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Introduction

The scope and breadth of this thesis are designed to give the reader a general understanding of the life and thought of the Ch'ing historian Ch'Uan Tsu-wang (1705-1755). An analysis of his contribution in the field of literature and history constitutes a significant portion of this paper, not because the author wishes to place inordinate emphasis on this aspect of Ch'Uan's life, but rather because he wished to allow Ch'Uan to reveal himself naturally, through his own prose and poetry, onto the pages of this work. The numerous poems and essays of Ch'Uan's friends add dimension to almost every aspect of our study. They praise, tease, and record unvarnished facts about a complex personality. To these friends, students, and admirers we offer our thanks, for without their assistance verification of dates, places, and events would be an insurmountable problem.

As in an artistic drama, there is here a beginning and an end; and in this sense we are taking a slice from the spectrum of time. The natural life of Ch'Uan Tsu-wang forms the parameters within which the bulk of this thesis must concern itself. To give our slice of time meaning for modern readers we must try to view the accomplishments of the past from within their own cultural prospective.

We are studying a historical figure who was himself concerned with the value of history, its importance to society as well as to himself. His entire life, he tells us, was devoted to the preservation
and transmission of historical material. In true Confucian tradition, he was a transmitter and not a creator, but this is too simplistic a description of any man, and certainly for Ch'üan Tsu-wang.

In 1736, when he was thirty-one, a series of fateful events cut short his career in the public service. He spent the rest of his life as a private scholar ferreting about the countryside, gathering old books, editing collections of poems, visiting pavilions, libraries and tombsites, and searching out the remains of someone's library, or of a particular school or academy. He was an inveterate traveller: often the guest of a wealthy patron, or journeying by himself or with a small group of scholars to some remote spot to discuss the history of Chekiang. We know that little was written about what was discussed at these gatherings, for the men involved were aware of the dangers of incurring the displeasure of the throne. The so-called literary inquisition had already demanded its share of martyrs, and few wished to violate too flagrantly either the letter or the intent of any of the imperial rescripts regarding this touchy subject.

Ch'üan was an exception. His choice of anecdotes and personalities to preserve for posterity was in no way synonymous with the court's concept of worthy historical personalities. His biographies and funerary inscriptions would warm the hearts of men who wished to know about Ming loyalists, but just for that reason they were quite unacceptable as public material during Ch'üan's own lifetime. Only a student or a friend would have read these accounts. They were never published during his lifetime.
Ch'üan was not a philosopher of history. He was a practicing
historian, who incorporated into his writings concepts and methodology
which had not been used in the historical genre in China. His
appreciation of the evolution of physical geography, his use of both
official and non-official types of history, the incorporation of
poetry as a means of verification of fact or amplification of a
personality, along with what I like to call his cameo portraits, were
the foundation of his approach to history. Unlike his contemporary
Chang Hsüeh-ch'eng (1738-1801) Ch'üan did not write essays on the
philosophy of history — we must decant his philosophical theory from
his treatment of fact.

For two centuries, Ch'üan Tsu-wang has been acknowledged for his
important literary contribution. All the well-known standard sources
trot out the same stock phrase, praising his contribution to the
literature of the Ningpo area of Chekiang. The true magnitude of his
contribution, however, cannot be appreciated, until one actually
unfolds the leaves of the hundreds of volumes which Ch'üan compiled,
edited, or annotated. The scope of his work is broad; the poems and
poets of the Sung, Yüan, Ming and Ch'ing dynasties all fall within its
bounds. They are organized to some extent into schools, and accompanied
by short commentaries on the poet and his works. The importance of
these poems as historical data is not overlooked, and indeed, for
Ch'üan, their historical importance provided the motivating factor for
his committing them to an organized collection. One of Ch'üan's close
friends, Li E (1692-1752), was similarly inclined, and this interest
in the preservation of poetry strengthened their friendship. Their correspondence is a key to understanding Ch'Uan's personality.

The Neo-Confucian heritage during Ch'Uan's time was all pervading. He revered Huang Tsung-hsi (1610-1695) and Wan Ssu-t'ung (1638-1702) as teachers, dynamic scholars and prolific writers. He wished to transmit the accomplishments and spirit of these men. He maintained vigorously a neutral position between the two main branches of Neo-Confucian thought, represented by the Ch'eng-Chu and Lu-Wang schools, but avoided the horns of dilemma implicit in the philosophical split between these schools. If he were required to state an opinion on a controversial point he reduced the question and his answer to very simple practical statements. He faithfully recorded Neo-Confucian influences on institutions and schools of thought in Chekiang. We can be impressed with his apparent lack of bias.

No critique of Ch'Uan would be complete without a consideration of the works he edited and revised. The three most famous are the Sung Yuan hsueh-an (Anthology of the Philosophers of Sung and Yüan) the Shui-ching chu (Classic of Waterways with Commentaries), and the Yung-shang ch'i-chiu shih (The Anthology of Old Poems of Ningpo). Ch'Uan's thoroughness is evident throughout all three of these works. They represent three individual pillars of Ch'Uan's concept of history; the importance of geography in a historical context as exhibited in his Shui-ching chu; the usefulness of poetry, not only as a medium of expression but also as historical evidence (Yung-shang
ch'i-chiu shih), and his dedication to the importance of the individual in the flow of history, as shown in his revised edition of Huang Tsung-hsai's Sung Yüan hsüeh-an. These concepts are given significance within Ch'üan's Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-p'ien (hereafter Collected Works). The works he edited underscore and corroborate the analysis of our investigation of his Collected Works.

To understand these springs of history as envisioned by Ch'üan, we must be conversant with his Collected Works: thirty-eight chüan arranged by Ch'üan himself before his death and transmitted down to us today in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi; fifty chüan collated by his student, Tung Ping-ch'un (1724-1794) which comprises the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-p'ien (hereafter wai-p'ien); ten chüan organized as a dialogue of questions and answers between Ch'üan and his students on the classics (Ch'ing-shih wen-ta), and ten chüan of poetry (Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, Shih-chi, hereafter Shih-chi). This also constitutes the structural organization of Ch'üan's Collected Works as preserved in the Ssu-pu ts'ung-kan.

The Collected Works are divided into styles of composition. These prefaces (hsü), records (chi), colophons (pa), biographies (chuan) and funerary inscriptions (mu-piao) in addition to their value to the historian of the Southern Ming, also contain background information on Ch'üan's family and ancestors, and the information becomes still more meaningful when read in conjunction with the poems written by Ch'üan's friends.
This thesis is divided into two parts, one part discussing Ch'üan's own personality and the other showing the expression of this personality. The first two chapters are devoted to an analysis of his Collected Works with an eye to understanding his character. A biography is offered, together with a description of his peer and student-teacher relationships, together with those senior-junior scholar relationships so ubiquitous in traditional Chinese intellectual life.

Much can be learnt about Ch'üan merely from thumbing through his Collected Works and noting the topics of his articles. Further investigation will reveal the type of historical figures whom he admired and for whom he felt obliged to secure a place in history, for their own sake as well as for the benefit of posterity. We may approach his idea of history from the subjects he chose and the way he recorded them, for his analysis always has the quality of displaying his own values, either in agreement or in opposition to those of the subject or topic under consideration.

Does his writing reflect his real personality? His Collected Works, and those of his friends and students, come to our rescue. The poems written to commemorate a special occasion are of particular importance and are certainly the most colorful. The topics vary immensely and we should not be surprised when we find Ch'üan or one of his group waxing poetic over a comrade's luggage, as if it were some great Taoist painting. These poems provide an opportunity to see Ch'üan among living people who were capable of responding to his
personality and who related these feelings in their poems. Many are matter-of-fact, some are teasing, but all illuminate Ch'üan Tsu-wang.

Furthermore, this thesis proposes that the traditional biographies of Ch'üan Tsu-wang are incomplete and contain false information. They correctly stated Ch'üan's passion for recording the lives of Southern Ming loyalists, but they assumed therefore Ch'üan was himself a Ming loyalist. Such a conclusion can only be reached after a selective reading of his Collected Works. However a comprehensive approach demands that Ch'üan's Ming loyalist reputation be revised. Moreover, it can be shown that Ch'üan was not writing for his contemporaries. He knew that his work was a legacy to posterity. This too has been incorrectly understood as showing Ch'üan to be a Ming loyalist; this will be shown to be an inaccurate interpretation.

Ch'üan Tsu-wang's Chi-ch'i t'ing chi was originally in fifty chüan. Twelve of these chüan were lost during the years the manuscript Chi-ch'i t'ing chi was in the custodianship of Hang Shih-chün (1696-1773). Traditional sources hold Hang Shih-chün blameless for the loss of that missing material: an evaluation of relevant information shows this exoneration to be invalid.
Ch'üan Tsu-wang was first and foremost a historian; from his early youth, his relatives had imbued within him an emphatic sense of responsibility for the past: to preserve and perpetuate that which was just and true. He was an anachronism, a true traditionalist, happy within his cultural heritage. Rather than maintain a false friendship, he would sever relations with anyone who violated the codes of this culture. In a letter to a friend of long-standing, he stated that their ten-year friendship must come to an end.  

Ch'üan observed that this man's father had gone to Peking to care for him when he was sick, and the great stress and worry had affected the old man's health. Ch'üan proclaimed, "Your honorable father died because of you,..." Most despicable of all, thundered Ch'üan, was that shortly afterwards you had a son! Ch'üan recounted the traditional mourning customs and argued how could he recovering from his illness and supposedly overwhelmed with grief at the loss of his father, consider conceiving a child? He cited a few historical precedents to support his case and concluded, "I am unfortunate to have known such a person as you." Ch'üan Tsu-wang does not reveal any areas in which his moral principles may be compromised.  

He had the kind of courage that gets people into trouble. He adhered too strictly to his own personal ethics. He was an idealist believing that men should try to live up to the great
teachings of the ancient sages. He did, however, often display a dry sense of humor, which moderated his otherwise pompous puritan profile.

He was born ten years after the premature death of his older brother Ch'üan Tsu-ch'ien. A rumor circulated that the new infant was the reincarnation of the well-known Ming loyalist, Ch'ien Su-yüeh (1607-1648).4 Ch'üan's milk name was Pu indicating "make-up," to "patch," or "mend" the void created by the death of the first born. Both parents were responsible for his early education; his mother, née Chiang, tutored him when the father was too busy.5

A year before his formal tutoring began he escorted his father to the residence of a certain Lu Chou-ming. He recorded this episode in two essays, which revealed his early propensity for preserving the memory of people, places, and events during the Ming and Ch'ing periods.7 When he was eight his father, Ch'üan Shu (1663-1739), used the Ssu-shu (Four Books) and the Tzu-chih t'ung-chien (Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government) as a medium of instruction for his only son.6 He attended a local school. His teacher believed him to be a promising young man and offered him his daughter in marriage. However, his poor health made this impossible.8 There will be other references to Ch'üan's fragile health; it plagued him throughout his life.9

In his first year at school he went on a trip with his classmates and teacher to a local temple commemorating notable officials. He noticed that the ancestor tablets of Hsieh San-pin (chin-shih 1625) and Chang Chieh (Ming) were in places of honor. Ch'üan knew
these men as traitors of the Ming. He pulled down their tablets and in a great fury "broke them into splinters," throwing the pieces into the adjoining pool. Some years later he wrote an essay in which he commented that "This was just the bubbling over of youthful spirit, nothing more." It may be true but the righteous indignation which prompted him to such action would always influence the manner in which he perceived and responded to his peers and society. The effect which this personality had on his career was to be of greater consequence.

Ch'üan had a few close brushes with the law. Although he had already received his chin-shih he still wished to participate in the second po-hsüeh hung-tz'u examination held in 1736. He had been recommended for this examination. Meanwhile, however, he had been assigned to the Hanlin Academy, where his friendship with Li Fu and Fang Pao had gained him access to the coveted Yung-lo ta-tien (Ming encyclopedia). The chief Grand Secretary Chang T'ing-yü (1672–1755), who had held power under both the Yung-cheng (r.p. 1723–1735) and Ch'ien-lung (r.p. 1736–1795) emperors, was upset over Ch'üan's intentional snubbing of protocol, for he had not made the customary visit to Chang T'ing-yü. According to Ch'üan's student, Chiang Hsüeh-yung, Chang T'ing-yü even sent his son to summon Ch'üan, but he did not respond to any of the requests. He paid a high price for refusing to make this courtesy call, for it was known that the Grand Secretary himself engineered the memorial recommending that all who had achieved their chin-shih be barred from the special po-hsüeh hung-tz'u examination. This memorial had the effect of
underscoring the Grand Secretary's displeasure with Fang Pao and Li Fu, for the excessive number of examination recommendees they had put forward. At the last minute, therefore, Ch'üan was denied his opportunity to succeed within the government.

Though unable to participate, he circulated his essay on the examination topic, and he also wrote two additional essays, which far surpassed those written by people who competed in the text. It is not hard to imagine the degree of displeasure such actions would cause. His abrasive independence, coupled with his textual expertise and a reputation for being hypercritical, did little to endear him with those in power, or with many of his peers.

By 1745 he had still not learned the dangers of frankness. He chided a local magistrate, Wei, for inappropriate allocation of licentiate positions, and he couched his remonstrations with such bluntness that this functionary was infuriated to action. The magistrate was evidently so bitter as to want him thrown into prison. Using Ch'üan's own writings the local officials attempted to twist the meaning of certain passages in his essays to show treasonous acts of sedition. In his inimitable way Ch'üan had insulted and angered a government official over a trivial infraction of the law.

Some hundred and fifty years later, scholars of the late Ch'ing depicted Ch'üan Tsu-wang as a protagonist of an anti-Manchu campaign. His writings and attitudes, however, reveal no such zeal. It would be difficult to find phrases, let alone entire essays, which
could be construed as derogatory to the Ch'ing dynasty. Fortunately, he was already well-known for his epitaphs and accounts of Southern Ming personalities. Ch'üan's second wife was the daughter of a Manchu scholar. The man who later saved him from disaster in his conflict with the magistrate was also a Manchu, the provincial governor of Chekiang from 1742-1747. This Governor Ch'ang An refused to prosecute Ch'üan, and because he was an admirer of his scholarship he entreated him to write a preface for his book.

Complementing Ch'üan's early traditional education was his exposure to the stories and accounts of Ming loyalists. His father and his paternal aunt, daughter of the super-hero of the Southern Ming, Chang Huang-yen (1620-1664), enjoyed imparting these accounts to their youthful charge. As a teenager, at sixteen, he would listen while the aunt related the events of these loyalists, and afterwards he would write down everything he heard. In his epitaph to Chang Ming-chen (d. 1656) a Ming general, we hear the aunt saying to the young historian, "My father and the Marquis (Chang Ming-chen) were colleagues of long standing. Every time his ambitions are mentioned there are many who slander and humiliate him... some day you may write something for him." Some of Ch'üan's best-known accounts were based on oral history. The data he recorded could lie dormant for years before it took shape as an epitaph or biography. We should never be surprised to hear him sigh, "Ah, already twenty years have slipped away and I have yet to fulfil my obligation to write
Ch'üan pursued his subject. He had heard from his aunt that a portrait existed of Chang Huang-yen from the time he was in jail. This portrait was reported to have shown the hero's real spirit. He inquired as to its whereabouts from Wan Ching (1659-1741), an elder scholar friend, whose father and uncles had studied under Huang Tsung-hsi (1610-1695). Wan Ching wrote to Ch'ilan, confirming the existence of the portrait, and supplied him with a copy. Wan Ching himself first heard of Ch'ilan through another scholar, Cha Shen-hsing (1650-1727). This was in 1721 when Ch'ilan was only sixteen years old. He related in Cha Shen-hsing's epitaph that he had shown him some of his work. Cha's house guest, Wan Ching, saw Ch'ilan's work and praised it highly. Although there was a great difference in age he felt that their mutual interests overshadowed any distance which might have otherwise formalized the relationship. Ch'ilan traced his ties to scholars of the Che-tung hsih-p'ai (Eastern Chekiang School of Learning) through Wan Ching. His interest in genealogy was not limited to only his clan; he said, "Master Wan and myself are students of a school [Che-tung hsih-p'ai] extending back some ten generations." Ch'ilan wrote essays tracing the genealogy of scholars of the Eastern Chekiang School. In this epitaph he stated his affiliation to the schools and his intention to transmit its traditions.

Ch'ilan was comfortable in his relationship with Wan Ching, "we were very close to each other,... when I was young he walked with a
cane. I accompanied him."34 Wan Ching's acceptance of Ch'üan as a scholar is seen early in their relationship. When in 1730 Wan Ching was asked to assist in the compilation of the Ningpo fu-chih (Local History of Ningpo) the two men exchanged numerous letters on points of geography and history. Ch'üan was particularly interested in the Lieh-chuan (collected biographies) and the location and names of places and rivers.35 He felt there were many omissions in the table of contents sent to him by Wan Ching. This was due, said Ch'üan, to the incompleteness of previous annals. However, because "I have long paid careful attention to the records of my native place, I possess much which has been omitted by these annals. I have saved this information from being lost."36

Where possible he substantiated his findings with results obtained from field trips, either examining the ruins of an old temple or routing about in a field. We often come across such passages as: "The river has already dried up and the bridge is no longer there, yet with excavation the remains of a river bank can be determined."37 He was convinced of the indispensability of geography to the historian in reconstructing past events. He began a letter to Wan Ching saying, "The greatness of geographical annals are their ability to retrieve what was lost from the incomplete old histories."38 The two men respected each other. This can be seen from the frequency, content and tenor of their correspondence.39

Ch'üan revered this scion of the Wan clan for more than his scholarly genius. He respected him for his integrity and
determination. When Fang Pao was imprisoned and "no one had the courage to speak on his behalf and free him, it was Master Wan Ching who unhesitatingly forwarded a written appeal." This appeal was instrumental in obtaining Fang's release. Ch'üan praised Wan's faithful execution of ceremonies done in remembrance of Southern Ming heroes, and lauded his code of ethics which served as a beacon to all. "Ah," said Ch'üan, "the master's character was always like that. However, when I read his autobiography his great humility would not permit him to discuss these things." Ch'üan recorded Wan Ching's life as one continuous chain of tragedies, precipitated by his unbending honesty or by fate. In the winter before his death a fire at his home destroyed his manuscripts and countless books, "the master spent his days weeping over his loss," said Ch'üan, "believing that he had sinned against his ancestors." By 1747 Ch'üan himself had experienced tragedy in his personal life, with the loss of his first wife and daughter, as well as in his career. He identified with Wan Ching and intimated that the feeling was reciprocal, "The master took me as a friend without regard to position or age...."

Ch'üan was proud of his clan heritage. He attributed scholarly accomplishments to his ancestors. Some scholars believe these were actually products of his own efforts. He traced his clan ancestry back twenty-four generations. Sometimes his family tree appears sparse but the fact remains that he placed himself at the end of a very long lineage. Hu Shih (1891-1961) noted in his
investigation of Ch'üan's contribution to the body of scholarship on the *Shui-ching chu* that he often honored his ancestors in colophons and articles he wrote on the *Shui-ching chu* and related topics.\footnote{48} This poses a problem for the uninitiated reader as Ch'üan used different names and titles for the same ancestor.\footnote{49}

Ch'üan's pedigree was important to him in establishing his clan, and himself, within the continuum of history. He was not a romantic writer, yet even the straightforward accounts of his ancestors take on the flavor of that style of writing. His grandfather, Ch'üan Wu-ch'i (1629-1696) and great-grandfather Ch'üan Ta-ch'eng (1608-1667) were both men of spirit. Ch'üan Ta-ch'eng retreated to the hills of Ningpo when pursued by Ch'ing forces. The invading troops burned the family library.\footnote{50} Yet afterwards, undaunted, the great-grandfather tilled the soil with one hand and grasped a book in the other. He even chanted while he toiled on the land.\footnote{51} Although the grandfather was poor he rebuilt the lost library. This was done through copying texts borrowed from other scholars. Ch'üan's father continued the tradition. Yet when he set his son to the task of copying he admonished him that a "copyist could never hope to become a true scholar."\footnote{52} Although Ch'üan traced his ancestors back through the Sung dynasty those of the recent four generations figured most prominently in his Collected Works. His father and aunt had brought old bones to life and instilled within the youth a strong attachment and appreciation of the past.

Ch'üan did not come from a wealthy family. They were respectable
but not affluent. He died leaving no direct heirs. The boy
designated as his heir received only a small amount of land with a
house. His entire library, including everything his grandfather and
father had acquired, was sold to cover funeral expenses. He was a
scholar and his love of books had kept him poor. Chiang Hsüeh-yung
(chü-jen 1773) recalls that on one occasion Ch'üan received a sum of
money which he at once used to buy books. Chiang intimated that books
were even more important to his teacher than eating.53

Ch'üan's prose contains few references to his poverty-line
existence.54 His penury was not limited to his immediate family. 
His ancestors and living relatives were also poor.55 From within
this very poverty, however, Ch'üan seemed to find sustenance. He
praised a relative saying, "Even though impoverished he regarded money
very lightly."56 He placed his emphasis on the quality of the
personal relationships.

Because he was poor "he had no other alternative than to
constantly move about, in order to provide for his family."57 In
1733 rice was so expensive that he was forced to sell part of his
library to make ends meet.58 These were recorded as simple
statements of fact, with no embellishments of any kind. From his
prose we are afforded a glimpse within his home. His poetry, however,
has shown us what he meant when he said he was poor. He told us of
one occasion when a friend had unexpectedly arrived and he was unable
to provide him a noon meal. His wife made a simple kao (cake) and
Ch'üan composed a few lines making sport of the situation. In this
poem, he said how nice it would be to have had a chicken and some wine to offer his friend. However, even such a simple item as an onion was beyond his reach.59 One New Year's Eve he received a Mr. Chang who had brought him a collection of poems written by a local notable Ch'Uan admired. He was unable to find the necessary cash to negotiate their purchase.60

Ch'Uan wrote to his son, when he began formal education encouraging him not to read worthless books, as scholars would surely ridicule him.61 He explained, "I have studied a long time but it has done nothing to help our material life."62 There are those, said Ch'Uan, who will jeer at you because you lack money, but these same people do not understand that the principles of a gentleman are not easily moved. In a self-deprecating tone he told his son that he has no position or wealth. The future depended on him, and to be like his father would be shameful.63

Although Ch'Uan was poor he was still able to find friends in even greater destitution. In a poem entitled "It's Been a Very Difficult Year, But The Difficulties of my Old Friend Ch'en Nan-kao Were Even Greater Than Mine. I Wished to Help Him But I Had Not The Capability And so Could Only Give a Sigh," he told how upset he was for not being able to help his friends in their time of need.64 He wished to be a philanthropist. In a brief biography of a Southern Ming notable he said, "the area where I live had many capable officials at the end of the Ming" and there were, in particular, nine men who distinguished themselves in service to their country.65 He
lamented that these worthies have been forgotten by the locals and so
"I am considering constructing a shrine..." to the memory of these
men. He was similarly moved when advised that an author
admired by both Huang Tsung-hsi and himself had not received a proper
burial. Ch'üan was then in the capital and had influential friends.
He was able to enlist sponsors for this project. At Ch'üan's behest
both Chao Yü (1689-1747) and Ma Yüeh-kuan (1688-1755) contributed
money to this man's funeral.

Ch'üan wrote for a living but we know his remuneration was
meagre. Fortunately he had friends who would assist him. In
this way he survived. In a preface for a collection of poems
written by Chao Yü, Ch'üan quoted a line from the famous poet, Lu Yu
(1125-1209): "He who is unaffected by the material world is a true
scholar." This line would be appropriate if we were looking for a
motto to express Ch'üan's thought on materialism and scholarship.

After 1747, Ch'üan was in very straightened circumstances. The
extent poverty affected Ch'üan and his family can be imagined by
reading his poems, though his prose writings are conspicuously devoid
of any such detail. They tell only that he was sick at a particular
time, but no further information is given. He did become more
specific about the family illnesses when he wrote his son's
epitaph. He said his son had been sickly since birth, with some
kind of lung disease.

In the epitaph to his father Ch'üan related how he himself was a
sickly child, and had caused his father much concern. Written in 1739,
it was one of the few pieces where Ch’üan discussed his health. By 1748 he was saying "I was very sick in Hangchou... I was taking medicine and was ill for many days." On the other hand, there are more than a dozen poems where Ch’üan discussed his health. He suffered from insomnia. He was working much too hard. If he relaxed, he was told, his insomnia would surely pass. This well-intentioned advice was evidently not the answer, for we read in another poem that someone recommended he drink his way to slumber. He was fond of drinking and this solution must have sounded appealing. The poem further revealed, however, that "even this was to no avail."

At forty Ch’üan had become quite despondent. The doctor had told him his son was in poor health. This news along with his own health problems and desperate financial situation depressed him greatly. His poems stated he was "hungry and without food." He endured "winter without proper garments" and his future showed no prospect for improvement. He warned his son of his weakness. He had inherited this from his father and he must, therefore, persevere and take good care of himself. He must, at all costs, avoid the aid of sorcerers. Their art is a total hoax. He flatly stated "at forty I am a failure," my hair has turned white and there is not an accomplishment to my name. His only ambition was to serve his son who, he believed, had the potential to be a success. In 1751 a friend visited him in Hangchou and "saw me spitting up blood." Ch’üan’s dejection is made all the more poignant when in the last year of his
life he picked up his brush to write his own son's epitaph. This was the last epitaph he wrote. The boy predeceased Ch'üan by only a few days.

In a group of poems written in his later years, his depression took a more direct form. Even the titles "In Illness, Three Poems" and "Written While Very Ill" indicate the severity of the situation. Ch'üan said that "for no explainable reason" his gums bleed profusely and his joints have become stiff. He compared himself to withered leaves and rotten wood, and suggested that the end was near. Even his hair was painful to the touch. He lamented, "all the goings-on in the world, but how can I take part... This is a chronic disease sent by heaven, which cannot be cured." His heaven ordained disease might have been alleviated with food.

Ch'üan used the two characters chih and li to describe his physical condition. Chih-li means "to disunite" or to be "disjointed." When used to describe a condition of health it denotes a lack of physical or mental harmony in the body. Ch'üan described Li Fu as being very forgetful in his last days. He repeated himself numerous times during the space of a single meal. Ch'üan said Li Fu was mentally chih-li, or not in control of his mental faculties. Ch'üan does not suggest that there was any similar weakness in his mental constitution. His problems were physical. In his poem "Being Sick After Eating Crabs," he described the discomfort he had from eating crabs as chih-li. He had had a physical reaction to seafood. His other conditions such as bleeding gums and aching joints
are also conditions which might have been caused by an unbalanced diet. In any event physical, and not mental, chih-li. There is only one instance where we have Ch'üan's own word that he may have been forgetful. This was a self admission that he had been remiss in returning books borrowed from Chao Yu. In a poem sent to Chao Yu he told his friend that in doing his research he had read a great deal of material. He opened his poem saying "To have books and not loan them is foolish, to borrow books and not return them is idiotic." He continued saying "the pleasures found within books are great, even in hunger food can be forgotten, and in the winter one can be remiss about wearing proper garments." Ch'üan concluded therefore, that the act of "returning books or borrowing books all becomes confused (chih-li)." Consequently, there are three different uses of the term chih-li in Ch'üan's Collected Works: to describe a persons physical or mental condition, and to describe a state caused by an external confusing situation.

In addition to family influences, and men like Wan Ching who opened and transmitted the value of the past, as well as the value of preserving recent as opposed to early historical personalities, there were other men who inspired Ch'üan. He devoted himself to the pursuit of a government career until 1736. When this possibility evaporated it was necessary that he find a new direction. The coterie of men which constituted the core of his friendships were considerably older than Ch'üan, but certainly still as fiercely independent. These men had integrity and courage. Some were friends,
while others, because of their age and station, maintained a more formal relationship. In 1733 Ch'üan said there were seven men he respected and would wish to emulate: "Besides Li Fu and Wan Ching, there was only Master Fang Pao, Master Wang Lan-sheng, Master Tsao I-shih, Master Hsieh Shih-lin, and Master Cheng Chiang." These men later helped Ch'üan retrim his sails for a new and bold career.

Tsao I-shih's (1678-1736) unflagging and selfless devotion to his country and people impressed Ch'üan. He was particularly cognizant of Tsao's courageous memorials enumerating the excesses of the literary inquisition. He quoted from one of Tsao I-shih's memorials which stated:

...in recent years, the commoners do not know the reason why people were weeded out and put to death. Some men bore a grudge; they took influential writers and attacked their poems, and pointed out passages which could be skewed to the author's disadvantage. When the officials caught sight of it the situation developed like wildfire. All involved were interrogated and the wave of disaster extended to teacher and student. Under the principle of guilt by association whole families were exterminated. This is truly pitiable.

Ch'üan detested literary persecution. He was outspoken in his criticism of restrictive regulations and was concerned about the effect they had on the quality of literature. He criticised Mao Ch'i-ling (1623-1716) for buckling under the fear of prosecution and for selling out his friends and teacher to save his own skin. He was not naive, though, as he was well-acquainted with the horrors meted out in the Chuang T'ing-lung (d. c.a. 1660) and Tai Ming-shih (1653-1713) cases. The mere possession of these men's books could prove unhealthy, yet Ch'üan wrote an entire article outlining the
events of both these cases. He also referred to Tai Ming-shih's offending work in his other writings. He was fired with a duty to keep historical data from vanishing into oblivion and the so-called literary inquisition did not inhibit him.

Ch'üan himself was not the object of literary persecution for a number of reasons. Firstly, he was never wealthy or powerful and therefore not a likely object for extortion. Secondly, all of his writings were short independent pieces: epitaphs, prefaces or colophons. These were never published nor appeared as an organized history, such as the Ming-shih chi-lüeh by Chuang T'Ing-lung and so they were not likely to attract the attention of the throne.

Ch'üan was a small fish and no one would gain anything by prosecuting him. Most importantly, it is exceedingly difficult to find anything in his Collected Works violating the various rescripts constituting the statutes under which literary cases were tried. Ch'üan wrote respectfully about both Sung and Ming loyalists but it was the ascending dynasty which always received the Mandate of Heaven.

Later historians have been in disagreement over whether a particular fu written by Ch'üan actually caused him to have difficulties with the authorities. The controversy revolved around two incidents which occurred, at two different times. First, in 1745 when Ch'üan reprimanded Magistrate Wei for his indiscretions there is no indication that Wei initiated any concomitant charges of sedition based on any of Ch'üan's works. The difficulties of 1745 arise out of Ch'üan's accusations against Wei, culminating in the governor's
dismissal of the case. Second, Ch'üan wrote a fu praising the accomplishments of the Ch'ing in the years 1644-1645. There were actually sixteen fu. These were completed in 1751, in time for the Ch'ien-lung Emperor's southern tour. They could not, therefore, have been included in sedition charges in 1745.102

A reading of these sixteen fu will not tell us exactly when they were written. There is, however, a short preface which begins "The great accomplishments of the san-tzu and er-tsung,..." indicating the five Ch'ing sovereigns who reigned before the Ch'ien­lung emperor assumed the throne in 1736.103 So, these fu were written after 1736. If Ch'üan was accused of making pejorative remarks against the Ch'ing then those damning sections would have been deleted by Ch'üan, by his students, and definitely by Hang Shih-chün before publication of the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi.

According to some sources Ch'üan's fourth fu offended the government's sensibilities. The character tsei preceded the name of the reigning dynasty - Ch'ing.104 This tsei may be interpreted as a term of abuse, linked to its common meaning of burglar, thief, or rebel. If Ch'üan had been indicted on charges of alleged sedition and Governor Chang An had dismissed the charges [1745] would Ch'üan or his students still have allowed that single character to appear in the fu? Ch'üan even wrote a poem thanking Governor Ch'ang-an for his refusal to prosecute. He clearly stated in a footnote to the poem that Governor Ch'ang-an had told a mutual friend to inform Ch'üan that a magistrate (left unnamed in the poem) had made accusations which he
did not believe. Ch'üan had been saved. Would he, therefore, be so indiscreet as to leave the repugnant character in place? It would seem that Ch'üan was never under investigation for violating literary taboos. If the fu were written in 1751, as his student Tung Ping-ch'UN recounts, then Ch'ang An no longer governor of Chekiang had no authority to dismiss the case. Tung Ping-ch'UN and Chiang Hsüeh-yung never mentioned that their teacher was ever in any such difficulty. Likewise, neither of Ch'üan's biographers mentioned this incident. The prose and poetry of his friends in the same society make no comment on Ch'üan's being involved in any difficulties with the government.

Ch'üan Tsu-wang chose epitaphs and biographies as his historical medium. They were not atypical of the type of work being done by some historians of the time. He did not write about major court figures but rather about men who responded, or were forced to respond, to an immediate situation. They were men who put their principles into action. His subjects portrayed the verve and gusto which Wang Yüan (1648-1710) had earlier ascribed to his subjects. The central theme rested always on a timeless Chinese principle. However, unlike Wang Yüan, these pillars of principle (i.e. filial piety, truth, honour, loyalty) remained the inner core and driving force of Ch'üan's subjects. Wang Yüan was more ostentatious.

Men had already begun to doubt the sacrosanct power of the written word. Yen Jo-chü (1636-1704) and Hu Wei (1633-1714) had shown the necessity of placing the study of the classics on a sound
historical foundation, and revealed at the same time how irresponsible scholarship had deluded and mislead people for centuries. Biographies also need careful attention to detail to ensure accuracy.

Scholars had developed a taste for writing recent biographical history. Late Ming scholars such as Wang Shih-chen (1526-1590) and Ch'en Jen-hsi (1579-1634) were pioneers in this field. During the Ch'ing, however, there were increasingly constant reminders of what happened to scholars who too zealously recorded recent (i.e. Southern Ming) history. Even the confident K'ang-hsi Emperor would brook no hint of allegedly seditious literature. Chuang T'ing-lung in his Ming-shih chi-jüeh not only referred to Manchu emperors by their personal names, he even used reign-titles of Southern Ming princes to reckon time in the Ch'ing dynasty. For these indiscretions more than 70 people were executed. Some 50 years later in 1713 Tai Ming-shih (1653-1713) was executed for using (among other heinous acts) reign-titles of the various Southern Ming Courts in his Nan-shan chi ou ch'ao. Known as "The Case of the Condemned Writings of Tai Ming-shih" even Ch'üan's friend Fang Pao (1668-1749) was implicated and thrown into prison for a period of time.

By now the writing on the wall was sufficiently clear to prompt another Southern Ming historian, Wen Jui-lin (chü-jen 1705) to complete his Nan-chiang i-shih at the home of his patron in Kiangsu rather than stay on in Peking. Wen Jui-lin believed man and not events were the heart of history. According to a modern historian Wen Jui-lin viewed,
"the capacity to take significant, effective steps in times of crisis leveled all social distinctions and rendered irrelevant such traditional biographical designations as "great ministers," "Confucian scholars," and "litterateurs.""108

In Wen's prefatory note to the i-shih section of Nan-chiang i-shih he stated that of those who gave their lives to save the [Ming] dynasty "few of them were ranking government officials."109

A man's pedigree did not earn him a place in Wen's history.

There were many famous incidents where scholars who offended the emperor brought down disaster on themselves, their family, and their colleagues. Cha Sa-t'ing (1664-1727), whose elder brother Cha Shen-hsing (1650-1727) Ch'iüan met in Peking, died in prison and his body was ordered to be dismembered owing to a skewed interpretation of a subject he set for an examination essay.110

Thirty-five years after the death of Lü Liu-liang (1629-1683), in 1728 his views against the Manchus were brought to light. Luther Carrington Goodrich's investigation of this case offers the following conclusion:

The case was concluded early in 1733 and resulted in the unearthing and dismembering of the corpses of both Lü Liu-liang and his son, Lü Pao-chung, the exposing of their skulls in public, the execution of one of Lü's sons, the banishment of his grandsons to the frontier of Northern Manchuria, and the enslavement of all their women, in the Imperial Household. Two of Lü Liu-liang's students, well-known for their support of his views, were similarly dealt with and more than twenty others involved were punished. Fifty years later all of Lü Liu-liang's writings that could be found were burned, even to occasional poems and complimentary prefaces written for his friends.111

Ch'iüan Tsu-wang was a historian influenced by his environment. His brief sojourn in government service in Peking and his constant travelling thereafter always found him sharing wine with scholars and
poets. If Ch'Uan had remained a government official the best accounts of the Lu chien-kuo (Chu I-hai, 1618-1662, eleventh Prince of Lu and after 1645 assumed the title chien-kuo or "administrator of the realm") Southern Ming regime would never have been written.

