works in *Fathoming the Cosmos* and in "The *Yijing* (Classic of Changes) in Comparative Perspective: The Value of Cross-Cultural Investigations," *International Journal of the Humanities* 1 (2003): 776-801. See also section VII of this paper.

11 Charles Hucker, *China's Imperial Past* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975), 72.72; Frederick Mote,
Intellectual Foundations of China (New York, etc.: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1989), 11.

12 A nineteenth century Chinese commentary on the *Yijing* states succinctly: "The *Changes* is the mirror of men's minds." He Yufu, *Yi jing* (The *Changes* as a Mirror). 1884 (Ni Tseh Collection, U.C. Irvine)

13 See the discussion of this point in Edward L.Shaughnessy, "Commentary, Philosophy, and Translation: Reading Wang Bi's Commentary to the *Yi jing* in a New Way," *Early China*, 22 (1997): 221-245, esp. 223. Authors such as Shaughnessy, Richard John Lynn, and others are at pains to distance themselves from the "timeless" approach to the classic put forward by Richard Wilhelm.

[14] ZMTY, 559-560 (108: 24a-28a).

[15] One of the most important features to keep in mind about *Yijing* exegesis (and, in fact, all classical Chinese exegesis) is the role of such variables. See, for example, the *Changes*-related scholarship of authors such as Gao Huaimin, *Liang Han Yixue shi* (A History of *Changes* Learning in the Han Dynasty; Taibei: Zhongguo xueshu zhuzuo jiangzhu weiyuan hui, 1970) and Xu Qinting, *Liang Han shiliu jia Yizhu chanwei* (An Explication of Sixteen Schools of Commentary on the *Changes* in the Han Dynasty; Taibei: Wuzhou chuban she, 1975). An excellent Western language study that emphasizes these variables is Howard L. Goodman's "Exegetes and Exegesis of the Book of Changes in the Third Century A.D.: Historical and Scholastic Contexts for Wang Pi" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1985; available from UMI Dissertation Services/ProQuest).

provocative. But for those of a shallower intellectual or psychological disposition, the rewards may not be so substantial. In the pithy words of a Chinese proverb: “The shallow man sees [the *Yijing*’s] shallowness, while the deep man sees [its] depth.”[16]

There are three points about the *Changes* that all students of world history should appreciate. The first is that the book is essential to a full understanding of Chinese history and culture, which for at least three thousand years has regarded divination as a mainstream belief system, not a marginal or counter-cultural one. The second is that the travels of the *Yijing* provide a great many fascinating and illuminating examples of the process of “globalization” I have just touched upon. And the third, which I have also discussed briefly, is that the *Changes* offers rich comparative possibilities, not only within the framework of Chinese history, but also well beyond it.

As to the first point, for some two thousand years, into the 20th century, the *Changes* enjoyed unparalleled prestige as “the first of the [Chinese] classics.” Here is a description of the work from China’s most important literary compendium, the *Siku quanshu* (Complete Collection of the Four Treasuries), compiled in the 18th century: “The way of the *Changes* is broad and great. It encompasses everything, including astronomy, geography, music, military methods, the study of rhymes, numerical calculations, and even alchemy.” This statement is not far off the mark, for there is virtually no aspect of traditional Chinese culture that was untouched by the *Changes*, from language, literature, art and music to philosophy, religion, politics, military affairs, social life, mathematics, medicine and science.

As to the second point, it is worth noting that over the past two millennia or so, the *Yijing* has been, with the notable exception of the *Bible*, the most widely read and extensively commented upon book in all of world literature. This is not only because of its profound importance in traditional Chinese social, political, intellectual and cultural life; it is also because of the great prestige it enjoyed in various civilizations on the Chinese periphery—notably Korea, Japan, and Vietnam (and, to a lesser extent, Tibet). During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Jesuit missionaries in China brought knowledge of the classic back to the West, where it found a number of ardent and influential admirers over the next three hundred years or so in Europe and the Americas, from the mathematician, Wilhelm Gotfried von Leibniz to the psychologist, Carl Gustav Jung, and the architect, I.M. Pei. The choreographers Merce Cunningham and Carolyn Carlson have found inspiration in the *Changes*, as have such noted composers as Joseph Hauer, John Cage and Udo Kasemets. It has been a significant element in the art of individuals such as Eric Morris, Arnaldo Coen, Arturo Rivera, Augusto Ramírez, and Felipe Erenberg, and in the writings of a wide range of Western authors, including Philip K. Dick, Allen Ginsberg, Octavio Paz, Herman Hesse, Raymond Queneau and Jorge Luis Borges. It also appears in the lyrics of Bob Dylan, among other. I might add that the practice of *fengshui*, which has recently attracted so much attention around the world, has its conceptual roots in, and derives much of its analytical and symbolic vocabulary from, the *Classic of Changes.*[17]

---

16 Cited in Kang-hu Kiang, *On Chinese Studies* (Shanghai: The Commercial Press, Ltd., 1934), 64, slightly modified.

17 See Yang Hongsheng, *Bentu yu yuwai: Yixue de xiandaihua yu shijiehua* (The Native Land and Beyond: The Modernization and Globalization of *Yijing* Studies; Shanghai: Shanghai shehui kexue yuan, 1995. For overviews in English, see Richard J. Smith, "The Place of the *Yijing* (Classic of Changes) in World Culture: Some Historical and Contemporary Perspectives," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* (Winter, 1998): 391-422,

"The *Yijing* (Classic of Changes) in Comparative Perspective: The Value of Cross-Cultural Investigations,"

As to the third point, the *Yijing* as a “sacred scripture” is both intriguingly similar to, and significantly different from, other great “classics” of world literature, such as, say, the Hebrew *Torah*, the Christian *Bible*, the Muslim *Qu’ran*, the Buddhist *Heart Sutra* or the Hindu *Rig Veda*. Yet it has seldom been brought into conversation with them. This is unfortunate, for despite obvious differences in provenence, language, style, content, and canonical status, “classic” works such as these can help to illuminate and elucidate one another. They shed light, for example, on a number of shared issues, including the origins, authenticity and authority of “sacred” texts and questions related to canon formation, commentarial traditions, orthodoxy and “heresy.” Again, I have addressed this issue in a preliminary way in *Fathoming the Cosmos and Ordering the World*.

