

MING STUDIES



Number 27

Spring 1989

Ming Studies
Hobart and William Smith Colleges
Geneva, New York 14456

SYMPOSIUM ON FIFTEENTH-CENTURY CHINA--PART TWO*

INTELLECTUAL TRENDS IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

Hung-lam Chu

The intellectual history of the fifteenth century has long been one of the understudied aspects of Ming history. Books on the general history of Chinese philosophy or thought almost as a rule start with Wang Yang-ming (1472-1529), whose philosophy matured only in the sixteenth century. Occasionally, Ch'en Hsien-chang (1428-1500), the most original thinker of the fifteenth century, is also mentioned, chiefly as the immediate forerunner of the School of Mind which became prominent in the following century. In general, Ming thought of the fifteenth century is presented as a mere continuation of the Neo-Confucianism represented by Chu Hsi (1130-1200) and his predecessors, Ch'eng Hao (1032-1085) and Ch'eng I (1033-1107). It was not until Wing-tsit Chan's 1970 article, "The Ch'eng-Chu School of Early Ming," that early Ming thought was shown to have actually undergone "significant changes, assumed a definite direction, and in these ways anticipated the rise of the School of Mind that culminated in Wang Yang-ming." Analyzing the thought of four Neo-Confucian masters, Ts'ao Tuan (1376-1434), Hsüeh Hsüan (1392-1464), Wu Yü-pi (1391-1469) and Hu Chü-jen (1434-1484), Chan argues that the important change seen in these thinkers is that, unlike their Sung predecessors, "the intellectual element [in their thought] has become subordinate" so that "the mind occupies the central position," to the extent that one (for example, Hu Chü-jen) "closely tied together the investigation of things and the preservation of the mind." What was valued was "personal demonstration instead of intellectual speculation," and "seriousness in personal cultivation took precedence over the extension of knowledge."¹ This point is reinforced by Chien Yu-wen's study on Ch'en Hsien-chang's "philosophy of the natural."² These thinkers are thus presented as incrementally building up an important new trend of thought.

But this was neither the only nor necessarily the dominant intellectual trend of the fifteenth century. There were, as a matter of fact, thinkers and scholars in this century who were equally well known as cultivated personalities and advocates of other intellectual pursuits. Neo-Confucianism was manifested not only in its philosophical aspects but also in its practical

* Part One of this symposium, consisting of papers by Edward L. Farmer, Mi Chu Wiens, Elliot Sperling, and John Dardess, appeared in the Fall 1988 number of MING STUDIES.

EDITOR: William S. Atwell, Hobart and William Smith Colleges

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Pamela Atwell, Hobart and William Smith Colleges

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR: Joanna F. Handlin Smith, John King
Fairbank Center for East Asian Research,
Harvard University.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Andrew H.B. Lo, School of Oriental and African Studies,
University of London

Willard J. Peterson, Princeton University

Lynn Struve, Indiana University

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND EDITORIAL ASSISTANCE: Sharon Elder

CALLIGRAPHY FOR COVER: Charles Chu

INTERNAL CALLIGRAPHY: Lung-chang Young and Hideaki Okawa

PRINTING: Geneva Pennysaver

* * * * *

Publication of MING STUDIES is made possible by financial and institutional support from the Office of the Provost and from the Department of History, Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

Manuscripts and items for News Notes should be sent to the Editor, MING STUDIES, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, New York 14456, USA. All manuscripts should be typed double-spaced throughout, including notes. Either Wade-Giles or Pinyin is acceptable. A style sheet is printed in MING STUDIES, Number 22 (Fall 1986).

Book reviews and items concerning book reviews should be sent to Professor Katherine Carlitz, Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures, 1501 Cathedral of Learning, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 15260, USA.

Questions concerning subscriptions should be sent to MING STUDIES, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, New York 14456, USA.

aspects. There was as much interest in the active application of knowledge as there was in philosophical reflection, and there was still much devotion to the "extension of knowledge" despite growing interest in the "cultivation of mind." The present article, though very much a survey in nature, thus attempts to show the other intellectual trends that ran parallel to the trend which gave rise to the prominence of the School of Mind. It endeavors to present in broad terms a balanced view in the context of fifteenth-century history.

If there was a central trend throughout the fifteenth century, it was the obsession of scholars and civil officials in general with the framework offered in the book *THE GREAT LEARNING* for bringing peace to the world. This trend might be described as the intellectuals' effort to implement the "regulation of the family," one of the eight steps in the *GREAT LEARNING'S* framework. This step was considered the most crucial. The family was made up of "persons," and it was the foundation of the state. Hence all propositions about a person, from his physical well-being to the cultivation of his mind and heart, were related to it; and all considerations of methods and policies concerning political stability and social harmony had to take the person as a point of departure.

This concern about the "regulation of the family" was expressed in three related intellectual activities: the compilation of clan or family genealogies, the establishment of clan ancestral halls, and the annotation and publication of manuals on family rites and etiquette. Whatever modern scholarship from anthropological, sociological, or religious points of view may have to say on the implications of these activities,³ people who engaged themselves in such activities at the time regarded their efforts as something having practical social consequences.

A survey of the relevant literature shows that more than the reconstruction and keeping of a family's history, the advocates of clan and family genealogies believed that the availability of a clan's genealogy was an important step toward inducing respect for the clan's common ancestors and the solidarity of its members. A genealogy was intended to inspire the young members of a clan by exalting the ancestors' virtues and merits.⁴ More importantly, it was a "modern" manifestation of the ancient system of clan leadership (*tsung-tzu*), the maintenance of which would foster kinship consciousness and kin identity, so that "the bodies and hearts of a thousand or ten-thousand persons would be deemed and treated as the body and heart of one single person."⁵ The stimulation of this consciousness and identity would thus enable capable members to provide for those who were less fortunate, enable one to help another in times of danger and distress, and enable clan members to socialize with each other according to established rites.⁶ At a minimum, it was expected that distant relatives would not lose their intimacy because of distance, and obscure

members of the clan would not have their relationship with the prominent ended; that the rich would not despise the poor, the powerful would not oppress the weak, the young would not be ill-behaved toward the old, and the adults would not treat each other as just any other man on the street.⁷ These advocates, scholar-officials as well as literati, wanted local social stability, and, owing to their peculiar philosophical assumptions, saw this as a practical, logical, and rational way to achieve it.

The more concrete step toward the realization of these expectations was the erection of the clan's ancestral hall. This building provided a defined space and a constant location for the tangible manifestation of the ideal of "distinguishing the lineage and gathering together the clansmen."⁸ It was to be used for scheduled ancestral worship; for announcing occasions of capping, marriage, and death; for gathering to explain the genealogy and to read the clan rules; to praise a kinsman's good deeds and admonish against his misdeeds. It was to make sure that separate dwellings would not distance the relatives from one another, and that they would treat each other as kith and kin even though there might be no more mourning obligations between them. In short, the point was to make a group of kinsmen -- an enlarged family -- "always gather together and never disperse."⁹

In this connection, the use of books for family rites and etiquette was to provide a common denominator for individual families. For only when all shared the same beliefs and practiced the same rites could the function of the ancestral hall be fully realized.

The writings of fifteenth-century intellectuals nevertheless show that the trend of "the regulation of the family" had different manifestations over time. By and large, the compilation of genealogies was the focus of most contemporary attention. The works of the following four figures at least provide evidence for this generalization. Yang Shih-ch'i (1365-1444), the most eminent grand secretary during the first four decades of the century, wrote prefaces and postfaces to the genealogies of some seventy clans and families.¹⁰ Wang Chih (1379-1462), the eminent minister of personnel active from the second to the sixth decades of the century, wrote for some fifty other clans and families.¹¹ Wu Yu-pi, the most eminent Neo-Confucian teacher famous especially during the middle four decades, wrote for fifty-five others.¹² Ch'eng Min-cheng (1445-1499), the Hanlin official and man of letters as famous as Li Tung-yang (1447-1516), also wrote some twenty-five such prefaces and postfaces during the last quarter of the century, most of them for families in the Hui-chou area.¹³ Other scholars and officials contemporary to them also wrote for other clans and families. This conspicuous trend reflects a general intellectual interest in fostering intra-clan harmony as a means of attaining and maintaining local

social stability.