Ch'Uan was twenty-eight when the Lu Liu-liang case was concluded. In 1736 Tseng Ching (1679-1736) was executed for defaming the Yung-cheng Emperor. To be sure these men maintained a much higher profile than did Ch'Uan, but the lesson to be learned was obvious: it was dangerous to write anything which could be construed as anti-Manchu, and if you do, don't show it around.

Ch'Uan's biographies captured the fire of Wang Yuan (greatly admired by Fang Pao) but were balanced with the more staid approach of Wen Jui-lin. Like these two historians Ch'Uan chose the biography to transmit the life and times of his subjects. However, Wen's Nan-chiang i-shih was systematically organized into a unified history whereas Ch'Uan's biographies [either mu-chih ming (epitaphs) or chuan (biographies)] in his Collected Works were not put into sequence other than by genre.

Ch'Uan developed the biography into a more independent piece of literature than did his predecessors. While maintaining the central importance of man he wove his narrative with an eye to exposing the individual's participation in events of the time; both the subject and the event took on a deeply indivisible relationship. It was two hundred years later in 1944, when Chu Tung-yün wrote his biography of Chang Chü-cheng (1525-1582), that the state of biography in Chinese
literature was taken beyond the plateau established by Ch‘üan Tsu-wang.
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Wang the Righteous Fighter - his real name is not known - was a native of Shantung and as a youth engaged in farming. One night he accompanied his older brother to do the plowing. At that time there were many robbers, and his brother cautioned him saying, "Be very quiet. If the robbers hear us, they'll make off with our ox!" The Righteous Fighter, who had just turned eight sui, shook his whip and shouted, "I'll kill any bandit who comes around!" His brother was so frightened that he went home, but the Righteous Fighter drove the ox and plowed until dawn. People in the locality were quite astonished. He grew up to be very strong, was skilled with both swords and firearms, and had extraordinary courage and strategic talent. He was eight feet tall, very ugly, and though slow of speech, was loyal and sincere in his very nature.... A certain Chu T'ien-yu was a great adventurer in Honan - swift, agile, and adept in combat. He had become angered at the rampaging of their pernicious bandits and wanted to join with some duty-conscious soldiers to aid his monarch, so he formed a bond of brotherhood with the Righteous Fighter and they planned a great undertaking.... They began as forty-two men at Feng-hsiang, where the bandits attacked them furiously with two thousand footsoldiers and cavalrymen. Drums rolling, they moved forward, T'ien-yu splitting his men into two wings of twenty each for a counterattack. They beheaded one subordinate [bandit] general and killed over a hundred others. Startled into disorder, the bandits had to retreat several li, regroup, and advance again in a circular formation. With arrows falling like rain, the forty-two men chatted and joked as they joined in battle, again slaying several hundred; but after three days and nights of hard fighting, the bandits were more numerous than before. As his strength gave out, T'ien-yu became surrounded by a thick ring of bandits. The Righteous Fighter gave a mighty hoot, leaped onto his horse, and galloped in, bringing a spear with his left hand and using his right to remove his armor for T'ien-yu. When T'ien-yu refused to accept, the Righteous Fighter said, "The world can do without me, but not without you, Sir." Forcing him to put on the armor, [the Righteous Fighter] broke the encirclement and helped T'ien-yu get free. [Then] the forty other men contended in cheering, "Master Wang truly is a Righteous Fighter!"


CHAPTER TWO

FRIENDS

FOUR MEN IN A BOAT: Amicus Fidelis, medicamentum vitae.

Ch'üan Tsu-wang maintained numerous friendships throughout his life. Fortunately not only were his prose and poems preserved in his Collected Works but his more intimate friends also set their journeys, moods, and experiences to paper. The books, letters and prefaces which these men exchanged so frequently offer the skeleton while the poems, bon voyage and welcoming couplets provide the flesh and blood of friendships founded in the common pursuit of scholarship but by no means bound by it. Ch'üan's lifelong friendship with Li E, a scholar thirteen years his senior, was one of the earliest, longest lasting, and best documented of these relationships.¹

At eighteen Ch'üan set out for neighboring Wu-lin where he was to meet Li E and other men whose names frequently appear in his Collected Works. These scholars, ten of them altogether, came to discuss the classics and verify local historical anecdotes.² Other than the fact that they met, that they enjoyed each other's companionship over what seems to have been a never ending supply of wine, and that they were not always in agreement, we know little of what transpired at their gathering.³ We are confident, however, that Ch'üan's initial introduction to Li E was followed up two years later in 1724 by another but more intimate meeting. Ch'üan was making a pilgrimage to
the tomb of Chang Ming-chen (d. 1656). He was accompanied by Li E. The two men verified historical records for posterity. We are told that another informal meeting took place at Wu-lin, where discussion of the classics and the verification of local historical anecdotes were again the primary objectives. Evidence is afforded here of these scholars' awareness of the so-called literary inquisition. There was "much discussion,... and never an empty moment. However their reports and critiques remained undated and we did not dare to make any provocative conclusions." Only when Ch'üan wrote to Li E did he give information without evasiveness. There is no record of Li's response, and there was no further communication between Ch'üan and Li for five years.

By 1729, however, their friendship had taken on a new dimension. Li E introduced Ch'üan to Ma Yüeh-kuan (1688-1755) and his younger brother Ma Yüeh-lu (1697-1766). This family, long noted for its patronage of struggling scholars, as well as for the maintenance of a respectable library, was to form the core of Ch'üan's coterie. Interestingly enough, at twenty-six Ch'üan was by far the youngest of his group, and only Ma Yüeh-lu at thirty-three could be considered as belonging to the same age-group. The other two men (Li E at thirty-nine, and Ma Yüeh-kuan at fifty-two) were much his senior. This difference in age, however, did not hamper their relationship. In the spring of 1730, when Ch'üan went north to study in Peking at the Imperial Academy, he passed through Yang-chou and came upon Li E, who was thrilled to see his old friend. The two men visited various
places, and they celebrated a trip to the famous P'ing-shan Pavilion with poems. Li E had recorded his personal interviews and local searches for relics, which he combined with more traditional methods of research into an account intended to record the heroic deeds of the local worthies of the West Lake area. In this pursuit he found sympathy from Ch’üan, who quickly agreed to write a preface for his friend’s work. Six years later, however, Ch’üan noticed Li E’s work on the desk of a friend, and Ch’üan relates in his preface that he was awash with guilt for not having written the promised piece. He immediately set himself to the task of fulfilling his obligation to his friend.

The 1730 trip through Yang-chou did not afford the two men time to do much travelling together, and their other obligations required them to bid farewell for what would be a hiatus of six years. Even at this point, however, an increasing openness in expressing friendship and praise is seen in their writing. Nearing the appointed day of departure Ch’üan and Li E, along with their new mutual friends Ma Yüeh-kuan and the younger brother Ma Yüeh-lu, rented a small boat, replete with facilities for serving wine, and headed off for the P'ing-shan Pavilion. As the boat parted the river grass and the four men passed under Red Bridge, Li E told of "the erudition of his friend from Ningpo... [alluding to Ch’üan] how he is on a level with the great sages of old, and that their friendship is not comparable to anyone elses." He may have been obliquely wishing Ch’üan luck when he said that "men seek fame, and sometimes they achieve this
fame" but it seems rather to be more or less a simple statement on the nature of man. As much as the trip was being enjoyed, the scenery and companionship blending harmoniously, Li E related that this very pleasure was ever tinged with "the anxiety of departure, which comes to all and cannot be avoided. Our next meeting shall be left to fate." Ch'üan went off by horse to Peking, and Li E and the Ma brothers returned home.

From Ch'üan's first meeting with the Ma's in this year of 1730 until his death in 1755 he was to be their guest more than a dozen times. These visits are recorded in Ch'üan's Collected Works as well as in the poetry of Ma Yüeh-kuan and Ma Yüeh-lu. In Ma Yüeh-kuan's Shao-ho i-lao hsiao-kao and Ma Yüeh-lu's Nan-chai chi there are more than a dozen poems commemorating some particular trip. In general the tone of the poems tends to place greater emphasis on friendship than did those of Li E. This is especially true of those written by Ma Yüeh-lu.

Ch'üan was still at Peking in the spring of 1731 when he received a letter from Li E informing him that the provincial governor of Chekiang, Ch'eng Yüan-chang (d. 1767) had recruited Hang Shih-chün, Chang Hui (1703-1750) and himself to edit the Chekiang Provincial Gazetteer. Li was writing in hopes of obtaining a copy of some old gazetteers from Ch'üan's library. When Ch'üan returned home he asked his father, who assented to the loan, and Ch'üan sent them numerous documents. Some of these records Ch'üan had personally copied from the library of Wan Ssu-t'ung.
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Here was yet another example of one of their important links of friendship between Li E and Ch'üan: that passion for exploring, collecting, verifying and recording local historical anecdotes.

Ch'üan had already received his chü-jen (1732) and chin-shih degrees (1736) when the two men met once more at the capital in 1736. Ch'üan dreamed of the arrival of both Hang Shih-chün and Li E the day before they reached the capital. In all of Ch'üan's writings this is the only example of his placing any efficacy to the legitimacy of dreams. The little incident was recorded by the biographers of both Li E and Ch'üan and included in the works of Hang Shih-chün. 18

Hang Shih-chün related that both he and Li E were selected to participate in the special po-hsüeh hung-tzu examination of 1736 and "at the time Ch'üan Tsu-wang was still in the capital, and the evening before he dreamed of the arrival of myself and Li E. He was truly happy when his dream was realized." 19 Before their arrival Ch'üan had already written a letter to Li E encouraging him to take advantage of the opportunity. Ch'üan told his friend of his own experiences with the examinations and reflected that whether you pass or not is really beyond your control "but that to seek the emoluments of an official position are justifiable in order to support your parents." 20

In expanding upon the greatness of previous Chekiang scholars who had been successful in examinations in earlier dynasties, Ch'üan was indirectly encouraging Li E to take part in the exams not only for personal reasons but also to maintain and promote the scholarly
reputation of the province. Ch'üan praised his friend saying, "It is undisputed that the greatness of the scholars of our province are on the lips of all men. The achievements of Li E are also on the lips of the scholars of our province." The letter was filled with commendations, stating most firmly Ch'üan's faith in his comrade. His confidence was not misplaced, for Li E would certainly have passed the examination had it not been for a technicality in procedure.

On the 13th day of the 10th month, 1736 Li was preparing to return home. He had been given a farewell feast at a pavilion to the south of the capital. Li E and Ch'üan left the capital within one year of each other. Ma Yüeh-lu had recently finished one of his books. He asked Ch'üan to write a preface for him. Two months later when Ch'üan had reached Chekiang he heard of the death of the scholar and historian Shen Ping-ch'ên (1679-1738). He met Li E who had written some poems in memory of Shen Ping-ch'ên, and he urged Ch'üan to write the scholar's biography. However, it was still in draft form when he had left for Yü-yao to pay his respects at the tomb of Sun Chia-ch'i (1604-1646).

Both Li E and Ch'üan joined the ranks of unemployed scholars when they left Peking. For eleven years, until Ch'üan gained temporary employment as the director of an academy in 1748, he earned his living by writing and through such support as wealthy patrons like the Ma brothers would offer. Li E, in a similar financial situation, also spent much time with the Ma brothers. In the winter of 1743 both Li E and Ch'üan were in Yangchou as guests of the Ma family. Li E was
already fifty-two and had still no offspring to carry forward his name. Although we know nothing about Li's formal marriages his less formal trysts are recorded. Whether in prose or poetry these occasions are preserved in matter-of-fact accounts, and there was often a jocular, contrapuntal, theme lurking around the edges. When Ch'üan wrote Li E's grave inscription in 1753 he remarked that he had been concerned about his lack of progeny, and his taking of concubines was intended to rectify that problem. 29

Thus it was in the 10th month of 1743, before a gathering planned by our four friends, that Li E made known his intentions with one such young flower. Ma Yüeh-kuan recorded the incident and captures the spirit of the event.

For a long time Chu-hsi has been known for its beauties many notables have come here;
Recently, I have heard it said that old Li has just made such an acquaintance;
Ah, but no, it would seem their relationship is well advanced'
By the lakeside minstrels offer songs of welcome,
By the bridge side taking his concubine,
in the shadows of the nuptial candles,
with brimming wine cups they toast,
Surely fitting for a chilly winter evening. 30

Not satisfied with this description Ma Yüeh-kuan continued by alluding to the great beauty of Li E's thirteen year old concubine, comparing her to exquisite jade. Of real fun was when it was learned that throughout the activities Ch'üan Tsu-wang had been "peering through the bamboo slats" taking it all in. 31 Unfortunately, Li E had no children by any of his liaisons. Ch'üan too died without surviving children. There is no record that he ever took a concubine.
In the winter of 1736 Ch'üan had returned home and it was not until 1746 that the men met again. In that year they attended a meeting at West Lake where sixty-one scholars from various prefectures gathered to revise certain spiritual rites. When one of the participants, Ch'en Chao-lun (1701-1771) was about to depart, a certain Wu Ou-t'ing gave a farewell feast for him at a nearby pavilion. Li E and Ch'üan were again brought together. They went off to a temple not far from Hangchou. Ch'üan was on his way north to Yangchou to work on Huang Tsung-hsi's *Sung Yüan hsüeh-an* (Anthology of the Philosophers of Sung and Yüan). While he was at Yangchou the members of the Hang-chiang Poetry Society hoped Ch'üan would come to their gathering. Many of his old friends were there, the Ma brothers, Hang Shih-chün, Yao I-t'ien, and of course Li E. Ch'üan duly arrived. Ma Yüeh-kuan's poem reveals how much they had looked forward to seeing him.

The firepot discomforts those who draw near
The fifth month is already like the sixth month
Where can we wash away this oppressive heat?
The monastery offers refuge.
My friend Ch'üan Tsu-wang,
I haven't seen you for three years, and suddenly you arrived here at dawn yesterday.
Without my cap and socks, I brewed some tea
and in a flash we chatted the day away;
chanting some 105 poems, their clarity and crispness infused within us;
manifesting in comfort, cool and delicious.

Ch'üan stayed in Yangchou for six months before he returned home. During his stay he wrote a preface for his poet-friend Ch'en Shou-i wherein he mentioned that he had begun working on the *Sung Yüan hsüeh-an*. When Ch'üan departed for the south his patron friend
wrote a poem in his honor.

"Bon Voyage to Hsieh-shan on his Return to Ningpo"

At the end of the year at my library
only you of all people return home;
Authoring has inescapable difficulties;
your works, an anachronism unacceptable in the
present world;
Yet you hold that hiding your light under a bushel
is the hallmark of an upright man;
You show your real depths only
over the intimacy of wine;
When composing in the wind and snow,
remember my warm hearth is ever waiting your
arrival.36

In addition to the traditional pleasantries of a farewell poem Ma
Yüeh-kuan revealed much about Ch'üan's work and personality. He
seemed to have his finger on his friend's pulse, the essence of what
Ch'üan was - a historian, who was an anachronism in his own lifetime.
This would not be so bad in the twentieth century, but for Ch'üan not
being orthodox offered special difficulties - not the least of which
could be the transgressing of the imperial rescripts which constituted
the so-called literary inquisition.37 At fifty-eight Ma Yüeh-kuan
had known Ch'üan for sixteen years, but he had not previously set his
feelings to paper. The themes introduced here will often be repeated
in the following years.38

Li E tells us that his work on poets of the Sung dynasty, after
more than twenty years of research, was finally finished, and in the
winter of 1746 it was set to woodblocks. Li asked Ch'üan to write a
preface for him, and Ch'üan completed it before the year was out. As
expected, he had nothing but praise for his friend's creation. He
emphasized the breadth and strength of the research involved as well as the perspicacity of the author. There were three main contributions he considered outstanding and which were "sufficient to rectify the deficiencies of the historical records" of the time. Li was praised for his meticulous research in "collecting the poems and including short biographical sketches of the poets." Ch'üan stated that Li E brought together a collection of poems based on their beauty and not "only those of well-known artists were included." In this sense it was the "accomplishment of the poem [on its own merit] which transmitted the poet" and so gave them both immortality.

During the next couple of years, while Ch'üan was working on the Sung Yüan hsüeh-an text Li E was twice tempted to pursue a government career. Although Ch'üan had previously encouraged his friend to compete for a civil service post he was not, however, opposed to Li's flirtations with government employment. Ch'üan never slandered the government, but rather reminded his friend that he was perhaps not suitably qualified to carry out successfully the duties of the job he was seeking. In the 9th month of 1747 they met and started their journey northwards. At the T'ang Pavilion they each wrote a poem commemorating the occasion. The titles are the same except for their own names: "In a Dinghy on a Moonlight Night With (Ch'üan or Li E) at the T'ang Pavilion." The message of each poem, however, was very different. Ch'üan made the proper noises about the scenery but included a footnote in the center of his poem stating bluntly, "Presently Li E is on his way to interview for a government position."
I tried very hard to dissuade him, but to no avail. Further along in their journey Li E became ill and was forced to return home.

The same scenario was repeated the following year when in March Li E was again going north to try his luck. He wanted the job to support his parents, but Ch'üan chided him and argued that they were in their eighties and his place was at their side, not roaming in the capital. In a farewell poem Ch'üan told his friend:

"Fan-hsieh's Northern Journey"

Your abilities are known far and wide,  
Why set your heart on an official position?  
Performing even as a minor functionary is no easy task,  
Still more the duties of a government tax official.  
In a state of poverty you are willing to compromise your principles  
to offer up support to your parents.  
If you are still capable of making decisions for yourself keep away from this officialdom.

Whether these admonitions had any effect on Li E is uncertain, but before he reached the capital he lodged at the home of a scholar in Tientsin. He became engrossed in and excited about this man's work and stayed on to co-author a book with him. This poem also revealed Ch'üan's attitude toward government service. A position on a board to compile a work of history was eminently acceptable, but jostling to secure the job of a tax collector did not recommend itself for further consideration.

In late 1748 Ch'üan received an invitation from the magistrate of Shaohsing to assume the headmastership of the Chi Shan Academy. Huang Tsung-hsi had studied at this academy under the late-Ming great Neo-
Confucianist Liu Tsung-chou (1578-1645), after whom this school is remembered. Ch'üan received the invitation while at home. At forty-four, having been unemployed for ten years, this was indeed good news for Ch'üan. Before taking up the post he was given a banquet at a pavilion near West Lake by the linchpins of the Hang-chiang Poetry Society: Ma Yüeh-kuan, Ma Yüeh-lu, Hang Shih-chün, and Li E. His friends honored him with poems before he left. They could not have known that in less than a year Ch'üan would return to continue working on his commentaries to the Shui-ching chu at the home of Ma Yüeh-kuan.

Ch'üan's fortunes were discussed over a few cups of wine and in this light we read Li E's revealing poem about his friend.

"A Rhyme in Sport of Ch'üan Hsieh-shan's Fondness of Drink'

Those of wealthy families may quaff alcohol
Those of modest means merely sip
You Mr. Ch'üan are in between
How is it you drink so lustily?
Certainly your stars are on the 'wine constellation',
You with a calabash of wine at your side.
Thus by your very nature you are bitter...

In your state of inebriation you knit not your brow
leaping into the air dancing like a myna
The fire of the wine invades your being
Spurting from the tip of your brush.

This was the last poem Li E wrote to his friend. He had known Ch'üan for more than twenty-seven years and the depth of his understanding was revealed through his poems. As Ch'üan's friendship
with Li E and the Ma brothers matured their understanding of his
class also matured. Toward the end of 1751 they met for the last
time, and significantly it was at the Ma's. The event was recorded by
Ma Yüeh-lu in his poem "In the Winter of 1751 Fan-hsieh (Li E) arrived
from Ch'ien-hu, Hsieh-shan from Ningpo and in the Rain we met at the
Library and Reminced About my Older Brother, Yüeh-kuan who was in
Hunan at the time."52

From these personal interactions much may be learned about the
springs of action which formulated a complex character. Ch'üan was a
historian whose writing was "an anachronism unacceptable to the
present world."53 Both Li E and Ma Yüeh-kuan stated in their poems
that Ch'üan was truly profound only after a good amount of liquor.
Just what these men talked about at these times can only be
guessed at. Li E's comment that "the prose show bitterness,
transporting you to poverty" offers us a hint of what we may expect
from the writings of Ch'üan Tsu-wang.

Ch'üan was already in Kwangtung taking up his second teaching
position, when Li E died in October of 1752. Before arriving home in
1753, Ch'üan had written an epitaph for his friend. This last tribute
to his friend has the same kind of frankness that marked their thirty
year friendship.

"An Epitaph of Li Fan-hsieh"

From the time of my youth, when I began seeking scholars of the
world, of all those who were in the field of humanities and who
wrote poetry, none were the equal of Fan-hsieh. Fan-hsieh lost
his father early. His family was poor and his elder brother sold
tobacco in order to maintain their family. It was proposed that he should become a monk, but Fan-hsieh refused. He studied for a number of years and achieved success in poetry. Later he was an avaricious reader, and what he absorbed from his reading found its way into his poetry. So his poetry contain many anecdotes, known to few and not found in historical texts. He was especially fond of travelling, collecting memorabilia and enjoying beautiful scenery. In all this he surpassed his contemporaries. Furthermore he excelled in the expression of emotions, and was good at the tz'yu form of poetry. He was knowledgable in the poetry of the Southern Sung.

He was very thin and kept very much to himself. In the intricacies of etiquette he was not well-versed and even irascible, not being able to play along with the crowd. His actions always corresponded to what he held was right. His entire life was devoted to poetry which was true in form as well as in content.

Li Fu was the proctor for an examination when Fan-hsieh was a student. When Li Fu saw Fan-hsieh's thank you note he knew it to be from a man of talent. He remarked, 'this is surely the work of a poet.' And thus he recorded it. A certain T'ang Hsi-an was very enthusiastic over Fan-hsieh's poetry. After a morning audience with the emperor T'ang sent an emissary to convey his best wishes to Fan-hsieh and made it known he would be happy to accept Fan-hsieh as his student. Fan-hsieh promptly packed up his belongings and left the capital. At the time of the examination Fan-hsieh was recommended. His friends strongly encouraged him before he assented to go. Li Fu tried to help him but was unsuccessful. Fan-hsieh, however, was then advancing in age.

Unexpectedly, he had an invitation to apply for a government position and as a convocation of the selection committee was imminent he decided to go. All his friends expressed their belief that Fan-hsieh did not have the makings of a bookkeeper, so why should he cast his line into this pool? Fan-hsieh replied, "I hope to use the emoluments of office to support my mother." Fan-hsieh proceeded to Tientsin, and so thoroughly enjoyed himself there he returned home without ever entering the capital. I teased him saying, "You're definitely not an easy fish to catch!" Alas! Fan-hsieh as a civil servant was never meant to be. Yet with his abilities, to roam solitary over the world, chanting his soliloquies until he died: can this not be said to be the will of heaven?

I knew Fan-hsieh for thirty years. Ma Yueh-kuan and his brother (Ma Yueh-lu) of Ch'ien-men invited him to their lodgings, and every few years I would have cause to pass through. Fan-hsieh
was the recording secretary of Ma Yüeh-kuan's poetry society. We often roomed together, and sharing a candle we would compose poetry. Shortly afterwards another poetry society was established at Ch'ien-t'ang. I also participated in this society. In recent years members of both societies have passed away one after another. Fan-hsieh and I have both lamented their deaths. This year [1752] I went to Kwangtung. K'uei-t'ang (a previous student of Li E's) wrote and told me of Fan-hsieh's illness. I expected he he would recover. Ah! Gracefulness, beauty and responsibility in the world of poetry, in the Chekiang area of which Fan-hsieh was a pillar, will from this time on experience a decline.

In order to have sons to carry forward his name Fan-hsieh often procurred concubines. He died, however, without any offspring. His last concubine he loved dearly, but he was unable to satisfy her and she left him. Losing his will and in depression he passed away. This is an example of a man of letters who has not learned the way of the tao. Even Wang Shih found no difficulty in teasing his future father-in-law to give his daughter as wife. Yet Fan-hsieh could not even satisfy his concubine. Ah! This truly shows how deficient he was in conducting his personal relations. Ah! Such a tragedy.

Fan-hsieh asked that I write a preface for two of his works: the Sung-shih and the Liao-shih. In a flash then years passed away. I offer my oath of devotion. Today I weep as I write his epitaph. Such a pity. This poem then is in commemoration of his poetry.

Into eternal peace I send you as Po Ch'i-i sent his friend
There are still those songs of affection which cannot be forgotten.
Man's affections cannot be severed
Men outstanding in virtue and learning are difficult to confine
Responding only to the search of the oar of Verdant Lake
So that he may secure his love.  

Hang Shih Chün, The Doubtful Friend

At the meeting in Wu-lin in 1722, where Ch'üan first met Li E, he also met Hang Shih-chün. This man not only influenced Ch'üan's life but was to have a marked effect on the fate of his Collected Works, the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi. A great deal of mystery has shrouded
this relationship. Hang Shih-chün and Ch'üan seemed to enjoy a friendship which was mutually profitable. It was on the occasion of Ch'üan's death, however, that the web of mystery starts to spin: with Hang's death and the subsequent publication of his collected works, containing a most derogatory preface to Ch'üan's collection, the prospects for an adequate accounting of this relationship are yet further diminished. Hang's sequestering of the Ch'üan manuscript for over fifteen years, his caustic preface, his apparent failure to write the agreed-upon epitaph for Ch'üan, have all been noted by modern scholars. Incomplete records, intentionally or otherwise, written by Ch'üan's students have supplied the ambiguity on which the imagination of later scholars has thrived. The unravelling of this mystery is of considerable importance if we are to dispel some of the myths which encrust present-day accounts of Ch'üan Tzu-wang.

From their first meeting at Wu-lin in 1722, until Ch'üan's death thirty-three years later, Hang and Ch'üan seemed to have developed a sound friendship based essentially on their scholastic pursuits. Within Ch'üan's Chi-ch' i t'ing chi and Chi-ch' i t'ing chi, wai-p'ien there are more than thirty-two articles in which Ch'üan refers to "my good friend Hang Chin-p'u [Hang Shih-chün]" and at least nine essays written to him directly deal with points of history upon which Hang was asking Ch'üan's advice. There is, however, as conspicuous a paucity in frequency as there is neutrality of tone in the content of the entries referring to Hang in Ch'üan's collected
poems.\textsuperscript{59} In comparison to Li E or Ma Yüeh-kuan \textsuperscript{60} this
dearth of deeper poetic reference is noteworthy, since the length of
relationship is the same. Reading Ch'üan's Collected Works,
therefore, we can perceive something special in the way the
relationship between Ch'üan and Hang developed. No poems can be cited
attesting to any kind of intimacy; no clicking of cups as the moon
dances on the lake, only formal references may be found.

Ch'üan was a prolific writer, and the quality of his work was
widely acknowledged.\textsuperscript{61} He also spent significant effort on Hang's
researches; sometimes supplying him with references, sometimes
obliquely chiding him by totally repudiating his authorities, and
sometimes telling him bluntly that his conclusions are absurd.\textsuperscript{62} In
a preface written in 1735 Ch'üan says of Hang's Shih-ching k'ao-i,
"Chin-p'ü's book exposes the inaccuracies of earlier scholars..." and
this is the only praise offered throughout the preface which is
concluded with a comment more typical of Ch'üan: "Chin-p'ü should
include the research of previous scholars, for modern researchers
wishing to pursue further textual criticism."\textsuperscript{63} While Hang was
writing his Chin-shih [History of the (Jurchen) Chin Dynasty (1115-
1234)] Ch'üan completed five essays relevant to Hang's topic,
commenting on the veracity of sources, and yet only once telling his
friend that one of his sources was totally inaccurate.\textsuperscript{64} So his
writing reflects honesty in his dealings with Hang, blunt and with a
possible hint of condescension.\textsuperscript{65} Outright or even oblique praise
of Hang, as a scholar or as a friend, either in prose or in poetry, is
not to be found anywhere.

From the sources we have available it always appears to be Hang who is asking and Ch'üan who replied. Hang's only evaluation of Ch'üan appears in the preface he wrote for the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi. It is this preface that has caused scholars much consternation in assessing Hang's intentions. It appeared in his Tao-ku-t'ang wen-chi, published posthumously by his students. Certainly not significant in itself, save for the interesting fact that it is not attached to Ch'üan's Collected Works, nor was it ever mentioned by either man in any of their writings, and it is written in what scholars consider a decidedly insulting tone. One such scholar, Hsü Shih-tung (1814-1873), relates that when the Tao-ku-t'ang wen-chi appeared (1776) two of Ch'üan's students, Chiang Hsiéh-yung (1725-c.1800) and Tung Ping-ch'un, were "very surprised" to see the preface and read such derogatory remarks. Hsu's essay continues by stating that the students were thereupon enticed to "read all the rest of the articles, whereupon they concluded that the author [Hang Shih-chüan] had taken for his own six or seven of Hsieh-shan's [Ch'üan Tsu-wang] articles. So we realize that Chin-p'u betrayed his friend after his death, but the reason is not known."68

In the 1930s Chiang T'ien-shu published a nien-p'u of Ch'üan Tsu-wang, as well as an article in the Bulletin of the National Peking Library. In both of these works the Hang preface is mentioned. It is Chiang's belief that Hang wrote this preface for
Ch'üan in 1736 while they were both in Peking. It was in that year
Ch'üan had dreamt of the arrival of two of his friends, Hang Shih-chün
and Li E. Ch'üan was living in the same house with Li Fu (1675–
1750) who was serving on the editorial board for the compilation of
the commentaries to the San Li i-shu (Three Rituals) with Fang Pao
(1668–1749). Fang Pao and Li Fu were both senior to Hang and
Ch'üan. Hang was then working under Fang Pao on the San Li i-shu.
Ch'üan had just received his chin-shih degree and had been chosen
as a bachelor of the Hanlin Academy. Chiang suggests that at this time
Ch'üan was putting together his Collected Works and so it was natural
for him to seek out Hang for a preface to his collection.

In support of this thesis he cites a letter written by Ch'üan to
his friend Yao I-t'ien wherein he states that he is "gathering
together his humble effort into thirty-two chüan." This was to
show that the title of Ch'üan's work (Chi-ch'i t'ing chi) was used
by him before his death, and so the preface to the Chi-ch'i t'ing
chi in the Tao-ku-t'ang wen chi, in which Hang's preface title uses
the four characters which comprise the title of Ch'üan's work, was not
written after Ch'üan's death but was written in 1735 or 1736. Chiang
concludes by telling us, "Chin-p'u was ten years older than
Ch'üan, and the preface contains the words of a friend."74

To proceed, however, from the initial premise that the thirty-two
chüan being gathered were actually Ch'üan's Chi-ch'i t'ing chi,
and then that the title was used some time before Ch'üan's death, to
the conclusion that Hang wrote the preface in 1736, and to the assertion that he employed the language of a friend ten years his senior, is all most unconvincing.

The four characters which comprise the title are found nowhere within Ch'üan's works, in either text or footnote. There are references to a Chi-ch'i t'ing (Chi-ch'i Pavilion) but Ch'üan does not in any way indicate that the "humble effort" which he is gathering into thirty-two chu'an is or is not to be known as the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi nor for that matter that he had any particular title in mind at all. If the Hang preface was written in 1736 then, we would expect that the collection of the "humble effort" should have been completed by that date, in order for Hang to write a preface to it. If Hang was able to call it the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi in 1736, why did Ch'üan make no mention of his work and Hang's preface at any time in the remaining nineteen years of his life? Furthermore, in a footnote to a poem composed in 1741 with Wan Ju-lu, an elder scholar friend, Ch'üan tells us "Ju-lu has agreed to write a preface for my crude collection."75 No further mention is made of the "Wan preface" and such a reference certainly does not establish, as Chiang T'ien-shu asserts that it does, the existence of a Chi-ch'i t'ing chi in either 1736 or 1741. References to other undertakings Ch'üan was working on appear by name throughout his Collected Works.76 He was a most meticulous and proud author, and he would certainly mention the completion of a "humble effort"; while it is difficult to accept that he would not have recognized the existence of a preface, let alone a
scathing one. He would never have passed up the opportunity! The Chi-
ch'i t'ing chi contains no introduction by Ch'iüan himself. 77 The
manner and frequency, then, in which Ch'iüan refers to Hang Shih-chün
in both the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-
pien edited by Ch'iüan's students further substantiate that Hang's
preface was written without the knowledge of Ch'iüan or his students.

Chiang T'ien-shu's assertion, that the preface was a
well-intentioned admonition written by an older scholar friend, also
lacks credibility. In 1736 both men were in Peking. Ch'iüan had just
received his chin-shih degree and had been chosen as a bachelor of
the Hanlin Academy. Hang had not yet received his chin-shih but was
to achieve fifth place in the second special po-hsüeh hung-tz'u
examination of 1736. So Ch'iüan succeeded in achieving his degree
first, and only by virtue of the special examination were the two men
able to refer to each other as t'ung-nien (graduates of the same
year). Ch'iüan was also employed by the government before Hang was.
78 These facts are of consequence if we are to read properly the
manner in which Ch'iüan addresses Hang, as well as being basic to a
reconsideration of later scholars' analysis of the relationship
between these two historians. Hang may have been older than Ch'iüan,
but nowhere in any of the prefaces, articles or footnotes, is this
expressed. In Ch'iüan's eyes the two men are of equal standing and if
anything Ch'iüan is a bit more equal.

The second stage of the mystery develops soon after the death of
Ch'iüan in August 1755. For this period of time we have only the
recollections of Ch'iian's student Tung Ping-ch'un, which he placed in
the ni.en-p'u he wrote for Ch'iian. Before his death, Ch'iian had Tung
help him correct his manuscript, which Tung states comprised fifty
chüan. Tung was instructed by his teacher that after his death he
was to deliver the manuscript to Ch'iian's longtime benefactor, Ma
Yüeh-kuan. Ch'iian died without sufficient funds to finance a funeral,
and as it was during the heat of the summer burial had to be
expedited. Another student of Ch'iian's, Lu Kao, was a relative of a
wealthy bibliophile, a certain Lu Chih of Ningpo, and it was to his
library (Pao-ching lou) that all of Ch'iian's books were sold,
yielding 200 taels of silver.79 Tung also sent two emissaries to
the Ma brothers informing Ma Yüeh-kuan of the death. Ma Yüeh-kuan
had, in fact, died ten days before Ch'iian, but his younger brother Ma
Yüeh-lu received the two emissaries and sent them back with 100 taels
of silver. Tung states clearly that the two messengers who went to the
Ma brothers were entrusted with the task of delivering not only the
formal death announcement but also a letter.80 He makes no mention,
however, of complying with his teacher's deathbed request to send the
manuscript to the Ma brothers.

Tung tells us also that in Ch'iian's last days he would read the
manuscript, and Ch'iian would correct him whenever he made an error.
The text was still in manuscript form and Tung (and at times other of
Ch'iian's students) helped in editing.

Why did Tung give the manuscript to Hang? Tung evidently wrote
to Hang, asking if he would write an epitaph for Ch'iian. Hang
replied, asking him to compile Ch'üan's genealogy, and as Tung had already done so he appended this to the front of the manuscript. Tung does not say how Hang received the fifty-chūan manuscript, but he does say that he gave him the genealogy and that it was attached to the fifty-chūan manuscript. Only in the accounts of the following year does he say that "I've begged Chin-p'u to return all the material, but he makes no reply; the ten volumes [the fifty-chūan manuscript] that I was ordered to take to Master Ma is also with Chin-p'u. I've tried repeatedly, but there is no reply." Therefore, the "ten volumes" which Tung refers to as still being with Chin-p'u must be the manuscripts these students had worked on. This is further corroborated twenty years later when Shih Meng-chiao received the "Chin-p'u manuscript" and in his edition of 1805 stated that what he received was "Hsieh-shan's manuscript in his own hand; interspersed were comments which were in Chin-p'u's brushwriting." How the manuscript physically moved from Tung to Hang remains unknown. Within the context of the situation there are at least two possibilities worthy of consideration: 1. In compliance with Ch'üan's wishes Tung had the manuscript forwarded to the Ma brothers. When Hang requested the material in order to write the epitaph, Tung asked the Ma brothers to release it to Hang. 2. Tung gave the manuscript directly to Hang or his emissary. Evidence in support of the former does not exist, but custom required that Tung carry out the wishes of his teacher and for this reason it is a possibility. Tung never said this is what he did, but if it was so natural an act.
he may not have recorded it.