III. The Globalization of the *Changes* in East Asia

Although the specific circumstances under which the *Changes* found its way to various East Asian countries naturally differed, there seem to be certain common patterns in the way that it traveled. In the first place, with respect to those areas closest to China in terms of both geography and culture—Korea, Japan, and Vietnam—the literati were thoroughly conversant in the classical Chinese language; hence, there was no significant barrier to written communication. Secondly, since the *Yijing* continued to occupy an exalted position in Chinese culture into the twentieth century, there was never a time when it lacked prestige in peripheral areas. Initially, elites—and then other sectors of society—embraced the *Changes*, using it for their own purposes. Finally, and most importantly, the *Yi* became “domesticated” in each of these environments, undergoing sometimes radical transformations in the process. Japan provides a particularly apt illustration of these themes, as the many writings of Benjamin Wai-ming Ng (of the Chinese University of Hong Kong) indicate.[18]

Prior to the seventeenth century, the *Yijing* exerted some influence in Japanese Confucian, Buddhist, and Shinto circles, but it did not become particularly popular until the Tokugawa era. During that period, however, interest in the *Yi* suddenly took off. From the beginning of the Tokugawa regime in 1603, to the fall of the regime in 1868, more than a thousand books were written on the *Changes*. This amount is not much less than the total number of books written on the *Yijing* during the more-or-less contemporary Qing dynasty in China—which had a population fifteen times as great as Japan’s.

Although the *Yijing* was employed primarily to bolster and amplify Tokugawa Confucianism, it was also used to validate or undergird other Japanese cultural traditions—including both “native” Shinto and “borrowed” Buddhism.[19] Buddhists, for instance, often explained the idea of reincarnation in terms of the following passage from the “Great Commentary” of the *Yijing*: “Tracing things to their origins and then turning back to [see] their ends, we understand the lessons of life and death. With the consolidation of material force into essence [精氣], a person comes into being, but with the dissipation of the soul [游

International Journal of the Humanities 1 (2003), 776-801 and "The *Yijing* (Classic of Changes) in Global Perspective: Some Reflections," in *Erlinglinger nian shijie Yijing dahui lunwen ji* (Collected Papers of the 2002 Classic of Changes World Conference), ed. Guoji *Yijing* xuehui (Zhongli, Taiwan: Guoji *Yijing* xuehui, 2002) 754-791; also

[18] See, for example *The I Ching in Tokugawa Thought and Culture* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2000).

[19] YJYY, 56; Cf. Lynn, *Classic of Changes*, 51-52.

魂], change comes about. It is due to this that we understand the true state of gods and spirits [鬼神].”[20]

Similarly, Shinto scholars sought to validate their belief system by reference to the *Changes*. A common strategy was to cite the “Commentary on the Judgments” for hexagram #20 (Guan 觀 in Chinese, signifying “Viewing”). It reads: “Viewing the Way of the spirits [*Shendao* 神 道 in Chinese; *Shinto* in Japanese], one finds that the four seasons never deviate, and so the sage establishes his teachings on the basis of . . . [this Way], and all under Heaven submit to him.’”[21]

As in China, the symbolism of the *Yijing* could be found in virtually every realm of Japanese life, from the tea ceremony, flower arranging, popular drama, military tactics, martial arts, medicine and board games, to artistic, literary and musical criticism. Even distinctly Japanese cultural forms, such as *tanka* poetry (consisting of five lines of 31 syllables, broken down 5-7-5-7-7), came to be explained in terms of *Yijing* numerical categories.[22]

Over time, the *Yijing* had become increasingly assimilated to the indigenous culture of Japan, at least in some circles. Thus we find Jiun Sonja (慈雲尊者; 1718-1804) arguing that: “The images of the River Chart [*Hetu*, which provided the model for the eight trigrams], were manifested through the Okitsu Mirror [a round bronze mirror kept at the sacred Ise shrine]…. Every word of the *Ekikyo* [*Yijing*] is interesting and significant... [and] the whole book is completely borrowed from us [the Japanese].[23] Similarly, Hirata Atsutane (平田篤胤; 1776-1843) asserted that the ancient Chinese culture hero Fuxi was actually a Shinto deity![24]

Like Hirata, and perhaps influenced by him, the nationalistic Korean scholar, Sin Ch’aeho (申 采 浩 ; 1880-1936), attempted to “domesticate” the *Yijing*, arguing, on the basis of forged texts, that Fuxi, the legendary Chinese inventor of the eight trigrams, was in fact a Korean prince who had learned the *Changes* from Hang Wong, an early Hangguk ruler.[25] Another strategy of domestication in Korea was to invent a book derived from, but significantly different than, the *Yijing*—rather like Yang Xiong’s (53 B.C.E.-18 C.E.) *Classic of Great Mystery* (太 玄 經), or the Han apocryphal treatise known as *The Penetration of the Laws of Qian* (乾 鑿 度) in the Chinese tradition. The most prominent example in Korean history is perhaps Kim Ilbu’s (金 一 夫 ; (1828-89) derivative work known as the *Correct Changes* (正易; Korean: Chongyok).[26]

I have not yet found evidence for similar strategies of domestication in the case of Vietnam. It is clear, however, that use of the *Chu Nom* (字喃) script in works such Dang

---

[20] YJYY, 56; Cf. Lynn, *Classic of Changes*, 51-52.
[21] YJYY, 29; Cf. Lynn, *Classic of Changes*, 260.
[22] Ibid., 188
ff. [23] Ibid.,
107.
[24] Quoted in ibid., 109-110, slightly modified.
[25] Yang Hongsheng, *Bentu yu yuwai*, 119 ff.