As implied earlier, the compilation of clan and family genealogies was but a first and rudimentary step toward that goal. It was agreed that harmony and stability could be attained only when ancestral halls of clans were established, because only then could the functions of assembling clan members for cooperative and mutual-aid projects be effected in concert. Viewing the century as a whole, the establishment of such halls became a relatively common feature only after 1450. The reason for this phenomenon, I submit, is not yet clear, but it shows that the intellectuals had in fact committed themselves to the achievement of their goal. From the relatively scholarly act of compiling a clan history they proceeded to the more practical act of providing a functional organization for the benefit (if also the abuse) of their fellow clansmen.

For the high-minded or highly-indoctrinated intellectuals such actions were also their way of implementing one of Chu Hsi's social ideas which was in accord with the dynasty's manifested will if not proclaimed policy. Chu Hsi's CHIA-LI (FAMILY RITES) was written into the HSING-LI TA-CH'UAN (GREAT COMPENDIUM OF HUMAN NATURE AND PRINCIPLES), a court compiled book that the Yung-lo emperor had ordered all official aspirants to study and to practice;¹⁴ the first chapter of the CHIA-LI is precisely about the erection of ancestral halls as the prerequisite of practicing the Confucian rites. In fact, virtually all writings that commemorated the founding of new ancestral halls made reference to this book. In this context, the fact that more ancestral halls were built after 1450 further reveals an even more determined intellectual effort to instill practical Neo-Confucian values into local social organization.

Thus it comes without surprise that the first and most influential Ming annotation of the CHIA-LI, the CHIA-LI I-CHIEH (ETIQUETTE IN FAMILY RITES) by Ch'iu Chün (1421-1495), appeared in 1470.¹⁵ Ch'iu Chün was not the first Ming scholar to comment on the CHIA-LI.¹⁶ But while the exegeses by others were piecemeal, his were systematic; and while the others' were intended for certain individual families, his were intended for publication as a practical guide.¹⁷ Also noteworthy is that such commentaries on the CHIA-LI also became popular after mid-century.¹⁸ Here again we see a shift of emphasis in the concerned intellectual circles. More about Ch'iu's book will be said later. It is important here to note that the reason for his annotation, as he stated it, was to make Chu Hsi's book comprehensible to the average educated person and thus to make him more capable and willing to practice the rites it prescribed. He argued that only in this way could the Confucian-educated literati regain the "handle of rites" which had been "usurped and controlled" by the Buddhist and Taoist priesthods long ago.¹⁹ The publication of Ch'iu Chün's book

and reissues of the CHIA-LI itself, together with increasing references to scholar-officials' practicing the etiquette prescribed in these books in the second half of the century, reflects an intensifying effort to Confucianize society. No longer were capable intellectuals satisfied merely with the erection of a clan ancestral hall; they now wanted the Confucian rites to be practiced in individual families. How far they succeeded in this is another question. The point is that such intellectuals were action-oriented, and ever more so as the fifteenth century drew to an end.

The most conspicuous change in intellectual mood and preference nevertheless appeared after the shocking year of 1449 -- the year that saw the inglorious defeat of the imperial army at T'u-mu.²⁰ This incident and its aftermath agitated many Ming minds and sobered as many others, both at the time and long afterwards. Imagine what the literati -- scholars, scholar-officials, potential officials -- would have felt, thought, and talked about when they realized that their emperor had submitted to the will of a eunuch and had as a result become the prisoner of a foreign, barbarian nation for a whole year, while they themselves were in the imperial capital city, besieged by the attacking Mongols, and then saw the enemy eventually repulsed and driven out. They realized that something had been terribly wrong with the Ming government, though the situation was by no means irremediable. After all, they had survived the unprecedented dynastic crisis.

Nevertheless, the events of the critical decade that followed convinced them that they had to rethink their intellectual priorities, if not alter the existing political system and the political institutions to which they were attached. The new emperor set up his son as heir-apparent to replace the son of his brother, the captured emperor. The ex-emperor, having returned and been made a virtual prisoner for another six years, was restored to the throne by a palace coup engineered by an alliance of a number of opportunistic generals, eunuchs, and scholar-officials. He then arranged for his brother, the dethroned emperor, to die mysteriously.²¹ The conspirators then mounted an ugly purge, after which they engaged themselves in relentless infighting. Some of them attempted another coup, which only failed after much blood was shed in the imperial city.²² All the while the government was facing an uncertain future because of an unwieldy, slack bureaucracy. Regional turmoil characterized by rampant banditry and minority rebellions was on the rise. Although it did not take the intellectuals long after the T'u-mu incident to question the premises of Ming government and officialdom, it was not until the end of the 1450s that their doubts, their worries, and their aspirations had taken a definite shape from which we can perceive a new trend at work accommodating two parallel movements.

The new trend appeared soon after 1449 and gathered momentum as the years went by. To put it as concisely as possible, it involved a general reappraisal of Sung Neo-Confucian propositions. The conventional understanding is that Ming intellectuals before the rise of Wang Yang-ming (1472-1529) were so closely identified with the Sung that they had not yet established a Ming complexion. Plainly, however, most of the literati at the time had mixed feelings. For more than thirty years they as a class had been taught what the Sung Neo-Confucians deemed meaningful and important for the individual and for the government.²³ After 1449, they in effect asked, if Sung learning was totally wrong or bad, why did the dynasty survive the unparalleled T'u-mu crisis? And if Sung learning was exactly right or good, why was the dynastic government not changing for the better? In the end they did not have definite answers, though their doubts were to prove enduring. The Ming dynasty still appeared to be strong, but they also sensed that it was beginning to weaken. What emerged in the meantime, in broad terms, was their qualified acceptance and modification of Sung propositions as well as the kind of intellectual preference that had been dominant for the past half century.

This change in attitude is revealed most clearly in an almost concerted attempt by the most learned and respected court officials to reexamine and even to challenge the Sung masters' teachings as they appeared in the two textbook-like compendia compiled in the early years of the Yung-lo reign, the SSU-SHU WU-CHING TA-CH'UAN (GREAT COMPENDIUM OF THE FOUR BOOKS AND FIVE CLASSICS) and HSING-LI TA-CH'UAN. The words and deeds of these court erudites taken together appear less as being critical of the Sung masters' learning *per se* and more as critical of the way in which such learning was presented and disseminated by the Yung-lo court. Or put another way, their dissatisfaction with government-dictated learning led them to question what was dictated. The work of a few of the most prominent scholar-officials of the time may illustrate this point.

First, take Ch'iu Chün, a Hanlin official from 1454 and a chancellor of the National Academy for the decade after 1477. In 1463 Ch'iu wrote the CHU TZU HSUEH-TI (OBJECTIVES OF MASTER CHU'S LEARNING), a book of twenty chapters presenting in logically connected categories the most important sayings and writings selected from Chu Hsi's many works.²⁴ Ch'iu maintained that while Chu Hsi's works were mostly exegeses and elaboration of the Classics and other philosophers, he never wrote an independent book that had presented his own philosophy systematically; Chu Hsi's ideas were scattered and therefore a book which could facilitate the understanding of Chu Hsi's teaching, such as the one Ch'iu just compiled, was useful, as a guide.²⁵

Of the many points Ch'iu Chün made in this book, that which concerned the steps of Confucian learning best

illustrates the point I am making. He stressed the progress from "learning on the lower levels" to "accomplishment on the higher levels."²⁶ This meant that the learner must proceed from the understanding of facts (events and affairs) to that of principles, from what could be known closest to a student's own environment -- his person, his family, his other circles of association -- to what could be known of the nature of human beings and of heaven and earth, principles and cosmic forces, *yin-yang* and the Supreme Ultimate.²⁷ More immediately, on the sequence of learning the Classics, he advocated that the books of POETRY, HISTORY and RITES be taught prior to the CHANGE and SPRING AND AUTUMN ANNALS, so that the student could proceed "from the shallow or easy to the profound or difficult."²⁸ The emphasis of all these priorities, simply put, ran contrary to what was given or implied in the two government compilations I have mentioned. The book's content and structure make it clear that Ch'iu Chün was making two overall points which also ran counter to the intellectual results of an education based on these government compilations. First, for practical purposes, acquisition of knowledge is better started from book reading, because, proper instruction by teachers not being available, for one "to plumb principles" (*ch'iuung-li*) at the expense of books is pointless drifting.²⁹ Second, rather than verbally stressing the importance of "seriousness," one should "approach seriousness by the practice of rites, because seriousness is within the realm of rites."³⁰ What Ch'iu stressed here -- accumulated knowledge and personal practice of a branch of learning -- was what he found lacking in many of his contemporaries. That amounted to saying that Chu Hsi was right but was understood wrongly; government-dictated learning did not promote true learning.