On the other hand, The collected works of the Ma brothers contains no mention of Ch'Uan's Chi-ch'i t'ing chi. Chiang Hsüeh-yung is silent on this point. Hsü Shih-tung, after having talked with Chiang Hsüeh-yung, wrote his "Chi Hang Chin-p'u" (The Record of Hang Chin-p'u), wherein he states:

Upon Hsieh-shan's death, some of his students, i.e. Chiang Hsüeh-yung and Tung Ping-ch'un, remembering their teachers close friend Chin-p'u, entreated him to write an epitaph, whereupon Chin-p'u's representative came to collect the posthumous works (i-ch'i) [manuscript Chi-ch'i t'ing chi], and the students gave it to him...84

Hsü does not say where this took place but the inference is that it was at Ch'Uan's house. In this account both Tung Ping-ch'un and Chiang Hsüeh-yung are implicated. However, as it was Tung who was specifically charged by Ch'Uan to transmit the manuscript to the Ma brothers, it is he who must accept the burden of guilt, ascribed to him in Hsü's article, if the material went to Hang Shih-chüin instead.

In any event, the manuscript was actually handed over to Hang for the purpose of writing Ch'Uan's epitaph. This in itself is sufficient to rekindle our curiosity. To write an epitaph, it is not necessary to have all of the deceased's works. Hang's request for Ch'Uan's genealogy is legitimate, but why the fifty-chüan of the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi? After all, they had known each other more than thirty years and for the writing of an epitaph, the aid of the genealogy supplied by Tung would largely obviate the need to consult the Chi ch'i t'ing chi. If Hang was asked to write a preface, however, then
such a request was reasonable. Yet neither Tung nor any of his contemporaries ever suggest that Hang was asked for a preface. Tung simply writes that he repeatedly entreated Hang to return the manuscript and the promised epitaph. Hang evidently never wrote the epitaph and as far as we know he never returned the manuscript to Tung.

This must have caused Tung extreme embarrassment, as he soon began to organize and edit Ch'üan's other articles, which had until then been in an unsorted heap in a box. Tung's efforts were to result in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-p'ien in fifty ch'üan. In his nien-p'u Tung does reveal that he believes he has let his teacher down and "how can I possibly meet him in the hereafter?" In a backwards compliment later scholars may have reason to praise Hang for sequestering the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, because part of Tung's motivation in publishing the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-p'ien was his uncertainty over the future of the work which he had consigned to Hang.

Chiang Hsüeh-yung does not put full blame on Tung but rather obliquely states that Hang is responsible; footnoting a poem written in memory of his teacher, Chiang further states, "the Compiler [Hang Shih-chün] wrote a preface, which was rather derisive...." In another footnote in the text of the poem, immediately following the character ch'ieh (to steal), Chiang adds "the master's manuscript in fifty ch'üan was sequestered by his old friend." Hang Shih-chün was now an old man and was aware of the dangerous
vagaries of the literary inquisition; he certainly did not want to become involved in any possible sedition charges.\textsuperscript{88} He held on to the manuscript \emph{Chi ch'i t'ing chi}, for fifteen years. Before his death in 1773, he handed it over to a certain Shen Sung-men who subsequently gave it to Shih Meng-chiao. Shih tells us, "I received it from Shen Sung-men and he had received it from Hang Chin-p'u."\textsuperscript{89} After Shih discovered there were a number of ch'\=uan missing, he went in search of Shen Sung-men, only to find he had already died. We do not know why Hang disposed of the manuscript in this manner (both Chiang Hsi\=eh-yung and Tung Ping-ch'un were still alive at the time) but the fifty ch'\=uan which Tung had wanted to retrieve from Hang had now been reduced to thirty-eight ch'\=uan, and they are the same thirty-eight ch'\=uan which comprise the \emph{Chi-ch'i t'ing chi} as we know it today.

Why did Hang write the preface? Although they were not the close friends we might expect of a thirty-year's acquaintance, we certainly find no evidence of a festering hatred in either man's writing. Ch'\=uan's academic arrogance may have irritated people, and if he never felt Hang academically competent, that would not help their relationship. However, it is clear from the poem he wrote when Hang visited him, during his period of illness when the two men were in Kwangtung, that enough respect existed between them for Hang to make the visit and for Ch'\=uan to record it.\textsuperscript{90} From this point forward, though, there is only silence.

Hsü Shih-tung has attempted to fill the gap, pointing out that
Hang used his position to compel people to buy his calligraphy to raise money. There are even two poems in Hang's collected works which refer to this. That it happened seems sure, but that it happened as blatantly as Hsü relates, we do not know. Ch'üan, being somewhat pompously principled, would have certainly disassociated himself from anyone committing such an act. Hsü relates that Ch'üan told the Ma brothers about Hang as he was on his way home, and that when Hang later visited the Ma family, he was furious with Ch'üan for divulging such embarrassing information.

In these circumstances, the vitriolic attack on Ch'üan in the preface makes better sense than it would, say, in the environment of 1736. Here is a translation of selected passages from Hang's preface to the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi.

Ch'üan Hsieh-shan has the erudition of two early provincial scholars... He has sufficient capability to further their accomplishment; the ability to verbalize that which is in the heart, and to set to paper all that he expounds. His scope is extremely wide and all-encompassing and there is nothing beyond his limits. However, I have heard it said, "The apex of virtue is refinement and is governed by the inner mind; virtue reveals the myriad things, which is the manifestation of the mind." With the primacy of virtue there is substance to one's writing, achieving depth and seldom dispersed; with the primacy of writing at the expense of virtue there appears verbosity without foundation. Meretricious, without base, verbose and unrestrained is the rule rather than the exception; all these Hsieh-shan deplores. Is it possible that Hsieh-shan is himself not cautious enough? With capabilities above the average, yet he has not heard of the tao. In history and the classics he is like a common tradesmen selling his wares, making a great commotion, spouting off at the institutions, like the beautifully embroidered garments of the empress which are flaunted at the palace—a consternation of the five constant virtues, and in literature a sin. Lacking in
knowledge and a deficient scholar, intimidating the heavens and stunning the spirits; pure and profound Confucian scholars would certainly ridicule him. Poems that vent feelings, a sentimentality which causes weaknesses of expressions; writing to expound a proper way, yet when that way is itself questionable its expression becomes incoherent. If one has a head but no brain how is it possible to discipline oneself and regain propriety?94

There are six essential points covered in this consideration of Hang Shih-chün, Chʻuan Tsu-wang and the Chi-chʻi tʻing chi. They do not represent all that could be brought to light, but they may reflect those central to the relationship, and to Hang's preface of the Chi-chʻi tʻing chi. By way of recapitulation, then, we may confirm that:

1. Contrary to the established belief that "Hang preserved the manuscript with great care"96 his sequestering of the manuscript Chi-chʻi tʻing chi resulted in a loss of twelve chüan, and was not an act of altruism. He could have returned the manuscript with the preface and would not thereby have run any danger of literary persecution.96

2. The analysis which indicates the Hang preface to be "no harsher criticism than one good friend would make of another, who was talented but not always tactful," was based on the belief that the preface was written in 1736.97 Furthermore, the preface, filled as it is with uncomplimentary generalities, is more a denunciation than a mere reproof.

3. Considering all relevant information, the Hang preface was not written in 1736, nor before Chʻuan's death in 1755, but rather
after Hang had an opportunity to read those articles which comprise the *Chi-ch'ī t'īng chi* given to him to read for the first time by Tung Ping-ch'un. Shih Meng-chiao's statement that the *Chi-ch'ī t'īng chi* he acquired had Hang's comments in the margin, substantiates this point.98

4. Hang and Ch'ūan were not intimate, close friends.

5. There were not two copies of the *Chi-ch'ī t'īng chi*.
The theory that there was one original (*cheng-pen*) which was sent to the Ma brothers and a second copy (*fu-pen*) which was given to Hang Shih-chün has no evidence to support it, and does not accord with the accounts of the time.

6. Similarly, there is no evidence that Ch'ūan's student, Tung Ping-ch'un, pawned the *Chi-ch'ī t'īng chi* to Ma Yüeh-lu of Yangchou for 100 taels of silver to help cover burial expenses.99
NOTES


2. There are only slight variations between the accounts of the three nien-p'u cited above.

3. There is Kung Ming-shui's grave record.

4. Chang Ming-chen was a Ming loyalist. See also Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period, "Chang Ming-chen." by Earl Swisher. pp. 46-47.

5. B.6:718-719. This essay establishes the date and specifically mentions Li E by name. See also Lu Ch'ien-she, Li Fan-hsieh nien-p'u, p. 25.

6. Chiang T'ien-shu's biography reports that the account in question was, in fact, written in the year 1724, but fails to make any mention of this meeting. According to Lu Ch'ien-she those in attendance were the same as for the 1722 meeting except for the absence of Kung Ming-shui. Both biographers place Chüan in Wulin and attest to his having spent time with Li E. Tung Ping-
ch'un, Nien-p'u also makes record of it.


8. B.20:932-933(10). Ch'üan's "P'ing shan t'ang chi" was not written until 1736.


10. Ibid. See also Chu Wen-tsao, Li Fan-hsieh hsien-sheng nien-p'u which places this in 1729 (Yung-cheng 7). Chiang T'ien-shu places it in 1730 (Yung-cheng 8). Yet, as Lu Ch'ien-she points out in his nien-p'u it should be 1729 as it was in the winter of 1729 that Li E went to Yangchou.

11. B.26:1016(2). Ch'üan tells us that in going south from Peking he passed through Yangchou (1731) but was unable to see Li E as he was sick.

12. Li E, Fan-hsieh shan-fang ch'uan chi, 37 chüan (Shanghai; Chung-hua, 1936) chüan 6. A poem to Ch'üan when he was leaving for Peking.

13. Ibid.


15. Ch'eng Yuan-chang (chin-shih 1721, d. 1767). Hsiang Shih-chün (1696-1773), Hui (1703-1750). Ch'üan also wrote his epitaph (A.20:244-245(5).

16. B.35:1170(38). See also Chu Wen-tsao and Lu Ch'ien-she, nien-p'u
which discuss participants of this project in greater detail.


19. Ibid. According to Hang Shih-chün there is a poem commemorating this occasion. I have not found it.

20. B.46:1371-1372(6). Later when Li wants to seek a political post Ch'üan chides him. Li responded that he wished to support his parents. See this Chapter p. 53.

21. Ch'üan's pride of being a scholar of the Chekiang tradition is found in many of his essays. See this thesis, chapter 6 pp. 236-263.


23. Nien-p'u's of both men contain similar information. In this letter Ch'üan showed loyalty to his friend. He discussed the exam system as it affected Chekiang. He mentioned the famous scholars who had participated in the exams. Ch'üan also said, "I did not succeed in the spring examination, but I had anticipated this. Success or failure at this is of no great significance, indeed it is truly ephemeral. What is real is that I must support my parents. Ah, such is life!" Ch'üan also noted that, "Today, Fan-hsiew is sought after by the officials. It was not
he who did the seeking. Yet he keeps to himself and is aloof. This is not the mark of a temperate man." Ch'uan further said, "My talents are not the equal of Fan-hsieh. My close friends privately agree!"

24. In Chiang T'ien-shu's Ch'üan Hsieh-shan hsien-sheng nien-p'u, Ch'üan's name does not appear on the guest list, but does appear in the nien-p'u of Li E written by Chu Wen-tsao and Lu Ch'ien-she.

25. Li E left Peking in the Fall of 1736. Ch'üan left in the Fall of 1737.


29. B.20:242-244(4).

30. Ma Yüeh-kuan, "Li Fan-hsieh na li" in Shao ho i lao hsiao kao chuan 2, pp.11b-12b.

31. Ma Yüeh-kuan, "Li Fan-hsieh na li" p. 12b. This event was also recorded in Ch'üan's biography. Chiang T'ien-shu tells us that Ch'üan relates this event in a poem. The author has not found this poem.

32. ch'i shih, semi-annual exorcism performed at the water's edge in ancient times.


35. Ma Yüeh-kuan, Shao ho i lao hsiao kao, chüan 2, pp. 10b-11a.
Two other poems of this nature were also dedicated to Chüan.
Chiang T'ien-shu, Chüan Hsieh-shan hsien-shen nien-p'u, p. 113-114. Chüan also has a poem dedicated to this occasion, wherein he specifically indicated the Ma house as the meeting place. See Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, Shih-chi, chüan 5, p. 1532.

36. Ma Yüeh-kuan, Shao ho i lao hsiao kao, chüan 3, p. 12b.


38. Ma Yüeh-lu, Nan Chai Chi, chüan 3, p. 2b. Also has a similar poem.


40. B.26:1018(4). Chüan told us these were short sketches including the surname, place of birth, position, rank, and family genealogy.

41. B.26:1018(4).

42. B.26:1018(4).

43. Lu Ch'ien-she, Li Fan-hsieh nien-p'u, p.71.

44. Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, Shih-chi, chüan 7, p.1558. Li E's poems in his Fan-hsieh shan-fang chi, chüan 6, is limited to commenting on the scenery.
45. Lu Ch'ien-she, Li Fan-hsieh nien-p'u, entered under 1747.

46. Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, Shih-chi, chüan 8, p.1578. "Fan-hsieh chih chin-men er kuei".

47. Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, shih-chi, chüan 7, p. 1568. "Fan-hsieh pei hsing".


49. The travails of the local tax collector of this period as well as the unsavory nature of his runners is discussed in Hsiao Kung-ch'uan, Rural China, (Reprinted Taipei: Ch'eng-wen, 1965)

50. Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, Shih-chi, chüan 8, p.1578. Ch'üan's poem, "Fan-hsieh chih T'ien-men er kuei" [Fan-hsieh arrives at T'ien-ts'in and Returns home] recognized Li E's decision not to continue on to Peking while the last stanza recommends to his friend the life of a simple civilian scholar.

51. Fan-hsieh shan fang chi, chüan 7, "Ch'üan Hsieh-shan hsü yin k'u-chiu shih."

52. Ma Yüeh-lu, Nan Chai Chi, chüan 4, pp. 3b-4a.

53. Ma Yüeh-kuan Hsiao ho i lao kao, chüan 3, p. 12b.

54. A.20:242-244(4)


56. Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period, "Ch'üan Tsu-wang," pp. 203-205. Ch'üan's biographer, Fang Chao-ying, discusses these points. Also Chiang T'ien-shu, nien-p'u, chüan 2, p. 64. Here
Chiang states that the Hang preface was definitely not written after Ch'üan's death, and as Hang is ten years older than Ch'üan these are the words of a friend. Chiang is mistaken about this age difference - it is eight and a half years. See also Chiang T'ien-shu, "Ch'üan Hsieh-shan chu-shu k'ao" in Bulletin of the National Peking Library (September 1929), vol. III, nos. 1, 2; see no.2, pp.48-53 where Hang's preface to the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi appears on pp.50-51. Hsu Shih-tung's "Ch'i Hang Chin-p'u" appears in part on p.51. The thesis put forward by Chiang T'ien-shu has various weaknesses, not the least of which is his contention that there were two manuscript copies of the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi. See also Hsieh Kuo-chen, "Quan Zu-wang, An Outstanding Historian of the Qing Dynasty," in Ch'ing shih lun-ts'ung, 2 (Peking, 1980), pp. 341-347. Hsieh concludes that Hang intentionally kept Ch'üan's manuscript Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, and did so because of the so-called "Hu pi" incident (where Hang allegedly used his position to compel people to buy his calligraphy). Hsieh Kuo-chen subscribes to the Hsu Shih-tung interpretation even though it had been partially discredited by Chiang T'ien-shu in his "Ch'üan Hsieh-shan chu-shu k'ao," pp. 48-53. Hsieh Kuo-chen shows that Ma Yüeh-kuan had already passed away when Hang was reputed to have visited the Ma brothers. Closer inspection, however, reveals that Hsu Shih-tung did not actually specify which one of the Ma brothers was visited and as Ma Yüeh-lu was still very much alive it is therefore possible
that the "Hu pi" incident has truth to it. Hsieh also holds that there are two manuscripts of the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi. See also Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Chung-kuo chin san-pai nien hsüeh-shu shih (Taipei: Chung-hua, 1966), p. 91. Liang believes that Hang intentionally withheld Ch'üan's manuscript, and hints that the incompleteness of them is related to Hang's actions. Liang makes no further comment, only adding a footnote citing Hsü Shih-tung's "Chi Hang Chin-p'u" in his Yu-yü lou-chi. See footnote 67.

57. Both Chiang Hsieh-yung and Tung Ping-ch'un became, shall we say, less accurate in the reporting of events involving Hang and their teacher's manuscript Chi-ch'i t'ing chi. It is certainly possible that the finer points were not deemed necessary to record. Tung could not accuse Hang of stealing but he was angry that he would not release Ch'üan's manuscript. Chiang was more blunt, but again did not go into detail. As for Hsü's statement that Chiang said six or seven of the articles in Hang's Tao-ku-t'ang chi were stolen from Ch'üan, we have only his word as Chiang himself left us no record of this. Hsü does not enumerate which articles. Hang's Tao-ku t'ang wen-chi and Tao-ku t'ang wai-chi (1845) (Reprinted Taipei: Ta-hua, 1968), 3 vols. do not contain articles which are at all similar to Ch'üan's style. Moreover, because twelve of the fifty chüan Chi-ch'i t'ing chi manuscript were lost while in Hang's possession it is difficult to draw any final conclusion concerning this matter.

B.34:1151-1152(32), B.35:1161(17), B.35:1163-1164(22),
B.35:1168(31), B.35:1170(37), B.38:1208-1209(2), B.40:1237-
1238(1), B.41:1271-1272(15), B.41: 1277-1278(21), B.42:1289-
1290(6), B.42:1290-1292(7), B.42:1292-1293(8), B.42:1293(9),
B.46:1368-1369(9), B.46:1371-1372(12), B.46:1373-1374(14),

59. Ch'üan Tsu-wang, Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, shih-chi, 10 chüan
(appended to Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-p'ien editions of 1805,
1872).

3:1475. A poem describing Hang's official reprimand (also
in Ssu-ming Ch'ing-shih lüeh, chüan 11:7a-b). In this poem
Hang is moving house and asks Ch'üan to write a housewarming poem
for his new abode. A short poem (40 character) discussing the
physical location of the house.

3:1490. A poem (20 characters) flatly stating that it has been a
long time since Ch'üan has seen Hang.

4:1520. Lists Hang's name among those at a meeting of the
Hang-chiang Poetry Society. Hang was a member of the same group.

5:1532. Hang was a member of the same group as Ch'üan and in
this poem Ch'üan relates how they haven't all met in three years.

5:1537. A gathering where they formed rhyming couplets; Hang and
Ch'üan were in attendance.

6:1552. Venue change for their celebration of the Mid-Autumn
Festival; Ch'üan writes a line to each guest, Hang included.

6:1553. The only poem where in any depth of relationship is revealed. Friends of Ch'üan want him to move house and they do not understand why he will not do so; whereupon Ch'üan says, "Only Hang knows my difficulties."

10:1605. A footnote to a poem stating Hang was called to the academy in Kwangtung and left before Ch'üan.

10:1609. A poem (28 characters) recording Hang's visit to Ch'üan when the latter was ill, entitled: "Chin-p'u tu chiang lai shih chi" (Chin-p'u fords the river to see me [lit. to "see my symptoms"]).

60. Li E and Ma Yüeh-kuan were close friends of Ch'üan's for more than twenty years. The collected works of both these men contain numerous articles and poems which shed light on the intimacy of their relationship. See note 12 and 14.

61. Such acknowledgement was instrumental in Ch'üan's acquittal from possible sedition charges.

62. In particular B.41:1277-1278(21), and B.42:1292-1293(8).


64. B.42:1292-1293(8). Here Ch'üan writes, "Your inclusion of this as a footnote in Yü's biography is utterly absurd." See also Ch'en Tan, Ch'en shih yüan-hsüeh tsa-wen (Peking: Jen-min, 1980), pp. 51-54. Ch'en Tan is critical of Ch'üan.
65. In addition to the "Shih-ching-kao-i hai" and the five letters discussing Hung's Chin-shih, Hung and Ch'üan also corresponded with each other on the subject of the classics carved on stone shih-ching. This in the form of Hung asking questions and Ch'üan replying. Ch'üan's answers are terse, which holds true for his other correspondences, but these answers even fail to include authorities which Ch'üan is careful to give in his letters to Fang Pao or Wan Ching. In the Hang correspondence the answers lack the background and supportive information found in Ch'üan's letters to Li Fu. Ch'üan may not agree with Li Fu but he is careful to point out his reasons, as well as supply substantiating source material.

66. This preface was first published in Hang's collected works, Tao-ku-t'ang wen-chi, chüan 9. This preface also appears in Chiang T'ien-shu, "Ch'üan Hsieh-shan chu-shu k'ao," no. 2, pp. 50-51. Unlike Ch'üan's style, this preface contains abstruse historical allegories characteristic of Hang's writing. Such ornamental phrases were seldom employed by Ch'üan and in the present Chi-ch'i t'ing chi never appear so abundantly in one article.


68. ibid.

69. See footnote 57.

70. Ch'üan Hsieh-shan chu-shu k'ao, no.2, p.56. See also Hang Shih-chüan, Tz'u-k'o-yü-hua chüan 1, pp. 13a-b. Also Miao
Ch’üan-sun, Li Fan-hsieh hsien-sheng nien-p’u, 1 ch’üan, in Chia-ye h t’ang ts’ung-shu.
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CHAPTER THREE

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF CH'ÜAN TSU-WANG

This chapter examines how Ch'üan Tsu-wang wrote history. It presents the analysis of the types of histories he wrote, the kinds of sources he used, the extent to which previous intellectual traditions of his province influenced his writing, as well as the degree to which respect for his own ancestors influenced his historiography. Such factors as motivation and prejudice as they effect his writing are also examined. The organization of his epitaphs and biographies is examined in order to further understand Ch'üan's historiography. He used poetry as a guide to better understand the subjects of his epitaphs and biographies. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of poetry as a medium of his history.

Two major influences on Ch'üan's biographical historiography are loyalism and attachment to his clan's ancestors. Loyalism was a general principle which Ch'üan could apply to describe those men and women who rejected the suzerainty of a conquering dynasty. These loyalists, argued Ch'üan, were not required to die for the waning dynasty. Ch'üan frequently voiced these sentiments and they are central to his biographical historiography. Consequently, the number of loyalist biographies Ch'üan wrote would be greatly reduced if it were necessary that the subject had to give his life to be a loyalist. Under certain circumstances suicide was an honorable way of ending one's life and in the subject's biography Ch'üan would consider the man a loyalist.

-90-
However, there were incidents where the act of suicide was criticised as a coward's form of escape. He considered the man's motivation and made his judgement accordingly.

In his hundreds of articles recording the deeds of Sung and Ming loyalists Ch'üan used several different formats. This made it difficult for scholars to establish a concise definition of his historiography. His Chi-ch'ē t'ēng chi and wai-p'ien are collections of essays. They do not form a single history. The Chi-ch'ē t'ēng chi was collated by Ch'üan himself, whereas the wai-p'ien was edited by his student, Tung Ping-ch'un. The greatest number of articles used in the Sung Yüan hsüeh-an are located in his wai-p'ien. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the largest number of articles on Sung loyalists as well as your average-type Ming loyalist are also found in the wai-p'ien. Therefore drawing conclusions about Ch'üan's historiography on anything but a thorough reading of both works would be indiscreet.

Ch'üan complained about the official histories Sung-shih and Ming-shih, on the grounds that their information was often inadequate, mistaken, or confused. His comments of this nature, however, were brief, and he did not expand on them. Furthermore, in his many epitaphs and biographies he never defined what he meant by loyalty. The reader is left to grasp this for himself. Ch'üan did attack Mao Ch'i-ling for believing that a man must die in order to be counted as a loyalist, but his argument was particularistic, aimed only at refuting Mao Ch'i-ling's premise. He gave no additional
information on his understanding of loyalism.

In 1736 Ch'üan wrote six letters to the Ming Historiographical Board. These letters expressed Ch'üan's concept of loyalism. They were short, averaging only 700 characters. They may be considered independently or as a whole. Independently, they stand as simple position papers, but they may also be read as a single essay which Ch'üan divided into six parts. It was essential for Ch'üan to establish a firm foundation from which to initiate his more heterodox views. He was already regarded as somewhat eccentric at the Hanlin Academy, and he may therefore have felt it necessary to broach the less controversial aspects of the topic at the beginning. This is what he does in the first four letters.

In the opening line of the first letter, Ch'üan mildly praised Wang Hung-hsiu (1647-1723), the previous co-director for the compilation of the Ming-shih. The first two letters dealt with the importance of the i-wen-chih (Treatise of Biography) to the credibility of the standard dynastic histories. Ch'üan noted the precedent for including such bibliographic treatises began with Pan Ku. Since then, said Ch'üan, "none have surpassed those of the Sui, though Master Ou-yang Hsiu's i-wen chih of the Hsin [New] T'ang-shu is also excellent." Ch'üan suggested that although Wang Hung-hsiu's condensed form of the i-wen chih in the Ming-shih[kao] is good, the practice of editing out certain texts was improper, and damaged the comprehensiveness of the history. Ch'üan believed that Wang Hung-hsiu should have followed the example set by the Han and
and T'ang histories. Eminently solid suggestions. One could not err praising such works.

Ch'üan then suggested cautiously that private historians could make a contribution to the official histories, saying, "Is it possible that nothing outstanding can come from the civilian (non-official) sector? Must the writing of history always be held and verified by government officials?" Even though Ch'üan was discussing bibliographies, he said, "The morality of today has fallen and man's hearts are evil, and even among the literati trickery is employed to deceive and cheat for personal gain." Ch'üan gave examples of officials tampering with historical records to prove his point. He believed that the mistakes of the official histories would be reduced if the i-wen chih were compiled on as broad a basis as possible. Not every subject may be explored to a satisfactory conclusion. There were limits of space. Where such limitations occurred there should be sufficient coverage in the i-wen chih to compensate for those places where the text is lacking. Ch'üan believed no effort should be spared to achieve this goal.

He said,

The i-wen chih for the Ming period are abundant. However, the Shih-lu of Ming T'ai-tsu was altered by Yang Shih-ch'i (1365-1444) thus sacrificing the truth. Even the names of the officials responsible for collating and editing were changed... thus the unreliability of these records can be seen.

Ch'üan argued that both official and private histories may be corrected and the truth ascertained. He cited a situation where certain information had been intentionally attributed to the wrong
This trick could not succeed, said Ch'üan, because of evidence supplied from private sources, who

...all are intimate with his village and have recorded his actions, so that those who follow and read this book may have all the evidence to supplement the insufficiencies of the lieh-chuan.16

Ch'üan knew his readers would be reluctant to broaden greatly the base of the i-wen chih. However, he noted that the combination of private and official documentation had produced such worthy histories as Ma Tuan-lin's Wen-hsien t'ung-ka'o, as well as the i-wen chih of the T'ang-shu. Even so, said Ch'üan, there "are those who are doubtful of works coming from the private sector."17 He reiterated the point that the T'ang i-wen chih had already established the precedent for such a procedure.18 Ch'üan concluded that, "...comprehensive investigation and collection of data will reduce omissions and errors."19

His primary message in these first two letters was concerned with the need to enlarge the i-wen chih, so as to give a necessary balance between official and private historical sources. This amplification would reduce the likelihood of mistakes being made within the text of the official history, as well as allowing later historians the opportunity to make their own decisions by having this raw data available to them. Ch'üan's goal could be accepted but the use of unofficial sources was not likely to be favorably received. Letters three and four discussed in similar fashion the importance of the piao (tables) to the dynastic histories.

The fifth and sixth letters constituted the climax of Ch'üan's
argument. He stated concisely his position on loyalty, and criticised the organization of earlier dynastic histories. His objections were always aimed at the insensitiveness of the compilers. They would place men in the same biography owing to some superficial similarity but neglected to consider the all important point of loyalty (Ch'üan type loyalty!). Ch'üan's epitaphs and biographies explode with a "do-or-die" spirit, but they are equally clear that giving your life was not an absolute requirement of loyalty. Ch'üan did not, however, specifically mention in these epitaphs other requirements which must be met for a man to be considered a loyalist.

In the fifth letter, however, Ch'üan emphasized that "all those who do not serve two dynasties are loyalists." He differentiated between conscientious objectors, hermits, and loyalists. The former, stated Ch'üan, simply refused to serve the reigning dynasty. T'ao Yüan-ming (372-427) was such a person. He refused a government position. It is true he served but one dynasty but at the time there was no other dynasty to serve! Moreover, people like T'ao Yüan-ming made a decision not to serve any government. Loyalists, however, had to make a choice between two governments.

Ch'üan noted that in his youth he had admired Shang Ch'ang and Ch'in Ch'ing. He later investigated the circumstances and learned that "they refused to serve the new dynasty. They both fled." These two men are in the i-min lieh-chuan (Biographies of Hermits) of the Hou Han shu, alongside the entry for Feng Ming. Feng Ming
also refused to serve Wang Mang (45 B.C. – A.D. 23). He fled to Liaotung.

Ch'üan, however, believed that these three men should not have been considered in the same category. Admittedly, they all refused to serve Wang Mang choosing instead to flee to the countryside. Ch'üan, however, was concerned with the reasons which led these men to make their decisions. Shang Ch'ang wished to pursue his understanding of Lao-tzu and the I-Ching. He and his good friend Ch'in Ch'ing went off to Wu-yüeh (the region of the lower Yangtse and Hangchou Bay). These men were hermits and should not be confused with loyalists. Feng Ming, on the other hand, was a loyalist, whose son was murdered by Wang Mang. He believed that the san-kang (the three bonds in human relations: prince and minister, father and son, and husband and wife) had been severed as a result of Wang Mang's usurpation, and that national calamity was at hand. Later historians, said Ch'üan, did not understand that there were two distinct principles involved.

So the historian must seek the subject's motive, and from this he may determine whether the man was a loyalist, a hermit, a conscientious objector or a coward. Ch'üan did not contend that loyalists were any grander type of person, but he did believe a distinction should be made.

Ch'üan cited the preface to the loyalist biographies in the Sung-shih, and agreed with the principles embodied there. However, said Ch'üan, in ten chüan of loyalist biographies the only criterion for inclusion was still the concept of defending principles to the
death. As a result, said Ch'üan, men like Hsieh Ao (1249-1295) and Cheng Sau-hsiao (1238-1315) were not even mentioned. He found a similar parallel in the Chin-shih. Chu Ch'eng-liang, who swore never to serve the Chin regime, was recorded only with other yin-yi (hermits or recluses). Ch'üan could not grasp the logic of such classifications and simply concluded, "If we speak of loyalists in general, then all those who refuse to serve two dynasties may be called by that name."  

Ch'üan's case for a more consistent approach to classifying and recording loyalists could have rested here. In the sixth letter, however, he continued to emphasize inconsistencies within different dynastic histories. Furthermore, he enlarged upon his point by bringing out specific discrepancies in the Ming-shih.

At the beginning of the letter Ch'üan noted that Wang Ying-lin (1223-1296) "believed that as a matter of principle Chi K'ang (Wei dynasty) did not serve the Chin dynasty. He was willing to sacrifice himself for this principle." There is, however, a biography of Chi K'ang in that dynasty's history. Ch'üan agreed with Wang Ying-lin when he said, "it is indeed humiliating that the present Chin-shu contains his biography." The problem, in fact, is that any dynastic history might be required to deal with two types of loyalists: one group, at the beginning of the period, was comprised of those who were loyal to the preceding dynasty, and who were compelled to live or die as rebels or protestors under the new, victorious government; the other group, of course, at the end of the
dynasty, fulfilled the same role on its behalf against its successor.

The Wu-tai shih placed biographies of men like Chi K'ang immediately after the biographies of loyalists. They were loyalists of the defunct dynasty, who had not been included in the history of their own dynasty. Ch'üan explained that the compilers of the Sung-shih had seen the error of placing such biographies so close to those of loyalists. They still used the biography (chuan) as a form for commemorating the deeds of these men but placed it at the very end of the Sung-shih. Ch'üan believed that rather than effecting any real change this was merely "a tricky shift of positions".29 The biographies were written but included in the wrong dynastic history!

In discussing these examples, Ch'ilan was concerned over the placement of the biographies of loyalists of the defunct dynasty in the standard history. He did not approve of their being included, regardless of their location in the history.

The Ming-shih was vulnerable to similar criticism. Many men loyal to the Yuan dynasty (1277-1367) were not included in its history because "its draft was completed early in the Ming Hung-wu reign-period."(1368-1398) 30 Some of these "interim loyalists" were sought after by Ming T'ai-tsu (Chu Yuan-chang) for either their expertise on the battlefield or for their personal reputation. Even though they refused to serve in the new dynasty their lieh-chuan were still included in the same chapter of the Ming-shih among those who served the Ming. So the Ming-shih did not follow the example of either the Sung-shih or the Wu-tai-shih.
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In this argument Ch'üan was not only voicing his disapproval of placement or location within the text but was still more concerned that these loyalists of the defunct dynasty (Yüan) were discussed in the same biography with men who served the Ming.31

He stated flatly that Yüan loyalists like K'uo K'uo and Ch'en Yu-ting should not have been included in the same biographies as men who served the Ming.32 It was owing to Ming T'ai-tsu's appreciation of loyalty, said Ch'üan, that these biographies were placed in the Ming-shih. Ch'üan cited cases where Ming T'ai-tsu had attempted to enlist the support of men loyal to the Yüan. These men refused his invitation, fleeing to the countryside, cutting their throats, or valorously dying on the battlefield. Regardless of their loyalty "the important point was that none of them accepted Ming sovereignty."33 Nevertheless, Ming T'ai-tsu saw in men like K'uo K'uo a loyalty worthy of honor as exemplary behavior toward their former sovereign.34 He wished to cultivate such spirit. Ch'üan concluded, "The Yüan loyalist biographies were included in the Ming-shih as a result of the encouragement of Ming T'ai-tsu."35

In the sixth letter, Ch'üan did not expand his definition of loyalty. He objected to placing loyalists of the defunct dynasty within the same chüan where subjects of the Ming were recorded. These loyalists, said Ch'üan, would find this deeply humiliating.36 Furthermore, he also disapproved of the arrangements whereby an independent chüan was created for these interim loyalists. However, K'uo K'uo and Ch'en Yu-ting died too late to be entered into the
Yüan-shih, and if their memory was to be preserved where were they to be considered?

Ch'üan believed Wang Ying-lin's statement on loyalism was "sufficient to energize the universe." He asserted that even an arrangement like the Sung-shih could not fulfill the spirit of Wang Ying-lin's position, on the recording of loyalists. It is clear that Wang Ying-lin and Ch'üan agreed that it would be best if these loyalists caught, as it were, between two histories not be forced into the history of the ascending dynasty.

Ch'üan's Solution

Ch'üan's basic philosophy of loyalism and loyalists is still quite simple: anyone who does not serve two dynasties is a loyalist. These parameters are large. Ch'üan did not narrow them. His loyalists represented people from all walks of life.

He was concerned how loyalists were treated in dynastic histories. He was consistent in his beliefs. Sometimes, however, his views proved difficult to implement. K'uo K'uo, said Ch'üan, should not have been included in the same chüan with Chang Ssu-tao and Li Ssu-ch'i who were subjects of the Ming. It would be impossible, however, to discuss Chang and Li without mentioning K'uo K'uo! More likely, Ch'üan was objecting that K'uo K'uo, as a loyalist of the Yüan occupied the primary position in a lieh-chüan of the Ming-shih.

At first sight, Ch'üan might seem to be advocating that such interim loyalists not be recorded at all. Taken in context, however,
we know this supposition is absurd. Ch'Uan strongly opposed including such loyalists in the standard history of the improper dynasty. However, because he supported the increased use of private sources in the 1-wen chih we know this would be his solution to the dilemma. The loyalist would not suffer the humiliation of having his biography incorporated into the dynastic history of the enemy. He would not, however, be forgotten if Ch'Uan's suggestion of an expanded 1-wen chih were implemented.

Loyalism Through Genealogy.

Ch'Uan's definition of a loyalist automatically implied that they lived long before he himself was born. Indeed, Ch'Uan's touchstone for the Sung and Ming loyalists frequently proved to be his own ancestors.

It is no coincidence that he traced his ancestry back to the Sung. He was proud of his forefathers. His student Tung Ping-ch'un wrote "Ch'Uan-shih shih-p'u" (The Genealogy of the Ch'Uan Clan) shortly after Ch'Uan's death in 1755, and because Ch'Uan had not himself written his genealogy Tung Ping-ch'un was forced to glean information from Ch'Uan's articles. Tung's "Ch'Uan-shih shih-p'u" (hereafter "Shih-p'u") traced Ch'Uan's lineage twenty-four generations. The entries for the Sung and Ming periods are the most nearly complete.