26 See Han Chang-gyong (韓長庚), 周易.正易: 易學原理總論; 易經大意; 正易 (Seoul, Sam kwa kkum, 2001); also Jung Young Lee, "The Origin and Significance of the *Chongyok* or Book of Correct Change," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 9 (1982): 211-241.

Thai Phuong's (鄧泰滂) *Chu dich quoi am ca* (周易國音歌; 1815) had this cultural effect.[27]

In many respects, pre-modern Korean and Vietnamese intellectuals approached the *Yijing* in the same spirit as that of the Japanese.[28] In both of these cultural environments, the work retained its aura as a Chinese classic; and in both, it had wide application at all levels of society as an explanatory device, extending into the realms of language, philosophy, religion, art, literature, science, medicine, and social customs. Despite the esteem of Zhu Xi's thought in both Yi dynasty Korea (1392-1910) and Le dynasty Vietnam (1428-1789), Vietnamese and Korean scholars seem on the whole to have appreciated the school of "images and numbers" (象數) more than the school of "meaning and principles" (義理).[29]

In the case of Tibet, the process of transmission involved substantial modifications—in part, no doubt, because unlike Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese elites, comparatively few Tibetan monks knew Chinese. The *Yijing* (Tibetan: *Yeekyin*) first came to Tibet as a respected Chinese "classic" during the early Tang dynasty, and there is some evidence of a scholarly interest in the document at that time. Meanwhile, and not surprisingly, Tibetan diviners began using the trigrams of the *Changes* in more or less the Chinese fashion. Later, they borrowed the numerological diagrams of the *Yijing*—notably the *Luoshu*—creating new divinatory symbols, including four-lined tetragrams (there was, of course, a precedent for this in China with Yang Xiong's *Taixuan jing*), and five-lined pentagrams—which were still, however, normally organized in groups of eight.[30]

Like the Japanese, the Tibetans seem to have been particularly eager to assimilate the *Yijing* to their indigenous culture. Some Tibetan commentators emphasized affinities between the *Yijing* and Tantric Buddhism, and other scholars in both the Buddhist and Bon traditions transformed Confucius, as the most famous transmitter of *Yijing* divination (and other forms) into their own religious figures. Moreover, in at least some cases, the eight trigrams acquired significantly different symbolic identifications in Tibet than their traditional Chinese ones. Zhen, for example, usually associated with Thunder, came to linked in some Tibetan divination systems with iron.[31]

A distinctive feature of the process by which various East Asian peoples borrowed from Chinese culture was their periodic use of emissaries—individuals and groups who transmitted Chinese texts and traditions to their home countries in a self-conscious and sometimes quite systematic way. Westerners, too, sent missions to China,

---

[27] From the preface of the published edition (積善堂), archived in the Hanoi National Library. There are several unpublished versions in this library with similar titles (e.g. 周易國音歌訣).

[28] For refinements and qualifications, see Benjamin Wai-ming Ng, "The *I Ching* in Late Choson Thought," *Korean Studies* 24 (2000): 53-68; Wai-ming Ng, *"Yijing* Scholarship in Late-Nguyen Vietnam: A Study of Le Van Ngu's *Chu Dich Cuu Nguyen* (An Investigation of the Origins of the *Yijing,* 1916), *Review of Vietnamese Studies*. 3.1 (2003): 1-24.

[29] Oddly enough, Yang Hongsheng's *Bentu yu yuwai* devotes substantial attention to Japan and Korea, but not Vietnam.

[30] See Gary Dickinson and Steve Moore, "Trigrams and Tortoises: Sino-Tibetan Divination," *Oracle* (special issue) 1.5 (Summer, 1997): 1-48.

[31] See Gyurme Dorje, trans. *Tibetan Elemental Divination Paintings: Illuminated Manuscript from the White Beryl of Sangs-rgyas rGya-mtsho with the Moonbeams treatise of Lo-chen Dharmasri*. London: John Eskenazi in association with Sam Fogg, 2001; also Phillipe Cornu, *Tibetan Astrology* (Boston: Shambala, 1997).

and they brought back all kinds of information, but these missions tended to proceed from very different motives.

VI. The *Changes* in Western Hands: A Brief Overview

In several respects, the transmission of the *Changes* to the West parallels the process by which Buddhism and Daoism traveled westward. As Stephen Batchelor, James Coleman, J.J. Clark and others have indicated, in each case Western missionaries have played a part in the process, and in each case there have been varied responses over time, ranging from "blind indifference," to "rational knowledge", "romantic fantasy" and "existential engagement." But in nearly every instance, as in case of East Asia, there has been some sort of an effort, often quite self-conscious, to assimilate and "domesticate" the classic.[32]

Initially, Jesuit missionaries played the major role in transmitting Chinese culture to the West. From the late sixteenth century onward, in a pattern replicated in many other parts of the world, the Jesuits attempted to assimilate themselves as much as possible to the host country. They studied its language, learned its customs, and sought to understand its philosophical and religious traditions. One such person was Father Joachim Bouvet (c. 1660-1732). According to Vatican records, there were times when Father Bouvet tutored the emperor every day for two hours in algebra and geometry. In addition, the two men discussed the *Yijing*—which fascinated them both. The emperor showed particular interest in Bouvet's claim to be able to predict the future with numerological charts based on the *Changes*.