In 1474 Ch'iu Chün wrote the CHIA-LI I-CHIEH, the annotation of Chu Hsi's CHIA-LI mentioned above. It is worth repeating that despite the doubts about its authorship, the CHIA-LI formed part of the HSING-LI TA-CH'UAN. It was meant to be used for the practice of family rites. But as Yang Shih-ch'i pointed out early in the century, doubts and difficulties about the text did not encourage the literati.³¹ Ch'iu Chün even wrote that in fact most of the literati class did not use it because the text in general was not intelligible. Implicitly, he complained that many of the prescribed ritual items were either too complicated or obsolete. To make family rites comprehensible and practicable, which was socially very important, Ch'iu annotated the text and with his critical notes he suggested discarding out-of-date items and modifying others. All in all, he abridged and simplified this government-approved Sung book into "easy and plain language so that even the average literati in the village could easily comprehend and practice it."³² Ch'iu Chün's annotation is not all beyond question. But I wish to make this point clear: to him as well as to his contemporaries the government-approved Sung teaching was to be made to serve their own purposes, not they themselves to unquestioningly serve that teaching.

Ch'iu Chūn did not stop here, even though appearing to be too meek for an open challenge. His other works also show strong characteristics of modifying or altering established but out-of-date positions by working along with the existing order. Call him a quiet, internal rebel if you will. This becomes more evident when we note what he was doing in the 1480s when he was chancellor of the National Academy. He asked one of his best students, Ts'ai Ch'ing (1453-1508), who became one of the most eminent Neo-Confucians of the Ming and was at the time an expert in the BOOK OF CHANGE, to criticize the part of the CHANGE in the government-sponsored compendium of annotated classics, WU-CHING TA-CH'UAN and to provide a new annotation. Ts'ai Ch'ing did what Ch'iu asked and was open in his criticism of the compendium's compilers, the scholars selected by the Yung-lo court.³³ From this untold incident we can see that contemporary dissatisfaction with scholarship of the early decades had reached a point where something like an open rectification was called for. Of course, for Chancellor Ch'iu, master of educated potential officials from all over the empire, to undertake this, the general feeling must have been strong and the consequences were to be far-reaching.

In fact, Ch'iu Chūn was not the first chancellor of the National Academy to take a challenging position, though he certainly was a more cautious and less vocal one. His good friend and immediate predecessor, the famous Chou Hung-mou (1420-1491), had already taken the lead. In 1480 Chou presented to the court a collection of notes, entitled [CH'UN-CHING] PIEN-I LU, which he had made as responses to questions by the Academy's students when he was chancellor.³⁴ These notes were all critical of traditional interpretations of the FOUR BOOKS and the five CLASSICS by Han, T'ang and Sung exegetes. In a total of 211 notes, Chou argued to correct former Confucians' interpretations which were "harmful to," which "mistook," and which were "incompatible with the gist of the Classics," and he offered to "elucidate the implication of these interpretations."³⁵ He was especially doubtful of the interpretations of ancient political institutions and events by the Ch'eng brothers and by Chu Hsi, so much so that he stated in his preface, "I would rather be Master Chu's loyal servitor than be his sycophantic servitor."³⁶ To be sure, most of Chou's own interpretations are no better than Chu Hsi's.³⁷ But the point is that he was not willing to be satisfied with what Chu Hsi held to be true and with what government-sponsored scholarship held to be orthodox. He manifested this independent attitude, but it certainly was not his alone. Not only was he revealing this to his students, but the students themselves must also have felt this for him to have undertaken to answer such questions. And Ch'iu Chūn shared his spirit and his position. When Chou retired Ch'iu urged him to write a book on the BOOK OF HISTORY to be based on his many criticisms of the government-approved annotations of this classic by Chu Hsi's student, Ts'ai Ch'en (1167-1230).³⁸

Chou Hung-mou was particularly critical of Chu Hsi's understanding of classical institutions and Ch'iu Chūn was inclined to focus on the practical aspects of Chu Hsi's learning and scholarship. Their colleague, Yang Shou-ch'en (1425-1489), the respected Hanlin official, was known to be very doubtful of Chu Hsi's philosophical interpretations of the Classics and the FOUR BOOKS.³⁹ In the decade right after 1450, Yang wrote his SSU-CH'AO (PRIVATE COPIES) -- speculative in nature, I must add -- for all these books, which constituted the required reading for state examinations. His books are no longer extant, but from his own separate prefaces to each of them and from a judicious comment on all of them by a friend of his,⁴⁰ he appears to have been no less daring than Chou Hung-mou. For these books he "corrected their texts, and rearranged the sequence of paragraphs and sentences." For exegeses "he followed only what he believed to be right, and did not uncritically agree with those he believed to be questionable, even though they were by the great masters of the Sung."⁴¹

From these instances it is clear that beginning at mid-century a new trend of examining and reappraising the government-exalted Sung learning was well underway. Ch'iu Chūn, Chou Hung-mou and Yang Shou-ch'en are scholars not to be found in MING-JU HSUEH-AN (PHILOSOPHICAL RECORDS OF MING CONFUCIANS) by the great Huang Tsung-hsi (1610-1695), but they were Confucian scholars. They had different personal traits and intellectual preferences, and their scholarly accomplishments were not the same. To make a figure of speech, Chou and Yang tended to be destructive and Ch'iu tended to be constructive in the transition from the old to the new. But their thought, the motivation behind their action, was the same: they were not all convinced of the rationality and practicality of the Sung learning approved by the Ming government. They began to criticize, to urge reform, to seek remedies. The Ming intellectual world was forever changed after the T'u-mu incident. From then on, aspiring literati wanted an intellectual complexion of their own, and they wanted to find out what really was basic to the solution of problems that they and their state were unhappily confronting.

We can now discuss the "two parallel movements" I have mentioned that were accommodated in this general trend. These movements came from two different assumptions about how society and government fundamentally could be better run; they reflect different contemplative reactions to the same situation. For those who had anything to do with the post-T'u-mu decade, the following two questions were unavoidable. What was wrong that had led to T'u-mu? What was wrong since T'u-mu that had not perceptibly changed the Ming for the better? The educated ideal of a Confucian scholar was that he cultivated himself so as to be able to govern. No Confucians questioned the necessity of institutions for governing and the appropriateness of scholars as officials. Moreover, they believed that good

men could make good use of institutions. From this they aspired to make right their emperor and make good social customs. But government and society both were far from ideal. Was it especially because of men, the officials? Or was it primarily a matter of institutional failure? Here the Ming intellectuals split in their consensus about the best way to achieve good government.

Although their split was a matter of difference in degree rather than in kind, it happened that those who stressed the "man" side of the problem in this period were those who have been identified as Confucians advocating the supremacy of the mind, including such famous figures as Wu YU-pi and his students. Their ideas of how to become a perfect man, even a sage, have been studied,⁴² although little can be said about their experience in government, which often was minimal or non-existent. In simple terms, they believed that good men could solve all government-related problems; and for a man to be good, he had to have a perfectly cultivated mind. A good man always contributed to good government. Even when absent from government he helped that cause: if he was unable to make others good, he at least could make himself good. Society was made up of individuals, and the GREAT LEARNING taught that "from the Son of Heaven to the common people, all must take as fundamental the cultivation of one's person." But only one's mind could help cultivate one's person. Most essential was now the cultivation of mind, not the investigation of things, as the Sung masters had insisted.⁴³ Scholars of this persuasion comprised a movement -- a sub-current -- which may be called cultivation of mind.