In Ch'Uan's accounts of the Ming loyalists he had no fewer than twelve different sobriquets for the Southern Ming traitor Hsieh San-pin. He also used different names for some of his more prominent
ancestors. Ch'üan might refer to a person by the office(s) he held, the county where he was born, his tzu or hao, or by some other name he especially created for the occasion. There are no difficulties when it is clear to whom Ch'üan is referring. However, he was so comfortable using these various names that he did not always apprise the reader when he was using a new name.

Members of his clan had been involved with Sung and Ming loyalist groups. In the epitaphs and biographies of Ming loyalists they were either good friends of relative So-and-so or he had found the writings of So-and-so and was recording his deeds. Ch'üan wrote very few epitaphs for Sung loyalists. He mainly used the chi (record of events) the hsü (prefaces) and the pa (colophon) to relate events of Sung loyalists. He integrated these into the Song yüan hsüeh-an when he edited it. 39

Ch'üan wrote many short articles on members of his family and their ancestors. Tung's "Shih-p'u" is helpful in establishing the general structure of Ch'üan's genealogy. There are, however, omissions and errors in the "Shih-p'u". In 1737, when Ch'üan was a bachelor of the Hanlin Academy, a ceremony was held honoring the deceased Yung-cheng Emperor. By virtue of this Ch'üan then petitioned the Ch'ien-lung Emperor to award his new title (Shu chi shih, bachelor) to his father and grandfather. 40 Therefore his grandfather, Ch'üan Wu-ch'i (1629-1696) whose tzu (courtesy name) was Ch'ing and whose hao (literary name) was Pei-kung, was also known as Hsien-ta-fu ts'eng-kung
Ch'üan's father, Ch'üan Shu (1663-1739) whose ts'eng kung. If we examine Tung's "Shih p'u" the father's title is given but the grandfather's is omitted. In all references to his grandfather Ch'üan used only the honorific titles. However, when referring to his father he used hsien-sheng ( ), hsien kung( ), or hsien chun ( ). He did not use ts'eng kung. Because Ch'üan so frequently refers to or quotes his ancestors it is important to know to whom he is referring. The following genealogy shows his clan from the Sung dynasty to his own generation in the Ch'ing dynasty.

Ch'üan's family influenced the way he wrote history. He had a close relationship with his paternal great aunt, the daughter of the Ming loyalist Chang Huang-yen. The epitaphs of Chang Huang-yen and Chang Ming-ch'ien reflect the influence of his great aunt. Ch'üan used the information she gave him in order to balance the tone of the account. Her stories inspired Ch'üan to write a number of other epitaphs.

Ch'üan's great-grandfather, Ch'üan Ta-cheng (1608-1667) a Ming loyalist who joined the court of Chu I-hai (1618-1662), and the well-known loyalist Ch'ien Su-yüeh (1607-1648) were serving the same court. Ch'üan pointed out, in fact, that Ch'ien Su-yüeh was related by marriage to his clan. Ch'ien Su-yüeh had eleven brothers. They were all involved with the Ming cause. Ch'üan wrote accounts for all of these loyalists. Ch'üan's uncle, Ch'üan Mei-hsien was also
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<td>詩</td>
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<td>君</td>
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<td>2</td>
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<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>祖</td>
<td>父</td>
<td>子</td>
<td>孙</td>
<td>曾孙</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>祖父</td>
<td>父亲</td>
<td>子男</td>
<td>孙子</td>
<td>曾孙子</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>爷爷</td>
<td>爸爸</td>
<td>儿子</td>
<td>孙</td>
<td>曾孙</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>祖</td>
<td>父</td>
<td>子</td>
<td>孙</td>
<td>曾孙</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>祖父</td>
<td>父亲</td>
<td>子男</td>
<td>孙子</td>
<td>曾孙子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>爷爷</td>
<td>爸爸</td>
<td>儿子</td>
<td>孙</td>
<td>曾孙</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
involved with the Ming loyalists. Ch‘üan would take the 
opportunity to closely associate members of his clan with Ming 
loyalists.

The extent to which Ch‘üan accepted the views of his father and 
grandfather is difficult to assess. However, in the biography of Liu 
Ch‘i-chuang (1648-1695) that influence was substantial: "What I know of 
Ch‘i-chuang I know from my father..." The biography of Mao Ch‘i-
ling was also distinctly marked with the sentiments of both the father 
and the grandfather. Sometimes Ch‘üan inserted the names of his 
ancestors into an article in order to establish association with the 
subject. Sometimes he would add a few characters to his account 
which would connect not only his relative with the subject but link 
him directly to a certain historical situation. He would say, for 
example, "My late grandfather was in the same mountain garrison with 
Hsü Fu-yuan (1600-1665). He was most informed on this subject." This 
served a dual purpose. It established the ancestor as an 
authority, and emphasized his presence with Ming loyalists as well as 
establish the Ch‘üan clan with that loyalist group. It is difficult 
to know whether being the authority or associating with loyalists is 
the more important point being transmitted. At the same time not only 
was association affirmed, but by implication Ch‘üan also allowed the 
reader to know his grandfather also participated in maintaining the 
literary heritage of Chekiang. Ch‘üan used his ancestors to 
verify situations or events he was trying to prove. In addition to 
historical considerations Ch‘üan also quoted his grandfather on points
of geography. 52

When citing either his father or grandfather Ch'üan used direct quotes. Although his grandfather died before he was born Ch'üan still accepted those opinions transmitted through his great aunt or his father as accurate enough to use.

Ch'üan commented on clan genealogies written in previous dynasties. 53 These comments were in a series of colophons and prefaces. He first identified his ancestors, in relation to other members of the clan, and placed them in an historical setting. Ch'üan defined his Sung dynasty clan members as loyalists and as being blood relatives of the imperial family. It was this royal branch that moved to Tung-p'u in Yüeh.

He maintained records of two branches of his clan. In the twenty-fourth generation Ch'üan Hsing had no sons. His older brother Ch'üan Ch'üan had two sons. The younger boy Ch'üan Tzu was adopted to maintain Ch'üan Hsing's lineage. According to Ch'üan's reckoning Ch'üan Hsing moved to Tung-p'u in Yüeh and established his family there. It was this branch which later became related to the Sung imperial household. 54 As a result of these connections the Tung-p'u branch of the clan as well as Ch'üan Ch'üan were granted various imperial honors and titles. 55

Ch'üan Ch'üan's great-grandson, Ch'üan Pi (21st generation) was a Sung loyalist. Ch'üan recounts a remarkable story about the remains of some of the Sung royal family. The temporary tombs had been desecrated and the valuables buried with the deceased had been stolen.
The thieves had strewn the bones (in cases really still corpses) about on the ground. Disguised as gleaners to avoid attracting attention, men loyal to the Sung went about the fields picking up these remains. Ch'üan Pi did not participate in recovering the bones, but those who did were his good friends and were often guests at his house. The collected remains, said Ch'üan, were buried at Lan T'ing (Orchid Pavilion) which was adjacent to and maintained by the T'ien-chang Monastery. The T'ien-chang Monastery was originally established in memory of Ch'üan Shao-ch'i. Ch'üan stated that this occurred during the time of Sung Li-tsung, sometime after 1259. Ch'üan Shao-shih's nephew was the blood brother of Ch'üan Pi (otherwise Ch'üan Weng). According to Ch'üan, then, this land was clan property, and even some of his ancestors had been buried there before the collapse of the Sung. Their ancestral tablets were maintained in the T'ien-chang monastery. Ch'üan Pi was implicitly involved with the plans to bury members of the Sung royal family on his land. He was an official under the Sung but did not serve the Yuan.

There had been much confusion as to who were the original loyalists who collected and reburied the bones in individual graves. Because they planted a holly tree in front of each grave they are collectively remembered as the Tung-ch'ing i-shih (the Holly Patriots). Ch'üan wrote letters to a local official charged with examining the history of this situation and erecting a new stele to the patriots. Ch'üan argued that presently only four of the original
six Holly Patriots could be positively identified.\textsuperscript{61} Ch'\u00f6an's ancestors, although definitely not one of the gleaners, were instrumental in finding a place for the remains to be buried.

Ch'\u00f6an was a local historian, interested in maintaining the records of his province.\textsuperscript{62} His own clan ancestors gave him the base from which he operated. Whether it was loyalism, poetry or delineating intellectual traditions Ch'\u00f6an worked within the geographical limits of Chekiang, and he travelled the area visiting his friends and benefactors. Ch'\u00f6an believed he was at the cultural center of the empire. "From Sung and Y\u00e6n times my province has been nicknamed Tsou-Lu,"\textsuperscript{63} said Ch'\u00f6an, referring to the significance the home states of Mencius (Tsou) and Confucius (Lu) had as the symbolic nexus of learning.\textsuperscript{64}

He seldom wrote about events of people that were not somehow involved with Chekiang.\textsuperscript{65} If it fell within the parameters of a biography, and if it would demonstrate the character of an individual, he would relate an event which had national implications.\textsuperscript{66} This was, however, the exception rather than the rule.

Ch'\u00f6an's history took loyalism, clan history, and provincialism as its basic foundations. He advocated that complete and accurate genealogies complemented local history.\textsuperscript{67} If he did not record these events and people, their significance and memory would be lost forever. In this sense, then, Ch'\u00f6an felt it incumbent upon himself to transmit his local heritage.\textsuperscript{68}
His provincialism was reinforced by his many field trips into the countryside. His subjects were people and events of comparatively recent history and his stage was the very ground he walked on. Although Ch'üan wrote articles and answered questions about the classics, the bulk of his energy, as exemplified in his Collected Works as well as in those works he edited, was in recent history.\textsuperscript{69} He was furious with the compilers of the Sung-shih. There were too many errors, inadequacies, or omissions.\textsuperscript{70} Ch'üan didn't say whether this prompted him to write detailed accounts of Ming loyalists,\textsuperscript{71} but, he certainly gathered much information from the countryside which he used to write them.

There were three basic kinds of evidence Ch'üan sought on his field trips. Firstly, he was an inveterate tourist of battlefields and grave sites. He never missed a chance to offer proper sacrifices at a local worthy's grave, and he would relate how although the grave site was overgrown and wild yet the tumulus could still be discerned. If there was a stele, Ch'üan copied down the information carved on it.\textsuperscript{72} Secondly, he would seek out living relations of his subject to ascertain their recollections of events in the subject's life. Sometimes such ferreting would result in his finding works written by the man himself.\textsuperscript{73} Thirdly, he combined what he'd retrieved and compared it with third party information. These techniques lent themselves well to the writing of recent history.

Ch'üan's favorite method of expressing this kind of history was through epitaphs and biographies. These epitaphs and biographies
emphasized recent history. They either record Ming loyalists or contemporaries of Ch'üan. Some of the epitaphs were written as an expression of his last respects to a friend, while others were written at the request of the subject's descendants. Ch'üan did not write for the very rich and famous, and his decision to write an epitaph did not depend only on his position or wealth.

There are certain elements which all his epitaphs have in common. Ch'üan did not stereotype his subjects. They are never entirely bad or good. In an epitaph for Mao Ch'i-ling for example both positive and negative aspects of Mao's life were given. It is also true, however, that whenever Mao is mentioned in other articles the reference is usually uncomplimentary. Huang Tsung-hsi's epitaph was overwhelmingly favorable. Ch'üan held Huang Tsung-hsi to have all the attributes of an honorable man. However, being honorable was no safeguard against making mistakes. Ch'üan did not flinch from revealing what he thought to be Huang's mistakes.

Even though he did not moralize, there were certain characteristics which all of his favored subjects (i.e. Huang Tsung-hsi, Chang Huang-yen, Chang Ming-chen, and Chang K'en-t'ang) had in common. If they were to be remembered as loyalists they must have served only the defunct dynasty. However, so-called loyalists as well as other positive-type subjects were all seen to possess: (1) self-respect manifested in (2) loyalty to a principle(s) and (3) implementation of this principle in his daily life. A man might have his flaw (i.e. Li E's weakness for women) but as long as he was
steadfast to basic principles Ch'üan's accounting would be favorable. Even in epitaphs, which Ch'üan has obviously been commissioned to write, the subject is still measured by these standards. Such people, however, seldom fared so well in comparison. 80

Ch'üan stated that facts are the foundation upon which his epitaphs were built, "It is absolutely necessary to seek the facts about the person..." before writing their epitaphs. 81 He also emphasized the necessity for obtaining more than one person's opinion. 82 His epitaphs usually employed a variety of sources, and he seldom depended on a single source to write an account. 83

The construction of the epitaphs themselves was straightforward. They were not strictly chronological. Ch'üan never developed his subject from birth through his adult career. He dealt with the adult. 84 He removed the image of a static personality through brief glimpses into the way a person conducted his daily life. These glimpses or cameo portraits did not reveal a process of growth within the character. They were intended to bring the subject closer to the reader while simultaneously disclosing an aspect of his character, which could be either positive or negative. They were brief, and could only be understood with a knowledge of the background which Ch'üan had already supplied. In some instances Ch'üan revealed his personal appraisal of a man's response to a situation in these cameo portraits. Ch'üan said of one character who was to have met his end by drowning, that he "didn't die in water but rather in wine." 85

In epitaphs of contemporaries the cameo portraits appeared
either as a straight narrative or as a dialogue between the subject and some third party. On occasions where Ch'üan had never met his subject, these cameo portraits naturally lacked the humor and insight which personal association permitted. On the other hand, the character or personality of earlier subjects could be brought into focus by relating some situation in which the man behaved in a way Ch'üan believed typified him: the epitaphs of Huang Tsung-hsi and Ch'ien Su-yüeh are typical of this genre.

Ch'üan used shock phrases which appeared as contrasts to a situation that he had just described. Similar to the technique which Haydn used to develop his "Surprise Symphony", Ch'üan could inveigle his reader into one descriptive style and then suddenly switch styles to describe some scene of horror or bedlam. The system could be reversed, so that a particularly gruesome narrative would be contrasted with a short passage of tranquility. Ch'üan's shock phrases held this power only when read in context. They were always terse statements of fact, but by his strategic placement of these contrasting units Ch'üan removed the necessity to insert his opinion. A particularly effective example may be found in the epitaph for Wang I (1616-1651):

The soldiers were irate at Wang's many years of obstinate resistance. They formed up and released their arrows at him, hitting him in the shoulder, in the jaw and in the side. Yet Wang I did not even flinch. Like a veritable tree he stood, his breast penetrated three times, and still he didn't succumb. So they axed off his head and then he fell. Two of Wang's supporters still ... would not kneel. When they were forced to kneel down, they did so facing Wang and died by his side. The Ch'ing troops saw this and there were some who wept.
In his epitaph for Chang K'en-t'ang (d. 1651), Ch'üan used the same style, to set the horror of the situation firmly in his reader's mind. In 1651 the Manchus had taken Chusan Island where Chang and his family were living. Ch'üan said:

The entire Chang family perished. The Ch'ing soldiers entered his house. When they got to the so-called Snowy-topped Pavilion they saw twenty-seven corpses. There were some who were hanging themselves from the beams. There were others who had hanged themselves and had already fallen to the ground. There were those who wore earrings and mink, with a jade tablet tied at the waist. In the main hall was Master Chang, majestically wearing his official robes. One of his lieutenants, Su Chao-jen of Wu-chang, had killed himself with his own weapon. The others did likewise. There were corpses floating in the pools. The Ch'ing soldiers were dumbfounded and withdrew in fear.

Ch'üan made the most of these scenes. The loyalist spirit of dedication, and of loyalty to the very end, is thus shown to be recognized even by the Ch'ing troops themselves.

Some scholars have argued that in these passages Ch'üan was showing his anti-Ch'ing sentiments. There are an insufficient number of examples, to justify this conclusion. One could suspect that Ch'üan's sympathies lay with the loyalists and by extension was anti-Ch'ing, but this in fact is false logic. There are many occasions where Ch'üan acknowledges the Ch'ing as having received the Mandate of Heaven, and he acknowledged the decadence and corruption of the Ming. Even though Ch'üan's works were used by some nineteenth century anti-Manchu scholars, we cannot allow ourselves to categorize him as anti-Ch'ing. Ch'üan recorded loyalists. We did not differentiate among Sung, Yüan, or Ming
loyalists. The life, plight, and fate of these men was of intense interest to him. Such men deserved to be given an honorable place in history, and Ch'Uan devoted his life to that task.

Internal Structure of Epitaphs and Biographies.

Ch'Uan used two basic methods in organizing his epitaphs and biographies, a straight-forward narrative or a "beads-on-a-string" method. His choice appears to have been determined by the nature and availability of material.

In the bead method Ch'Uan strung together the episodes and cameo portraits to form his account. The technique allows the writer more freedom, as each item exists independently while it develops the account of a subject's personality. Chronological order is not essential. Ch'Uan would use a few historical episodes, a cameo portrait or two, and in one section he would introduce any material his ancestors might have recorded on the subject. The beauty of this method was that each bead could be independent, and this made it convenient to compose. The effect of the epitaph would not be lost if one of the items were omitted.

These kinds of epitaphs were developed, as it were, horizontally, not moving vertically toward any kind of a climax. It was not essential to have a denouement or resolution within each item. Some recapitulation, however, not necessarily the last item in the narrative, is essential to the whole and cannot be removed without loss of meaning. A cameo portrait may stand alone or may be
integrated into a bead. The diagram below gives the bead structure of the biography of Mao Ch'i-ling.

**BEAD 1**

Information supplied by Ch'üan's grandfather

**BEAD 2**

Information supplied by Ch'üan's father

**BEAD 3**

Information supplied by Ch'üan

---

N CAMEO PORTRAIT

N dialogues, revealing

N Mao's character.

N Bead of Recapitulation

The narrative approach, on the other hand, required that Ch'üan pay greater attention to chronology. In the epitaph to Chang Ming-chen, Ch'üan established him within a particular environment and showed how he reacted to the situation. The environment was developed chronologically: Ch'ing soldiers were in the dominant position and Chang Ming-chen was a loyal Ming supporter to the very end. There are few surprises in a narrative account of that type, for the outcome is already known. Ch'üan, however, was describing his subject's participation in these events, and narrative epitaphs also contained cameo portraits, which were somehow linked with a final shock phrase.
In addition to biographies and epitaphs about an individual, Ch'üan might also compose prefaces and colophons to his works. These discussed the particular work in more detail than did the basic biography or epitaph. Such prefaces also provide information about the author and Ch'üan's relationship with him, as well as his appraisal of the man and his work. He did not feel constrained to adhere to the main task of reviewing or introducing the book, but would often wander into some related subject, such as loyalty, or the maintenance of provincial historical records.96 If the man had written more than one work there could be a number of prefaces, where Ch'üan would discuss the same topic as he reviewed a different work, and if the man were a bibliophile Ch'üan would probably have an article discussing his library and its present status. These articles were always shorter than the biography.

As a result, to obtain all the information that Ch'üan has to offer about any individual subject requires reading more than the single epitaph or biography. Theodore de Bary recognized this aspect of Ch'üan's writing when he wrote his "A Plan for the Prince: 'The Ming-i tai-fang lu' of Huang Tsung-hsi."98 Although the main thrust of his thesis was the importance of the Ming-i tai-fang lu (The Plan of The Prince) within the Chinese intellectual tradition of the early Ch'ing, it was also necessary for him to examine the author's life. Almost half of his thesis dealt with background material on Huang Tsung-hsi. Ch'üan's shen-tao pei to Huang Tsung-hsi is the longest one in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and de Bary recognized Ch'üan's
contribution saying, "This account is based largely on the obituary by Ch'üan Tsu-wang, ... This is the earliest extant biography of Huang Tsung-hsi and the one which all subsequent studies follow."\(^99\)

In addition to this shen-tao pei there are other articles in the Collected Works which discuss Huang's Ming-i tai-lang lu, his collected works, his scholarship, as well as the Cheng-jen shu-yüan (Academy to Confirm the True Nature of Man) which he established.\(^100\)

The following articles are directly relevant to Huang Tsung-hsi:

1. "Li-chou hsien-sheng shen-tao pei wen" (Master Li Chou's Huang Tsung-hsi Stele on the Road of the Spirit.\(^101\)
2. "Che-ku hsien-sheng shen-tao pei" (Master Che-ku's Huang Tsung-yen, 1616-1686. Huang Tsung-hsi's younger brother) Stele on the Road of the Spirit.\(^102\)
3. "Yung-shang Cheng-jen shu-yüan chi" (A Record of the Ningpo Confirm the True Nature of Man Academy at Ningpo).\(^103\)
4. "Er-lao ko ts'ang-shu chi" (A Record of the Books Held at the Hall of the Two Elders).\(^104\)
5. "Pa Li-chou hsien-sheng Hsing-ch'ao lu" (A colophon to Huang Tsung-hsi's Hsing-ch'ao lu, a brief historical account of the Southern Ming regimes.\(^105\)
6. "Tsai-shu Hsing-ch'ao lu" (Additional comments on the Hsing Ch'ao-lu).\(^106\)
7. "Shu Ming-i tai-fang lu hou" (A colophon to the Plan of the Prince).\(^107\)
8. "Ta chū-shēng wen Nan-lei hsūeh-shu t'īsh-tze" (A letter answering questions about Nan-lei's [Huang Tsung-hsi] scholarship.)

With the exception of the two epitaphs (§1 & §2) all these articles examine Huang's scholastic achievements. Some overlapping occurs as each essay was intended to stand independently. Chüan did not write a biography of Huang Tsung-hsi which incorporated all the points listed, but the articles he did write could be organized into a respectable life history of Huang Tsung-hsi.

If Huang Tsung-hsi's loyalist activities were also to be included, many more articles would have to be consulted in order to understand the extent of his participation in the southern Ming loyalist movement. Chüan wrote no unified historical account of this period.

The accounts of other loyalists are similar to those of Huang Tsung-hsi. As the actions of a single personality may be approached through the prefaces colophons, records, and epitaphs of the subject, so may the events of the court of the Lu chien-kuo (Prince of Lu, Chu I-hai, 1618-1662) and the southern Ming loyalists be attained through a similar exercise. The epitaphs of Chang Huang-yen (1620-1644), Chang K'en-t'ang (d. 1651), and Ch'ien Su-yūeh (1607-1648) place a greater stress on the military events of the Lu chien-kuo period than do the epitaphs of Huang Tsung-hsi.

These three men also have supplementing articles which help complete the picture of their participation in southern Ming loyalist activities, and these different genre used by Chüan are a part of his
There is, on the other hand, no evidence to show that he intentionally wrote many short articles about a single loyalist so as to avoid prosecution for violating imperial rescripts prohibiting such activities.\footnote{111}

Ch'üan \hspace{3pt} Tsou-wang admired Huang Tsung-hsi. His loyalism, his scholarship, his filial piety all inspired Ch'üan, and he wrote enthusiastically of these qualities.\footnote{112} In an article answering questions from his students, however, Ch'üan revealed that his admiration of Huang Tsung-hsi had limits. Ch'üan said:

There are two criticisms which the Master cannot escape. The first is that he did not rid himself completely of the evil of partisanship. From a very early age he had participated in political and literary societies, and the bias of his own school was so deeply ingrained in him that he could not throw it off. The second is that he had not completely rid himself of the evil habits of the literati. Instead of confining himself to exposition of true facts, he sometimes made big issues of small points in criticising others.\footnote{113}

Ch'üan deplored partisanship or factionalism. He believed that the intellectual turpitude of the late Ming was characterized by empty speculation, resulting from scholars not having devoted their energies to scholarship.\footnote{114} "The sickness of partisanship," said Ch'üan, was that it was "most capable of restricting man."\footnote{115} He exposed the waste and futility of partisanship and concluded that divisions between schools was like the "many pennants of armies and that this was inappropriate in scholarship was manifestly clear."\footnote{116}

Ch'üan saw this deficiency in Huang Tsung-hsi. In his own works he strove to avoid such prejudices. He praised scholars who avoided such temptations saying that they put the wisdom of the sages into practise
and were not "decadent scholars making empty speculations." His own writing avoided such dilemmas. This is evident in his editing of Huang's *Sung Yüan hsūsh-an*, and it also finds expression in his writing on loyalists. Ch'üan did not maintain that his interpretation or narrative was the only one. On the contrary, it would be through the efforts of many historians that the memory of the "great men of the nation" will be preserved.

**The Medium of History**

Ch'üan Tsu-wang wrote poetry about events and happenings of a personal nature. He also recorded historical, geographical, and economic data obtained from his trampings around Ningpo. Poems revealing his interpersonal relationships, his state of health, his relative poverty, all appear in the ten ch'üan of poetry (hereafter Collected Poems) appended to the 1604 edition of his Collected Works. These poems, written by Ch'üan during his lifetime, are based on his personal experiences: poetry society meetings, excursions to various places of historical significance, day trips with his friends, deaths of close friends or relatives, and even poems decrying his own physical condition. From a reading of this collection one may obtain a more intimate understanding of Ch'üan than may be garnered from his prose.

Ancient temple or pavilion ruins are also common subjects, discussing their location and describing the adjacent topography.
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Somewhat unusual, however, are the poems relating local products. Crabs, oysters, watermelons and other delicacies of an area are paraded across the pages of his poetry.

Ch'üan used poetry as a medium for transmitting facts. His verses do not offer a new standard of beauty. They are down to earth, dusty dry, and void of any philosophical wanderings. They seek to deliver a record of events. He was aware of the importance of poetry to the historian, and he used it frequently to substantiate points in his writing, while he praised others who did likewise. He was especially pleased about poems written by or about Ming loyalists. He often stated his belief, that the causes of a man's actions can be seen through his poetry, "as a man," said Ch'üan, "he was like his poetry." These accounts were always tempered with other data he was able to scrounge from old ruins, or extract from accounts given to him by elderly villagers. He balanced his material, and he did not consider poetry as the only evidence. A certain Mr. Li wrote once about one of Ch'üan's ancestors, consulting only the man's poetry. Ch'üan disparaged such a method: "how could one know him!"

The paramount objective in poetry was in its meaning, or content. This was not to be jeopardized or subjugated to the dictates of style or form. In his epitaph to Shen T'ung (1688-1752) Ch'üan praised him for following exactly such a concept, "no literary extravaganza, only giving expression to his message." In a preface to a collection of poems for his friend, Ch'en Shou-i, he said no one has been able to
surpass Ch'en's poetry in the last thirty years. He truly had no rivals. It was this very lack of competition, however, which caused him difficulties as "his poems became too beautiful." There was a flaw in this beauty. The more elegant his poems became the more deeply he felt remorse. What would seem to be a truly treasurablen talent had somehow been poisoned and we must look to his character, said Ch'üan, to understand the contradiction. It is because he is honest and upright, and has the spirit of a scholar, that the extravagant and beautiful lines he produces are at odds with his very inner self; thus the conflict and the ever deepening regret.

The message rings clear, poems should reveal more than beauty. They are to reveal the world as it is (its non-romantic self) and balance must be struck between meaning and beauty - but never sacrificing the former to the latter.

We would expect Ch'üan's poetry to be void of the beauty he cautions us against. The conclusion is valid. His poems are bland, straightforward accounts which leave little to the imagination. There are very few historical anecdotes and the key to understanding his poetry seldom lies with these anecdotes or with understanding abstruse poetic metaphors. This is not to say that some turns of words or phrases, are not employed. Writing of his health he likens his life to the "fallen leaf" or to "decayed rotten wood," yet such use of natural metaphors are comparatively elementary.

Ch'üan once wrote a short poem dedicated to some plum trees planted at a friend's home. He related the difficulty involved in transplanting
and raising this species in its new habitat. He discussed their qualities and compared the characteristics of the plum to the personality of his friend and his brother. His allegories and metaphors were of this nature.

His Collected Poems related contemporary events. While we may find the occasional couplet waxing poetic over the luggage of a departing friend, yet in the main his poems are a record of a situation, a reverberation or echo of a personal feeling. In this collection there are no poems dealing with events of the remote past. There is also no romanticizing of the past or, for that matter, of his contemporary scene. If there is any philosophizing it is limited and couched in practical situations. In one poem, he related how an emperor should overlook the minor infractions of his loyal administrators as it is to these very men that the emperor must turn in time of crisis, and it is they who can be counted on to control the lower echelons. They should therefore be maintained in office rather than being removed for some insignificant offense. Such departures, however, are rare.

Ch'üan's love of geography also appears in his poems. One point of contention which he addressed was a dispute over the location of a certain underground spring, which had developed an aura of mystique over the years. There were in fact two of these springs, both with the same name but with different qualities. One was deemed excellent for wine-making while the other, not even potable, was considered efficacious in curing battle wounds! This poem uses various sources,
including poetry, to fix the geographical location of these two springs.\textsuperscript{133}

The tone of his poetry is sober, with one significant exception. Whenever he is talking about the recovery of some long lost book you can almost see him beam with excitement.\textsuperscript{134} Poetry for Ch'\u0101an Tsuuwang served two major functions: a medium to record and transmit contemporaneous data, and as an avenue of personal expression. Such personal expression included poems written thanking someone for gifts or favors received, reflections of a friend's visit, despondency over his health, or loss of offspring. Poems of a more purely historical nature are in his \textit{Chu-yu-t'u-yin}, published posthumously by his student Tung Ping-ch'un in 1814. Ch'\u0101an put together this collection in 1742 while he was touring with friends from a poetry society.\textsuperscript{135} By 1743 he had already accumulated 300 poems and had organized his manuscript.\textsuperscript{136} These poems deal with a large variety of subjects but are limited geographically to Ch'\u0101an's home province of Chekiang and more specifically to the Ningpo region. He wrote a preface to this collection, which discussed the literary tradition of Ningpo from the Sung to Ch'ing dynasties. Concluding the preface he told the reader he has a commitment to recover the unrecorded accomplishments of the previous generations of his province.\textsuperscript{137} Many of the men discussed in these poems are found in his \textit{Collected Works}. Huang Tsung-hsi, Ch'ien Su-yueh, and Huang Ping-ch'ing (d. 1649.) frequently appear in Ch'\u0101an's prose and poetry.

Ch'\u0101an's prose and poetry are written for the same purpose. In
neither is the content to be subordinated to the form. Both conduct
the serious business of transmitting historical information. For this
reason Ch'üan was adamantly opposed to the popular social-type (ying-
ch'ou) of writing. These compositions were created to meet a social
obligation, and their main function was not the recording of history.
They lacked accuracy and depth. Ch'üan stated, "As far as I'm
concerned ninety per-cent of this social writing can be shelved
away."138 He also remarked that of "Yeh Shih's social writing, half
of it could be deleted."139 Ch'üan sought out facts to establish
and build accounts. He said, "history is the recording of fact, that
which is not factual is not history."140 He was concerned with
people and how they related to events.

Ch'üan viewed the biographical form as a technique for the
protrayal of history. "I have examined," said Ch'üan, pre-Sung and
Yüan historians, and most of them are capable of clearly setting forth
a man's life."141 With one man at the center of his narratives
Ch'üan would relate events to this person. The subject remained the
key figure throughout the narrative even if the sequence of events
seemed to be sweeping the protagonist toward a historically
predetermined doom. The fate of these men had already been inscribed
by time. Ch'üan knew their end but wanted it woven into the whole
pattern of the fabric of history.

This sense of fate or predetermination is difficult to avoid.
Everyone knows the end of the story, so it becomes of primary
importance to set in relief man's participation in these events.

-128-
Sometimes Ch'üan despairs that, despite a hero's monumental efforts, the sands of time and fate have already sealed his story. Ch'üan admired loyalists. It could be said that he wished such individual paragons of virtue might be rewarded with success. However, he knew better, and as a historian his single desire was to keep the memory of their great deeds from being lost in the passage of time.142

Ch'ilan held to the traditional view of history. A cycle of ages, with each dynasty spread along a descending spiral.143 Ch'üan looked to the ancients for his models. However, his ancients were not deeply embedded into the mythical past of China. Although he had a solid foundation in the classics, Ch'üan looked to the more recent works of Ou-yang Hsiu as a model.144 He saw no one, however, as being perfect, though it is true that the further back in time that the man lived the less caustic would be Ch'ilan's attack.

Ch'üan believed history to be composed of facts, man-made facts, and he related these facts in his narratives to re-create the essential features of his subject. So his narratives included the full spectrum of report: factual, factual humorous, factual derogatory, factual cajoling or whatever was necessary to show what he knew in his mind to be the true portrait of his subject.145

In addition to his preference for the ancients, Ch'üan had other prejudices which influenced his writing. He was a staunch Confucianist who clearly analyzed, examined, and judged men by Confucian codes of conduct. Of one man Ch'üan noted,

Even though he never married, not in keeping with our Confucian way of life,... he was not a common man.

-129-
Regarding his literary abilities they were truly great. He was opposed to gambling. He never went so far as to denounce someone in writing for such a decadent pastime but he did once criticise his benefactor and friend Ma Yüeh-lu. This was in a short poem that Ch’üan first gave a brief history of a cricket run and then told Ma Yüeh-lu how decadent such a thing can be when used as an instrument of gambling. His prose did not discuss the evils of gambling.

On more than one occasion he referred to one of his subjects as being born into a famous Confucian family. He remarked that such people seldom came to any harm. However, these were the people who were vulnerable to any changes of wind at court. Wan T’ai (1598-1657), Huang Tsung-hsi, and Fang Pao were examples of men from such leading families. Huang Tsung-hsi’s father was a victim of court intrigue, while Fang Pao and his entire family were imprisoned because of a preface he had written for a book which was later proscribed. Ch’üan may have been making a general statement, as well-positioned and wealthy families usually could protect themselves. However, the three examples Ch’üan gave were not immune, and he himself had written their epitaphs!

Subjectivity and Objectivity

A question historians often ask themselves is whether a particular account is true, and if it is prejudiced by material that has not been included, yielding an unbalanced analysis? It has been
shown that in Ch'üan's works it is necessary for the modern historian to seek out all the articles relevant to a specific individual or event before any degree of completeness can be achieved. Even after this has been done the same questions of subjectivity apply. It may also be queried how much use Ch'üan made of internal and external criticism before he accepted the validity of an account. An obvious obstacle to our approaching his awareness of this aspect of historiography is his extensive use of oral history. His many trips to the country seeking information on loyalists were always coupled with visits to village elders or descendants of the deceased. If the family had a genealogy (shih-p'u) or other material Ch'üan would use it. He was familiar with the history and the personalities of the Southern Ming Lu chien-kuo period. This basic history (mainly military) was incorporated into the epitaphs of Chang Huang-yen, Chang Ming-chen, and Ch'ien Su-yüeh. Incidents which occurred within this structure would be developed in other epitaphs or groups of epitaphs. The activities of the liu k'uang sheng (The Six "Crazy" Men) and wu chün-tzu (The Five Gentlemen) were only mentioned in the basic epitaph to Ch'ien Su-yüeh but was developed externally in other epitaphs. Single incidents may be similarly viewed. The events leading to the execution of General Wang I are treated in full detail only in his epitaph. The intrigues of the Cheng family [Cheng Chih-lung (1604-1661), Cheng Ch'eng-kung (1624-1662), and Cheng Ching (d. 1681)] however, appear in the three basic epitaphs as well as in many other epitaphs. Diagrammatically the situation may be shown:
There are three basic types of situations which may occur. The problem of intent again manifests itself: did Ch'üan Tsu-wang compose his epitaphs and biographies in order that they be read like pieces of a puzzle? But it was Ch'üan himself who collated the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and those epitaphs and biographies are for well-known Southern Ming personalities, wherein military history is more fully treated. Those of the wai-p'ien (collated by Ch'üan's student) are briefer,
and military events not immediately relevant to the subject were not included. These short epitaphs of the wai-p'ien seem to fit into the longer epitaphs of the Chi-ch'ii t'ing chi, but this was not an esoteric method created by Ch'üan to write a secret history of the Ming loyalists of Chekiang.154

There was no source which Ch'üan accepted without reservation. There was always room for improvement. If it was not an error of fact then it was an error of omission. There was no work which Ch'üan revered or referred to with an air of finality. He was, in fact, overwhelmingly negative about both official and unofficial histories.155 If he knew an account was inaccurate he would even criticise people who used it.156 Of one work he said,

... it is preposterous and cannot be trusted. No one in the world has believed what he wrote. And yet, against expectation, Shao Ting-ts'ai of Yao-chiang believes it.157

In some places Ch'üan may not explain why he believed a certain account to be fallacious, and these instances must be taken as expressions of personal feeling. Similarly, he will praise a work and its author, with Ou-yang Hsiu frequently cited as a competent historian.158 Regardless of the praise Ch'üan may offer, he is sure to find places which can be supplemented or improved.159 It is a characteristic of his writing one becomes accustomed to. Although he was not above praising someone else's work, these occasions were infrequent,160 and he held marked contempt for decadent scholars. Their shabby scholarship, typical of the late Ming, were the "products of inferior men."161
There were times when Ch'üan might question the authorship of a text. With no other writings by the same author extant, Ch'üan was forced to consider the style and content of the work. Believing that he knew the caliber of the author he deduced that such work would not flow from his brush. On the other hand, Ch'üan supported this highly subjective analysis with firmer internal criticism. He subjected his analysis to examinations of time and place. He proved, for instance, that his subject, Hsieh Ao (1249-1295), could not have been involved in person with the reburial of the remains of the Sung imperial family, and in the process he incorporated a wide variety of sources, using gazetteers, prose, and poetry to substantiate his belief. The event and the man's biography did not match. Ch'üan hailed Hsieh's own poem as being the decisive evidence. Hsieh Ao wrote a poem commemorating the deeds of the men who did participate in the re-burial and Ch'üan stated, "...simply use the words of Hsieh Ao to examine the case of Hsieh Ao." He liked to be thorough, and he was critical of those who were not. "Because these scholars only read his fu," said Ch'üan, "and never examined his collected works, it is therefore, impossible to settle the case." Part of his mission as a historian was to balance accounts biased by prejudice, where intentionally or unintentionally a biography had been skewed through inaccuracies or omissions. Such mistakes must have their origins and Ch'üan knew he had to be attentive to them. Taboos and fear of transgressing imperial rescripts on what was and was not acceptable in literature.
worried others more than it interfered with Ch'üan's work. He found it necessary to encourage and to reassure people, in order to have them hand over the material he needed.167

The Audience

Ch'üan knew that he was writing for the future, and his understanding of his position in the academic world is revealed in an examination of the title of his Collected Works.