I have discussed Bouvet's scholarly interactions with the emperor and various Chinese officials at considerable length elsewhere (see my handout).[33] He and his colleague, Jean-François Fouquet (1665-1741) represented a development in Western Christianity known as the Figurist movement. In general, the Figurists tried to find in the Old Testament evidence of the coming and significance of Christ through an analysis of "letters, words, persons and events." Apart from the literal meaning of the "outer" text, in other words, there existed a hidden "inner" meaning to be discovered. In China this gave rise to a concerted effort to find reflections (that is "figures") of the biblical patriarchs and examples of biblical revelation in the Chinese classics themselves.

Bouvet and Fouquet were masters of the art. Using a somewhat strained etymological approach to various written texts, as well as an evaluation of the trigrams and hexagrams of the *Yijing*, they found all kinds of hidden messages. Dissection of the Chinese character for Heaven (天 ; the number two and the word for Man) indicated a prophecy of the second Adam, Jesus Christ; the three solid lines of the Qian (Heaven) trigram represented an early awareness of the Trinity; the hexagram Xu (需; Waiting, #5), with its stark reference to "clouds rising up to Heaven" (in the Commentary on the Big Image), could only refer to "the glorious ascent of the Saviour." And, of course, the first hexagram, Qian, referred to Creation itself.

Efforts to link Chinese culture heros to biblical figures produced all kinds of creative connections: Peng the Ancestor (Pengzu) became Adam; Fuxi, inventor of the

[32] For relevant works by these and other authors, see http://www.aasianst.org/eaa/smith.htm#T9

[33] The discussion that follows in based on the paper titled "Jesuits and the Yijing" posted at

http://asia.rice.edu/yijing.cfm. See also Claudia von Collani, "The First Encounter of the West with the Yijing," *Monumenta Serica* 55 (2007): 227-387.

eight trigrams, was the mysterious Patriarch Enoch, who reportedly "walked with God;" references to the moral exemplar Yao (堯), they argued, must have been derived from the Hebrew term Yaweh.

Eventually Bouvet developed the idea that the *Yijing* contained the idea of three "states" or stages in the history of the world—a state of original perfection, one of corruption and degeneration, and one of reformation and restoration. By Bouvet's account, the Kangxi emperor approved of this notion, perhaps because it resonated with similar schemes devised by Chinese scholars (notably Shao Yong) centuries before. The emperor did not, however, accept Bouvet's assertion that the *Yijing* was originally one of several Jewish-Christian books by Enoch that found its way to China after the flood. Indeed, for the Kangxi emperor the *Classic of Changes* was an ideal example of the "Chinese origins of Western learning" (西學中源).

By some accounts, the Kangxi emperor's interest in Bouvet's ideas was so great that he encouraged the French Jesuit to play an active role in the complilation of the huge annotated edition of the *Yijing* that was published under the title *Zhouyi zhezhong* (周易折中; 1715). But eventually Bouvet's Figurist enterprise, like the broader Jesuit evangelical movement, fell victim to harsh criticisms and vigorous attacks by other members of the Christian community in China and abroad.

Despite the unhappy fate of the Figurists in China, their writings captured the attention of several prominent European intellectuals in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries—most notably, of course, Leibniz.[34] And these individuals, in turn, provoked a sustained and substantial Western interest in the *Yijing* and other Chinese classics that has lasted to this day.[35] A systematic examination of the westward movement of the *Changes* would go well beyond my allotted space, but a few important points should be emphasized here.

First, it is clear that in certain respects the process by which the *Yijing* has moved the Europe and the Americas during the past four centuries parallels the earlier (and, in fact, on-going) process by which the document has travelled to East Asia.[36] Most significantly, in both cases, conscious efforts have continually been made by devotees of the *Changes* to "domesticate" it by various means.

---

[34] See David E. Mungello's *Curious Land* as well as his *The Great Encounter of China and the West, 1500-1800*, New York, Oxford, etc.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999, and his *Leibniz and Confucianism: The Search for Accord*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1977. For just a few of a great many other relevant works, consult Li Wenchao and Hans Poser, eds., *Das Neueste uber China: G. W. Leibnizens Novissima Sinica von 1697*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2000, Claudia von Collani, *Eine wissenschaftliche Akademie für China: Briefe des Chinamissionars Joachim Bouvet S.J. an Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz und Jean Paul Bignon*, Wiesbaden: Steiner 1989, Daniel J.Cook, and Henry Rosemont, Jr., *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, Writings on China*. Chicago: Open Court, 1994, David B. Honey, *Incense at the Altar: Pioneering Sinologists and the Development of Classical Chinese Philology*, New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2001 and David Porter, *Ideographia: The Chinese Cipher in Early Modern Europe*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001. To this day, Chinese scholars continue to celebrate the connection between Leibniz (and other Western scientists) and the *Yijing*. See, for example, Zhang Qicheng, *Yijing yingyong da baike*, 1: 5.

[35] For an excellent summary of the early stages of this process, see Collani, Claudia von. "The First Meeting of the *Yijing* and the West." Forthcoming in *Monumenta Serica*.