I would emphasize here the other movement, which I shall refer to as learning of statecraft. This belonged to scholar-officials and literati who aspired to a government career. While believing that good men made good use of institutions, they also insisted that good men needed to master a variety of practical kinds of knowledge to make institutions function well in the first place. They were more concerned with the "institution" side of the problem. Statecraft is a broad term, and was referred to by the rubric ching-shih, which literally means the management of society. This kind of management was basically pursued on two levels. On the high level, the concern was how to manage the institutions which managed society at large; on the low level, it was the institutional enforcement of state policies throughout society. On both levels, the intellectual who so committed himself displayed an eclectic approach towards learning. He often had a sound knowledge of fields other than classical studies. He was obliged to be broadly learned in many subjects, because practical government was never simply a matter of mind, and the governed might not need classical instruction to be obedient.⁴⁴

Broadly speaking, literati in the second half of the century who pursued "low level" statecraft involved themselves

in learning which had tangible and observable effects on the daily life of society. These literati were not necessarily all in high government positions, even though as a matter of fact many of them were. Many of their works in this vein were intended to provide guidance in practical affairs. For example, there was a book called CHIU-HUANG HUO-MIN PU-I SHU (SUPPLEMENT TO WAYS OF FAMINE RELIEF AND SAVING THE MASSES) by a certain Chu Wei-chi. It was a revised and expanded version of two similar works from the Sung and Yüan periods, respectively. In addition to historical policies, methods, and cases of famine relief, there were Ming edicts and orders concerning the administration of famine relief. The author intended the book to be used as a reference by officials and social leaders in famine stricken years. It deserves notice that although Chu, the author, was but a rich man having no official status and obligations, his concern about such social affairs had impressed even the respected minister of personnel, Wang Chih, who accordingly wrote a preface for this book.⁴⁵ The point we should stress is that even senior officials well versed in Neo-Confucian theories valued such practical works as this and encouraged the writing of them.

In fact, many of the period's most eminent scholar-officials, including some famous Confucians, not only did not slight the importance of such practical but unphilosophical learning, but also personally pursued them with fruitful results. It is significant that they justified this pursuit by holding that such learning was also genuinely Confucian. Thus, for instance, there was Ch'iu Chün writing his PAN-TS'AO KE-SHIH (PATTERN FOR HERBAL MEDICINE), a book which created a typology for herbs and set rules for the collection and distinction of herbs according to their medical nature. Ch'iu's reason for this undertaking was that herbs had been wrongly classified because of improper and inadequate recognition. He thought his work was justified because "Confucian learning includes not only the learning of the principles of human nature, but also the learning of the principles of things."⁴⁶ Admitting that he himself was no medical practitioner, he nevertheless was to make his book a practical guide based on the learning of the principles of things. In the same way, he studied acupuncture, and did it so expertly that he was able to emend two traditional acupuncture charts and to add to them simulation charts of internal organs showing related points of the human body's circulatory and nervous systems.⁴⁷ He also compiled a collection of prescriptions gathered from the medical books he read.⁴⁸

All in all, Ch'iu held that this was also Confucian learning about the investigation of things and extension of knowledge. Whether Ch'iu was aware of it or not, he actually was reasserting here (not redefining) a more traditional role for the Confucian intellectual and a more traditional content for Confucian learning. The Confucian was not to be confined merely to the mastery of the principles of human nature; he

also had to be able to apply the knowledge of the principles of things to concrete deeds. To use Ch'iu's words, not only must he know why a thing was as it was, he must also push to the end to know what its inevitable result would be.⁴⁹

Ch'iu Chün was not alone in such intellectual pursuits. Men of his generation, like Hsü Yu-chen (1407-1472), Liu P'u (fl. 1410-1450), and Yüeh Cheng (1418-1472), to name only a few, also had an eclectic knowledge of medicine, astrology, the calendar, water control, and canal drainage. And they were never uneasy about their knowledge of such pedestrian subjects as divination, physiognomy and geomancy.⁵⁰ In fact, even the art of painting in this period displayed a creative eclecticism which embraced a plurality of traditions.⁵¹

Nor did men a generation younger differ much from them. The interests and concerns of Ch'eng Min-cheng, the celebrated court erudite serving in the last quarter of the century, are most revealing. His ardent advocacy of the reconciliation of the philosophical differences of Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan notwithstanding, Ch'eng was also a known expert in the subjects mentioned above, in addition to medicine. He regarded such learning as a legitimate form of the Confucian investigation of things and extension of knowledge.⁵² We have to conclude that a considerable number of Confucian-minded intellectuals, both in and out of government, considered knowledge with practical applications as important as knowledge of a more philosophical nature, and they tried to acquire it and to put it into use.

"High level" statecraft learning essentially consisted of two kinds of inquiry, one relatively theoretical and the other more practical. These two kinds of inquiry concerned, respectively, the reexamination of historical issues, particularly those of the Sung and Yüan periods, and historical as well as contemporary government institutions and policies. The vogue for this learning is perhaps best revealed in a 1470 memorial soliciting court support for the compilation of a T'UNG-TIEN (COMPREHENSIVE STATUTES OF THE MING DYNASTY) and a chronological history of the Sung and Yüan dynasties. The first book was called for because "already a hundred years have passed to the present day, yet there are no defined and established rules." Many rules and regulations in government books were already obsolete. The second book was needed in order to provide the literati with new judgments about historical events for their better understanding of present realities. The most important contention of this memorial was that while this was a time of "cultural enlightenment and peace," the institutional and administrative aspects of government still fell short of the standard that would "perpetuate order and peace."⁵³ This reveals a certain awareness among leading court intellectuals about the political situation in general. To them, perpetuation of the state's peace and order was to be determined by its defined instrumentalities as well as by the capacity to draw both

practical and philosophical wisdom from the lessons of history. Their direction was toward a better functioning government. Such an awareness was being expressed since the T'u-mu debacle in 1449.

The reexamination of Sung history had in fact become a fashionable if not obsessive intellectual exercise. Throughout this half century a host of discourses on Sung topics by famous court officials and students of the National Academy appeared continuously. Chronologically listed, these included works by Liu Ting-chih (1409-1469),⁵⁴ Ho Ch'iao-hsin (1427-1503),⁵⁵ Ch'iu Chün and his students,⁵⁶ Wang Ao (1450-1524),⁵⁷ Ch'eng Min-cheng,⁵⁸ and Chu Yün-ming (1461-1527).⁵⁹ In addition, there was in the early 1450s an effort to write a new Sung history in the standard annalistic form;⁶⁰ in the mid-1470s the Sung and Yüan chronology called for in the memorial mentioned above was also compiled.⁶¹

Ming studies of Sung history in general reveal a high degree of shared political preoccupation on the part of the writers. Individual writers showed common characteristics in using what happened in Sung times as a reminder of what was happening to the Ming. History was for them by no means academic, although some of their original arguments proved to be so influential that they are still pursued by modern historians. Among these arguments, which still shape the study of Sung history today, are the following: that the Sung founders actually instigated the usurpation coup; that the second emperor might have murdered the first emperor; that Emperor Kao-tsung worked to prevent the return of his brother, the captured emperor who preceded him, from the Jurchens; that Yüeh Fei, the noble general, would not have been able to recover the territories lost to the Jurchens despite his ability as a brilliant military leader; and that Ch'in Kuei, the bad minister, was in fact a capable administrator.⁶²

There is no need here to evaluate the merit of these revisionist theses; I merely wish to point out what they meant to their authors' contemporaries. For example, the discussion of the second Sung emperor's succession to the throne of his brother and its aftermath was understood as a discussion of the relationship between the Ming emperor Ying-tsung, who was captured by the Mongols, and Emperor Ching-ti, his brother, who succeeded to the throne. The issue the writers addressed was the proper moral relationship between these brothers. Their implied question was whether Ching-ti treated Ying-tsung properly when the latter was returned by his Mongol captors. This problem was even made the focus of a metropolitan examination question in 1456.⁶³ Likewise, other criticisms of the Sung government's conduct and policies contained implied criticism against their Ming counterparts. And the Ming critics were unanimous in condemning even the "great Confucians and gentlemen" involved in the partisan struggles that had plagued the government of Northern Sung. For it was they who

had caused their opponents, the advocates of the reform initiated and led by Wang An-shih (1021-1086), to go to the disastrous extreme. Wang An-shih was wrong. But so were his critics Su Shih (1036-1101) and Ch'eng I (1033-1107), because the unnecessary quarrel between these two and their followers foreclosed a concerted effort either to improve upon the reforms or to negate the harmful effects of the reform policies. And Ch'eng I was the more wrong, because while Su Shih was but a literatus, Ch'eng was a Confucian master.⁶⁴ The Ming critics nonetheless praised the Sung emperor Shen-tsung's courage and determination to launch the reform, and they especially admired him for wholeheartedly entrusting the reform to his prime minister.⁶⁵ The Ming statecraft enthusiasts were here conveying two messages: they would appreciate it if their emperor would agree to reforms, to having them carried out by his ministers; they also wanted to see a good working relationship among all high officials.⁶⁶ Their overriding problem was again what to do if the Sung did not deserve to serve as their model.