The Chi-ch'i t'ing chi (The Chi-ch'i Pavilion Collection) was not named until immediately before Ch'üan's death.168 There are altogether four references to the Chi-ch'i t'ing (Chi-ch'i Pavilion) in the prose and poetry of his Collected Works.169 Ch'üan also wrote the "Chi-chiang fu" which extolled the delights of a sauce made from the sea creature after which Ch'üan named his Collected Works.170

The sources tell us that both a village and the pavilion were named after this creature. There is also a mountain in the vicinity which carries this name and it may be surmised that it too was named in the same way.171 In the Treatise of Geography (ti-li chih) of the Han-shu the Chi-ch'i ting appears under the entry for Yin prefecture.172 The Sung gazetteer Yüan-feng chiu yü chih states that the pavilion received its name because of the great number of chi in the area.173 More recently the Ta Ch'ing i-t'ung chih states "Chi-ch'i mountain is fifty-five li southeast of Feng-hua prefecture and near the ancient Chi-ch'i Pavilion..."174
The physical location of the pavilion and its existence in previous dynasties can be verified.

Ironically, the sea creature after whom all these places have been named is impossible to describe with any accuracy. There are numerous sources which have described a chi. They seldom agree on anything more than that it lived in the water and depended on a crustacean for shelter. This confusion became so acute that it is now unclear which of the two creatures was called a chi or whether the combination of the two when together was called a chi.175 Two descriptions were offered by Ch'üan in his "Chi-chiang fu."176

There was disagreement over how the chi could be classified. The three possibilities suggested were clam (pang), crab (hsieh), and oyster (li). Ch'üan subscribed to Shuo-wen's definition that a chi is a kind of a clam.177 Further along in a brief footnote within the fu, he stated, "most pearls come from large chi," so it would seem this clam was more probably an oyster.178 Curiously enough the opening lines of his fu say that the shell of the clam "is occupied by a crab."179 This sounds like a fiddler crab which takes over unoccupied shells for protection. [It was classified as a clam as the host was a member of that family.] This combination for mutual benefit was then known as a chi.

Hsü Shih-tung (1814-1873) confused the issue even further. He said that although he was not the equal of such greats as Wang Ying-lin (1223-1296) or Ch'üan Tsu-wang his eyewitness account surpassed all their work on the subject. The all important point, said Hsü, was
"they had not seen a chi" but he had not only seen one but had watched it being cooked!\(^{180}\) Hsü believed Ch'üan was writing about a totally different species. Hsü located the Chi-ch'i Pavilion in Yin prefecture but observed that "it is now considered a part of Feng-hua."\(^ {181}\) There was no disagreement over the geographical location of the village or the pavilion named for the chi.

In the "Chi-chiang fu" Ch'üan said that one of the true ancient delicacies from his locale was a sea food sauce known as chi-chiang (chi sauce). The history of this sauce should be preserved even though, as Ch'üan said, "I don't like it."\(^ {182}\) The modern mixture was clearly not the equal of the early chi-chiang. Whether Ch'üan actually had seen the chi he wrote about is debatable. However, the pavilion and what Ch'üan himself believed was a chi are important for our understanding of his personality.

The pavilion was a refuge where Ch'üan would cogitate personal matters. He would also go there with a friend, possibly writing a poem to record the event. When he used the character chi in his poems or prose it was always as part of the three characters which form Chi-ch'i t'ing. On one occasion a friend invited him to have a meal. They were to feast on a special fish known as a yao. Unfortunately, it was already out of season. They consoled themselves with the composition of a poem entitled, "At the Close of Spring under the Chi-ch'i Pavilion, Sighing that the Season of the yao had Passed."\(^ {183}\) This poem and the "Chi-chiang fu" show that Ch'üan knew about and had visited the Chi-ch'i Pavilion.
Ch'üan also wrote two poems which indicated the pavilion held other attractions. In the first of these poems (56 characters) he was in a contemplative mood. This was prompted by a friend's comments about those officials in Peking who had held office with Ch'üan in 1736. He had undoubtedly given some thought to his own position vis-a-vis these men and he here revealed the results. Although the poem began with "At the Chi-ch'i Pavilion..." Ch'üan offered no assurances that he was really there when he wrote the poem. The feeling and mood are reflective: since leaving office, he said, he has earned "less than a simple fisherman" but that this was sufficient to meet his basic needs. Closing pessimistically though, he stated, "In the future I have no career, so why should I be afraid of spending time at home."

The second poem (116 characters), written at a later date, showed a deeper understanding of his position, as well as a greater awareness of his own character. Ch'üan observed that while he was at the capital he had been unable to produce the kind of poetry fashionable at court and with the emperor. He likened such an exercise to "casting your fishing line into an empty river." There was no future in forcing oneself to do something for which one has no capability. Continuing, he said, yet "At the Chi-ch'i Pavilion... in my entire life I shall not give out a sigh of depression" if I am able to make a small contribution to the field of scholarship.

The true significance of the title of Ch'üan's Collected Works may be viewed through these poems, but is ultimately approached by a
consideration of the "Chi-chiang fu." Ch'üan may have had some attachment to the pavilion itself. Its beauty and location impressed him. However, it is the chi which had truly captured his attention. The main thrust of the "Chi-chiang fu" is not as the preface stated, for Ch'üan's aim went beyond the recording of a famous sea food sauce of his province.

He used many traditional sources to formulate the physical description of the chi. One of the interpretations was "the clam is the host (mother) and provides the shelter, while the crab (as the child) lives inside." The idea is that they need each other to survive. Although Ch'üan spoke of this aspect he did not really develop it. Some sources claim that "the chi depends on the crab for his livelihood and cannot for one day do without him." This more or less mutually parasitic relationship is not pursued in Ch'üan's fu.

Ch'üan's definition of a chi runs from its physical qualities of size, length, width, and shape into a description of its character. It is at this point that the chi and Ch'üan become one. He personifies the chi until it takes on qualities of wisdom (chih) and humanity (jen). It becomes a sentient being. Ch'üan stated:

*When it moves it seeks provender*
*It dwells within itself*
*When in motion it approaches wisdom*
*In tranquility it approaches humanity*
*Hiding its light under a bushel, it is a hermit*
*Divorcing itself from its own kind*
Whether at the foot of mountains or
At the bottom of rivers
This is its character.\textsuperscript{192}

Ch'üan's personality has already been explored through the poems of his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{193} However, in this section of the \textit{fu} Ch'üan is expressing his awareness of himself. He realized his worth was not in seeking fame in this world, for he could not create what was currently in demand. He was an anachronism. Yet he did have confidence in himself and in his work and believed that at some future date he would be recognized. Ch'üan continued his \textit{fu}, saying that even though the \textit{chi} is so humbly classified with oysters and conches its delicious meat is known to a few connoisseurs:

\begin{quote}
A military officer
Directed the fisherman to
Go to the river village
To catch the \textit{chi} and mince them.\textsuperscript{194}
\end{quote}

This was the highly prized sea food sauce of ancient times. The officer knew the value of the meat produced by the lowly \textit{chi} and sought it out. Ch'üan will bide his time, knowing that the pearl of wisdom, the delectability of the \textit{chi} (i.e. the greatness of his work) will be sought after by someone sometime.\textsuperscript{195}

The director of the Chi-ch'i Pavilion, as Ch'üan once called himself, expressed through these poems the insights of a mature man.\textsuperscript{196} The subject matter plainly indicates that these poems and the \textit{fu} were written after Ch'üan had left the capital.

Indeed, Ch'üan was writing for the future. Time and again he explained that although his work was not equal to that of Ou-yang Hsiu he hoped it would be sufficient to add to the body of
He wrote to prevent information from being lost which might somehow benefit later writers. Sometimes he specifically stated that his articles were for future writers of loyalist history. Generally, however, he was satisfied knowing that future historians would utilize his works. They were valuable, he said, because of the contribution they made toward mending the inaccuracies or errors of the Sung-shih and Ming-shih. Ch'üan criticised the unofficial histories almost as vehemently. Believing in the importance of his work he constantly reminded the reader that had it not been for his efforts much valuable historical data would have been lost.
NOTES

1. Ch'üan Tsu-wang, _Chu-yü-t'u-yin_ (10 chüan), in _Chia-yeh t'ang ts'ung-shu_ and _Chi-ch'i t'ing chi_, _Shih-chi_ (10 chüan).


5. There are fourteen articles in the _Chi-ch'i t'ing chi_ used in the Tseng-pu _Sung Yüan hsüeh-an_, and sixty-eight articles from the _Wai-p'ien_. See this thesis, chapter 6, pt. II, pp. 275-283.

6. See Appendix I, "Index"


8. See note 2.


14. B.42:1294(10). Ch'üan stated that there were always such dishonorable activities. During the Ming, however, they were especially rampant.
15. B.42:1296(11).
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
22. B.42:1299(14).
23. Tseng-pu Sung yüan hsüeh-an, chuan 56. Also B.42:1299(14).
24. B.42:1300(14). See also Chin-shih, chüan 127.
26. See note 200.
27. B.42:1300(14).
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.

33. B.42:1301(15).
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid.
36. These men were dead. The humiliation Ch'üan and Wang Ying-lin were referring to was that which would be carried by the descendants.
37. B.42:1300(15).
38. See this thesis, chapter 4 pp. 188-196.
39. See note
40. Chiang T'ien-shu, Ch'üan Hsieh-shan hsien-sheng nien-p'u, p. 67. See also B.1:649-652(1). Ch'üan wrote this fu commemorating this occasion.
41. Hu Shih used this honorary name as the title of his critique of Ch'üan's "P'ü-yang chiang chi". See this thesis, chapter 7 pp. 326-327 note 23.
42. B.12:825-828(18). Ch'üan used an honorific title for the grandfather and also refers to his father.
43. In addition to Tung Pin-ch'un's "Ch'üan-shih shih-p'u" the following references were used to establish and verify entries in Ch'üan's genealogy. Specific references have been placed in the margins of the genealogy itself for quick reference. A.22:278-280(11), A.24:304-306(6), A.30:383-384(6), A.33:415-

44. See this thesis, chapter 4, pp. 180-182.

45. B.5:706-707(6).

46. See Appendix I, "The Index". See entry for the surname "Ch'ien."

47. B.21:947-948(10)


50. B.12:808-810(2).


52. B.32:1115-1116(8). This point is also discussed in relation to Ch'üan's "P'u-yang chiang chi". See this thesis, chapter 7 pp. 306, 326-327 note 23.

54. See genealogy.

55. Those who received such titles have an asterisk (*) by their name.


58. See genealogy, 22nd generation. Ch'üan Shen-wang had no sons and took the son of Ch'üan Ssu-ching, Ch'üan Ho-wang as his line of descent. Ch'üan always refers to Ch'üan Pi as Ch'üan weng.


60. This temple also housed the ancestral tablets of a Sung royal family.

61. Originally, there were more than six men involved. These six were recorded and celebrated.


65. Ch'üan met men he admired when he was in Peking. Biographies,
epitaphs, or other accounts of these men are, however, the exception rather than the rule.

66. Lu Shih-i's biography tells how the government did not heed his reform memorials and as a direct result lost the mandate. Cheng Ch'eng-kung is often seen in Ch'üan's accounts of Ming loyalists but there is no single essay devoted to him.

67. Ch'üan shows these feelings in many places. An example involving loyalism, clan history, and provincialism as they pertain to supplementing later history is found in A.33:415-418(1),(2) & (3).

68. See this thesis, chapter 5 p. 209.

69. Writing recent history was very much within the Chekiang tradition. See this thesis, chapter 6, pp. 260-264.

70. A.6:71-83(2)


72. B.13:831-832(3), B.16:878-879(14), B.19:921-922(15). On one trip Ch'üan went to the home of Chang K'en-t'ang on Chusan island. He located some manuscripts but the local gentry and military officials were afraid they might "confuse the hearts" of the local people and so they directed that the books be burned.


74. See Appendix I. There were also a few Sung period subjects.


77. A.11:131-141(1).


80. See this thesis, Chapter 4, pp. 194-195.


82. B.29:1066(10).

83. A.28:355-358(3).

84. Ch'üan's own son was the obvious exception.

85. For other examples of cameo portraits in Ch'üan's epitaphs, see this thesis, chapter 4, pp. 171-182.


88. B.4:689-692(3). ta-ping is translated as Ch'ing soldiers.

89. A.10:121-129(1).
Ch'üan's work became popular with some anti-Manchu scholars of the Late Ch'ing. However, these scholars did not examine or comment critically or in detail on Ch'üan's works. They praised him for the "spirit of loyalism" expressed in his articles. Huang Yün-meil's article (see note 111) introduces an interesting examination of Ch'üan's literary style. He states that Ch'üan exposed his anti-Ch'ing sentiments by using a kind of contrasting structure which did not change in tone from the body of the essay. He further stated that "Ch'üan himself didn't inject a single word, but caused one fact to contrast with another fact, allowing the fact to expose its own truth." [p.95.] The author introduces three examples supporting his thesis. Two of them are from the epitaph to Chang Huang-yen and one from Wang I's epitaph. These are both famous accounts and contain excellent examples of Ch'üan's writing skill at its best. The most vivid example is in Wang I's epitaph. See translation this chapter, page 115. The contrast statement reads: "The Ch'ing troops saw this and there were those who wept." The author argues that this formed a contrast which emphasized the bravery of the loyalists. It was a silent contrast Ch'üan did not need to voice his own opinion. The other two examples also had contrast statements. These statements praised the Ch'ing emperor and his troops. The author believed that these praises placed as they were after moving narratives describing Chang Huang-yen actually form the
height of sarcasm. He concluded that Ch'üan's sarcasm was secretly and poignantly inserted in this way. It is unfortunate that there are not more examples to substantiate this thesis.

91. Ch'üan's own definition of a loyalist is that he served only the defunct dynasty. Therefore Ch'üan is not a loyalist. He is a sympathizer of Ming loyalists. By definition: All Ming loyalists are anti-Ch'ing, Chang Ming-chen and Wang I are Ming loyalists. Therefore they are anti-Ch'ing. The fallacy is that Ch'üan sympathized with the Ming loyalists. This is a different class altogether. We have no premise—which state "All" Ming loyalist sympathizers are anti-Ch'ing. Ch'üan's case must be considered only from the material he wrote, and which we have available today.

92. A.7:85-95(21) Lu chien-kuo allowed the opportunity to slip through his fingers and did not perform a pincers movement on Hangchou..."this is sufficient to see that the present dynasty had received the Mandate of Heaven."


94. Chang Ping-lin (1868-1936) and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (1873-1929) both emphasize Ch'üan's Ming loyalist or loyalist position. See especially Chang Ping-lin, Ch'iu shu (Shanghai: Ku-wen, 1958) where Chang says that Ch'üan's works were part of his early educational foundation. See also, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Chin san-pai nien hsüeh-shu shih, chüan 1 & 2, where he discussed Ch'üan's contribution to Ch'ing historiography. Note
particularly his account of Lu Shih-i (See also Appendix I); more than 60% is directly taken from Ch'üan's Chi-ch'i t'ing chi.

95. See this thesis, chapter 4, pp. 179-182.

96. A.31:32:391-413. There are twenty-one prefaces in these two chüan. Although there are many in the wai-p'ien which may also be examined for these qualities; those in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi are brief and cover a wide range of subjects.

97. Examples of such accounts in B.17:883-893 (1),(2),(3),(4),(5), (6),(7), & (8).


100. Ibid., p.42.


104. B.17:884-885(2).


112. A.11:131-141(1). See also notes §7 & §10.

113. B.44:1331-1332(8). A modern scholar, Chang Wu-cheng, places a different interpretation on Ch'üan's criticism of Huang Tsung-hsi. See his *Ch'ing-jen wen-chi pieh-lu*, 2 vols., (Peking:
Ch'üan criticized Huang at other times. See B.23:965(3), B.11:795-796(3).
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CHAPTER FOUR

EPITAPHS IN COLOR

Among the more than 1100 articles which comprise Ch'üan Tsu-wang's Collected Works we can find numerous examples of various styles of epitaphs. Since ancient times, such epigraphs have held a significant position in the development of Chinese necrology. By Ch'üan's time different kinds of epitaphs had metamorphosed considerably from their earlier form. We can imagine that in the last millennium, not only the style and content of these inscriptions was prescribed, but the size, shape, and even style of calligraphy employed was dictated, if not by actual imperial rescript, then in concert with pressures of the cultural ethos. No more than a quick glance at earlier funerary inscriptions will suffice to prove the truth of this statement, and by consulting a few standard histories of earlier dynasties the picture will be virtually complete.

Within a traditional framework, however, Ch'üan wrote epitaphs which were strikingly different, strikingly alive. It is through these works that the so-called Ming loyalists can be approached; not only the ins and outs of their battles, but the intricacies of personal relationships, the hardships endured during the war years, but the subject's participation in these events, is also considered.
For the hiatus between Ming and Ch'ing, the works of Ch'üan Tsu-wang offer invaluable insight to the lives of these loyalists. Mid-nineteenth and twentieth century historians dealing with this period have found his material of inestimable value.¹ In order to appreciate the full significance of Ch'üan's work we must consider briefly the historical development of the epigraphs.

Chinese sources contain many terms for sepulchral inscriptions intended to preserve the memory of an individual. For our discussion let us consider them in three different categories: inscriptions on "grave stones" (mu-p'ai); those of eulogistic biographies buried in the tomb, known as "sepulchral biographies with eulogy (mu-chih-ming); and large sepulchral tablets standing upright near the actual grave, known as the "stele on the road of the spirit" (shen-tao pei).²

Grave stones are intended simply as markers, identifying who is buried there, and they have short terse inscriptions, telling nothing about the deceased other than his name, the birthplace or home of his parents or ancestors, and possibly the date when the tomb was erected. If the deceased held an official position or received a posthumous honor from the emperor, these titles may also appear. Information appearing on the grave stone is always in the mu chih-ming and on the shen-tao pei if these were used.³

As to the mu-chih-ming, by the Sung dynasty (960-1279) the sources are filled with information regarding eulogistic biographies, "There shall be used, besides a stone bearing a record of the life
of the deceased, one stone on which the deed [grave deed] is engraved...."4 We note that the "stone bearing a record of the life of the deceased" or chih-shih is used as source material for the standard histories of both Sung and Ming, the contents and the appropriate form for these stone biographies is clearly set forth.

Two biographical stones shall be used for all mandarins regardless of rank. The one, forming the cover, shall be inscribed with the words: 'Grave of the mandarin So-and-so'; the other, forming the bottom, shall bear the family name, the name and native place of the deceased; his ancestors up to the third generation; the year of his birth; the month and day of his death and burial; his sons and grandsons; the location of his grave. In the case of a married woman, the stone shall bear the title conferred upon her in accordance with the rank of her husband, sons, and grandsons. The two faces of the stones shall be placed against each other, fastened together with bindings of iron, and buried in the grave.6

This decree, promulgated in 1372 is quite similar in content to the formula set forth by Chu Hsi in his Chia-li (Family Rituals).7 Up to this point, edicts concerning interment ceremonies and rituals had been directed toward high officials and the gentry.8 This decree, however, applies the same rules to the commoners as were applicable to the gentry. The Ming-shih states, "biographical stones in two slabs, made in accordance with the rules in force for mandarins" were to be used.9

Not surprisingly, in the Ta-Ch'ing t'ung li (Collected Rules of Ceremony of the Ch'ing Dynasty), we find almost identical rescripts regarding the use of these biographical stones. The Ch'ing interpretation varies only slightly from the rescripts found in the standard histories of the Sung or Ming regarding what information was

-164-
considered suitable. From these few examples it is seen how the awesome weight of tradition might stifle attempts to add any meat to the rather spare bones which constituted the biographical section of the epitaphs.

In all the sources we have mentioned thus far, however, in the sections dealing with ceremonial regulations, the character indicating eulogy (ming) is never followed by the character for biography or record (chih). In the Ta Ch'ing t'ung li (expanded edition completed in 1824) those regulations applicable to one class were used as a basis for determining guidelines for another; for the gentry "a sepulchral biography shall be carved, adhering to the funeral regulations of mandarins." When the seventh son of Emperor Wen of the Liu-Sung dynasty died in A.D. 458 the standard history of that period tells us "the Emperor, very much stricken with grief, personally made a sepulchral biography with eulogy for him." We have already noted that Chu Hsi in his Chia-li set forth what he believed to be the required contents of a grave biography. No mention was made of a eulogy inscription. According to Yao Nai (1730-1815) in a preface to his Ku-wen-tz'u-lei-tswan (Anthology of Ancient Literature), since the time of Ou-yang Hsiu (1007-1072) the strict interpretations of the style and content of a biography and an inscription have "all lost their original significance." In this, we may understand him as saying that the biographical section or (chih) began to contain information which went beyond the intended scope as set forth by
earlier tradition and imperial rescripts mentioned previously. This had a very limiting effect and allowed for little information beyond mere birth, death, offspring, offices held, and other such details. It was only in the eulogy attached at the end of the biography that the author was permitted to praise the deceased in glowing terms.\textsuperscript{14}

The early sixth century work \textit{Wen-hsin tiao-lung} (Kernels of Literary Style) tells us that properly written eulogies are like bringing the pages of history to life, "biographies with accolades" allowing us to first perceive the glory of the deceased and then to feel commiseration.\textsuperscript{15} The ultimate goal being to afford the reader an opportunity to have "for all intents and purposes come face to face with the deceased.\textsuperscript{16} The author, Liu Hsieh (465-522), also implies that the better we personally know our subject the more likely will our material display these qualities.

In the \textit{Wen t'i ming p'ien} (A Critique of Literary Styles) of Chao Meng-fu (1254-1322) a section entitled "Sepulchral Biographies With Inscriptions" sets forth the original meaning ascribed to \textit{chih} and \textit{ming}. He then goes into exhaustive discussion of the different possibilities of form and content for these epitaphs; whether they include an inscription or not, or whether the inscription stands alone without a biography.\textsuperscript{17} Of special interest to us, though, is that he continues by delineating the various styles of eulogy: some are a mixture of prose and poetry; some all in rhyme; some utilizing the particle \textit{hsi} (typically associated with the \textit{fu} form of prose-poetry), as well as different rhyme patterns employed. However, when
"the recording of affairs began to appear within the inscription (as opposed to the biography) [this] was indeed a newly derived style."18

With the shen-tao pei, an immediate difference, I suspect in its very name, is that the stele is above ground while the stone biographies were buried in the coffin pit or inside the coffin itself.19 Early sources indicate the presence and use of such stele,20 but it was not until more recent times that the three characters shen, tao and pei appeared together in sequence.21

From ancient times stele have been raised in memory of the deceased.22 By the time of Ch'uan Tsu-wang imperial rescripts governed almost every aspect of these stele. In addition to the dimensions, ornamentation, and materials which may be used in construction, the regulations also prescribed content. In the Ta-Ch'ing t'ung li rules applicable to both officials and gentry were provided.

The carved stele at the entrance of the tomb shall bear this inscription: 'Tomb of Mr. So-and-so, invested with such-and-such an office.' If for a woman, the inscription shall read: 'Mrs. So-and-so, on whom such-and-such a title of honor has been conferred.' If the husband and wife are to be buried in the same grave, the two inscriptions will be engraved on a common stele.23

The rescript continues with detailed instructions on the physical aspects of the stele for officials as well as for gentry, and closes with regulations pertinent to the gentry.

Grave of So-and-so, invested with such-and-such and office or if no office, grave of So-and-so, member of the gentry. And for the principal wife it will read: 'Mrs. So-and-so, upon whom such-and-such an honorary title has been bestowed, or if she
possessed no title, Mrs. So-and-so.24

The fact that during the last dynasty the privilege of raising a stele was restricted to officials and gentry is also made manifestly clear; for the commoners "there shall be a stone biography, but no stele."25

In the Ch'ing dynasty the bestowing of posthumous titles on nobleman of the first three ranks and on officials of the first degree was the preserve of the Imperial Chancery (if no title is to be conferred) and on the Hanlin Academy (if a title is to be conferred).26 So it is obvious that officially, as far as the reigning dynasties since the Han, the inscriptions on stone biographies, and on steles were prescribed in scrupulous detail. It is undeniable that these rules had their effect, but there is also no question that liberties were taken. Such poetic licence, however, seemed always to base itself on the rules of the reigning dynasty.

In Liu Hsieh's Wen-hsin tiao-lung the epitaphs of Ts'ai Yung of later Han are regarded as the ideal standard.27 They had the enduring qualities of honesty and uprightness, in that they contained the "necessary and appropriate" facts stated in "clear yet elegant" fashion, in order to produce a piece of work which was not only offered to the memory of the deceased but also dedicated to the living; a combination of "biography and eulogy" allowing us to know "initially the glory of the deceased and then to feel commiseration for him."28 The eulogy plays an important and integral role in attaining these goals, leading us to sympathizing with the
subject.29 As we have noted earlier, however, the styles of these epitaphs are elusive, and for every rule we are sure to find exceptions.30

Ch'ang Hsiueh-ch'eng (1738-1801) found the preponderance of tradition against him when he wrote an epitaph with an uncommonly long eulogy, of much greater length than the biographical section. Such a stir did this arouse that Chang wrote an essay entitled "ku-wen shih-pi" (Accepted Form in Classical Prose) attempting to justify his position. Invoking the age-old concept of the might of historical precedent Chang Hsiueh-ch'eng justified his style with examples of works by scholars from T'ang and Ming dynasties.31

Ch'lian Tsu-wang did not write essays of this type - it was not his nature. We may seek and understand his historical viewpoint through his epitaphs, biographies, and short treatises. If he looked to the distinguished scholars of the past for guidance in style, he has not passed this information on to us. That he was a widely read and erudite scholar is known through his works, but he does not attribute any of his ideas or concepts on literature or history to any specific school of thought.32

In Ch'üan's Chi-ch'i t'ing chi there are numerous examples of funereal writing. These were popular during his period, and they provided the scholar with an opportunity to earn some well needed cash.33 Most prominent among these pieces, both in length and in number, are the shen-tao pei and the mu-chih; the former was also known as mu-piao (grave notice) and the mu-chih had already become...
highly stylized in content and form.

Traditional to both forms is the inclusion of a ming at the end of the biographical section. This is usually eulogistic and in Ch'üan's works it is always very much shorter than the biography it followed. In all pieces, however, it is panegyric and it constituted a form of recapitulation which is not substantial enough to stand independently from the biography, nor even form a cameo description of the deceased. In his ming Ch'üan does not offer any new information about the subject.34

Ch'üan wrote epitaphs for individuals whom he considered of true historical significance, and he also wrote for those who may not have changed the course of history but whose life offered an opportunity to present an exemplary biography. In the former category, dealing with a man of historical importance, we have Ch'üan's longest epitaph (approximately 6,500 characters) dedicated to Huang Tsung-hsi.35 In comparison with such a long epitaph the short biographies of individuals found in the Ming-shih (usually between 800 or 1,000 characters in length) seem too superficial to be worthy of that comparison. At the same time, others of Ch'üan's epitaphs are so long they are in fact meaningful biographies: those for example of Lu Shih-i (1611-1672), Ch'ien Su-yüeh (1607-1648), Chang Huang-yen (1620-1664) and Chang K'en-t'ang (1648-1695).36 Although he is not considered in an independent essay, Cheng Ch'eng-kung (1624-1662) frequently appears in epitaphs and biographies.37

Those personalities which Ch'üan felt obliged to record, either
through some personal obligation incurred during his life, or because the subject was of such truly unique character that he felt his biography should be preserved for posterity are all short epitaphs, averaging approximately 600 to 800 characters. Not all these minatures concerned obscure persons, though some were a village-hampden, that with dauntless breast defended his land.

In these small cameos, often a flaw or a foible of the subject is found; the former bringing destruction, the latter lending to the subject a special quality. For these soliloquies Ch'üan has been differently criticized, as "cold-hearted," and as a "forerunner of Ranke." Some part of Ch'üan's fairness and fidelity to truth is shown in these epitaphs, with short character sketches which nevertheless give perspective to the subject. Amongst all the official data and verifiable happenings, we can find an item or two devoted to character development. Sometimes, such an item is simply an appendage to the flow of the composition, but other times it forms such an integral part that causation is not just alluded to obliquely but is firmly thrust before our eyes.

The Contemporary Scene

Ch'üan was not long-lived. He did, however, write a few epitaphs for friends of his generation. His thirty year friendship with Li E offers an example of how Ch'üan would compose an epitaph for a companion of such long standing. Ch'üan had other friends who predeceased him and so became subjects of one of his epitaphs. He
used the same techniques of character description in these pieces as he did with the epitaphs of Ming loyalists. However, the epitaphs written for his peers could contain excerpts of actual conversation between Ch'üan and the subject, and situations in the cameo portraits could also include Ch'üan himself.

Three men who have been considered friends of Ch'üan have epitaphs in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi: Pao Hsin-p'u (d. aged 59), Kung Chien, and Chou Ching (d. aged 73). They were all older than Ch'üan.

In 1748, when Ch'üan was forty-four years old, he wrote Pao's epitaph. Pao wrote Ch'üan saying he was sick and about to die. "Only you, Ch'üan," said Pao, "will feel commiseration and remember me in the loneliness after death." Ch'üan respected him as an honest official and as a poet. He noted that at twenty Pao was already magistrate of Ch'ang-hsing district in Chekiang, but his love of composing poetry evidently hindered his ability to carry out the requirements of his office properly: "In his entire life not one day went by without composing poetry." Other magistrates reported Pao, an investigation followed, but no action was ever taken. Ch'üan did not criticise Pao, but remembered that he was addicted to writing poetry. In this epitaph Ch'üan pointed out the subject's indiscretion, relating the effect it had on his life. He made no judgement himself but gave the following cameo portrait of the subject. Pao befriended a poor local student who excelled in both prose and poetry. He even looked after the student's family when he was wrongly convicted of a crime and sent to the capital. When his
death was reported Pao took it upon himself to see to it that the man's works were published. Pao was an honorable man. He died the day after Ch'üan received the books he had sent to him. This epitaph does not have, nor could it be expected to have, the depth of feeling exhibited in the epitaph to Li E. The relationship was different.

Chou Ching and Ch'üan were distantly related by marriage. According to Ch'üan it was owing to this bond that "Chou Ching and I had a special mutual affection." In fewer than 500 characters, Ch'üan described the kind of person he was, rather than a strict chronological account of events in his life. Chou, a poet whose sobriquet, Peaceful Disciple, accurately described his personality enjoyed writing poetry and being respectable: he helped raise destitute children to adulthood and find them spouses. Ch'üan told the story that when Chou Ching was away travelling, his younger brother took the opportunity to sell Chou's property. When Chou returned said Ch'üan, "he had to rent accommodations, but he never brought the subject up."

Both Kung Chien and Chou Ching knew Hang Shih-chün. Kung was a successful scholar as well as a government official. Ch'üan praised him as a conscientious official, who went out during a flood to inspect the condition of the people. This epitaph is a more impersonal narrative and does not contain any cameo portraits. Ch'üan explained that one of Kung's descendants had sought Ch'üan out to write a short piece for his deceased relative. The basic information for the epitaph came from this person, as well as from
Kung's records of conduct (hsing-shih) written by Kung's nephew.

During the period 1722-23 Ch'üan had occasion to stay at Hangchou. 48 He stayed not far from where Kung Chien lived. Ch'üan said, "Everytime he talked about the classics and someone disagreed with him he would argue in a loud voice until the neighbor's children had been awakened." If they were in agreement, however, there was also great excitement, money would be found and for entertainment they would "search for fish and wine." 49 These few lines add to our overall understanding of Kung Chien's personality.

In his brief epitaph to the grandson of Shih Jun-chang (1619-1683), Shih Nien-tseng, Ch'üan relates all that is necessary to establish Shih's scholastic and personal integrity, but in the center of such seriousness are a few words which expose the relationship and humour of the two men. We first read, "Once while studying late into the evening a breeze flicked his lamp, burning his long beard and singed his left cheek," and Ch'üan then seals the story with, "On the following day I happened to pass his place, and when we met each other we broke into laughter." 50 The intimacy of shared humor not only lifts the piece beyond the confines of a traditional epitaph, but also illuminates the life of Shih Nien-tseng.

In quite a different vein, and with a stunning effect on an already sombre piece, is the epitaph of Tung Hsiao-shan (1623-1703) wherein the dedication of the early loyalists is portrayed. Bringing this piece to its climax Ch'üan writes,

"...Lu Yu-ting fled with the severed head of the Master Wang, the leader of the troops. He concealed it in a secret..."
room and each year he would lament over it.51

The very depth of conviction of these people is brought to bear on the reader then with horrifying clarity.

Those epitaphs where some degree of causation is attempted tend to be longer and allow the reader greater knowledge of the subject's character, making his actions or lack of them more meaningful. A friend of Ch'üan's, a certain Wang Li-fu, married the elder daughter of a mutual friend Yao I-t'ien. Wang and Yao were the same age and their literary talents were also of equal calibre, so it proved difficult for them to earn a living. Wang Li-fu's wife excelled at history. Even at this stage of the narrative one could catch the drift of Ch'üan's story. This does not, however, satisfy Ch'üan who bludgeons us saying, "... so when Wang Li-fu was in the village he had his competition, and at home he was in fear of pressure from his wife."52 The characters having all been paraded across the stage Ch'üan tells us, "A great shortcoming of (Wang Li-fu) was his desire for fame, but he was not careful in his choice of friends."53 The flaws are introduced and we are not surprised to learn that his indiscretions cost him five years in prison in Peking (naturally, Ch'üan tells us, Wang Li-fu was too poor to pay the necessary bribes to have the case dropped), and, owing to the destitution of his family, his wife died while waiting for his return. If the object of the epitaph was to elicit compassion, then it was necessary to introduce these tragic flaws. Read out of context they might seem a cruel epilogue to a friendship, but they should rather be viewed as a
string of beads: independent occurrences in the subject's life, but inalienable pieces of the life of Wang Li-fu.