[36] For general accounts of the process by which the *Yijing* travelled westward, consult Smith, "The *Yijing* (*Classic of Changes*) in Global Perspective," Iulian Shchutskii, *Researches on the I Ching*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979 (translated by William MacDonald and Tsuyoshi Hasegawa.), 13-55, Richard Rutt, trans., *The Book of Changes (Zhouyi)*, Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 1996, 60-82, and William Fancourt, "Figurism," *The Oracle: The Journal of Yijing Studies* 3 (Spring 1996), 28-34.

But the effort by both missionaries and lay people to introduce the *Yijing* to Western audiences from the eighteenth century onward has involved unprecedented problems of translation and accomodation—not least, because the text has moved from a "mainstream" cultural environment in East Asia to a "counter-cultural" one in the West. And in this latter process, particularly during the twentieth century, market forces have come increasingly into play, complicating the already "complex dialectic" by which the words of the text have interacted with the intellectual concerns of its translators and commentators.[37]

Significantly, the first complete translation of the *Changes* in a Western language (Latin) was undertaken by three missionary-scholars who were extremely critical of the allegorical approach of Father Bouvet and his followers. Although completed in 1736, this translation of the *Yijing* did not actually appear in print until the 1830s.[38]

Within decades, several additional translations of the *Changes* appeared in Europe, including Canon Thomas McClatchie's *A Translation of the Confucian Yi-king* (1876), Angelo Zottoli's 1880 rendering of the Changes, which appeared in volume 3 of his *Cursus literaturae sinicae neo-missionariis accomodatus* (1879-1882), James Legge's *The Yi King* (1882), P.L.-F. Philastre's *Tscheou Yi* (1885-1893), and Ch. de Harlez's *Le Yih-king: Texte primitif, rétabli, traduit et commenté* (1889).[39] These works, as Norman Girardot suggests, reflect a "scholarly vogue in European culture at this time concerned with the uncovering, and the rational and historical explanation, of all manner of apparent Oriental mysteries," including not only Buddhism and Daoism, but also theosophy, spiritualism, the Golden Dawn, and various occult novels.[40]

Like Bouvet, but with no acknowledgement of him, McClatchie believed that the *Yijing* had been carried to China by one of the sons of Noah after the Deluge. But whereas Bouvet tried to use the *Changes* to prove that the Chinese had knowledge of "the one true God," McClatchie believed that the work reflected nothing more than a form of pagan materialism.[41] Scandalously, for his time, McClatchie identified the two primary hexagrams of the *Changes* , Qian and Kun, with the male and female sexual organs respectively—an interpretation that at least some recent Chinese and Western research affirms.[42]

Albert Terrien de LaCouperie, for his part, believed that the *Yijing* was originally a dictionary—"a handbook of state management . . . set forth under the sixty-four words [hexagram names]." Hostile to the Chinese commentarial tradition (the product of what he derisively described as "tortured minds" and "maddened brains") and to most Western

---

[37] For an insightful analysis of this process, see Gardner, "Confucian Commentary," esp. 416-418. On the general development of Western "Sinology," consult Honey, *Incense at the Altar*, passim.

[38] For a cogent and illuminating evaluation of this work, see Knud Lundbaek, "Notes sur l'image du Néo- Confucianisme dans la littérature européen du XVII a la fin du XIX siecle" in Colloque international de sinologie (3rd: 1980: Chantilly, France), *Appréciation par l'Europe de la tradition chinoise à partir du XVIIe siècle: actes du IIIe Colloque international de sinologie*, Centre de recherches interdisciplinaire de Chantilly (CERIC), 11-14 septembre 1980, Paris: Belles Lettres, 1983, 131-176, esp. 154-155.

[39] These works were evaluated by the relentlessly critical A. Terrien de LaCouperie in "The Oldest Book of the Chinese (the *Yh-King*) and Its Authors," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, new series, 14 (1882), 781-815 and new series, 15 (1883), 237-289.

[40] Norman J. Girardot, *The Victorian Translation of China: James Legge's Oriental Pilgrimage*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002, 371-372.

[41] See Shchutskii, *Researches on the I Ching*, 23-24.

[42] See Edward L. Shaughnessy, trans. *I Ching: The Classic of Changes*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1996, 17. Cf. Shchutskii, *Researches on the I Ching*, 23-24.

interpretations of the work as well ("amusing enough to dispel the spleen"), with misplaced erudition he posited Near Eastern origins for the basic text of the *Changes* (but not the commentaries). His intent was not to "domesticate" the *Yijing*, however, for he held it in very low esteem. According to Terrien de LaCouperie, the *Changes* originated in the ancient kingdom of Akkad, which he believed to be Bactria. De Harlez held a somewhat similar view of the *Yijing*, arguing that the *Changes* was originally the notebook of some ancient political figure, which had been turned into a book of divination by another political figure at a later date. Iulian Shchutskii points out, however, that something of the opposite process actually took place.[43]

James Legge, the object of some of Terrien de LaCouperie's most vitriolic criticisms, began his translation of the *Changes* in 1854, but for various reasons it was not completed for another twenty years or so.[44] Like the Jesuits, Legge believed that the Confucian classics were compatible with Christian beliefs, but he was not a Figurist.[45] In addition to denouncing McClatchie for focusing on the *Yijing*'s sexual imagery, Legge assailed him for resorting to the methods of "Comparative Mythology." In Legge's words: "I have followed Canon McClatchie's translation from paragraph to paragraph and from sentence to sentence, but found nothing which I could employ with advantage in my own."[46]

Legge had no love of China and no respect for the *Yijing*. Indeed, he described it as "a farrago of emblematic representations." Although he admitted the *Changes* was "an important monument of architecture," he characterized it as "very bizarre in its conception and execution."[47] Legge's highly literal translation, published in 1882, followed the prevailing neo-Confucian orthodoxy of the Qing dynasty as reflected in the *Zhouyi zhezhong*, a work that probably encouraged Legge to separate the "basic text" from the Ten Wings. This intellectual orientation also informed the more famous and more influential rendering of the *Changes* by the German scholar Richard Wilhelm, which first appeared in 1924. Like Legge, Wilhelm had been a missionary in China before embarking on a more "scholarly" career.