From probing historical problems they thus turned to probing their own problems, especially those concerning the functioning of government institutions. A simultaneous revival of the study of government policies -- modern as well as historical -- based on the understanding of political institutions and conditions present and past is evidence of their concern. Their rationale for this study was to find solutions for current state and social problems. Soon after 1449, official-scholars suddenly found an interest in recovering and collecting the "policy essays" by Fang Hsiao-ju (1357-1402), the loyalist of the Chien-wen reign (1399-1402), who was the leading Ming Confucian writer of the genre in the previous century. Eventually, Ch'iu Chün compiled Fang's essays into a book called LUN-YÜAN (SOURCE OF DISCOURSES ON POLICY) for the purpose of study and discussion.⁶⁷ In 1451 the first single-authored collection of policy-related discourses, the TS'E-HSUEH CHI-LÜEH (A BRIEF COMPILATION FOR POLICY LEARNING) by Huang P'u (cs. 1448) also appeared. Included in this work are discourses on five groups of government policies under the headings of court institutions, ritual institutions, political administration, state finance, and military preparation. They deal with such specific topics as personnel administration; law and punishments; state-sanctioned local organizations; school systems, agriculture, population, social customs, taxation; canal transportation, famine relief, currency, state monopolies; military organization, weaponry, border defense, horse administration, and military colonies. The professed aim of the publication was to better equip students for government examinations.⁶⁸ Nonetheless, the book's message was also clear: students must be knowledgeable about the details of government.

Huang P'u was not alone in this. What he did in fact was compatible with what many others had done or had wished to do.

Contemporaries much more famous and influential than he was, men like Liu Ting-chih, Chou Hung-mou, Ho Ch'iao-hsin, Yin Chih (1427-1511), and Wang Ao, wrote extensively on such statecraft topics.⁶⁹ And much that was discussed by the students was left unrecorded. The greatest achievement to come out of it was, of course, Ch'iu Chün's TA-HSUEH YEN-I PU (SUPPLEMENT TO THE EXTENDED MEANING OF THE GREAT LEARNING) written in 1487. I have elsewhere written about the background and special features of this classic of pragmatic statecraft.⁷⁰ The following list of its sections may serve to reveal the range of its concerns. The sections included topics on "adjustment of the imperial court, adjustment of officialdom, consolidation of state (economic) foundations, administration of state finance, rites and music for state and society, arrangement of state offerings, education and moral instruction, provision of official facilities, law and punishments, military preparation, control over barbarian peoples, and moral perfection of the emperor." In short, it treated the various ways government should work in order to achieve lasting stability and prosperity for the state and society. To use Ch'iu's own words, these were his "diagnoses and prescriptions"⁷¹ for the cure of the diseases that he saw in the state and society of his day. The book was his blueprint for implementing reform policies for the Ming dynasty of the late fifteenth century. Equally important, he intended it to serve at the same time as a reference work on statecraft knowledge for the Ming emperors and their servitors. As for the intellectual historian, the coming of this masterpiece reveals that fifteenth-century intellectuals had been aware of and had devoted themselves to the pursuit of organized, pragmatic statecraft knowledge. The tremendous influence of this book during the following two centuries further demonstrates that the Ming intellectual world was never wholly dominated by idealistic Neo-Confucians.⁷²

More about Ch'iu's SUPPLEMENT can be said; here it must suffice to point out the philosophical approach he took. Ch'iu's book was written to supplement the Sung Confucian Chen Te-hsiu's TA-HSUEH YEN-I (EXTENDED MEANING OF THE GREAT LEARNING), a Ming government-approved book on what I have called theoretical statecraft, which elaborated the GREAT LEARNING up to the step called regulation of the family.⁷³ Chen's fundamental assumption was that an imperial family regulated by a sincere-minded and well-cultivated emperor inevitably led to an orderly and well-run government and state. Ch'iu Chün argued that this would not do unless both the emperor and his officials simultaneously possess practical knowledge about the functional aspects of governing. He referred to Chen's book as one concerned about principles, the original substance, and the "knowing" part of government, and to his own as one concerned with the affairs, the effective functions, and the "doing" part of government. He argued that although action was the end of knowledge, knowledge must precede action. In practice he insisted that knowledge and action complemented one another in the achievement of a unitary

goal.⁷⁴ Here, unmistakably, we see the beginning of the characteristic Ming quest for unity, be that one of knowledge and action, principles and affairs, or substance and function. The philosophically-minded wanted oneness, even at the risk of contradicting the teachings of Sung Confucian masters who had been honored by the state.

In this light, it should come as no surprise that in 1489 there appeared the Ch'eng Min-cheng thesis that only Chu Hsi's early philosophical positions were different from those of Lu Chiu-yüan (1139-1192), and that ultimately there was no basic difference between the two since "the Way is one only." This thesis, set forth in Ch'eng's TAO-I PIEN (ON THE WAY BEING ONE), a book that professed to correct the prevalent intellectual bias of venerating Chu at the expense of Lu, was construed from a chronological study of Chu Hsi's poems and letters which bore on Lu Chiu-yüan.⁷⁵ But despite his good intentions and his sophisticated methods, the research that led to this thesis proved to be completely wrong. In 1548, Ch'en Chien (1497-1567) was able to demonstrate conclusively that only the opposite of this thesis was true, that the philosophical approaches of Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan ultimately diverged.⁷⁶ This conclusion has been upheld by modern authorities on Sung and Ming Neo-Confucian thought.⁷⁷

The implication of Ch'eng's thesis was nonetheless profound. The Way now being one, why then must only Chu Hsi's teaching -- a symbol of, if not a synonym for, the government's will -- be accepted and taught? Here is found the real struggle in this movement: independence in intellectual judgment and pursuit. Ch'eng Min-cheng was acknowledged as an excellent scholar in "evidential research,"⁷⁸ and he was a devoted young friend of Ch'iu Chün, who also excelled in such scholarship.⁷⁹ Why was Ch'eng exceptionally careless in this piece of scholarship? It is not enough merely to attribute this to Ch'eng's "being a literatus who did not have real insight into Chu Hsi's teaching of the acquisition of knowledge."⁸⁰ It seems more probable that, owing to Ch'eng's uncontrollable desire to be intellectually independent and to rise above Sung domination, he somehow bent facts to fit his conclusion. This desire and this attitude continued and became stronger during the sixteenth century. The fact that Ch'eng, Min-cheng's thesis was soon embraced and expanded by Wang Yang-ming in his CHU-TZU WAN-NIEN TING-LUN (CHU HSI'S FINAL CONCLUSIONS ARRIVED AT LATE IN LIFE) is but one example of this trend.⁸¹

NOTES

1. Wing-tsit Chan, "The Ch'eng-Chu School of Early Ming," in Wm. Theodore de Bary, ed., SELF AND SOCIETY IN MING THOUGHT (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1970), pp. 29-52.
2. Chien Yu-wen, "Ch'en Hsien-chang's Philosophy of the Natural," SELF AND SOCIETY IN MING THOUGHT, pp. 53-92.
3. See, e.g., Hsiao-tung Fei, PEASANT LIFE IN CHINA (London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1939), pp. 83-94; Hui-chen Wang Liu, "An Analysis of Chinese Clan Rules: Confucian Theories in Action," in David S. Nivison and Arthur F. Wright, eds., CONFUCIANISM IN ACTION (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959), pp. 63-96; Kung-chuan Hsiao, RURAL CHINA: IMPERIAL CONTROL IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1960), pp. 323-370; Francis L. K. Hsu, UNDER THE ANCESTORS' SHADOW: KINSHIP, PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL MOBILITY IN CHINA (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967), pp. 50-53, 107-130; Patricia Buckley Ebrey, FAMILY AND PROPERTY IN SUNG CHINA: YUAN TS'AI'S PRECEPTS FOR SOCIAL LIFE (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 1-171; Patricia Buckley Ebrey and James L. Watson, eds., KINSHIP ORGANIZATION IN LATE IMPERIAL CHINA, 1000-1940 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).
4. Yang Shih-ch'i (1365-1444), TUNG-LI HSÜ-CHI (SSU-K'U CH'ÜAN-SHU edition) (Taipei: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1983), 12:25b.
5. Lo Lun (1431-1478), I-FENG WEN-CHI (SSU-K'U CH'ÜAN-SHU edition), 2:29a.
6. Ibid.
7. Ni Yüeh (1444-1501), CH'ING-HSI MAN-KAO (SSU-K'U CH'ÜAN-SHU Edition), 18:4a-b.
8. Ch'iu Chün (1421-1495), CH'IUNG-T'AI SHIH-WEN HUI-KAO CH'UNG-PIEN (Ming edition of 1621), 17:30a.