We begin to see how Ch'üan's epitaphs and his later biographies, do not fit within the accepted framework established by the Chinese cultural milieu which required that, "The ultimate purpose of biography was to instruct officials in orthodoxy, not to present rounded portraits of fallible human beings."54 Although Ch'üan was no Lytton Strachey, we feel there are moments he could be had he so desired. He described the position of an individual as being similar to the mid-point of an hourglass, that is, "at the apex of a pyramid whose base broadens downward through descendants and whose base broadens upwards through ancestors....", and that the individual's effect on the forces of time and space are the concern of the biographer.55

The well-known account of Huang Tsung-hsi (1610-1695) revenging his father's incarceration and death at the hands of the powerful eunuch Wei Chung-hsien is a case in point. Since the death of Huang, says Ch'üan, "It has been more than forty years and there is no grave monument" and he proceeds to tell how the incompleteness of the accounts of conduct (hsing-lûeh), written by one of Huang Tsung-hsi's sons, and the very nature of the subject itself fraught with taboos, had generally inhibited scholars from writing this account.56

Ch'üan used a two-pronged approach in this epitaph; by relating Huang Tsung-hsi's reaction to his father's death we are apprised of one facet of his personality and by reviewing his philosophical and
scholastic positions we view him from yet another angle. The two are melded together giving us far more than the outline biographies found in the standard histories. As a result, in addition to the expected information of date, death, and number of sons, we are told that after his father's death Huang would often find himself weeping while reading late into the evening. These tears of grief he would keep from his mother. "When Emperor Ssu-tsung (1628-1644) ascended the throne the then nineteen year old Huang Tsung-hsI went to the capital with a long awl up his sleeve to seek revenge..."\[57\] [In early nineteenth century biographies of Huang this incident is always retold.] Huang went to Peking with a memorial for the emperor, entreating him to take action against the Wei clique. Wei himself, unbeknown to Huang, had already committed suicide before his arrival at the capital and the emperor had already granted burial ceremonies and bestowed posthumous honors on those who had died owing to the injustices of Wei and his group, Huang Tsung-hsI, however, remained in Peking. He successfully sought and obtained the conviction of other members of the Wei clique.

The courtroom scenes climax the first phase of Ch'üan's epitaph to Huang. Although emotional enough to give the subject a full red blooded portrait - which we must accept as Ch'üan's goal - it is still the traditional pithy terse style of Ch'üan Tsu-wang.

The Ministry of Justice was instructed by the emperor to proceed with all speed in the investigation. In the fifth month Hsü Hsien-tung and Tsui Ying-yüan were brought before the court. Huang Tsung-hsI, using the awl secreted inside his sleeve, stabbed Hsü Hsien-tung until his body was enveloped with blood.\[58\]
Hsu Hsien-tung then proclaimed that since he was the nephew of the queen he had special privileges and should not be prosecuted in this court. Whereupon, Ch'üan tells us, Huang retorted, "...Hsu Hsien-tung and Wei Chung-hsien have brought disaster on virtuous people. Those people met their death by his hands, and he should be treated the same as everyone else involved in this case..." Huang is given as citing precedent, saying, "even a relative of the king,... could not avoid prosecution, how much more must this apply to a distant relative of the queen." Then we are told that "Huang Tsung-hsi fell upon [Tsui] Ying-yüan raining blows upon his chest and pulling his beard."

In the following month, Ch'üan tells us, a certain Li Shih attempted to secure Huang's silence at the next court session for the sum of three thousand tael. Huang, as we would expect, not only rebuffed the bribe attempt but memorialized the throne on the matter. On the day of the hearing "he again repeated this [accusation] at the trial, and at the same time used an awl to stab Li Shih." We need not detail the complexities of the trial, for the main thrust of the story is to expose Huang's personality. It may be revealing, however, to reflect for a moment that the so-called model epitaphs often collected for the purpose of emulation never infuse their subjects with such full-blooded human traits. To be sure there are numerous examples of the laudatory type which have historical significance, and of the relatively straightforward type which are a development and refinement of the early stone biographies.
discussed earlier. Ch'üan, however, refrains from excessive praise, allowing his matter-of-fact approach to arouse in us a more solid sense of respect than simple praise could ever accomplish. Ch'üan was a pioneer, not in holding that there is a relationship between the man's character and the life he led, but in the setting of it to a man's epitaph - so that whatever aspect of character is of influence upon action is worthy of inclusion in his epitaph.

All these epitaphs of course, are written about the dead, but as we have seen they are not restricted to those who have recently died or who have recently been interred. Ch'üan was most selective when it came to the question of whom he would write about. He did not take the task lightly and would, as he said, "scour the unofficial histories separating truth from fiction", before moving his brush.

What considerations did Ch'üan take into account before he would write someone's epitaph? Some personalities are surely considered because of their historical significance (Huang Tsung-hsi, for example), but with Chang Ming-chen (d. 1656) we may note a number of reasons why Ch'üan chose to write his epitaph. In the very opening lines of this grave record we are told:

My maternal aunt née Chang was the daughter of Chang Huang-yen... In 1720 my aunt went to view her burial plot. At that time I was sixteen sui and I followed along, asking about the events of the past. My aunt told me: 'My father and the Marquis (Chang Ming-chen) used to be colleagues. Every time his ambitions are mentioned there are many who slander and humiliate him.'

Ch'üan goes on to say that twenty years later he was able to present
Chang Ming-chen's case. Not only did he believe he was fulfilling the wish of his aunt but, more importantly for us today, he fervently believed he was correcting a biased account.

Chang Ming-chen was, as were many of Ch'üan's subjects, a so-called Ming loyalist. So the question of his deeds or misdeeds was certainly controversial at the time Ch'üan was studying his contribution to the Ming cause. Ch'üan tells us that he "started investigating the various versions found in different unofficial histories in order to reach a conclusion, and to allow later scholars, who investigate the history of the fall of Chusan, access to balanced accounts."

If one believes that we may know a man from his writings, then we may recognize that Ch'üan was no obsequious bureaucrat, oiling his way up the ladder of success. He wrote about controversial people, in a time when the throne was virtually paranoid about any writing which even hinted of possible sedition. Ch'üan defended the cause of truth as he knew it, and he did not subscribe to flowery attempts at cover-ups, "regarding the charges that Chang Ming-chen was power hungry, assassinated irresponsibly to achieve power... I do not need for his sake to conceal them..." Ch'üan is laying it on the line.

Chang was not perfect, but in Ch'üan's opinion the motives behind his actions had not been given due consideration. Between Chang Ming-chen and a certain general by the name of Huang Ping-ch'ing there had been a long standing quarrel. Huang controlled Chusan, and when the Ming forces under the Prince of Lu arrived at Chusan with Chang, Huang...
would neither receive nor welcome them. Then, Chang had Huang killed, and so the Ming forces obtained a refuge. By this means, the life of the Ming cause was extended for another two years, and in this respect Ch'üan argues that Chang acted properly. But when it comes to killing one of Huang's generals, a certain Wang Ch'ao-hsien, then Ch'üan takes exception, "I have often stated that Chang's elimination of Huang Ping-ch'ing was proper but the indiscriminate liquidation of Wang Ch'ao-hsien was a mistake. This cannot be covered up."77

Chang's family had moved to the relative safety of Chusan, but soon after the assassination of their favorite general, Wang Ch'ao-hsien, Huang's former troops defected to the Manchus, and in 1658 Chusan fell to the Ch'ing.78 According to Ch'üan, Chang's family locked themselves in their compound and set it aflame, dying by self-immolation.79 Ch'üan is obviously upset by the manner in which this event has been recorded in other accounts:

Presently, those writing about the events at Chusan distort the facts regarding Huang Ping-ch'ing, and couch in abstruse terms the account of Chang Ming-chen. To offer sacrifices to Huang Ping-ch'ing as the leader of those men who died in the disaster of 1658, while at the same time not mentioning the names of Chang Ming-chen's family members; how could such a travesty of justice come about? 780

Again Chang was evidently criticised for his military tactics, which, according to Ch'üan, relied upon the use of topography to military advantage. However, Ch'üan argued that, his utilization of geographical position in combat is the will of heaven....81

Interestingly enough, Ch'üan does not praise Chang for his resourceful
military tactics but rather credits his success to the "will of heaven." This is a rare approach for Ch'üan.

Additionally, Ch'üan defends Chang somewhat feebly on two counts. "Chang's entire family was in the city, that he would flee with the prince is not reasonable. As to the death of Shen (an officer under Chang Ming-chen who lost his life at sea) how can this be attributed to Chang Ming-chen?"82 Here Ch'üan reveals what is to be the nexus not only of this account but of many of his other essays, "Generally speaking, Chang's repeated losses and recoveries, his death in the service of his liege, and his unreserved loyalty are unimpeachable...."83

Ch'üan, however, is no misty-eyed romantic. The manifestations of loyalty may be emotional, but the motives are based in solid reality:

Those who had more intimate official connections with the Ming, often-times strengthened through marriage bonds, felt the dynastic collapse to a greater extent, and by virtue of this greater commitment reacted with stronger conviction to its overthrow, committing suicide, or dying in battle.84

So loyalty to a cause, or to an individual, was the key characteristic of an overwhelming number of Ch'üan's subjects. Yet, loyalties had their priorities; loyalty to the legitimate dynasty, loyalty to the family, loyalty to friends and, most importantly, loyalty to one's self.
Those Loyal Men

Ch'üan held that Sun Chi-feng (1585-1675), Huang Tsung-hsî (1610-1695) and Li Yung (1627-1705) were the three most famous Neo-Confucian scholars at the beginning of the Ch'ing.85 All of these men are known for their loyalty to the Ming, vigorously refusing official positions within the Ch'ing and even its invitations to participate in special examinations.86

Both Sun Chi-feng and Huang Tsung-hsî participated in military campaigns against the Ch'ing.87 Even though Li Yung never raised or directed arms against the Manchus, his courageous and defiant attitude attracted Ch'üan's attention when a friend invited him to write the epitaph.

Ch'üan recounts Li's fortitude as a child.88 Steeling to the realities of life by the early loss of his parents, his loyalty to their memory, as well as to his own principles, forms the backbone of this epitaph. After Li's father died in battle, his mother intended to commit suicide but Ch'üan tells us that Li Yung persuaded her not to, for "Mother, to die for father is fitting and proper, but then I will also die for you."89 Many years later, after his mother's death, he set off on foot to recover his father's remains, lost on the battlefield almost thirty years ago. The search, though unsuccessful, so moved the magistrate and local gentry that they erected a memorial at the battlefield where Li's father was killed.90
Ch'üan thus firmly establishes Li Yung as a filial son. Being filial is one of Ch'üan's golden rules, "Ah alas, filiality, the basic essence of the universe, its vibrating strength never fades," is done by means of third person narrative, for Ch'üan does not at this point insert his own interpretation.

Then Ch'üan directs himself to establishing Li Yung's academic credentials. We are told that as they were poor "the family had no books, so they had to borrow from other people." We are also told that Li Yung was an assiduous reader, and his knowledge and wisdom was above the average. Ch'üan discusses Li Yung's philosophy in general terms vis-à-vis the Sung schools. Li believed in man as the center of the universe and that order and disorder emanate from the degree of correctness of men's minds. In essence "meditation and concentration on the mind" are the initial requirements, and through meditation we may recognize errors and be able to correct them. Li Yung held practical views when it came to the differences between Neo-Confucian schools of thought. He was a synthesizer, who believed in separating what he considered to be the wheat from the chaff, regardless of school origin. In these ways he was very much like Ch'üan himself.

As Li Yung's fame spread, his decision to stay out of government remained firm. Here Ch'üan tells a story which helps to crystallize the image of Li Yung the loyalist. Pressed by officials to take posts which he didn't want, Li would feign sickness to escape, and at one time he did not accept food or water for six days. When
the official entreating him to consent appeared once more "Li picked up a knife and stabbed himself." The officials, we are told, were stunned and allowed him time to recover. Li Yung is reported to have said "that any future attempts will also meet with failure." His very fame became a form of punishment.

Ch'Uan has established him as a person filial and upright and as a scholar widely read and eclectic. Closing his epitaph he summarizes these characteristics "this can be said to [be the mark of] great filial piety." It is apparent the adjective "great" is important to Ch'Uan; a scholar of integrity whose filial loyalty and allegiance to the defunct dynasty were unswerving.

In addition to these well-known scholar-loyalists there were many less imposing personalities who also attempted to preserve the Ming. The bulk of this type of epitaph by Ch'Uan is located in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-pl'ien. All these pieces are much shorter than the longer epitaphs of Yao Ch'i-sheng (1624-1684), Huang Tsung-hsi, or Ch'ien Su-yüeh (1607-1648), found in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi. They are also of a different nature, essentially recording the man's contribution in the battlefield, and seldom expanding the account beyond these considerations. Ch'Uan did not get involved again in a dissertation on Neo-Confucianism or discourse on the filial piety of the deceased.

One of the more lengthy epitaphs in the wai-p'ien was written for Wang I (1616-1651) a tenacious general of the Ming cause. Ch'Uan
succinctly develops his background, and in a few lines we learn he was orphaned at five, was not attentive to managing house affairs, but was fond of discussing things military. The events leading to the fall of Chusan are developed along with Wang I's reliability. However, after Wang I's capture by the Ch'ing troops Ch'üan treats us to an account of the general's execution in heroic terms.

On the fourteenth day the execution was carried out. The soldiers were irate at Wang's many years of obstinate resistance. They formed up and released their arrows, hitting him in the shoulder, in the jaw and in the side. But Wang I did not even flinch. Like a veritable tree, his breast penetrated three times and still he didn't succumb. So they axed off his head and then he fell. Two of Wang's supporters, however, would not kneel and when forced to kneel they did so facing Wang. They died by his side.100

Such stirring accounts, exuding as they do not only loyalty to an individual but to an overall greater cause, typify those epitaphs dedicated to military heroes of the Southern Ming. One feels as if Ch'üan is pursuing a mission, a battle against time and ignorance. "Alas," said Ch'üan, "such men gave their lives for their country, but the events are still not clear and this leads people to speculation. How long before the truth is to be achieved? Isn't this truly deplorable?"101

This form of loyalty to death is constantly brought before our eyes, and when someone dies during a fast, or from being incarcerated, Ch'üan considers the reasons involved before he makes his judgement. If it were for such principles noted above the man would surely merit a favorable epitaph, but at times Ch'üan is more specific, "To
starve to death is a small matter, to be remiss in loyalty is a large matter." He could not make his feelings any more clear.

In all his essays on loyalists, Ch'üan sets forward no single formula which may be used by the reader as a benchmark for loyalty. Each case is decided independently. In stark contrast, however, is his position regarding the necessity of the subject to actually sacrifice his life in order to be deemed a true loyalist. Ch'üan takes strong exception to the thesis promoted by Mao Ch'i-ling (1623-1716), in his essay discussing the problem of whether men must die in order to be loyalists. Ch'üan not only denounces Mao's position as absurd, but he goes one step further and decries Mao's actions in later life as indicative of a weak character. Mao wished to categorize loyalists; those who sacrificed their lives were chung-ch'eng (loyal patriots) and those who lived to talk about it were i-shih (patriots). Such "persistence in erroneous extremes" says Ch'üan, leaves one truly dumbfounded. To add credibility to Ch'üan's argument, Mao is shown to have written his article in an attempt to cover up his own previous statements. He was very loyal and respectful to his teacher when he was alive, says Ch'üan, but after his death Mao repudiated a preface he had written for this teacher. Citing the possible precedent of "The Case of the Condemned Writing of Tai Ming-shih" Mao requested his teacher's son to suppress his own father's writings, and moreover wrote an article denouncing his books.

Ch'üan derides Mao for such despicable behavior, saying to the
son,

"This can really happen! In fear of persecution it is easy for him to repudiate his teacher and sell his friends, and surely when danger approaches it would not be difficult for him to repudiate his lords and sell his country!" 106

Although Mao was already ninety when this occurred, Ch'üan offered no leniency. He had no time for anyone who was not loyal to himself and to his teacher, and in the case of Mao Ch'i-ling, Ch'üan by extrapolation abused him as a traitor. 107

Some epitaphs were written for the sole purpose of filling gaps left because of taboos in an earlier period. So in addition to amending accounts biased by prejudice, Ch'üan also undertook the writing of epitaphs for those men whose achievements were not fully disclosed owing to what Ch'üan refers to as "taboos." Recalling how much he had enjoyed reading Huang Tsung-hsi's epitaph to a certain Lu Chou-ming, he relates how some great achievements have not been completely recorded, and that while writers of recent times have used the account written by Huang Tsung-hsi as their main source, "they failed to realize the extent of the taboos of the time." 108 Such restrictions, Ch'üan asserts, have decreased in recent times.

In yet another epitaph he discloses that "because of the taboos of the time no one dared to write" but says the "magnanimity of the [present] emperor" has been the catalyst in opening opportunities to write about these people. As a consequence, some material has come to light, but "local writing is still filled with absurdities." 109

The devastating effect of these taboos or restrictions, and of
later historians' unthinking acceptance of material written during that period, these are what Ch'üan has set himself to correct. He is reasonably circumspect about the nature of these taboos, and refers merely of their negative impact, "Therefore in the last 100 years literature has declined as a result of taboos, to the point that even the particulars of descendants of the loyalists] are no longer clear."110

Ch'üan was up against a few of the inescapable problems of putting oral sources into writing, making permanent, as it were, accounts which had not yet been recorded and which could by their nature change from time to time. Ch'üan knew that each narrator or informant had his flaws, and that the threat of literary persecutions was always a factor in the story being related.111

The Six "Crazy" Men

The spirit of loyalism in Ch'üan's Collected Works was epitomised in those epitaphs and biographies dedicated to the liu k'uang-sheng (The Six "Crazy" Men) and the wu-chüen-tzu (The Five Gentlemen).

The Ming dynasty had ceased to exist as a viable government. The Ch'ing troops were on the verge of invading Chekiang, and the situation was extremely bleak. Even at the twelfth hour, however, in 1645 when the Ch'ing soldiers moved south into Chekiang, there were still pockets of resistance led by local loyalists. One was Tung
Chih-ning (d.1648) who rallied a group of five other like-minded men to repel the Ch'ing invaders. These five men, Chang Meng-hsi, Mao Chú-k'uei, Wang Chia-ch'in, Lu Yu-ting, and Hua Hsia together with Tung Chih-ning, appealed to village elders for their support. No one would receive them and as a result of their courage against all odds they became known as the liu k'uang-sheng.112

The name liu k'uang-sheng, although popularized by Ch'üan, was first used by Tung Shou-lun (d. 1664) in his "Liu lieh-shih lun" (A Discourse on the Six Patriots). Tung Shou-lun's poems, with an introductory biography, are included in Ch'üan's Hsü Yung-shang chi-chiu-shih.113 Tung Shou-lun did not direct his efforts, however, at recording the deeds of the six men, but rather was aiming at exposing Hsieh San-pin (chin-shih 1625) as an evil person, who would sell his friends and his country.

In fact, it was Hsieh San-pin who was responsible for the destruction of the liu k'uang-sheng and the wu chün-tzu. Ch'üan found no redeeming qualities about Hsieh San-pin. He was thoroughly despicable. In thirty-two pieces of prose and poetry in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-p'ien, and the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, Shih-chi there was not a single positive word to be found about Hsieh San-pin. Ch'üan crowned Hsieh with twelve different abusive sobriquets which he used at random throughout his Collected Works.114 Ch'üan was not alone in this hatred. His ancestors also deeply regretted that Hsieh San-pin had not been executed for treason.115 Ch'üan maintained this feeling, and made Hsieh San-pin
the villain of Chekiang. Hsieh San-pin used spies and money to achieve his ends, and he was responsible for the deaths of many loyalists.

The liu k'uang-sheng were a group of men with one common goal, the preservation of the Ming dynasty. Only one of the six had an official career before joining the group. Lu Yu-ting (d. 1652) had not only been an official, but came from a well-connected monied family. He was the only one with such a background. Ch'üan wrote that Lu Yu-ting was opposed to Ma Shih-ying's (1591-1646) power at the court of the Prince of Fu (Chu Yu-sung, d. 1646), and he returned home when he failed to have Ma Shih-ying removed from office. Even though he was not an official at the court he still continued to support the Ming cause, to the ruin of his own family and fortune.

As leader of the group, Tung Chih-ning continuously tried to maintain Lu chien-kuo (Prince of Lu) suzerainty over the southern realm. He was a super-patriot even when no one supported him, and he travelled around encouraging people to align themselves behind the Ming cause. He committed suicide in 1651 when Lu chien-kuo was forced to leave the mainland for Chusan.

Mao Chü-k'uei and Wang Chia-ch'in were educated men, both were known for their scholarship. Because of his training as a mu-fu Mao Chü-k'uei would handle the important memorials. Wang Chia-ch'in was noted for his commentaries on the Classics. The common bond was again loyalty to the Ming.

The sixth member, Hua Hsia, was also the leader of the...
patriots known as the wu chün-tzu, which was organized in 1648 to support the Ming cause. Wang Chia-ch'in and Hua Hsia were involved in both organizations. The three other members who comprised the wu chün-tzu were T'u Hsien-ch'en, and Yang Wen-ch'i, and Tung Te-ch'in. Hsieh San-pin intercepted their military messages and was thus able to round them up. All of the men except Wang Chia-ch'in were executed in Ch'Uan's hometown of Yin. Wang Chia-ch'in was executed at Hangchou.119

The term wu chün-tzu was also in use before Ch'Uan used it in his works.120 It was Ch'Uan, however, who caused the names of these two groups to become synonymous with Ming loyalism. There are twenty-four articles in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and the wai-p'i'en alone which mention the liu k'uang-sheng and the wu chün-tzu affair.121 There are many references to these groups in Ch'Uan's Hsü Yung-shang ch'i-chiu shih. There is not, however, a great deal of information about what these two groups did, nor about their individual lives. This lack of information is concealed through repetition, for Ch'Uan would tell the same story many times. The name at the head of the epitaph might change, but the general narrative overlaps with the epitaphs of other loyalists. Ch'Uan's work, however, is still indispensable when examining events surrounding the liu k'uang-sheng and wu chün-tzu.123 Even Chang Hsüeh-ch'eng (1738-1801), although criticising Ch'Uan for telling the same story over and over again, concedes that this was due to the fact that his Collected Works were not a single narrative but rather a
collection of epitaphs and biographies. Moreover, Chang stated, "For all that I observe his shortcomings, it is indeed these very shortcomings that delight me the most." 124

Though they were sympathetic to the cause, none of Ch'üan's ancestors were directly involved in either of these two groups. Ch'üan records the men of his great-grandfather's generation as being close friends with Tung Chih-ning. 125 According to Ch'üan they tried to recover the works of some of the men involved in the loyalist groups. 126 In his poems Ch'üan also says that his ancestors supported the loyalists and could not understand why Hsieh San-pin was not executed. 127 It was to Ch'üan's consternation that these loyalists were not included in the Ming-shih. Although little is known of them, they do represent spontaneous loyalty that Ch'üan was fond of recording. Many of their wives were also loyalists to the end, and the Ming-shih contains a record of four gallant women of Ningpo. These were the wives of Yang Wen-ch'i, Hua Hsia, Chang Meng-hsi, and T'u Hsien-ch'ên.

**Those Loyal Women**

Another notable feature of Ch'üan's epitaphs is his consideration of loyal women. 128 Although Ch'üan has written only one epitaph solely in remembrance of such loyal ladies, we do find a considerable number of places in other epitaphs, where their actions are extolled, to know that Ch'üan respected these women's contribution. There are also epitaphs dedicated to women, for their exemplary character or for
being model mothers and wives. These women were contemporaries of Ch'üan as opposed to the former loyalist category, who lived during the Ming-Ch'ing transition period.

An example of the former is the epitaph written for both Hua Hsia and his wife. Ch'üan used the term loyalist to describe both husband and wife. Hua Hsia was one of a group of six loyalists made famous by Ch'üan as "The Six 'Crazy' Men." Ch'üan offered guarded praise of Hua Hsia, believing his deployment of troops was not founded on sound military strategy. Yet, he had unreserved admiration for Hua's wife, and he closed the epitaph saying,

"Regarding the awe-inspiring integrity of Dame Hua, the nation and families with illustrious ancestors bask in her radiance, and her brave actions just prior to death, proved her capability was above that of Hua Hsia."

In yet another piece, a gallant lady admired for her pluck received the epithet "The Great Madame Chin"; a short piece written for her temple epitaph. In one of his shortest epitaphs (524 characters) Ch'üan minces few words about this lady's courage of her convictions. Her husband having been lost in battle, the conquerors were taking their spoils and Madame Chin "refused to enter the Banner; and when they were about to remove her she reviled them in a coarse manner and would not submit." Ch'üan then revealed why the people of her village revered and built a temple in her honor:

The interrogator began to threaten her with decapitation and then with dismemberment. Madame Chin replied, 'If it's death than so be it. I can't take the insult of going into a Banner.' The interrogator was greatly agitated and actually ordered dismemberment. The executioners noticing her a comely woman, could not refrain from making improper remarks. Madame Chin reviled them even more. After the execution was completed they left her where she lay."
Such was this widow's courage, a beacon unto her people and fitting subject for Ch'üan.

Ch'üan evidently held that acts of loyalty are not limited to a certain class or stratum of society and was willing to offer praise where it was due, even to entertainers if they were so deserving. His inclusion of women in his writings does not stop with the above mentioned examples. Where appropriate he would also include their accomplishments within other records written for other personalities.

Though Ch'üan never entered government service after he left Peking and he devoted most of his energies to writing epitaphs of people less than wholeheartedly in support of the Ch'ing, this did not prevent him from recording exemplary contemporary officials. Of one of these, Chiang Chao-lung (chin-shih 1691), Ch'üan wrote he "is truly a benevolent official who is scrupulously honest. His Honor has only recently passed away, his sons and grandsons are destitute and cannot support themselves. Such are the consequences of being an honest official!"

Not all manifestations of loyalty, however, are viewed so favorably. The giving of one's life for a worthy cause will win praise in Ch'üan's accounts. However, suicide, the wilful self-destruction for no apparent reason other than an inability to cope with the changes inherent in time of dynastic transition, rewards the subject with unremitting scorn.

Chang Chih-yü (d. 1646) could not accept the changes required by the new dynasty and used wine to help him solve his inability to face
reality. Ch'üan tells us that "Chang closed his door and sat in the middle of the room, took wine from the head of the bed and drank in solitude. He became tipsy, placed wood beneath his bed, set it aflame and threw himself on his pyre." Leaving little to the imagination, Ch'üan adds, "the corpse turned crimson red."139

Ch'üan believed that to destroy oneself so meaninglessly was intolerable, a "travesty of righteousness." Chang's will to carry out such a feat can only be found in his desire to be a famous loyalist.140 Ch'üan could never accept Mao Ch'i-ling's simplistic formula for determining who is and who is not a loyalist. The man's actions prior to his death are of paramount importance. Of another local patriot, whose talents were sought by the emperor, and who did all in his power to avoid giving service to the new dynasty, but who was eventually captured and died in prison, Ch'üan explains that his great achievement was not that he starved himself, but rather the righteous conduct which led him to this act.141 The method of death is of less significance than the reason behind it.
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3. See The Religious System of China, pp. 1101-1107, for a detailed account indicating size, shape, placement of characters on the stone and their importance as well as geomantic considerations.

4. Sung-shih, chʻuan 124. See also The Religious System of China, Vol. 3, p. 1079. There are numerous accounts in the sources which demonstrate that eulogistic biographies were in use during the Chou dynasty and common by the Han. The Chou-Li, chʻuan 25 and 26 discuss the lei (a form of eulogy). Also Hou Han-shu (History of the Later Han), chʻuan 16, wherein a description of an imperial interment relates the genre and significance of the eulogy, referred to as ai-tzʻu.
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CHAPTER FIVE
BIOGRAPHIES

There are thirty biographies in Ch'üan's Collected Works. As with his epitaphs, the subjects of his biographies had predeceased him by some years. There was only one biography which dealt with a contemporary, the others were all about men who died well before Ch'üan was born.

The subjects of the biographies were entirely of Ch'üan's choosing, and he discussed all kinds of people from the eminent scholars Wan Ssu-t'ung (1636-1702) and Liu Hsien-t'ing (1648-1695) to obscure soldiers, hermits and loyalists. The provincialism evident throughout his epitaphs is maintained in his biographies: fully two-thirds of the subjects hailed from Chekiang, and all of them had some connection with that province.

Ch'üan was again concerned that unless he recorded what he knew of the subject the information would be lost for all time. As he wrote in the biography for Liu Hsien-t'ing, "Ah, such is the way of man's talents, even their names will be swallowed up by the sands of time (literally "by the fox"). Isn't that truly frightening!" As a historian he must record events to keep them from such a fate, and in similar fashion, he often tells the reader that owing to the inaccuracies and omissions of the Ming-shih it was necessary that he write a particular biography.

Ch'üan was not an objective, detached historian. He did present
material which runs contrary to the general theme of his narrative, but ultimately this is intended to establish his own case. He drew a distinction between subjective and objective history. Although good history requires the combination of an objective presentation of facts with a subjective analysis by the author, Ch'üan endeavored to indicate his personal points of involvement in the narrative. He signaled personal opinion by a prefatory "alas,..." or the personal pronoun "I..." and unlike some other historians of the time, who placed their personal conviction at the end of the narrative, Ch'üan voiced his opinion when the spirit moved him.

The genre in which he was writing however, must be taken into consideration. Ch'üan never suggested that the biographies and epitaphs of his Collected Works were to be considered as some kind of connected narrative. Since each article represented an independent piece of history, it is not surprising that he projected his own image on almost all of these biographies.

The qualification is necessary, because some of the biographies are extremely short. Although written from the same motive, to preserve the memory of a worthy individual, Ch'üan sometimes had difficulties in obtaining sufficient data to produce anything more than a few lines. All the very short biographies are in the wai-p'ien. They tell of military men, who died on the battlefield, defending the banner of Lu chien-kuo. Because they had no descendants to preserve their name they were Ch'üan's prime subjects.
The biographies were not written in the hope that they might form the basis of some later standard history, but rather as a balance to what had already been written or to what might be written in the future. Neither his epitaphs nor his biographies constitute the type of bureaucratic biography which would be produced by the History Bureau. Ch'üan's biographies pointed up anomalies within the subjects' accepted biography. They were not written as a medium for instructing officials in orthodoxy.

His shortest biography (136 characters), that of Chou Chih-fan (See Appendix I), does not show his ability to describe a personality. On other occasions, given sufficient information gleaned from written and oral sources he could well introduce his character. He took aspects of the personality which he believed exemplified the individual, and unrolled them one at a time. He did not shrink from exposing a person's excesses, if they were critical in determining the direction of his career or life. On the other hand, even his bete noire par excellence, Mao Ch'i-lung (1623-1716), upon whom Ch'üan heaped scorn, was never treated as shabbily as he could have been. Ch'üan admired Lu Shih-i (1611-1672), and his biography exhibits a box-car approach at character building.

The life story of Lu Shih-i is the longest and best known of Ch'üan's biographies (more than 2,300 characters). Ch'üan does not give a cradle to grave account of Lu Shih-i, but presented Lu Shih-i's scholastic, political and social beliefs and chose those facets of personality which seemed to guide Lu in his daily affairs. Each of
these points were developed independently and, like the cameo portraits of the epitaphs they can be separated or lifted from the rest of the biography. Ch'üan included no discussion of the personality growth of his subject, though it would be unfair to conclude from this that he viewed human personality as static.

He did not aim to expand upon the growth of any individual. Subjects like Lu Shih-i were often dynamic, but it was the culture within which such men were operating that took precedence over the individual. A man may have been great but he lived and died for something even greater. Keeping to their principles, men might starve to death in jail, be slain on the battlefield, or build themselves a pavilion and retire from active participation in national affairs. Lu Shih-i was a pavilion builder.

Lu's biography begins with a discourse on the development of Neo-Confucianism in Chekiang, and there is evident a dual purpose in this arrangement. Ch'üan wishes to establish the milieu within which Lu Shih-i lived, and he also uses this medium to declare his own position vis-à-vis these schools of thought. Rather than enumerating names representative of the various branches of Neo-Confucianism, he summarises the essential points of the less well-known schools. The fortunes of all these schools are discussed, but Ch'üan's sympathies are clear.

In the early Ming there were eighteen schools which held Chu Hsi as their founder and twelve which considered Lu Chiu-yüan to be their founder. They passed on their learning from one generation to another each preserving their individual doctrines, yet factionalism had not yet taken hold.
He was not concerned that there were many different schools.\textsuperscript{14} His concern was with factionalism, and its attendant evils.

Ch'üan has left no philosophical treatise on Neo-Confucianism. His position must be discerned by a synthesis of his comments from his Collected Works. The first few lines of Lu Shih-i's biography reveals his eclecticism, "Li hsüeh and hsìn hsüeh became two schools of thought... How is it possible to divide and discuss li and hsin? It is reckless to do so."\textsuperscript{15} On these basic points Lu Shih-i and Ch'üan were in agreement, and Ch'üan chose to give the conclusion before presenting the evidence.

In the balance of the biography it is not Ch'üan who interposes his personal opinion on these schools of learning, but Lu Shih-i. Ch'üan was interested in recreating and maintaining the proper lineages and relationships between these schools of thought.\textsuperscript{16} He was less interested, however, in the intricacies and philosophical hairsplitting pursued by the followers of these traditions. He believed such practise became self-feeding and self-defeating.

Lu Shih-i is portrayed as a fellow eclectic, and Ch'üan finds a position for him somewhere between the Scylla and Charybdis of the variant schools. He concludes that it was the excesses of Wang Shou-jen (1475-1529) and of Ch'en Hsien-chang (1428-1500) which Lu opposed.

Ch'üan said:

Lu Fu-t'ing [Lu Shih-i] did not like the teachings of either Wang or Ch'en. He was capable of seeing clearly their accomplishments as well as their faults. This allowed him to criticise them. This would not have been possible had it
not been for his profound learning. 17

Fairness was a quality Ch'üan cultivated. He believed Lu Shih-i to be a man of similar temperament. Though Lu was not a disciple of Ch'en Hsien-chang, for example, he made a special effort to rectify slanderous remarks made against him.

Many people believe that Pai Sha (Ch'en Hsien-chang) was a disciple of Ch'an, yet this is not true... His emphasis was on being casual and his achievements were thus derived... He was not given to deep contemplative introspection and textual research... his daily routine would include composing poetry and practicing calligraphy as a way of personal amusement. This does resemble Ch'an in some ways. 18

Lu, however, concluded that the teachings of Ch'en Hsien-chang were "never derived from Ch'an." 19

Ch'üan praises Lu Shih-i's Ssu-pien lu as a series of articles dealing with everything from astronomy and calendric cycles to music, government and human affairs. He says that, "All that he wrote was clearly analyzed and documented" but that he was "most effective at unravelling the wrangles between the Neo-Confucian schools of thought." 20

Ch'üan used the discussions in the Ssu-pien lu to illuminate Lu's erudition. He places particular emphasis on Lu's handling of Ch'en Hsien-chang and Wang Shou-jen, which support Ch'üan's idea of Lu Shih-i as a man of justice. He admired him and believed he was unfairly treated in the Ming-shih: "In the Ju-lin chuan (The Biographies of Scholars) of the Ming-shih [Lu's] sense of justice is not mentioned and it is for this reason that I have written this brief biography." 21
Ch'üan's biographies are not written chronologically. He does not formally introduce his subject's full name until two-thirds of the way through the biography. He summarizes Lu Shih-i's younger days perfunctorily, and then rushes to describe his adult accomplishments. Ch'üan's cameo portraits, or narratives, devoted to a man's formative years were always brief. The life and actions of the adult were most important.

Ch'üan's biographies are a type of pieh-chuan. He repeatedly says that it was necessary that he make a record of a man because he has not been properly included in a dynastic history. This is usually due to omissions in the official histories, though he was sometimes prompted to action because of what he believed was erroneous history.

Only one of the titles of his biographies actually incorporated the term "pieh-chuan." His biographies offer information not found in earlier sources, but they do not give information which official bureaucratic biographies were wont to incorporate. If the traditional definition of pieh-chuan is accepted, that is, as an "other" biography supplementing and written in response to an official account, then some of his biographies would be of this type. If we accept an alternative definition of pieh as "separate" or "distinct," implying a biography of a subject written wholly on its own merits, regardless of any official version, and "with the human individual as the subject in focus" then some of his biographies were this type of pieh-chuan. His biographies do not fit any pre-
determined definition. One common characteristic is that they all have the subject on main stage, and it is his response to the times and to his environment that form the essential part of the narrative.