The standard English translation of this work was carried out by one of Carl Jung's students, Ms. Cary Baynes, and published in 1950. The standard comparison of the two works—somewhat of a distortion on both ends—is that Legge's text indicates what the *Yijing* says while Wilhelm's conveys what it means.[48] The interesting point about Wilhelm's translation is that it bespeaks a man not only in love with China, but

---

[43] Shchutskii, *Researches on the I Ching*, 27.

[44] On Legge's translation of the *Changes*, and the debates that surrounded it, see Girardot, *The Victorian Translation of China*, esp. 366-374. Girardot offers a particularly insightful appraisal of Legge as a "comparativist" in the "meager disciplinary history of nineteenth-century sinological Orientalism." See ibid., chapter 5, passim.

[45] He did, however, insist that the term Di (or Shangdi) should be rendered "God." See the discussion in ibid., 372-373.

[46] James Legge, *The I Ching* [originally rendered *Yi King*], New York: Dover Publications, 1963 (reprint of 1899 edition), xvii.

[47] Ibid., xiv-xv, 10, 17, 25-26, 38, etc.

[48] See Gerald Swanson's introduction to Shchutskii, *Researches on the I Ching*, xi-xii. For an excellent, historically senstive analysis of the these two works, see Tze-ki

Hon's "Constancy in Change: A Comparison of James Legge's and Richard Wilhelm’s Interpretations of the *Yijing*." Paper for the international conference on "Fascination and Understanding: The Spirit of the Occident and the Spirit of China in Reciprocity" Smolenice Castle, Slovakia, February 21-25, 2003. Forthcoming in *Monumenta Serica*.

also one who believed that the *Yijing* had something important to say to all mankind. Like Bouvet, he considered the *Changes* to be a global property and a work of timeless wisdom, but unlike Bouvet he treated it solely as a Chinese document, with no genetic links with the ancient West or Near East. [49]

This said, it should be noted that Wilhelm—like many before him, both East and West—tried to "domesticate" the *Yijing* in various ways. One was to call upon the authority of classical German philosophers and literary figures, like Kant and Goethe, to illustrate "parallel" ideas expressed in the *Changes*. Another was to cite the Bible in the same way. Yet another was to argue that the *Yijing* drew upon "some common foundations of humankind that all our cultures—unconsciously and unrecognizedly—are based." Wilhelm believed, in other words, that "East and West belong inseparably together and join hands in mutual completion." The West, he argued, had something to learn from China.[50]

Wilhelm also tried to "demystify" the *Changes* by providing elaborate commentaries that paraphrased and explained the "spiritual" material that he felt might "confuse the European reader too much with the unusual." This strategy of "rationalization," as Michael Lackner points out, was somewhat similar to that of the French Jesuit Figurists, "who frequently prepared second translations of certain texts because they claimed to know the intrinsic meaning of these texts: the prefiguration of Christian revelation."[51] In the case of the Figurists, this process often involved the willful misrepresentation (or at least the ignoring) of traditional commentaries in order to "dehistoricize" the "original" text, but in Wilhelm's case, the impulse to explain away material that might be considered as "superstitious" reflected the general climate of "rational" academic discourse in early twentieth century Europe. Wilhelm reamined a "missionary," so to speak, but a secular one, whose rendering of the *Changes* seemed to confirm Carl Jung's theories about archetypes and "synchronicity"—just as Bouvet's representations of the work had confirmed Leibniz's binary system and fed his speculations about a "Universal Characteristic" and a "Primitive Language."[52]

By contrast, Aleister Crowley (1875-1947), an Englishman who travelled to China for awhile during the first decade of the 20th century, adopted a self-consciouously mystical approach to the *Changes*—a harbinger of counter-cultural enthusiasm for the document that would peak worldwide in the 1960s. Upon his return from China, Crowley undertook the study of various Chinese texts, including the *Yijing*. At first he relied heavily on Legge's translation, but found it wanting—not least because of the Scottish missionary-translator's hostility to the document ("what pitiable pedantic imbecility," Crowley once wrote). Eventually he developed an approach to the classic that dispensed with the conventional attributes of some of the trigrams and tried to assimilate them, in the fashion of Bouvet, to the Kabbalistic "Tree of Life."

---

[49] Hon (2003) makes the important point that whereas Legge "was confident that the West had something to offer to the East," Wilhelm's profound disillusion with the mass destruction of World War I led him to believe that Chinese wisdom was, in Wilhelm's own words, "the cure and salvation of modern Europe."

[50] See Michael Lackner, "Richard Wilhelm: A 'Sinicized' German Translator" in Viviane Alleton and Michael Lackner, eds. *De l'un au multiple. La traduction du chinois dans les langues européennes*, Paris: Maison des Science de l'Homme, 1998.

[51] Ibid.

[52] On Leibniz and Bouvet, see Mungello, *Curious Land*, 312 ff. and 356 ff. As is well

known, Jung wrote a revealing preface to Wilhelm's translation of the *Changes*.