9. I-FENG WEN-CHI, 4:3b. See also Ch'eng Min-cheng (1445-1499), HUANG-TUN WEN-CHI (SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition), 14:6b.
10. Figures based on Yang Shih-ch'i, TUNG-LI WEN-CHI and TUNG-LI HSÜ-CHI (both SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition). Compare John W. Dardess, "A Century of Social Change: T'ai-ho County, Kiangsi, 1400-1500," MING STUDIES, 26 (Fall 1988):56-60.
11. Figures based on Wang Chih, I-AN CHI (SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition). Compare John W. Dardess, op. cit.
12. Figures based on Wu Yü-pi, K'ANG-CHAI CHI (SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition).
13. Figures based on HUANG-TUN WEN-CHI, op. cit.
14. This compendium, though much criticized by early Ch'ing scholars, was copied into the SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU and hence is now easily accessible.
15. This work had been printed many times in the Ming after 1470 and had appeared in several slightly different versions. For a discussion of its various editions, see Hung-lam Chu, "Ch'iu Chün (1421-1495) and the TA-HSUEH YEN-I PU: Statecraft Thought in Fifteenth-Century China" (Doctoral dissertation, Princeton University, 1984), pp. 446-447.) The copy referred to in the present article belongs to a "collated edition" published in Canton in 1490.
16. At least Chu Yu's (1314-1376) SHEN-I K'AO, Huang Jun-yü's (1389-1477) K'AO-TING SHEN-I CHIH-TU, and Yüeh Cheng's (1418-1472) SHEN-I TSUAN-SHU appeared earlier than Ch'iu's work. See Chu I-tsun (1629-1709), CHING-I K'AO (SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition), 150:17a-b.
17. This intention is clearly stated in Ch'iu's preface to the book.
18. Besides the works of Huang Jun-yü and Yüeh Cheng cited above, there were also Tso Tsan's (1424-1490) SHEN-I K'AO-CHENG and Hsia Shih-cheng's (1412-1499) SHEN-I K'AO. See Chu I-tsun, op. cit., 150:18a-b.
19. CHIA-LI I-CHIEH, "Preface."

20. For a study of this incident and its ramifications, see Frederick W. Mote, "The T'u-mu Incident of 1449," in Frank A. Kierman, Jr. and John K. Fairbank, eds., CHINESE WAYS OF WARFARE (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 243-272.
21. For a study of the political history of the seven years following the T'u-mu incident, which constituted the Ching-t'ai reign of 1450-1457, see Philip de Heer, THE CARE-TAKER EMPEROR (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986).
22. This refers to the coup instigated by the eunuch Ts'ao Chi-hsiang and his heir Ts'ao Ch'in (both died in 1461). See MING-SHIH (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1974), pp. 7774-7775.
23. This became especially clear following the publication of the court-compiled HSING-LI TA-CH'UAN in 1415.
24. For a discussion of this work in conjunction with the development of Ch'iu Chün as a statecraft writer, see Hung-lam Chu, "Ch'iu Chün and the TA-HSUEH YEN-I PU: Statecraft Thought in Fifteenth-Century China," pp. 215-217. For the various editions of this work, see *ibid.*, pp. 445-446.
25. CHU-TZU HSUEH-TI (1866 reprint of 1709 edition by the Cheng-i t'ang), *hsia*: 76b.
26. *Ibid.*, *hsia*: 77a.
27. *Ibid.*, *hsia*: 77a-78a.
28. *Ibid.*, *hsia*: 78b.
29. *Ibid.*
30. *Ibid.*
31. TUNG-LI HSÜ-CHI, 18:1a.
32. CHIA-LI I-CHIEH, "Preface."

33. See Ts'ai Ch'ing's letter to Ch'iu Chün concerning this matter in HSU-CHAI CHI (SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition), 2:1a. Ts'ai's criticisms eventually became the P'I-TIEN I-CHING TA-CH'UAN in 8 chüan, which, however, appears to be no longer extant. Ts'ai Ch'ing the Neo-Confucian master was highly regarded in Ming and Ch'ing times. He has a biography in MING-SHIH (p. 7234). His exegetical works on the CHANGE and the FOUR BOOKS, I-CHING MENG-YIN and SSU-SHU MENG-YIN, were highly influential in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For a recent study of his ideas and his role in the school of Chu Hsi's philosophy during the Ming, see Kao Ling-yin and Ch'en Ch'i-fang, FU CHIEN CHU-TZU HSUEH (Foochow: Fu-chien jen-min ch'u-pan-she, 1986), pp. 252-287.

34. For a modern biography of Chou by Ray Huang, see L. Carrington Goodrich and Chaoying Fang, eds., DICTIONARY OF MING BIOGRAPHY, 1368-1644 (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1976), pp. 769-771.

35. The expressions in quotation marks are the exact wordings of the four sections of the PIEN-I LU. The copy of this work referred to in the present article is from the WU-SHIH CHING-HSUEH TS'UNG-SHU edition, printed by the Pao-jen t'ang in 1830.

36. PIEN-I LU, "Preface" by Chou Hung-mou.

37. See the critical comments on this work in Chi Yün (1724-1805) and Yung Jung (1744-1790), eds., SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU TSUNG-MU T'I-YAO (WAN-YU WEN-K'U edition, Shanghai: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1931), vol. 7, p. 74.

38. CH'IUNG-T'AI SHIH-WEN HUI-KAO CH'UNG-PIEN, 23:5a-b.

39. For biographies of Yang, see MING-SHIH, pp. 4875-4877; Ho Ch'iao-hsin (1427-1503), CHIAO-CH'IU WEN-CHI (SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition), 30:40b-47a; Chiao Hung (1541-1620), ed., KUO-CH'AO HSIEN-CHENG LU (Reprint of 1595 edition, Taipei: Hsüeh-sheng shu chü, 1965), 26:18a.

40. For his own prefaces, seven in total, see Yang Shou-ch'en, YANG WEN-I KUNG CHING-CH'UAN KAO (Ming edition of 1588), 2:1a-12a; for the comment by Ho Ch'iao-hsin, see CHIAO-CH'IU WEN-CHI, 30:42b.

41. CHIAO-CH'IU WEN-CHI, *ibid.*

42. See, e.g., Wing-tsit Chan, "The Ch'eng-Chu School of Early Ming" and Jen Yu-wen, "Ch'en Hsien-chang's Philosophy of the Natural," in SELF AND SOCIETY IN MING THOUGHT, pp. 29-51 and 53-92, respectively; Jung Chao-tsu, MING-TAI SSU-HSIANG SHIH (Reprint, Taipei: K'ai-ming shu-tien, 1962), pp. 13-51.

43. This important aspect of early Ming thought is well revealed in Wing-tsit Chan's "The Ch'eng-Chu School of Early Ming." See also Sano Kōji, "Mindai zen hanki no shisō dōkō (Intellectual Trends in the First Half of the Ming Dynasty)," NIHON CHŪGOKU GAKKAI HO 26 (1974), pp. 112-126; cf. Iwama Kazuo, "Minshō ikō no shisō dōkō to Yōmeigaku no keisei (Intellectual Trends since Early Ming and the Formation of Wang Yang-ming's Philosophy)," HOSEI RONSHŪ 34 (1966), pp. 68-93.

44. This point was made most explicit by Ch'iu Chün in the prelude of a didactic play he composed for a non-elite audience, the WU-LUN CH'UAN-PEI CHI. For a brief discussion of this play in the context of mid fifteenth-century intellectual sentiment, see Hung-lam Chu, "Ch'iu Chün and the TA-HSUEH YEN-I PU: Statecraft Thought in Fifteenth-Century China," pp. 213-214.

45. Wang's preface is preserved in I-AN WEN HOU-CHI (SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition), 8:29a. The book, however, is not extant.