Lu Shih-i recognized the extent of decay within the government toward the end of the Ming. Lawlessness was rampant and he offered unorthodox solutions to this problem. Ch'üan stated,

The plague of the bandits was becoming more serious by the day. Lu Fu-t'ing (Lu Shih-i) said that the elimination of the bandits could be accomplished with good generals and good officials. This could be achieved by breaking the present regulations and accepting all men into service who had attained their chin-shih. This should be done regardless of their other qualifications and official background. Those with civilian and military experience should be given special consideration, and assigned to command troops, regulate granaries, and protect cities. If successful he should be made leader of the area... The present... system of bribery, where anyone can be put into office, is literally selling the country down the river.24

Ch'üan argued, "His suggestions were not followed and the country was lost."25 The Ming was fleeing south under pressure from the Manchus, but Lu Shih-i still memorialized on ways to prevent total destruction; "In the south Lu frequently memorialized the throne, yet he was not heeded."26 However, even after the Ch'ing dynasty was established "local authorities repeatedly recommended Lu for appointment. He firmly refused."27

After his unsuccessful attempts to promote reform Lu retired. He retreated to a pavilion which he had built in the center of a specially constructed pool, ten mou in diameter. This "allowed no access way for visitors - and it was in this way that he received his literary name – Fu-t'ing (Floating Pavilion)."28 He accepted some
students and with the exception of a few lecture excursions he spent his retirement in seclusion. It was through a student-teacher dialogue that Ch'üan discussed Lu's understanding of "knowledge" and its connection with "conduct."

Ch'üan used this dialogue technique, not so much to establish the existence of a student-teacher rapport, but rather to emphasize Lu's eclecticism. "His students," said Ch'üan, "often asked him about the sequential relationship between knowledge and conduct." His answers avoided the horns of dilemma placed before him.

Therefore it is not possible to place these two quantities (knowledge and conduct) on a scale and so discuss them. This is the ultimate conclusion; true knowledge is conduct, and true conduct begins with knowledge - it is impossible to consider them independently.

This biography exhibits Ch'üan's dependence on the subject's own writings for the basis of his narrative, with considerable use of direct quotation. Whether Ch'uan believed this added credibility to his biographies is unknown, but he was thoroughly committed to the idea that "through a man's works one may understand his actions."

Moreover, it was particularly for his application of this unity of knowledge and action that Ch'üan praised Lu, stating:

I believe the most famous Confucian scholars of the early Ch'ing are Sun Ch'i-feng (1585-1675), Huang Tsung-hsi (1610-1695) and Li Yung (1627-1705). Lu Shih-i was seldom heard of, yet after reading his works one realises how profound was his learning.

The biography of Liu Hsien-t'ing is shorter than that of Lu Shih-i and the organization and approach are also different. There are no long discussions on Neo-Confucianism, attempting to put the
views of the subject into perspective. Instead we find frequent reminders of the human limits of a scholar, while few words of praise, implied or explicit, are not to be found. Ch'üan believed Liu had over-extended himself.

This evaluation was based on two main sources; information handed down by his father, and Liu's own works. Ch'üan dismissed a previous biography by Shen T'ung (1688-1752) as incomplete arguing that Shen T'ung's total reliance on a family biography of Liu had reduced the credibility of his work, and Shen T'ung had not known Liu personally. Ch'üan of course had the same difficulty to overcome. He admitted, "I too have had to estimate the capabilities of this man, and in the final analysis I have been unable to depict his life history thoroughly." The all important difference, he said, was that he had used Liu's own Kuang-yang tsa-chi as a basis for his biography. He could only regret that Liu's other works had been lost.

He summarizes Liu's fields of accomplishment, noting especially his contribution in linguistics and geography as well as his interest in climatology. Liu was an avid traveler and his Kuang-yang tsa-chi often recorded local conditions. Ch'üan said, "Local products are also included, so the character and local customs of these various peoples can be deduced." Ch'üan gives guarded approval to Liu's scholastic achievements. He was widely read, noted Ch'üan, and his talents were appreciated by Wan Seu-t'ung. Liu worked on both the Ming-shih and the great comprehensive geography of the empire, Fa-Ch'ing i-t'ung-chih. Yet, he was unhappy, said Ch'üan, because
although Wan Ssu-t'ung and Hsiu Ch'ien-hsueh (1631-1694) had achieved success in their field, they were not practical enough for Liu. Liu decided to return home.36

Ch'üan has reservations about Liu. Regarding Liu’s leaving the capital he says, "Yet I had doubts about him after he changed professions."37 Similar disparaging remarks mar an otherwise positive biography. Concerning Liu’s work on geography Ch’üan does say "The similarities and differences of geographical areas can be ascertained, including special qualities of each area (sun exposure, humidity)."38 However, he thought Liu attempted to cover too much, and says, "This is not the kind of work which is within the capacity of one man."39 He wrote a description of Liu’s work on water conservancy, and he again announces, "The very ambition of Liu Hsien-t'ing’s work does not permit it to be the product of one person at one time..."40 He concludes that, "His field of investigation was broad but he did not follow anything to completion."41 As this comes after the statement that, "The warp and woof of his achievements is truly wide ... A hundred generations will not be displeased", it is difficult to know what Ch’üan meant when he said that Liu "didn’t follow anything to its proper conclusion."42 This conflict is not resolved and flaws the biography. He gave no justification for these statements.

Part of this prejudice may have been imparted to him by his father. Ch’üan said, "What I know of Liu Hsien-t'ing I know from my father, and he learned it from Wan Ssu-t'ung."43 Ch’üan suggests that with all the travelling Liu was famous for, why were there no
accounts of this remaining for later scholars to examine? Even his writings have vanished (except for the Kuang-yang tsa-chi) and for someone of his standing, murmurs Ch'üan, that is remarkable. Here he indicates the flaw of his biography. The very point he prided himself on, basing his biographies of the subject's own works, has here turned to his disadvantage.

His father's influence was significant in forming his attitudes. In a brief epilogue to this biography he says that "the talents of Liu Hsien-t'ing were great" but that there is still one thing which cannot be explained. How is it, he asks, that a local pedant from the same village as Liu Hsien-t'ing is afforded an equal position in the local gazetteer? Ch'üan wished to make it clear that this other scholar was a man of "little capability and his learning had no foundation," not at all in the same category as Liu.44 He attributes these and other statements to his father, and laments "how regrettable it is not to be able to explore Liu's writings in depth, and in that way know the man."45

This biography brings to light the force with which his father influenced Ch'üan's writing. The non-committal position is uncommon to his style.46 He praises Liu's scholarship and yet decries his inability to follow through to completion these endeavors, while all the time saying that his own conclusions are based on a reading of the Kuang-yang tsa-chi (which represented only a portion of Liu's work). Ch'üan seldom burdened the reader with so many contradictions. His indecision destroys the unity and credibility of the biography, and
leaves the reader awash with confusion. It reveals, however, that Ch'üan did not blindly accept his father's opinions: he seemed honor bound to present them but nowhere did he state his agreement.

The biography of Mao Ch'i-ling (1623-1716) harmoniously incorporates the beliefs of both father and son. Ch'üan seldom praised Mao Ch'i-ling, and the tone of this biography is uncomplimentary. In both the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and wai-p'ien he frequently excoriates Mao for his unreliable research and outrageous views on loyalism. Mao Ch'i-ling is mentioned in more than seventeen different articles, but only twice is the reference a favorable one.47

The organization of this biography is different from the two already discussed. It is not chronological, and it was not aimed at revealing any single facet of Mao's character. It was, as Ch'üan stated, "a kind of pieh-chuan of Mao Ch'i-ling."48 Ch'üan responds to a student's question about Mao's scholarship by saying "you obviously haven't heard all that my grandfather had to say about Mao,"49 and forty per-cent of this biography relates the grandfather's observations of Mao.50 Ch'üan reveals that his father had used Mao's collected works as part of his early education program: seeking and exposing faults in its scholarship.

He criticizes Mao's personal behavior as well as his scholarship.51 During his grandfather's lifetime, says Ch'üan, Mao's collected works were not yet completely printed. So the grandfather's evaluation of Mao is more general and revealed more
personal information. The grandfather described Mao's pugnacious character saying:

Mao was fond of punching people. When he was talking if there developed the slightest disagreement he would curse. He could really abuse people and would follow it up by striking them.  

Not satisfied with this general description he gave a specific example. Ku Yen-wu's (1613-1682) scholarship was the object of debate. The outcome of the discussion was an exchange of fists, and Mao was hurt in this punch-up. Those, said Ch'üan, "who heard about it were pleased."  

In further revelation of Mao's character, Ch'üan tells us that once, when it was discreet for Mao to leave Hangchou,  

When Mao first fled, he left his wife in Hangchou. She was destitute for three years. Their son died of starvation. When Mao became well-off he did nothing to help his wife.  

He stated that Mao "frequently spent his time with catamites as an all night entertainment" and for this reason "his wife hated him like an enemy."  

When Mao did go to Hangchou he was forced to lodge with one of his students. This, combined with Mao's shabby and dishonorable treatment of his teacher, provided the material Ch'üan needed to write the negative aspects of this biography. The personal evaluation was harsh and it was matched with a strong disapproval of Mao's scholarship.  

Mao Ch'ü-ling's patron helped finance his schooling in Peking. Mao passed the special po-hsüeh hung-tzu examination of 1679 and was appointed to the Historiographical Board. "He did not distinguish
himself" was Ch'üan's grandfather's assessment of Mao during this period.\(^56\) Mao's propensity to expound on the classics draws criticism throughout the biography. Mao believed that "books written after the T'ang need not be read" and that the writers of the Sung were especially heterodox.\(^57\) Chu Hsi, in particular, was singled out for special attention. Mao likened Chu Hsi to a common costermonger, who trumpeted his opinion to all who would listen.\(^58\) Mao was working on correcting errors in the Ssu-shu (Four Books) but "when he heard Chu Hsi's commentaries had been made the officially accepted interpretation he took an ax to his work."\(^59\)

Mao's collected works, however, have survived, and Ch'üan criticised them. He first makes a general examination of a passage in Mao's work and follows (in footnote fashion) with data to support his criticism. Sometimes he directly attacks Mao's scholarship; "The mistakes of previous scholars which had been corrected he [Mao] would still copy without being aware of it." Many carry an additional overtone. Ch'üan said, Mao "would change ancient texts to fit his own purposes," or "owing to one false utterance he would falsely judge the man's entire life." Furthermore, "where previous scholars had shown there was sound proof, he would condemn their analysis as having no basis."\(^60\)

At the end of Mao's works was an article defining loyalism, and Ch'üan views this article as epitomizing Mao's philosophy. It is this position on loyalty which brings to a climax his biography of Mao.\(^61\) He believed Mao was a chameleon, who changed positions to
suit a situation, and was "very good at protecting himself."\textsuperscript{62} He had no principles and his denial of his own teacher showed he was not even true to himself. This alone was enough to discredit him, and the information given by Ch'üan's father and grandfather was mere reinforcement.

The three biographies considered show no uniformity of structure. Each subject was different, and each was portrayed in a different way. The methodology used to construct each biography, however, was indeed very similar. Basic to all of them was a review of the subject's written work, and Ch'üan extrapolates a certain amount of the subject's character and personality from his works. Thus Lu Shih-i's memorials, aimed at solving the bandit problem and improving the efficiency of the local government, translated into a positive character description. Mao Ch'i-ling's position on loyalism leads into a negative assessment. Again Ch'üan reinforces his argument with information he says he received from his father or grandfather.

Unlike the epitaphs where, due to the nature of the genre, a modicum of uniformity must be maintained, the biographies offered Ch'üan a greater amount of freedom. The subject's full name, family, marriages, offspring, hometown, dates of birth and death were usually not included. He chose the subjects for himself, and this greater latitude means that the biographies exhibit greater subjectivity. There was, of course, no \textit{ming} (eulogistic poem) at the end of a biography.

The eighteen biographies found in the \textit{wai-p'ien} are

-223-
shorter than those of the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and are mostly summaries of local loyalists, most of whom died doing battle for the Ming. Often-times these men had no descendants and if Ch'üan had not recorded their names and deeds they would have been forgotten. Where information was available Ch'üan relates more than just the subject's military contribution, but most of the material is derived from the records of Ch'üan's grandfather or other ancestors.

There was no attempt to develop the character of these subjects. The intention was to note their deeds. If the man was known to Ch'üan's ancestors, there is sometimes a line or so praising his virtue, military prowess, or scholastic achievements. He takes care to point out their contributions, and noted when the Ming-shih has inaccurately recorded events. Even worse, and equally likely, was the possibility the Ming Shih does not record the event or the man.

Ch'üan also decries the Sung-shih failing to include a complete account of Sung loyalists. However, in over three hundred epitaphs and biographies, only six were about men who lived during the Sung. Far from emphasizing Sung loyalism these articles extolled scholarship, and filial piety. That the subject was a loyalist was mentioned but not expanded upon. Ch'üan stated:

I have seen that Southern Sung (1127-1279) loyalists have not been entered into the Sung-shih. A hundred years later men like Sung Lien (1310-1381) have brought the virtues of these people to the light of day.

He likened himself to a latter-day Sung Lien, and said of his subjects, "Ah, is it possible to allow the record of such virtue to vanish and not have it transmitted!" He said this while
in the process of personally saving a Ming loyalist from historical oblivion. The article closed with a reference to Sung Lien and his saving a Sung loyalist from the same fate. Is there then a connection between Sung loyalism and Ming loyalism in Ch'üan's Collected Works?

He told us that in the many colophons, prefaces, and records to Sung loyalists they almost suffered the same fate that Ming loyalists nearly experienced. Had it not been for his dogged determinism, said Ch'üan, many of the heroes of these periods would not be a part of their own history. He believed the Ming-shih and Sung-shih to be full of inaccuracies and omissions.68 He did not say that in his efforts to record Ming loyalists that the deeds of the Sung loyalists served as an example or model. In narratives of Ming period subjects, he first told the reader, "The Ming-shih did not include his biography and in the last one hundred years there are few people that know about him." In the next line he might condemn the Sung-shih. Some condemnations were general. "I [Ch'üan] have read the Sung-shih and most detestable is the utter confusion of the memorials therein. It is simply infuriating."69 He gleefully informs the reader if his subject were not in the Sung-shih. "Correcting mistakes," though, as Ch'üan put it, occupied most of his energy. "After five hundred years I have thoroughly combed the sources and retrieved all the information .... to correct the inaccuracies of the Sung-shih."70

Some condemnations were more specific. Ch'üan criticises the handling of a biography in the Sung-shih, stating that the subject's teachers and students were not properly reported.
Furthermore, he says, "In general, the Sung-shih rejected the teachings of Lu Chiu-yüan. Scholars of this school were not recorded in detail."71

He does not always show disapproval of the Sung-shih. He supplemented accounts of those people whose biographies he believed to be incomplete. He would append a note advising the reader that this account was to "supplement the Sung-shih."85 This supplementary material also found its way into Huang Tsung-hsi's Sung Yüan hsüeh-an, which Ch'üan edited from 1746 to 1754.72

He knew of Sung Lien's contribution. He may have believed they shared a common mission. However, his own Sung period clan members had a much larger impact on him than the example of the Sung loyalists.73 The major source of information about Sung loyalists, Sung period philosophy and their schools as well as Ch'üan's genealogy are in the colophons, letters, and prefaces of the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and wai-p'ien.

**History and the Moral Code**

There are more than three hundred epitaphs and biographies in Ch'üan's Collected works. In chapters five and six of this thesis it has been shown that loyalty to an external principle(s) or to one's own personal set of principles occupied a paramount position in determining how a man was remembered. The character pillars of filial piety, integrity, and implementation of knowledge joined with
loyalty to form a standard by which all subjects were weighed. Ch'üan's understanding of his subject's degree of success in these areas determined the way he wrote the biography.

He did not write about history. He wrote history. He did tell us that facts were the foundation and mortar of history. However, it must be recognized that his scope was limited. Limited by these narrow moral concepts his subject would necessarily represent only a narrow slice of society. Owing to Ch'üan's commitment to a rigid moral code, biographies were structured around the question of how the subject measured up to his benchmarks. So the norms were rigid, and man did the conforming.

When he was able to find sufficient information about his subject to report on all the crucial benchmarks, then that biography fell into one of two categories: positive or negative. Wan Su-t'ung, Ch'ien Su-yüeh, and Huang Tsung-hsi all had positive biographies. Ch'üan maintained objectivity when he disagreed with the mechanics which these men used to implement their knowledge.74

If there were insufficient evidence to accurately judge all norms then the biography would be neutral. The one exception to this appears if the subject violated Ch'üan's standard of loyalism; this always resulted in a negative biography.75

Ch'üan did not vary his norms. Once the formula has been found, therefore, the reader should be able to determine how well a particular subject will fare. Naturally, there are many men discussed in his Collected Works that did not have separate
biographies. However, these men are still judged as to how well they measured up to Ch'üan's Neo-Confucian standard. The names of Chao Ich'ing (1710?-1764?), Ma Yüeh-kuan (1688-1755), Ho Ch'o (1661-1722), and Wang Ying-lin (1223-1296) appear throughout Ch'üan's Collected Works. He did not write their biographies. They are, however, positive figures. Ch'üan also mentioned Tai Piao-yüan (1224-1310) in many of the articles he used to describe his Sung period ancestors. His articles on Sung loyalism also quoted Tai. However, Ch'üan never praised Tai Piao-yüan. Although he was often mentioned and often quoted he was a distinctly neutral figure. Negative figures are Mao Ch'i-ling and Hsieh San-pin. They are frequently mentioned, but almost always unfavorably.

The reader becomes aware of this exploitation. Ch'üan used his subjects to personify his own ideals. This accounts for the preponderance of the all-good or all-bad type biographies. Fortunately, Ch'üan allowed some deviation in the way his characters might choose to implement their knowledge, and he did adapt style and judgement to known historical facts.
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1. There are eighteen biographies in the wai-p'ien and twelve biographies in the Chi-ch'ı t'ıng chi. See Appendix I.


7. This point is further developed in this thesis, chapter 3, p. 91.

8. The shortest biography is of Chou Chih-fan, B.12:814(7). See also note 4.

9. Diagrammatically the structure is the same as for Mao Ch'i-ling's biography. See diagram this thesis, chapter 3, p. 118.

A box-car or beads-on-a-string method develops aspects of a man's career. Each aspect is developed independently and is not integrated into other parts of the narrative. The reader must determine cause and effect relationships himself.

10. David Nivison, "Aspects of Traditional Chinese Biography," pp. 458-459: "Later historical biographies are very different. They give essential information about a man (essential from the point of view of the bureaucrat - historian) in a highly formal way-
his family background (but usually not his date of birth), his official career (if he had one), and anecdotes, often stereotyped and quite false, intended to indicate his character. This portrait of character conceives of man as falling into a type, at most realizing potentialities present from birth, but never exhibiting a dynamic and changing personality." See also, Howard L. Boorman, "The Biographical Approach to Chinese History: A Symposium," pp. 453-455. Both articles discuss official biographies in traditional China.


12. Ch'üan's best character development ability is shown in his biography of Huang Tsung-hsi, A.11:131-141(1).
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The flaws in the traditionally accepted definition of *pieh-chuan* as well as the more independent "separate" or "distinct" definition was developed in this article.
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27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. B.11:796(3). Ch'üan always mentions the subject's works. This dialogue technique is also used in his *Ching-shih wen-ta*.
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46. Force with which family and clan members dictated Ch’üan’s persuasion is seen in Ch’üan’s other writings. Ch’üan’s maternal aunt spurred him on to write epitaphs of Ming loyalists, particularly Chang Ming-chen.
49. B.12:825-828(18). See also Yao I-t’ien (A.20:240-241(2), where Ch’üan again used this dialogue technique.
50. There were 760 characters attributed to the grandfather out of a total of 1,960 characters.
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52. B.12:825(18).
53. B.12:826(18).
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61. See note 47.
63. For citations on the inaccuracies of the Sung-shih see this thesis, chapter 5, p. 160, note 200.
65. B.13:830-831(2).
66. B.12:814-815(8).
67. Ibid.
68. For Ch'üan's work on Sung loyalists, see this thesis, chapter 3, pp. 100-112.
69. A.34:430-431(4).
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid.
72. For Sung Yüan hsüeh-an, see this thesis, chapter 6, pp. 263-284.
73. For clan influence on Ch'üan see this thesis, chapter 3, pp. 100-112.
74. For Ch'üan's understanding of the concept implementation of knowledge, see this thesis, chapter 6, pp. 270-272.

75. A.8:101-102(3). Also this thesis chapter 4, pp. 194-195.

NEO-CONFUCIANISM: The Non-Conflict of Interests.

Ch'üan Tsu-wang has been praised for his contribution to the study of the Chinese classics. His Ching-shih wen-ta is his best known independently published work on the classics and history. There are, however, many articles on the classics in his Collected Works, the majority of them in the wai-p'ien. They are brief and address themselves to a single topic or problem. Through his epitaphs, Ch'üan demonstrated his concern for transmitting the deeds of Ming loyalists; the same concern for maintaining the correct transmission of the classics, as well as the proper perspective of influences on these texts (i.e. apocrypha, prognostication texts, Taoism and Buddhism) was also important to him. The classics, their interpretation and applicability to governing the state and conducting one's life were intimately associated with his understanding of history.

Ch'üan acknowledged Huang Tsung-hsi and Wan Ssu-t'ung as his teachers, thereby accepting the tenets of the Chekiang School of History, but he recognized that the tradition of "his school" had its roots further back in history. The Sung Yüan hsüeh-an, a monumental undertaking begun by Huang Tsung-hsi and brought to fruition by Ch'üan, traces the intellectual traditions of these two dynasties. Through Ch'üan's contribution to this work we may understand the influence Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan had on the Eastern
Chekiang School of History, while Ch'üan's own position among the Neo-
Confucian schools of thought may be reached through a reading of the
Sung Yüan hsüeh-an, the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and wai-p'ien.

Ch'üan was a historian. Whether he was recording the history of
a pavilion or the history of a philosophy, he establishes himself as
an impartial narrator. The topics of philosophy seem remote to him,
and the differences which emerged from various schools were well
removed from any influence on Ch'üan himself.

The Ching-shih wen-ta exemplifies Ch'üan's approach to the
classics. Each of the ten chüan records conversations between
Ch'üan and his students. This collection of dialogues was originally
published independently of Ch'üan's Collected Works, though it should
not be read as being representative of either the style or content of
the balance of his writing. The topics addressed to Ch'üan by his
students have been examined in his other miscellaneous essays, and the
depth and breadth of the material covered in the dialogues varies from
topic to topic. So the Ching-shih wen-ta should be viewed as a
supplement to Ch'üan's Collected Works.

The title of the first chüan prepares us for a discussion of
the I-Ching, and the seventeen questions put forth by Tung Ping-
ch'üan call for prior and wide knowledge of this text if we are to
understand Ch'üan's responses. This is not to say that they penetrate
the very heart of the subject, but rather they take a single topic
within the classic and discuss different aspects, or stages of its
development, within the works of well-known early Chinese scholars.
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Each chüan has a general heading, indicating the area of consideration. In Ching-shih wen-ta Chüan discussed the I-Ching (Book of Changes), Li Chi (Book of Rites), Shih Ching (Book of Poetry), Lun-yü (Analects of Confucius), Ta-hsueh and Chung-yung (The Great Learning and the Doctrine of the Mean). These titles, however, should be taken as no more than a general guide, for there is no direction within each chüan. There is only a series of questions, where coherence is often maintained solely because the questions are based on the same classic. The dialogues relate to the title, but whether Chüan explored minute points of textual criticism, general philosophy, or the history of the topic is left as an adventure to the reader.

In 1794 Juan Yüan (1764-1849) wrote a preface for the Ching-shih wen-ta, and he praised Chüan's great ability. He said that in Chüan's collection of dialogues, the three fields of history, classics and literature were all united and given expression, and that the Ching-shih wen-ta was the equal of Ku Yen-wu's Jih-chih lu. He placed Chüan in the same class with Wan Ssu-t'ung. In fact Juan Yüan's preface might have been more suitable if it had been dedicated to Chüan's Chi-ch'i t'ing chi.

Li Tzu-ming (1830-1894) also found Chüan's work on the classics valuable. In his diary, known as the Yüeh-man t'ang jih-chi, though he praised the Ching-shih wen-ta, he suggested that other articles in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi were superior. Li Tzu-ming observed that he was collating an anthology of great Confucian scholars of the
late Ming and early Ch'ing periods, and that many so-called
great scholars were not included, but the name of Ch'üan Tsu-wang would
certainly appear. Li Tz'u-ming knew that Ch'üan's contribution to the
study of the classics was not limited to the Ching-shih wen-ta,6
and he recognized the significance of those dialogues - they were to
be read as a supplement to Ch'üan's other articles. In Li's opinion
the cornerstone of Ch'üan's work on the classics was his "Han Ching-
shih lun," found in the wai-p'ien.7

In chüan seven, Ch'üan discusses The Great Learning, The
Doctrine of the Mean, and Mencius with his student Lu Kao. In
addition to asking purely historical questions, points were raised
which probed at the very essence of the divergence between the two
main schools of Neo-Confucian thought: the Ch'eng-Chu school, also
commonly known as the Li Hsüeh school or "School of the Study of
Principle," and the Lu-Wang school, also known as the Hsin Hsüeh
school or "School of the Study of the Mind." The Ch'eng-Chu school
has also been referred to as the Rationalistic school while the Lu-
Wang school is also known as the Idealistic school.8

Lu Kao questioned Ch'üan on the essential meaning of "the theory
of the investigation of things" (ko-wu chih-shuo). This concept of
"investigation of things" and "extension of knowledge" (chih-shih)
is found in a famous passage in The Great Learning. The
understanding and interpretation of these two phrase-concepts became
central to the two schools' definition of self-cultivation.

(The ancients who wished to illustrate illustrious
virtue throughout the kingdom, first ordered well their
own states. Wishing to order well their states, they first regulated their households. Wishing to regulate their households, they first cultivated their persons. Wishing to cultivate their persons, they first rectified their hearts. Wishing to rectify their hearts, they first sought to be sincere in their thoughts. Wishing to be sincere in their thoughts, they first extended to the utmost their knowledge. Such extension of knowledge lay in the investigation of things.9

Ch'üan sweeps through 800 years of philosophical wrangling to answer Lu Kao's question. Although his passion for tidiness drove him to place each philosopher within his proper school, Ch'üan was basically a philosophical synthesizer who deplored the destructiveness of partisan squabblings.

Before examining this question of "investigation of things" in the Ching-shih wen-ta we need to place ourselves within Ch'üan's philosophical milieu. Li-hsüeh, the philosophy of Principle or Neo-Confucianism had its genesis in the thoughts and writings of such men as Hu Yuăn (933-1059), Sun Fu (922-1057) and Shih Chieh (1005-1045).10 It is generally recognized, however, that not until the contribution of the Five Masters of the Northern Sung (Chou Tun-i (1017-1073), Shao Yung (1011-1077), Chang Tsai (1020-1077), Ch'eng Hao (1032-1085), and Ch'eng I (1033-1107)) did the concept of 11 take on the new and significant meaning of Principle.11 Chou Tun-i alludes to it in his T'ai Chi T'u Shou and T'ung Shu, but it is in the writings of Chang Tsai that we have the introduction of such concepts as "investigation of principle", "principle of nature", and "moral principles" (i-li). Principle then became not only central to the understanding of the world, but the very foundation of philosophy. This can be seen in Ch'eng I's statement:
All things under heaven can be understood in the light of their principle. As there are things, there must be their specific principles. One thing necessarily has one principle.12

Ch'eng I took the idea of investigation of things and forged it into a method of understanding principle itself; applying oneself diligently to studying history, reading books, examining oneself, investigating one thing intensively, and investigating many things extensively. With the promulgation of such methods the foundations of the rationalistic branch of Neo-Confucianism was established. Ch'eng I's younger brother, Ch'eng Hao, couched his thoughts in more moralistic terms, and his philosophy was developed by Lu Chiu-yüan (1139-1193).

Although the philosophies of the two Ch'engs are similar, the seeds of division were sufficient to be developed by later philosophers into the Lu-Wang [Lu Chiu-yüan and Wang Shou-jen] and Ch'eng-Chu [Ch'eng I and Chu Hsi] schools of Neo-Confucianism.

Ch'eng Hao was seeking through li to unify the universe in the mind of men.

The students must first comprehend love (jen). The man of love is undifferentiably one with other things. Righteousness (yi), propriety (li), wisdom (chih) and good faith (hsin): all these are love. Get to comprehend this truth and cultivate it with sincerity (ch'eng) and earnestness (ching); that is all. There is no need to impose any other rules or pursue any further research.13

Ch'eng Hao developed his unitary approach even further and in doing so showed how different his understanding of the universe was to that of Ch'eng I and Chu Hsi.
The student need not seek afar. Let him take what is near his own person, and only (realize that the essential is to) understand Heavenly Principle and earnestness (ching). Then it is simple enough.... Therefore Heaven and man are one in that they both have the Tao and Principles; there is no further distinction between them.  

Ch'eng Hao's approach to cultivation led students to the doors of Lu Chiu-yüan and Wang Shou-jen, who developed his concepts.

Chu Hsi and Ch'eng I were also seeking to unify the universe in the minds of men through li, but their method was analytical.

The words, 'the extension of knowledge lies in the investigation of things,' mean that we should apply ourselves to things so as to gain an exhaustive knowledge of their principle.

Although Chu Hsi attempted to harmonize the theoretical schisms begun by the two Ch'engs, his particularistic approach was attacked by Lu Chiu-yüan. "To investigate things is to investigate the [mind]," said Lu.  

Lu did not need to investigate things in the external world or in the classics, as Chu Hsi felt compelled to do. Lu added, "Principle is endowed in me by Heaven, not drilled into me from the outside."

By the fifteenth century Wang Shou-jen again promoted the theory that principle was not in things, but in the mind. He brought forth the liang-chih theory, whereby man could achieve understanding if his selfish desires are eliminated from the mind.

Ch'üan's student, Lu Kao, stated that there were seventy-two schools of thought on the theory of the investigation of things. The uninitiated student could not comprehend the similarities and differences between them. Lu Kao asked Ch'üan about one school
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which believed that the things being investigated are those things which have a commencement and a completion. Lu Kao stated, "things have their roots (commencement) and their branches (completion)...," and if one first approaches the root the branches need not be sought.\textsuperscript{18} Lu Kao asked Ch'üan why certain scholars would not accept this explanation.

Ch'üan replied that, "this is the theory of Wang Lang and he was not a disciple of Chu Hsi. Therefore those abiding with the theories of Chu Hsi would ridicule this position."\textsuperscript{19} Ch'üan showed the importance of the school or tradition when discussing philosophical concepts. The informed scholar would be certain to have the teacher-student lineages clear in his mind.

If Wang Lang had examined carefully the works of previous scholars, said Ch'üan, he would have found that Li Li-wu (an official under Sung, who did not serve the Yuan) had already said the same thing which he was so proud of discovering.\textsuperscript{20} Ch'üan established Li Li-wu as a disciple of Hsieh Ao. Hsieh Ao, although a contemporary of Chu Hsi, was a student of Kuo Chung-hsiao, and Kuo Chung-hsiao was a student of Ch'eng I. That Ch'üan placed great emphasis on student-teacher relationships is clear.\textsuperscript{21} He invariably framed a philosophical problem within such a context before examining the statement itself. The reader would be prepared for Ch'üan's analysis by virtue of the school lineage which Ch'üan had established.

Ch'üan told his student Lu Kao that Chu Hsi never made any statements about the kinds of things which have a commencement and a
completion. Typical of Chu Hsi, though, he did worry the subject into many categories. Things capable of being investigated are of two kinds; the macro (ta) and the micro (hsiao). The macro concerns itself with affairs of family, state, and world whereas the micro concerns itself with the individual, his mind (hsin), preconceptions (i) and knowledge (chih). Taken to its natural and furthest extension, the macro concerns itself with the evolutionary processes of the world (past and present). The micro followed to its greatest extent concerns itself with "a piece of dust and a single breath."

Ch'üan summarized the whole process again and asked his student, "Has anything been omitted?" Ch'üan believed Ch'eng Hao held the opposing view, that it was unnecessary to exhaustively investigate all things in the universe.

Ch'üan summarized the positions of the two main schools of Neo-Confucianism on the subject of investigation of things. He admonished his student to be careful of the teachings of Wang Lang, "as it is uncertain that they are all pure. His analysis of 'investigation of things' is especially unmanageable."

Ch'üan's answer is complete. He showed that neither of the two major Neo-Confucian schools of thought was involved in the concept of dividing things into those that do and those that do not have their commencements and completions. Even Chu Hsi had not thought of this. He told his student, however, that this thesis did not originate with Wang Lang but with an earlier scholar.

Ch'üan next dealt with the origins of the concept of investigation
of things. He clearly tries to extricate this concept from the wranglings of school politics and place it on more neutral ground. His success, however, was limited to placing himself, rather than the concept, onto neutral ground. "In conclusion," he said, "the theory of investigation of things is all set forth fully in the Lun yü."

The Master said, 'In the Book of Poetry there are three hundred pieces, but the design of them may be embraced in one sentence - Having no depraved thoughts.'

"The theory of investigation of things," said Ch'üan, "is within man's mind." The outward manifestations of this Ch'üan then divided into macro and micro concerns. The family, country, and world, as well as the serving of one's father and liege, were the macro things to be investigated and understood. The micro constituted the natural world (beasts and plants). This he believed to be Ch'eng Hao's interpretation. The difficulties sprang up later, said Ch'üan, when scholars lost track of the original intention. Wang Shou-jen's "investigating the bamboos for seven days until he fell sick" is an example, said Ch'üan, of one "who doesn't appreciate that extensive knowledge is also a tenet of sagehood." Ch'üan exhorted his student to widen his horizons; again he cited the Lun yü, "Hear much and put aside the points of which you stand in doubt, see much and put aside the things which seem perilous." Ch'üan coupled this with another quote which aimed at instructing students against having false pretenses about their knowledge (or lack of it).

(The Master said, 'Yu, Shall I teach you what knowledge is? When you know a thing, to hold that you know it: and
when you do not know a things, to allow that you do not know it; - this is knowledge. 30

Ch'üan returned to Ch'eng Hao's position that it is not mandatory to exhaustively study all things. 31 In the final analysis, said Ch'üan, the attention paid to the beasts and plants (a reference to Ch'eng Hao) is not directed at knowing everything there is to know (regardless of Wang Shou-jen's staring down the bamboos). "Therefore, the theories of investigation of things [of these two schools] may be viewed together without obstructing either one." 32

Ch'üan demonstrated his adamant, non-partisan, position. He believed it important that the lineages of intellectual traditions be clearly defined, so as to preserve and show accurately the historical development of a school of philosophy. Ch'üan believed that the theoretical schism which developed into the Ch'eng-Chu and Lu-Wang Neo-Confucian schools was not the intention of the original scholars but rather a result of later scholars building their own interpretations. Therefore, even though it was his duty as a historian to transmit the development of these schools of thought, he still strongly encouraged scholars to remember their similarities rather than their differences.

In the first chüan of the Ching-shih wen-ta, where Ch'üan discusses the I-Ching with Tung Ping-ch'un he develops specific philosophical points from within the classic. The topics dealt with include: the use of prognostication in the Tso Chuan, the concept of hu-t'ī (哈佛) and the use of hexagrams. The reader, however, must look to Ch'üan's articles in the wai-p'ien for a pulling
together of the threads. It is here that Ch’üan discusses the significance of different schools of learning on the study of the I-Ching.

In the opening lines of his essay on the mutual origins of the three schools of the I-Ching Ch’üan stated that "From the time when these three schools began discoursing on the I-Ching they knew only of the differences between each school, but they did not know of that which united them." He examined their interpretation and influence on the study of the I-Ching: the Neo-Taoist school as embodied in the thought of Wang Pi (226-249) and Han Po (d. 385), and the school of thought which emerged from the works of Meng Hsi (d. 37 B.C.) and Ching Fang. He identified the founder of the third school as Shao Yung (1011-1077) of the Sung dynasty. Ch’üan noted the interdependence which existed between the earlier schools. He stated that the I-Ching was their mutual basis and "who would think that the teachings of the t’u-wei school (Meng Hsi and Ching Fang) actually had their foundations in Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu," and that the Neo-Taoists used the t’u-wei to implement their teachings! The original intent to understand the universe and to apply this knowledge to man’s world was the way of the sages.

Ch’üan criticized later scholars for trying to comprehend and predict the myriad changes of the universe from a finite data base. The difficulty was that they didn’t have the self-cultivation that is, a base of learning, of a sage. The result was that their theories
became couched in abstruse language and when they attempted to use their talents they found themselves using the concepts of yin and yang to hoodwink the people and hide any inconsistencies in their discourse. Ultimately they talked in such a mystical manner that no one dared criticize them.