According to Crowley, the *Yijing* “is mathematical and philosophical in form,” and its structure “is cognate with that of the *Qabalah*; the identity is so intimate that the existence of two such superficially different systems is transcendent testimony to the truth of both.” In Crowley’s view, the *Dao* as expressed in the *Yijing* was “exactly equivalent to the Ain or Nothingness of our Qabalah,” and the notions of *yang* and *yin* “correspond exactly with Lingam and Yoni.” Furthermore, he equates *jing* (essence) with Nephesh, *qi* (material force) with Ruach, and *hun* (soul) with Neschamah. For Crowley, the Confucian virtues of *ren* (humaneness), *yi* (duty), *li* (ritual) and *zhi* (knowledge) suggested the principles of “Geburah, Chesed, Tiphareth, and Daath.”[53]

In Crowley’s decidedly sexual interpretation of the *Changes*, reminiscent of McClatchie, the eight trigrams represent the male and female reproductive organs, the sun, the moon, and the four Greek elements—earth, air, fire and water. Thus he writes:

> In the place of Chesed, which is water in our Qabalah, we find Tui [Dui; “Lake”], which is water in the Chinese system. In Geburah, our Fire, is Kan [Zhen; “Quake” or “Thunder”]. In the place of Netzach, which is Earth in our Qabalah, there is Kan [Gen; “Restraint” or “Mountain”] on the Chinese plan. Finally, for the Sephira Hod, which in our system is Airy and Mercurial, we find Sun [Sun or Xun; “Compliance” or “Wind], the Chinese trigram of Air.[54]

Qian [”Pure *Yang*” or “Heaven”] is equated with Daath, Kun [”Pure *Yin*” or “Earth”] with Malkuth, Li [”Cohesion” or “Fire”] with Tiphareth, and Kan [”Sink Hole” or “Water”] with Yesod. With similar abandon, Crowley equates the four attributes of the judgment for the first hexagram, Qian—*yuan*, *heng*, *li* and *zhen*—with the four spheres of the Tree of Life and the four parts of the human soul, representing wisdom, intuition, reason and the animal soul.[55]

In more recent times, a great many books and articles (including website publications) have appeared that relate the *Yijing* to the conventional values of Christianity and that employ Figurist techniques and logic. The many writings of Jung Young Lee are representative.[56] Lee asserts, for example, “God the Father is closely associated with the image of a dragon in *The Book of Change*.” As the “hidden dragon,” Lee writes, “he is “the source of [all] creativity.”[57] C. H. Kang and Ethel R. Nelson make the same kinds of connections in their 1979 book, *The Discovery of Genesis*. In it, they dissect several dozen characters in an effort to show that “the ancient picture writing of the Chinese language embodies memories of man’s earliest days,” and that “when broken down into component parts . . . [these characters] reflect elements of the story of God and man recorded in the early chapters of Genesis.”[58] I. Mears and L.E. Mears, for their part,

---

[53] J. Edward Cornelius and Marlene Cornelius, "*Yi King*: A Beastly Book of Changes," *Red Flame: A Thelemic Research Journal* 5 (1998), 1-226, esp. pp. 19 ff..
[54] Ibid., 21.
[55] For a similar effort to link the *Yijing* to ancient mysticism--including not only the Kabbalah, but also various forms of astrology and Tarot card reading--see Charlie Higgins' on-line article, "The Hexagram and the Kabbalah" http://www.mension.com/del_3.htm (1997).
[56] See, for example, Jung Young Lee, *Embracing Change: Postmodern Interpretations of the I Ching from a Christian Perspective*, Scranton: University of Scranton Press, 1994.

[57] See ibid., 136-150.
[58] C.H. Kang and Ethel R. Nelson, *The Discovery of Genesis: How the Truths of Genesis Were Found Hidden in the Chinese Language*, St. Louis: Concordia, 1979.

try to show in *Creative Energy* (1931) that "God-like qualities" can be found in the various symbols of the *Yijing*, from the characters of the text, to the trigrams, to the hexagrams.[59]

In a more strictly "Figurist" vein, but without an acknowledged debt to Bouvet or his followers, Joe E. McCaffree's *Bible and I Ching Relationships* (1982; first published in 1967) tries to show in 446 extraordinarily convoluted pages that: (1) certain Chinese characters were "specially designed" for correlative purposes in works such as the *Changes*; (2) the texts of the *Yijing* and the Hebrew Bible "follow the same sequence with respect to the order of events and their inherent characteristics" (for example, McCaffree maintains that the first fifty hexagrams of the *Yijing* correspond with the fifty chapters of the Book of Genesis); (3) various biblical personalities, including Joseph of Genesis, Moses and Soloman, are identified in the *Yijing*; (4) Biblical accounts have "a hexagrammic structure" which includes literal references to the trigrams; (5) the Zhou people were "probably" Israelites; (6) the *Yijing* "fulfills" biblical prophecy; and (7) the *Changes* were intended as a "study guide" to the Bible. In short, the *Yijing* unveils a "divine plan for the culture of man," and in so doing "consumates" what the Torah has "generated." In the process, McCaffree attempts to establish connections between the symbolism of the *Changes* and that of ancient Egypt, India and the Middle East.[60]

Dr. Ong Hean-Tatt's *The Chinese Pakua* (1991), one of the most recent and most comprehensive works of this sort, clearly draws a good deal of self-conscious inspiration from the Jesuit model, as well as other "Figurist" interpretations. Indeed, he even acknowledges Jesuit precedents explicitly on occasion. Moreover, he covers much the same ground that Bouvet and others covered in the 16th and seventeenth centuries: the "common origin" of Chinese-Hebrew "Kabalic [sic] Magic Squares," the "link between [the] Chinese and Hebrew languages," "similarities in [the] Structures of Chinese and Sumerian-Egyptian Characters," the identity between the twenty-two symbols of the Chinese stem-branch (*ganzhi*) system and the 22 letters of the Kabbala, and the appearance of "Middle East legends in Chinese ideograms" (for instance he asserts that the *long* [龍 "dragon"] is the winged "seraphim" of the Bible). Like the Figurists, he breaks down a number of Chinese characters into their constituent elements to reveal biblical "messages," arguing, for example, that the "sheep," "hand," "knife" and "self" components of the character *yi* (義 righteousness, duty, etc.) depict a "hand using a spear to sacrifice the lamb," meaning that "the Chinese knew righteousness will come from [a] slain lamb."[61]