46. CH'IUNG-T'AI SHIH-WEN HUI-KAO CH'UNG-PIEN, 9:33b.

47. *Ibid.*, 9:39b-42b.

48. A copy of this collection, known as CH'UN-SHU CH'AO-FANG, with supplements by Ho Men-ch'un (1474-1536) in 1504, entitled CH'UN-FANG HSU-CH'AO, is preserved in Peking Library. A Japanese edition was published in 1840, and a copy of it is preserved in the Naikaku Bunko.

49. CH'IUNG-T'AI SHIH-WEN HUI-KAO CH'UNG-PIEN, 9:41a; text reads "ch'iu-chi ch'i so-tang-jan erh chih ch'i so-i-jan."

50. For example, in the case of Yüeh Cheng, see Hung-lam Chu, "High Ch'ing Intellectual Bias as Reflected in the IMPERIAL CATALOGUE," THE GEST LIBRARY JOURNAL, 1.2 (Spring 1987), pp. 51-66.

51. See the article by Kathlyn Liscomb below.

52. See HUANG-TUN WEN-CHI, 23:18b, 34:15b.

53. See MING HSIEN-TSUNG SHIH-LU (Reprint, Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1964), 75:1453. The memorialist was Yin Chih (1427-1511). The entire text of this memorial can be found in CH'ENG-CHIANG PIEH-CHI (Ming edition of ca. 1500), chung:1a-3a.

54. Liu's works comprised the famous SUNG-LUN, issued as a monograph in as early as 1472 (Ming edition of 1472) and appeared in the collection of Liu's literary works, TAI-CHAI TS'UN-KAO (Ming edition of 1488-1505).

55. Ho's works were incorporated into the collection of his literary works, CHIAO-CH'IU WEN-CHI (in chüan 4, 5, and 6).

56. Ch'iu's writings on the Sung formed part of his historical work, SHIH-SHIH CHENG-KANG, extant in Ming editions of 1488 and 1563, and also available in modern editions of 1936 (Hai-k'ou, Hainan) and 1972 (Taipei: reprint of the 1488 edition). The works of Ch'iu's students include, e.g., Chang Shih-t'ai's (fl. 1480s) HSÜ TZU-CHIH T'UNG-CHIEN KANG-MU KUANG-I, which was incorporated into the HSÜ TZU-CHIH T'UNG-CHIEN KANG-MU itself (and hence is available in the SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition); Hsü Kao's (fl. 1480-1500) SUNG-SHIH CH'AN-YU, which appears to have been lost. For comments on these two works, see SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU TSUNG-MU T'I-YAO, vol. 17, pp. 85 and 95, respectively.

57. See CHEN-TSE CHI (SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU edition), 32:20aff.

58. Ch'eng's works include SUNG-CHI SHOU-CHUNG K'AO (Ming edition of 1491) and SUNG I-MIN LU (Ming edition of 1524-25 and CHIH-PU-CHU-CHAI TS'UNG-SHU edition).

59. Chu's comments are to be found in his CHU-TZU TSUI-CHIH LU (extant in an edition issued during the Wan-li [1573-1620] period), which has been studied by Christian Murck in his "Chu Yün-ming (1461-1527) and Cultural Commitment in Su-chou" (Doctoral dissertation, Princeton University, 1978).

60. This refers to the call by Chou Hsü (1392-1452) in 1448. See Hok-lam Chan, "Chinese Official Historiography at the Yuan Court: The Composition of the Liao, Chin, and Sung Histories," in John D. Langlois, Jr., ed., CHINA UNDER MONGOL RULE (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 96.

61. This became the HSÜ TZU-CHIH T'UNG-CHIEN KANG-MU, compiled under the directorship of Shang Lu (1414-1486).

62. Modern studies bearing on these problems are too many to warrant an enumeration here. Eminent scholars of Sung history, like Chang Yin-lin, Chiang Fu-ts'ung, Liu Tzu-chien (James T. C.), Wang Teh-yi, Miyazaki Ichisada, Araki Toshikazu, and Ichimura Sanjirō, have all contributed to the ongoing inquiries. For their works one may consult Sung Hsi, comp., SUNG-SHIH YEN-CHIU LUN-WEN YÜ SHU-CHI MU-LU (Taipei: Chung-kuo wen-hua ta-hsüeh, 1983); Sōshi Teiyō Hensan Kyōryoku Iinkai, comp., SŌDAI KENKYŪ BUNKEN MOKUROKU (Tokyo: Tōyō bunko, 1957, 1970), SŌDAI KENKYŪ BUNKEN TEIYO (Tokyo: Tōyō bunko, 1961). For a most recent study on the succession problem involving the first two Sung emperors, see Liu Tzu-chien, "Lun Sung T'ai-tsung yü Sung ch'u ts'uan-wei," forthcoming.

63. The text of this question by Liu Yen (1394-1457) is preserved in Ch'eng Min-cheng's SUNG-CHI SHOU-CHUNG K'AO (1491 edition), hsia: 11b-12a. The implication of this question was also addressed by Ho Ch'iao-hsin. See CHIAO-CH'IU WEN-CHI, 4:11b.

64. SHIH-SHIH CHENG-KANG, 25:16b-17b.

65. Ibid., 25:3b-4a.

66. For implications like these, see also CHIAO-CH'IU WEN-CHI, 19:10b-12a; CHEN-TSE CHI, 32:20a-23a.

67. See Fang Hsiao-ju, HSÜN-CHIH-CHAI CHI (SSU-PU TS'UNG-K'AN edition, Shanghai: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1934), "Fan-li," second entry.

68. This book was reissued ca. 1490 by the provincial government of Shensi. A rare copy of this edition, with a preface by Ch'en Yao (cs. 1472) and a postface by Han Wen (1441-1526), both dated 1490, is held by the Gest Oriental Library of Princeton University.

69. Such writings of these scholar-officials can be found in the collections of their literary works. Yin Chih, in particular, wrote a 18-chüan MING-LIANG CHIAO-T'AI LU, a comment on which can be found in SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU TSUNG-MU T'I-YAO, vol. 18, p. 95.

70. See Hung-lam Chu, "Ch'iu Chün (1421-1495) and the TA-HSUEH YEN-I PU: Statecraft Thought in Fifteenth-Century China."

71. TA-HSUEH YEN-I PU (Ming edition of 1488), "Preface."

72. For this point, see Hung-lam Chu, "Ch'iu Chün's TA-HSUEH YEN-I PU and its Influence in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," MING STUDIES 22 (Fall 1986), pp. 1-32.

73. For a modern comment on the TA-HSUEH YEN-I in connection with Chen Te-hsiu's other works, see Wm. Theodore de Bary, "The Neo-Confucian Learning of the Mind-and-Heart," in de Bary, NEO-CONFUCIAN ORTHODOXY AND THE LEARNING OF THE MIND-AND-HEART (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), pp. 67-185. For a study of the background and intention of the TA-HSUEH YEN-I, see Chu Hung-lin (Hung-lam Chu), "Li-lun hsing te ching-shih chih hsüeh: Chen Te-hsiu TA-HSUEH YEN-I chih yung-i chi ch'i chu-tso pei-ching (Theoretical Statecraft: The Background and Intention of Chen Te-hsiu's EXTENDED MEANING OF THE GREAT LEARNING)," SHIH-HUO MONTHLY 15.3-4 (1985.9), pp. 108-119.

74. Hung-lam Chu, "Ch'iu Chün's TA-HSUEH YEN-I PU and its Influence in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries."

75. See TAO-I PIEN (Ming edition of ca. 1490). The quotation begins a note of Ch'eng's at the end of the book's table of contents. For this note and Ch'eng's preface to the book, see also HUANG-TUN WEN-CHI, 16:21a and 28:27a, respectively.

76. See Ch'en Chien, HSUEH-P'OU T'UNG-PIEN (available in CHENG-I T'ANG CH'UAN-SHU edition). For a biography of Ch'en Chien by Lienche Tu Fang, see DICTIONARY OF MING BIOGRAPHY, 1368-1644, p. 148.

77. See, e.g., Ch'ien Mu, "Tu Ch'en Chien HSUEH-P'OU T'UNG-PIEN (Notes on Reading Ch'en Chien's HSUEH-P'OU T'UNG-PIEN)," in Ch'ien Mu, CHUNG-KUO HSUEH-SHU SSU-HSIANG SHIH LUN-TS'UNG (Taipei: Tung-ta t'u-shu kung-ssu, 1979), vol. 7, pp. 213-230; Okada Takehiko, "Chin Seiran no hihan ron (The Criticisms of Ch'en Chien)," KYUSHÜ CHÜGOKU GAKKAI HO 10 (1964), pp. 49-62.

78. SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU TSUNG-MU T'I-YAO, vol. 33, p. 68.

79. Ibid., vol. 18, p. 54.

80. Ch'ien Mu, "Tu CH'ENG HUANG-TUN WEN-CHI (Notes on Reading Ch'eng Min-cheng's HUANG-TUNG WEN-CHI)," CHUNG-KUO HSUEH-SHU SSU-HSIANG SHIH LUN-TS'UNG, vol. 7, p. 38.

81. For a note on this work as well as a translation of Wang Yang-ming's preface to it, see Wing-tsit Chan, INSTRUCTION FOR PRACTICAL LIVING AND OTHER NEO-CONFUCIAN WRITINGS BY WANG YANG-MING (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), pp. 263-267.

GLOSSARY

Araki Toshikazu 荒木敏一

Chan Hok-lam 陳學霖

Chan Wing-tsit 陳榮捷

Chang Shih-t'ai 張時泰

Chang Yin-lin 張蔭麟

Ch'en Ch'i-fang 陳其芳

Ch'en Chien 陳建

Ch'en Hsien-chang 陳獻章

Chen Te-hsiu 真德秀

CHEN-TSE CHI 震澤集

Ch'en Yao 陳瑤

Ch'eng Hao 程顥

Ch'eng I 程頤

CHENG-I-T'ANG CH'UAN-SHU 正誼堂全書

Ch'eng Min-cheng 程敏政

Chi Yün 紀昀

CHIA-LI 家禮

CHIA-LI I-CHIEH 家禮儀節

Chiang Fu-ts'ung 蔣復璁

CHIAO-CH'IU WEN-CHI 椒丘文集

Ch'ien Mu 錢穆

Chien Yu-wen 簡又文

CHIH-PU-CHU-CHAI TS'UNG-SHU 知不足齋叢書

Ch'in Kuei 秦檜

CH'ING-HSI MAN-KAO 清谿漫稿

ching-shih 經世

CHIU-HUANG HUO-MIN PU-I-SHU 救荒活民補遺書

Ch'iu Chün 丘濬

ch'iung-li 窮理

CH'IUNG-T'AI SHIH-WEN HUI-KAO CH'UNG-PIEN 瓊台詩文會稿重編

Chou Hsü 周敘

Chou Hung-mou 周洪謨

Chu Hsi 朱熹

Chu Hung-lam (Hung-lin) 朱鴻林

Chu I-tsun 朱彝尊

CHU-TZU HSUEH-TI 朱子學的

CHU-TZU TSUI-CHIH LU 祝子罪知錄

CHU-TZU WAN-NIEN TING-LUN 朱子晚年定論

Chu Wei-chi 朱維吉

Chu Yu 朱右

Chu Yün-ming 祝允明

(CH'ÜN-CHING) PIEN-I LU (群經辨疑錄

CH'ÜN-FANG HSÜ-CH'AO 群方續抄

CH'ÜN-SHU CH'AO-FANG 群書抄方

CHUNG-KUO HSÜEH-SHU SSU-HSIANG-SHIH LUN-TS'UNG 中國學術思想史論叢

Fang Hsiao-ju 方孝孺

Fei Hsiao-tung 費孝通

FU-CHIEN CHU-TZU HSÜEH 福建朱子學

Han Wen 韓文

Ho Ch'iao-hsin 何喬新

Hsia Shih-cheng 夏時正

Hsiao Kung-chuan 蕭公權

HSING-LI TA-CH'UAN 性理大全

HSÜ-CHAI CHI 虛齋集

Hsü Kao 許誥

HSÜ TZU-CHIH T'UNG-CHIEN KANG-MU KUANG-I 續資治通鑑綱目廣義

Hsü Yu-chen 徐有貞

Hsüeh Hsüan 薛瑄

HSÜEH-P'OU T'UNG-PIEN 學節通辨

HSÜN-CHIH-CHAI CHI 遜志齋集

Hu Chü-jen 胡居仁

Hui-chou 徽州

Huang Jun-yü 黃潤玉

Huang P'u 黃溥

Huang Tsung-hsi 黃宗羲

I-AN CHI 柳菴集

I-AN WEN HOU-CHI 柳菴文後集

Ichimura Sanjirō 市村瓚次郎

I-CHING MENG-YIN 易經蒙引

I-FENG CHI 一菴集

Iwama Kazuo 岩間一雄

Jung Chao-tsu 容肇祖

- K'ANG-CHAI CHI 康齋集
 Kao Ling-yin 高令印
 K'AO-TING SHEN-I CHIH-TU 攷定深衣制度
 KUO-CH'AO HSIEN-CHENG LU 國朝獻徵錄
 Li Tung-yang 李東陽
 Liu P'u 劉溥
 Liu Ting-chih 劉定之
 Liu Tzu-chien 劉子健
 Liu Wang Hui-chen 劉王惠箴
 Liu Yen 劉儼
 Lu Chiu-yüan 陸九淵
 LUN-YOAN 論淵
 MING HSIEN-TSUNG SHIH-LU 明憲宗實錄
 MING-JU HSOEH-AN 明儒學案
 MING-LIANG CHIAO-T'AI LU 明良交泰錄
 MING-SHIH 明史
 MING-TAI SSU-HSIANG SHIH 明代思想史
 Miyazaki Ichisada 宮崎市定

- Okada Takehiko 岡田武夫
 PAN-TS'AO KE-SHIH 本草格式
 P'I-TIEN I-CHING TA-CH'UAN 批點易經大全
 Sano Kōji 佐野公治
 Shang Lu 商輅
 SHEN-I K'AO 深衣考
 SHEN-I K'AO-CHENG 深衣考證
 SHEN-I TSUAN-SHU 深衣纂疏
 SHIH-SHIH CHENG-KANG 世史正綱
 SŌDAI KENKYŪ BUNKEN MOKUROKU 宋代研究文獻目錄
 SŌDAI KENKYŪ BUNKEN TEIYO 宋代研究文獻提要
 SSU-CH'AO 松抄
 SSU-K'U CH'UAN-SHU TSUNG-MU T'I-YAO 四庫全書總目提要
 SSU-SHU MENG-YIN 四書叢引
 SSU-SHU WU-CHING TA-CH'UAN 四書五經大全
 Su Shih 蘇軾
 SUNG-CHI SHOU-CHUNG K'AO 宋紀受終考
 Sung Hsi (Shee) 宋晞

- SUNG I-MIN LU 宋遺民錄
- SUNG-LUN 宋論
- SUNG-SHIH CH'AN YU 宋史闡幽
- SUNG-SHIH YEN-CHIU LUN-WEN YU SHU-CHI MU-LU 宋史研究論文與書籍目錄
- TA-HSUEH YEN-I 大學衍義
- TA-HSUEH YEN-I PU 大學衍義補
- TA-MING T'UNG-TIEN 大明通典
- TAI-CHAI TS'UN-KAO 采齋存稿
- TAO-I PIEN 道一編
- Ts'ai Ch'en 蔡沈
- Ts'ai Ch'ing 蔡清
- Ts'ao Chi-hsiang 曹吉祥
- Ts'ao Ch'in 曹欽
- Ts'ao Tuan 曹端
- TS'E-HSUEH CHI-LOEH 策學輯略
- Tso Tsan 左贊
- tsung tzu 宗子
- TUNG-LI HSU-CHI 東里續集

- TUNG-LI WEN-CHI 東里文集
- Wang An-shih 王安石
- Wang Ao 王壑
- Wang Chih 王直
- Wang Teh-yi 王德毅
- Wang Yang-ming 王陽明
- WU-LUN CH'UAN-PEI CHI 五倫全備記
- WU-SHIH CHING-HSUEH TS'UNG-SHU 吳氏經學叢書
- Wu Yü-pi 吳與弼
- Yang Shih-ch'i 楊士奇
- Yang Shou-ch'en 楊守陳
- YANG WEN-I KUNG CHING-CH'UAN KAO 楊文懿公鏡川稿
- Yin Chih 尹直
- Yüeh Cheng 岳正
- Yüeh Fei 岳飛
- Yung Jung 永瑤