Some Concluding Remarks

In retrospect, the westward movement and eventual "globalization" of the *Yijing* is fairly easy to comprehend. As indicated in my abstract for this paper, the *Changes* was in many ways an ideal instrument for building bridges across cultures. Challenging,

[59] I. Mears, I and L.E. Mears, *Creative Energy: Being an Introduction to the Study of the Yih King, or Book of Changes, with Translations from the Original Text*, London: John Murray, 1931.
[60] For a convenient summary of McCaffree's basic argument, see *Bible and I Ching Relationships*, Hong Kong and Seattle: South Sky Book Co, 1982, 428-432. At various points in his book, McCaffree links the Li hexagram (#30) with (A) the Torah as a whole, (B) the thirtieth chapter of Genesis, (C) Jesus at age thirty, (D) Jacob, (E) the Kabbalistic "Tree of Life," (F) the fleur-de-lis, and (G) the unicorn.

[61] Hean-Tatt Ong, *The Chinese Pakua*, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia: Pelanduk Publications, 1991. For dozens of Ong's Figurist-style etymologies, see ibid., 166 ff.

sophisticated, useful and adaptable, it was a potentially valuable commodity in the ever-widening marketplace of ideas. Simple only to the simple-minded, it encouraged inventive people to make creative connections of all sorts, linking in various ways not only the past, the present and the future, but also heavenly and earthly phenomena, numbers and images, moral principles and practical predictions. It generated innovative scholarship in a wide range of areas—from philology and philosophy to math and science—and it continues to do so to this day, not only in East Asia, but also in Europe and the Americas.[62]

In short, the transmission of the *Changes* to the West parallels the process by which Buddhism and Daoism travelled westward. In each case, "missionaries"—clerics or true believers of another sort—have played a pivotal role in the process of translation, and in each case there have been varied responses in the West over time, ranging from "blind indifference," to "rational knowledge", "romantic fantasy" and "existential engagement."[63] And as with the sophisticated texts of Buddhism and Daoism, the *Yijing* has been subjected to rigorous scholarly analysis as well to superficial punditry. It has provoked fascinating speculations and idiotic drivel. Our task is to look carefully and critically at the process that has produced stimulating scholarship as well as books such as the *The I Ching and Transpersonal Psychology*, *Self-Development with the I Ching*, *The I Ching Of Goddess*, *The I Ching Tarot*, *Death and the I Ching*, *The I Ching on Love, Karma and Destiny*, and *The Golf Ching*. Whatever scholars may think of such works, they—like *The Dao of Pooh*—are part of the multifaceted story of the "globalization" of Asian culture, and cannot simply be dismissed because they seem goofy.

One of the most revealing examples of the way philosophical and religious systems intersect in the process of cross-cultural communication is the work of Ernst Lothar Hoffman, a German citizen who became a "homeless" lay Buddhist in the late 1920s and was given the name Lama Anagarika Govinda. In the 1980s, after many years of Buddhist study and practice, he wrote a book titled *The Inner Structure of the I Ching, the Book of Transformations* (1981). Replete with elaborate diagrams and illustrations, it claims to reveal "what the *I Ching* itself has to say," rather than what "various Chinese and European philosophers and scholars thought about this book."[64] The diagrams and text of this study, which draw upon Tibetan Buddhist traditions as well as Western astrology and Chinese Confucian and Daoist traditions, suggest the same sort of "grand synthesis" that Bouvet attempted more than 250 years before.

For some two thousand years, the primary incentive for commenting on the *Yijing* in China was to clarify the meaning of the sages. This generally involved an effort to "fix" or "stabilize" the text in accordance with a particular philosophical or religious outlook, and it often involved an implicit or explicit reaction to previous interpretations. A related goal, also common to many cultural traditions, was to make a work that was

---

[62] For some examples, see Smith, "The *Yijing* (Classic of Changes) in Global Perspective" and "The Place of the *Yijing* (Classic of Changes) in World Culture."
[63] See Stephen Batchelor, *The Awakening of the West: The Encounter of Buddhism and Western Culture*, Berkeley, Pasrallax Press, 1994, xi; also James W. Coleman, *The New Buddhism: The Western Transformation of an Ancient Tradition*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, Martin Baumann and Charles Prebish, eds. *Westward Dharma: Buddhism beyond Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002, J. J. Clark, *The Tao of the West: Western Transformations of Taoist Thought*, London and New York: Routledge, 2000, etc.

[64] Lama Anagarika Brahmacari Govinda, *The Inner Structure of the I Ching, the Book of Transformations*, Tokyo and New York: Weatherhill, 1981, xi. For details on Govinda, consult Batchelor, *The Awakening of the West*, 312-314, 320-321, 327-329.

diverse in origins appear coherent, consistent, and relevant to readers of a different time. This might be done to "legitimate" a text in the face of claims that the version in hand was not "authentic." And, of course, commentary allowed individuals to associate their own ideas with a classic, another strategy of "legitimation."[65] All of these motives have been evident in *Changes* exegesis, East and West, and they will continue, no doubt, to be.

[65] Henderson's *Scripture, Canon and Commentary* provides an illuminating comparative study of several commentarial traditions that display common characteristics of the sort discussed in this paragraph.