In later periods two practises dominated. One, said Ch'üan, used Taoism to study apocrypha. These men remained distant from the people and kept their learning to themselves. The other group used apocrypha to study Taoism. These men employed their learning to benefit the world. Yet, in their exuberance they overstepped their bounds and were excessive in their claims. They became trapped in their own assertions and when these proved invalid, they paid with their lives. So the learning of both these groups was ascribed to the immortals. Ch'üan reiterated his dislike of excess; "The immortals, however, have their way (tao) and their method (fa). The way is its essence (t'í) and the method is its use (yung). One should not seek only one of these, for each is an equally important part of the whole.

"The theories of Ching Feng and Meng Hsi on the I-Ching developed into the method (fa), while the theories of Wang Pi and Han Po developed into the way (tao)." It was Shao Yung (1011-1077) who brought the two together. Ch'üan praised Shao Yung for combining the strong points of each group.

It has been shown that the Ching-shih wen-ta will either provide the synthesis, the pulling together of the strings, as it were, of
Ch'üan's discourses on an individual topic (i.e. investigation of things) or it will give the raw data from which a concluding statement must be found in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi or the wai-p'ien. It is important that the Ching-shih wen-ta should not be considered as either a unified or complete examination of a subject it explores.

Ch'üan's non-partisanship approach to the study of the classics and Neo-Confucian philosophy was acquired early in life and was a key part of his scholarship. Li Fu (1675-1750) was impressed with Ch'üan's work and invited him to live at his house. Ch'üan moved into the Wisteria Studio, a part of Li Fu's home in Peking in the winter of 1733. Ch'üan could identify with Li Fu, and their empathy was revealed in the epitaph he wrote for Li Fu many years later. He lived at Wisteria Studio until 1736 when he moved to quarters just outside Li's home.

Li was a much older man than Ch'üan. Li Fu was fifty-eight and Ch'üan only twenty-nine when they first met in 1733. Li had a strong personality and was not beyond embarrassing students who made irresponsible statements. Ch'üan admitted that he was a young student. However, if a point of dispute arose between them, "sometimes the master would change his mind and take up my position." According to Ch'üan not only did his scholarship please Li but the fact that he did "not toady" to anyone helped cement their relationship.

With so much honesty and frankness there were sure to be points of disagreement. Early in 1733 Li Fu was writing his biography of Lu Chiu-yüan (Lu-tzu nien-p'u) as well as a work on Lu's philosophy,
entitled "Lu-tzu hsüeh-p'u." Li Fu was born near Lu Chiu-yüan's native place and wished to defend his teachings. Ch'üan wrote four letters to Li commenting on the "Lu-tzu hsüeh-p'u." 42

The following pages examine these letters and Li Fu's response to Ch'üan's critique. Many years later, when Ch'üan began editing Huang Taung-hai's Sung Yuan hsüeh-an, the same attention to detail that he applied to the critiques of Li Fu's "Lu-tzu hsüeh-p'u" will be evident. Li Fu had asked Ch'üan questions about scholars connected with Lu Chiu-yüan. In addition to answering these questions, Ch'üan also offered his opinion on points which Li Fu had not intended to submit for comment. Ch'üan's position as a historian of the schools of the Neo-Confucian tradition is first approached through these letters. They may be read with the Ching-shih wen-ta, as the way to viewing Ch'üan's understanding of the position and importance of these schools of thought to the Eastern Chekiang School of History.

The first letter is general and deals with the development of Lu Chiu-yüan's school of thought. He praised Li Fu for his balanced account and for his extensive and wide use of sources. 43

According to Ch'üan, in "the teachings of the sages there is nothing more important than putting knowledge into practice." 44 It was this principle which was sacrificed after the death of Lu Chiu-yüan and Chu Hsi when the theoretical schism became polarized between their disciples and followers. Factions, said Ch'üan, did not immediately appear with the death of Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan. An eminent disciple of Chu Hsi, Huang Kan (1152-1221) as well as a
disciple of Lu Chiu-yüan, Shu Lin (1136-1199) would not subscribe to such divisiveness. It was not until after these two scholars died that men spent their time philosophizing on the differences between Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan. Ch'üan wished to emphasize the commonality of the two schools. After all, he observed, "Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan both teach the implementation of knowledge." Later scholars would criticize the theories of Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan, using the weaknesses of one to secure the primacy of the other. Yet, retorted Ch'üan, "what does this have to do with implementing one's knowledge?"

Ch'üan noted that scholars of his day believed Chao Fang (1319-1369) to have been responsible for initiating the move for unity between the schools of Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan. According to Yuan Chüeh (1266-1327), however, there were scholars before Chao Fang who were working toward this same goal. Ch'üan showed preference for a position most dear to his heart.

Striking a theme of harmony, and emphasizing concepts common to both schools, is the central and ever-present theme Ch'üan attempts to drive home. He found it necessary to place each scholar within his proper school or tradition, for it was essential to represent accurately each school in order that their traditions and instructions were properly preserved. Implicit in this approach is the need to define the position of a student and a disciple. Is it possible, for instance, to be a disciple of one master and the student of another? Ch'üan pointed out that this was certainly the case with
many well-known scholars. However, the claim of one scholar to be the
disciple of another was of primary importance, for this was how a
school or tradition regenerated itself.

Ch'üan gently informed Li Fu that he had not faithfully
represented some of the scholars in his Lu-tzu hsüeh-pu. His
second letter praised Li Fu for the wide range of material he
employed. Ch'üan told his friend that in this respect he even
exceeded Huang Tsung-hsi's Sung Yüan hsüeh-an. The balance of
the letter undertakes an internal criticism of Li Fu's analysis of
the school of Lu Chiu-yüan.

Although Ch'üan acknowledged Li Fu's wide range of material he
was opposed to his indiscriminate acceptance of the veracity of any
account. In a double-barrelled reproach, Ch'üan brings both the Sung-
shih and Li Fu's account of Hsü I (chin-shih 1172) into
question. Ch'üan quoted part of Hsü I's epitaph, which stated,

Hsü I took 'awareness' (wu) as his basic principle. He used it to clarify those points in doubt. He used common
daily occurrences, and offered these to scholars as proof. This
awareness was as if body and mind were totally eclipsed from the
teachings of the past, as a spirit all-seeing, all-hearing, all-
perceiving which can be likened to a loud thunderclap while in
meditation. It is like a crystal clarity after haze - nothing is
not understood. Something can be learned from this
experience.

Ch'üan asserted that it was in this manner that Hsü I's teachings
were in harmony with the philosophy of Lu Chiu-yüan. "The Sung-
shih, however, does not mention this point." Ch'üan further
argued that the account of Hsü I in the Lu-tzu hsüeh-pu presenting
him as a disciple of Lu Chiu-yüan, is incorrect.
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Ch'üan was not only showing his penchant for seeking points of common philosophical ground among scholars but was also calling Li Fu to task for confusing Hsü I's relationship with Lu Chiu-yüan. "Hsü I," stated Ch'üan, "never regarded Lu Chiu-yüan as his teacher. Your biography states that he personally attended Lu. I fear there is no evidence for this." Ch'üan believed that Hsü I was an adherent of Lu's teachings, but never his student. "The ancients took the relationship between students and master very seriously," said Ch'üan. It was for this reason that the practice developed whereby one could become a student of a scholar without formally becoming his disciple. Ch'üan stated that such relationships were common. Hu An-kuo (chin-shih 1098) was a disciple of the Ch'eng brothers, but he also studied the teachings of Yang Shih (1053-1135) and Hsieh Liang-tso (1050-1103). He also cited Ch'en Fu-liang, who had received instruction from both Lü Tzu-ch'ien (1137-1181) and Chang Ch'ih (1133-1180), though neither of these men could claim Ch'en Fu-liang as their disciple. Ch'üan mentions other examples of men studying under eminent scholars but who did not actually become their disciples.

Once Ch'üan had established his case for stricter interpretation of discipleship, he accused Li of misrepresenting the school of Lu Chiu-yüan.

In the section dealing with Hsü I you include Ts'ai Yu-hsüeh (chin-shih 1172), Lü Tsu-chien, Hsiang An-shih (chin-shih c. 1174) and Tai Hai as all being disciples of Lu Chiu-yüan. Personally, I have my reservations. Ch'üan thought this not only exaggerated the size of Lu Chiu-
yüan's following but did not transmit the proper relationship between scholars. It distorted the lines of intellectual traditions.

Ch'üan argued that after the death of his elder brother (Lü Tsu-ch'ien) Lü Tsu-chien formulated his learning into a single school of thought.57 Ts'ai Yu-hsüeh and Yeh Shih (chin-shih 1179) adhered to the teachings of Ch'en Fu-liang and formed a school which transmitted the teachings of Hsüeh Chi-hsuan and Cheng Po-hsiung (chin-shih 1145). These two branches with Ch'en Liang's school, said Ch'üan, "formed a triangular base of learning."58 They maintained a balance between the teachings of Lu Chiu-yüan and Chu Hsi. They established their own schools.

Furthermore, even though Ts'ai Yu-hsüeh met and held discussions with Lu Chiu-yüan, he never referred to him as his teacher. Ch'üan argued that Ts'ai Yu-hsüeh was taught by Cheng Po-hsiung, and that it was because Ch'en Fu-liang was a disciple of Cheng Po-hsiung, that Ts'ai continued his studies under him.59 According to Ch'üan, "In his entire life he never called anyone else master."60 Tai Hsi was also a student of the same tradition.61 As for Hsiang An-shih, Ch'üan noted that he "had contact with both Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan but never referred to either man as his teacher."62

One by one, Ch'üan shows that these men were not to be assigned categorically to the status of students or disciples of Lu Chiu-yüan. If a man had only to hold conversations with Lu Chiu-yüan, and as result he is classed as his disciple, then the lineage of intellectual traditions "would be confused and the sequence of the
schools would be in disarray.\textsuperscript{63}

...a few days ago, when you were giving instruction you enumerated the disciples of Chang Ch'ih (1133-1180). When you mentioned Chao Fang you said that it was uncertain that he received instruction from Chang Ch'ih. What I am saying today is indeed your very meaning.\textsuperscript{64}

During this earlier lecture Li Fu had used the same line of reasoning to construct his case as Ch'Uan was now using to criticize Li's own reconstruction of the Lu Chiu-yüan's school of thought. Ch'Uan took exception to Li Fu's unbalanced accounts. It was not what he said but rather what was omitted. The third and fourth letters express this in greater depth.

Ch'Uan singled out the biography of Liu Shao-fu (chin-shih 1176) for special attention.\textsuperscript{65} This letter is particularly valuable because it formed the basis for Ch'Uan's biography of Liu Shao-fu in the Sung Yuan hsüeh-an, though the latter account is much less involved and complicated. It shows, to some extent, how he wrote many of the biographies for the Sung Yuan hsüeh-an.

Ch'Uan established his argument by quoting both Lu Chiu-yüan and Chu Hsi. The Fu chou chu-chih (Fu-chou Gazetteer) stated that Liu Shao-fu died while serving as an assistant magistrate in Lung-hsing (in present day Honan).\textsuperscript{66} Ch'Uan believed otherwise and referred to a letter Lu Chiu-yüan sent to Ch'en Fu-liang:

Liu Shao-fu braved the heat to return to Lin-chiang. He had diarrhoea and after a fortnight he could not get up. Now very sad. In recent years he had been avoiding his friends and teachers. He was strange and doing unacceptable things. This is truly a great pity. Between the spring and summer I went to Lin-chiang to see him at his sick bed. Just as it appeared some progress was being made, he was taken.\textsuperscript{67}
So much for Liu Shao-fu dying in office. Ch'üan's evidence reveals additional information, which he used as a springboard for further analysis. Liu Shao-fu was seventeen when he was Lu Chiu-yüan's student. He later turned away from the teachings of his master and embraced Buddhism. Ch'üan did not fault him for his change of heart, but rather for his irresponsible behavior. According to Ch'üan, Chu Hsi stated, "I went to see Liu Shao-fu on business, at which time he reiterated the absurdity of Lu Chiu-yüan's learning." 68

Ch'üan showed no leniency, stating that, "From this we can see the thinness of his sense of morality." 69 He added that Chu Hsi had gone to see Lu Chiu-ling (elder brother of Lu Chiu-yüan), and scolded Liu Shao-fu for his improper behavior (he was sitting in a corner practicing Taoist meditation), saying, "I suppose what Lu Chiu-yüan and I say is not of sufficient merit to listen to! It has already been a number of years, why do you continue to behave in such an eccentric manner?" 70 Ch'üan was no less delicate in his survey of Liu Shao-fu's official career. He gave further insight into his character when he compared Liu to his friend Ch'en Kang. 71

Ch'en Kang was an industrious student who studied under Lu Chiu-yüan, Ch'en Liang and later under Lü Tsu-ch'ien. Ch'en Kang and Liu Shao-fu were intimate and loyal friends. Both undertook the study of Buddhism; Liu Shao-fu became a monk, while Ch'en Kang approached Buddhism as a student. Ch'üan did not need to incorporate terms like "eratic" or "rash" into his narrative to convey his view of Liu Shao-fu. He allowed the man's actions, as told by a
contemporary, to do the job for him. He believed Liu was given many advantages and opportunities, but that his brashness got the best of him. Ch'üan remarked, however, "who would expect him to come to this end..."72

There is a marked difference between the accounts of Liu Shao-fu in the Chi-ch'i t'ìng chi and the one Ch'üan wrote for him in the Sung Yüan hsüeh-an.73 In the latter there was no mention whether or not Liu Shao-fu died in office. Ch'üan simply stated that he was an assistant magistrate in Lung-hsing. He had begun his studies under Lu Chiu-yüan, received his chin-shih in 1175, voiced his opinions at court too loudly, and later repudiated his master's teachings. Chu Hsi upbraided him for saying that the teachings of Lu Chiu-yüan were preposterous and, said Ch'üan, "From this we can see the thinness of his sense of morality."74

Ch'üan was disappointed that Li Fu had not considered the circumstances surrounding Liu's career changes. Li Fu had made a parallel between the career of Liu Shao-fu, and two other scholars. These men had also found new teachers during their academic career. The reasons for such changes, however, were entirely different. Ch'üan believed these men should not be considered in the same class.75 The biography in the Sung Yüan hsüeh-an is terse, and does not discuss Liu's character flaws. It includes only the final points of Ch'üan's position outlined in letters to Li Fu. The thrust of the letter had been to balance what Ch'üan thought was a lopsided account, and in this way his own position appears biased.
Fortunately, we have the Sung Yüan hsüeh-an to see the final analysis. This shows that, although Ch'üan attached great importance to the practical implementation of knowledge with the concomitant concept of self-cultivation (hsiü-shen) (and so he deplored Liu Shao-fu's erratic and rash behavior), he was capable of restraining himself when writing the biography itself. The letters are critiques of Li Fu's biographical accounts, found in his Lu-tzu hsüeh-p'u, rather than a presentation of his own real opinion.

In his fourth letter to Li Fu, Ch'üan addressed the problem of balance and historical accuracy. Commenting on Li-Fu's accounts of Chao Yü-hsien (chin-shih 1220) and Yuan Shao (chin-shih c. 1182), he said:

The disciples of Yang Chien were Shih Mi-yüan (d. 1233) and Chao Yü-hsien. The disciples of Yüan Haieh (1144-1244) were Yüan Shao and Shih Sung-chih (+ 1256)... In your hsüeh-p'u you make no mention of the two Shihs yet emphasize Chao Yü-hsien and Yuan Shao.

Li Fu had not only omitted the two Shihs from his hsüeh-p'u, but made an attempt at whitewashing the less than distinguished career of Chao Yü-hsien and Yüan Haieh. Ch'üan argued that the full details of their sordid financial adventures should be included in their biographies. "Moreover," he said, "of the disciples of great scholars, cannot there be among their ranks 'mean' people?"

Li Fu admired Ch'üan's work, but these letters undoubtedly piqued him. In a long letter, Li responded to some of Ch'üan's charges. The main charge, of biographies biased through omission of material, could not be denied. Li praised Ch'üan, saying, "sir, you are
highly intelligent, and if you are able to accomplish something far reaching it will certainly greatly benefit future generations..."79

Li Fu admired Ch'Uan and thought him capable and intelligent, but although he knew the value of textual criticism he was not as committed to it as Ch'Uan and there were times he was sure Ch'Uan could not see the forest for the trees. Li Fu admonished him to pay greater attention to the big picture when he said, "All that which does not do violence to li (principle, forest or big picture) does not actually need to be extensively examined."80 Ch'Uan himself was a pointillist. His biographies were created from a composite of small points. As it has been shown he wanted each point factual. Li Fu stated that in verifying the facts of a case, "it is impossible to do so without error."81 Regardless of the truth of this statement the concept supporting it ran counter to Ch'Uan's spirit of building with facts.82

Li Fu upbraided Ch'Uan for being too critical, and as it were, a lover of minutiae. However, he found his next letter even more objectionable. Ch'Uan disagreed with Li Fu over the course of Lü Tsu-chien's career. The controversy centered around whether Lü Tsu-chien took up his official post in Ming-chou. Ch'Uan affixed the following postscript to his letter. He realised that Li Fu thought him too concerned with the miniscule facts of a situation rather than with an accurate overview. Ch'Uan stated,

As it regards earlier scholars this matter is actually trivial, and not of sufficient worth to examine in depth. However, it is very relevant to the literary tradition of my province and for this reason I have gone into such detail.83
It was extremely important for Ch'üan to establish that Lü Tsu-ch'ien was in Ningpo. It was not, however, difficult to prove.

Ch'üan's fifth letter began with a summary of Li Fu's position. He stated that Li had two sources of support for his thesis. It was a misreading of these sources, however, which allowed Li Fu to believe that Lü Tsu-ch'ien was unable to take his post in Ningpo. Li Fu was so inclined because, he reasoned, to do so Lü Tsu-ch'ien would have had to disobey prescribed mourning rites for the loss of his elder brother.84 "I have carefully examined this," said Ch'üan, "and I personally don't agree."85 According to the Sung-shih the last office Lü Tsu-ch'ien held was that of chien-ts'ang (Supervisor of Granaries). This was exactly when Lü Tsu-ch'ien's elder brother (Lü Tsu-ch'ien) died. Custom dictates a one year mourning period. Lü Tsu-ch'ien was authorized six months and on request was given a year. It was at this juncture that Lü Tsu-ch'ien allegedly requested assignment and was forthwith posted to K'uei-chou. Li Fu therefore concluded that Lü Tsu-ch'ien never went to Ningpo.

Ch'üan asserted that the Sung-shih did not in fact include Lü Tsu-ch'ien's final assignment - which was to Ningpo. In a letter which Chu Hsi gave to Sheng Lin (1150-1229) he stated that Lü Tsu-ch'ien had received assignment as a chien-ts'ang.86

Ch'üan reasoned that Lü Tsu-ch'ien was already a chien-ts'ang when his elder brother died in 1181. When his term expired in 1182 the one year mourning period had been fulfilled and he was ready for a new assignment.
Ch'üan stated:

Lü Tsu-ch'ien died in 1181, and in the winter of 1182 Lü Tsu-ch'ien took up his post. He properly fulfilled the period of mourning... and thus when his term as chien-ts'ang was complete, there were new orders. 87

Ch'üan quoted Wang Ying-lin's (1223-1296) Ssu-ming ch'i-kuan wherein it stated Lü Tsu-ch'ien was appointed a Ssu-ts'ang (Director of a Granary). He offered further evidence by citing Lü Tsu-ch'ien's own poems, wherein he had made a parallel between himself and Ch'ao Shuo-chih. 88 (Ch'ao Shuo-chih had held office in Ningpo in 1110, and seventy some years later Lü Tsu-ch'ien was to go to the same place.) Lü Tsu-ch'ien also wrote poems to Wang Chi-ho, an official in the same place with Lü. These poems recounted the ancient sites they had visited around Ningpo.

Sung-shih, argued Ch'üan, states that Chou Pi-ta (1125-1204), when prime minister, recalled Lü Tsu-ch'ien but that Lü disregarded the call. Ch'üan showed that Chou Pi-ta became prime minister in 1187. Chu Hsi's letter to Lü Tsu-ch'ien dated 1187 reminded Lü of his responsibility to obey instructions. So Lü Tsu-ch'ien was still in office in Ningpo in 1187.

Ch'üan placed considerable importance on the position of Lü Tsu-ch'ien within the intellectual tradition of Eastern Chekiang. Although Lü spent only six years in Ningpo, Ch'üan was fully prepared to make him an honorary citizen. He reasoned that the duties of his office required Lü to spend much time travelling the countryside. 89 He thus had frequent opportunity to exchange views with Yang Chien (1140-1226), Yuan Hsieh (1144-1224), Shu Lin (1136-1199), and Shen Huan
These scholars were known as the Four Masters of Ningpo. Ch'üan argued that a shrine to Lü Tsu-ch'ien should be built west of the shrine to the Four Masters. He reasoned that since there was no appropriate place in his own hometown to raise such a shrine, it was proper to build one adjacent to those men he so greatly influenced. In Ningpo, said Ch'üan, "His contribution is not to be seen as a function of his office, but rather he is known through his teachings."

Lü Tsu-ch'ien, and his son Lü Ch'iao-nien, were responsible for compiling Lü Tsu-ch'ien's Collected Writings. Known as T'ung-lai chi it contains both his prose and poetry in forty chüan. Lü Tsu-ch'ien was responsible for attempting to reconcile the alleged differences between the teachings of Chu Hsi and Lu Chiu-yüan by arranging for these two scholars to meet and discuss their positions. The famous debates were held at the Goose Lake Monastery in Kiangsi in 1175. Although the outcome of the discussions at Goose Lake Monastery brought the philosophical discrepancies between the two schools into greater relief, and so defeated Lü Tsu-ch'ien's objective, he is still remembered as a scholar who wished to synthesize the strong points of both schools. So in addition to honoring the Four Masters of Ningpo Ch'üan wanted Lü Tsu-ch'ien and his brother brought into the Ningpo tradition.

He works the connection even closer in his essay "Chu-chou san hsien-sheng shu-yüan chi" (A Record of the Academy of the Three Masters at Bamboo Isle), where he stated that the land given to
Shih Hao on his retirement from government by Emperor Hsiao-tsung (reign-period, 1163-1189) and intended as the site for the Bamboo Isle Academy became the property of his own ancestor Ch'üan T'ien-shu, and was then passed on to Ch'üan himself.

The Three Masters were none other than Lü T'zu-ch'ien, Shen Huan, and his younger brother Shen Na. Shen Huan was a close friend of Shih Hao, who had asked the two Shenas to stay with him. They lived on the east side of the lake. Lü T'zu-ch'ien's duties, however, kept him on the west side. Lü's friend Wang Chi-ho was an official in a boat yard and had a small wooden dinghy built for Lü. The scholars met often, and even planned to build a school and receive students. Both Shenas were followers of the Lü Chiu-yüan tradition, and the elder, Shen once lived with Lü T'zu-ch'ien and revered his teachings. Ch'üan has ensured that the synthesizing stream of thought begun by Lü T'zu-ch'ien and maintained by Lü T'zu-ch'ien is given a home in Ningpo. He also placed himself within that stream of thought.
Ch'üan visited ancient sites, and the ruins of houses and schools of well-known scholars of Chekiang. He would search for information relevant to a particular school or scholar. He was piecing together the traditions which later became known as the Che-tung hsüeh-p'ai (Eastern Chekiang School of Learning). His ancestors were a part of this intellectual tradition: those of the Sung period were included in the Sung Yüan hsüeh-an, while ancestors of the Ming-Ch'ing period appear in his Hsü Yung-shang ch'i-chiu shih. His Collected Works formed the basis from which these other accounts were drawn. Examining these works together we may reconstruct Ch'üan's concept of the development of intellectual traditions in Eastern Chekiang.

Ch'üan Tsu-wang and the Eastern Chekiang Philosophical Traditions.

Modern scholars point to Chang Hsüeh-ch'eng as the first scholar of Eastern Chekiang to recognize the existence and uniqueness of the so-called Che-tung hsüeh-p'ai. Chang Hsüeh-ch'eng even defined the tenets of this school. In essence, he was defining Ch'üan's principles of scholarship. Ch'üan never used the phrase Che-tung hsüeh-p'ai, but it would be inaccurate to conclude that because he did not use this name he was unaware of the school of thought it represented.

Ch'üan recognized the geographic terms Che-tung (Eastern
Chekiang) and Che-hai (Western Chekiang). He wrote two essays on the physical geography of Chekiang. 99 Even though he referred to three schools of learning within Eastern Chekiang, "Che-tung" was not limited only to representing a piece of land. Ch'üan wrote about "Confucian scholars of Che-tung" or So-and-so's learning was "the brilliance of Che-tung", the "scholars of Che-tung," "the learning of Che-tung" or "the tradition of Che-tung" in many of his articles. 100

Ch'üan conceived of the various traditions of Eastern Chekiang as constituting a unified whole. Ever since the Sung the cultural center of China had been Eastern Chekiang. 101 Within this geo-cultural sphere, which Ch'üan called wu-tang, "our school" or "the school of Eastern Chekiang" there were three distinguishable schools of thought, known by the name of their founding master or the area where they flourished. Ch'üan was a synthesizer. He wished to emphasize the similarities of the school and he did not dwell on their disagreements. An examination of these schools, their masters, their disciples, and their literature formed the backbone of Ch'üan's analysis.

He used geographic terms to identify the three schools of thought: Yung-chia, Chin-hua, and Ningpo. However, alternate names of these places were also used: Wu to denote Chin-hua, and Ssu-ming for Ningpo. 102 These three traditions developed through a process of synthesis and eclecticism. Ch'üan wrote sixteen records (chi) of the Sung, Yuan, and Ming period academies in Che-tung. 103 These academies are located within Yung-chia, Chin-hua and Ningpo.
In an article discussing the development of the Chin-hua school, Ch'üan said that these schools were all part of the "tradition of Chekiang." His use of wu-hsiang is also noteworthy (wu: I, me, my, our, us; hsiang: village, rural, native place). He was referring to Eastern Chekiang as well as his birthplace of Yin. In the same way then it is understood that since the Sung and Yüan times, "our Eastern Chekiang (not "my native birthplace of Yin") has been known as the cultural center of China." Similarly, when Ch'üan said wu-hsiang hsüeh-p'ai he was talking about the Che-tung hsüeh-p'ai (Eastern Chekiang School of Learning).

An investigation of the philosophical roots of these three schools is revealing. Ch'üan's reconstruction underscores the importance he attached to eclectic synthesis, and implementation of knowledge (i.e. Action). Lü Tsu-ch'ien still occupied a prime position in Ch'üan's narratives. "It is with the Four Masters that the wisdom of the sages is seen," said Ch'üan, "their way is that of Chu Hsi, Chang Ch'ih (1133-1180), and Lü Tsu-ch'ien, but ultimately resides within the teachings of Lu Chiu-yüan." As a result of their learning "the later scholars of Eastern Chekiang were able to comprehend the principles of the universe." The efforts of these men was not long-lived, for unfortunately interpretational differences splintered the schools and scholars diverged, either "following the path of study and inquiry" or "honoring the moral nature." The former was the hallmark of the Ch'eng-Chu school and the latter represented the Lu-Wang school.
According to Ch'üan, Chu Hsi's learning has its foundations in the teachings of Yang Shih (1053-1135). He believed in "following the path of study and inquiry" which, when coupled with active accumulation of moral principle (i-li), can allow one to approach his goal. Thus, with this knowledge one is capable of ascertaining what must be put into effect. This concept has always been a part of the Eastern Chekiang tradition, as it was a primary principle in the thought of Ku Hsien-ch'eng (1550-1612) when he founded the Tung-lin Academy in 1606.

Lu Chiu-yüan, said Ch'üan, emphasized the seeking of the "original mind" (pen-hsin) as basic. Lu's philosophy is similar to the thought of Hsieh Liang-tso (1050-1103) with the exception that the "original mind" must also be linked up with the study of the classics. Ch'üan believed that, thus prepared, "we can know the principles of the universe." He did not believe there was anything inherently wrong with either school of thought: "From each scholar one can learn a particular talent, but the wisdom of the sages cannot thus be obtained; what one excels at another is lacking." He took exception to the corruption within each school. Ch'üan said that hair-spliting was the excess Chu Hsi warned against, while Lu Chiu-yüan protested against the tendencies in his school to condone "instant enlightenment." He wanted his students to appreciate that the two schools were not mutually exclusive, but rather formed a colloidal suspension of philosophical interdependence. "Instant enlightenment" was a corruption of Ch'an and had nothing to do with
the teachings of Lu Chiu-yüan. Even as Chu Hsi’s "following the path of study and inquiry" needed a mainstay (and here we understand it to be Lu Chiu-yüan's "original mind"), so with Lu’s "honoring of the moral nature" or "original mind" does one need solid scholarship.

The learning of Lu Chiu-yüan instructs us that the illumination of the original mind is with the classics, founded in the teachings of Mencius and simultaneously consistent with the principles of exhaustive research of Chang Ch'ih (1133-1180). and furthermore, "it is certainly not, as those subscribing to the instant enlightenment thesis would have it, like being hit on the head with a ton of bricks.""118

"The learning of the ancients," advised Ch'üan, "developed along many paths; their points of departure were not always the same, but this is not to say that they were mutually exclusive." Ch'üan gathered support for his general thesis from Chu Hsi, who believed "that scholars were too slow at self-criticism" and as a result their scholarship suffered. Ch'üan then focused on the scholars of Ningpo saying that they would never consider neglecting the path of study and inquiry after they had acquired some knowledge. "For this reason they could not fall into the abyss of instant enlightenment." There are many ways to reach the same goal but taken as a group they all seek the way of the sage.

Ch'üan maintained this position throughout his Collected Works. After the Chien-tao (1165-1173) and Ch'un-hsi (1174-1189) reign-periods there were three major schools of learning: those of Chu Hsi, Li Tsu-ch'ien, and Lu Chiu-yüan. The three schools existed at the
the same time, with somewhat incompatible philosophies. Ch'üan
summarized them saying,

The learning of Chu Hsi held to exhaustive investigation
into the principle of things; the learning of Lu Chiu-yüan
held to the concept of the original mind. The learning of
Lü T'ou-ch'ien united the positive aspects of both schools...

Ch'üan still concluded, "The paths of these schools were different, yet
their goals were at one with the sages." With this foundation, Ch'üan's records of the Sung, Yuan, and
Ming period academies in Eastern Chekiang are more comprehensible.
They are not, however, the only essays wherein Ch'üan discussed the
learning or the schools of thought of these periods. Where he found
scholars of a particular school needed greater coverage than he gave
them in the record of their school, he would write additional essays
(usually in the form of an epitaph), to develop their achievements on
a more individual basis. In some instances information about a
scholar will be found in an article dedicated to his student, friend,
or colleague. The reader must attune himself to these
possibilities.

Ch'üan stated that before the Four Masters during the reigns
of Sung Chen-tsung (r.p., 998-1022) and Jen-tsung (r.p., 1023-1063),
the Confucian literati were in their infancy. It was not until the
Five Masters of the Ch'ing-li reign period (1041-1048) that "the
Confucian Way was established," and the Five Masters (Yang
Shih, Tu Ch'un, Wang Chih, Lou Yu and Wang Shuo all lived in Eastern
Chekiang at about the same time. When Ch'üan edited the Sung
Yüan hsüeh-an he created a special school-category (hsüeh-an) to
include these five scholars. Both Huang Tsung-hsi and Ch‘u-an considered Hu Huan as the founder of the Confucian revival of the Sung. He is known to have stressed the importance of the teacher-student relationship. He emphasized the relationship between the interpretation of the Classics and their direct application to current problems of statecraft. The following passage, included in Hu Huan's biography in the Sung Yüan hsüeh-an, reveals his understanding of the Confucian Way (tao).

My master was teaching students in the Southeast (Hu-chou) about the Way and Virtue, Benevolence and Justice, when Wang An-shih was still busy in the examination halls working for the chin-shih degree. It is said that the way of the sages has three forms, Principle (t‘i), Practice (yung), and Literary Expression (wen). The bond between prince and minister and between father and son, Benevolence, Justice, Rites and Music ... these are things which do not change through the ages; they are Principles. The Books of Poetry and History, the dynastic histories, and the writings of the philosophers ... these perpetuate the right example down through the ages; they are its Literary Expression. To initiate these principles and put them into practice throughout the Empire, enriching the life of the people and ordering all things to imperial perfection ... this is Practice.

Our dynasty, through its successive reigns, has not made Principle and Practice the basis for the selection of officials. Instead we have prized the embellishments of conventional versification, and thus have corrupted the standards of contemporary scholarship. My teacher (Hu Huan), from the Ming-tao through the Pao-yüan reign-periods (1032-1040), was greatly distressed over this evil and expounded to his students the teaching which aims at clarifying Principle and carrying it out in Practice. Tirelessly, and with undaunted zeal, he wholly devoted himself to school-teaching for over twenty years, first in the Su-chou region and finally at the Imperial Academy T‘ai-hsüeh. Those who have come from his school number at least several thousands. The fact that today scholars recognize the basic importance to government and education of the Principle and Practice of the sages is all due to the efforts of my Master.
These concepts of Principle, Practice, and Literary Expression are the three pillars of Ch'üan's philosophy. They form the basis for his personal assessment of subjects, regardless of whether they were scholars, loyalists, or officials. Literary achievements were never considered in isolation from their author. Ch'üan never argued over whether knowledge precedes action or principle precedes practice. He maintained that it was the "implementation of knowledge" which was most important, and he judged men according to the degree to which they fulfilled this obligation.

He believed in "learning which is practical" (yu yung chih hsüeh), and he praised Ou-yang Hsiu for his practical learning and Literary Expression. He never succumbed to allowing style dictate content. Our knowledge must be used to solve present-day problems. Our efforts should benefit society. Knowledge for the sake of knowledge had no place in Ch'üan's world. It had to be practical. His epitaphs frequently remind the reader that his subject was a man who put his knowledge to work. Such men stood by Principle, truths which were applicable to all times and all places. Without these cultural anchors continuity as well as man's ability to achieve sagehood would be lost. "I believe," said Ch'üan, "that the learning of the sages would not countenance a theory alien to Principle."

Ch'üan accused Ming scholars of not being attentive to learning. He examined the decline of scholarship during the Ming and concluded:

...from the middle of the Ming period the practise of philosophizing (chiang-hsüeh) had disintegrated to a very low state, scholars devoted much time to the discussion of hsing (nature) and ming (destiny) to the extent that they pursued
Ch'ān. They closed their books and did not study. Even rather common people considered themselves scholars, none of them had any scholastic foundation.\textsuperscript{134} They lacked the foundation of Principle and were therefore incapable of its application. He stressed the application of Principle—the practical aspect of the three concepts.

The highest form of praise describing a subject was kung-hsing (practical application of knowledge), and it naturally presumed possession of Principle. He stated that the li-hsūeh of two of his ancestors, Ch'ūan Ting-sun and Ch'ūan Chin-sun "was outstanding and worthy of transmission."\textsuperscript{134} The Literary Expression of Ch'ūan Ch'i and Ch'ūan Yen was equally valuable. The modus operandi of the Ch'ūan clan during this period was an "unspoken commitment to practical application of knowledge."\textsuperscript{135} Ch'ūan did not assert that such practical application had to manifest itself necessarily in literature. The man's very life may exemplify the concept. For one such man, of whom Ch'ūan said, "few people would know about him because he didn't write,"\textsuperscript{136} Ch'ūan himself felt obliged to write about him. More commonly, though, "practical application" and "practical learning" were manifest in Literary Expression.

Wan Ssu-t'ung (1638-1702), Lü Ts'ū-ch'ien, and Lü Tsu-ch'ien were scholars who eminently fulfilled the responsibilities of these three concepts.\textsuperscript{137} Ch'ūan proclaimed that all three men were "indeed gentlemen who implemented their knowledge."\textsuperscript{138} Both prose and poetry were proper vessels in which to pour one's efforts. History, however, was the most practical of all expression. In this manner men
could achieve immortality. Gentlemen should indulge themselves in the belles-lettres only during their spare time. Such frivolous activities and also attempts to prove the supremacy of one Neo-Confucian school of thought over another were not the way (tao) of the sages.

**Ch‘Uan’s Ancestors**

Ch‘Uan was so ostentatious in professing an eclectic synthesis of the earlier schools that hints of his allegiance to a single school might be overlooked. An examination of this must be considered together with our understanding of the influence Ch‘Uan’s ancestors had on his decision making processes.

When he revised Huang Tsung-hsi’s Sung Yüan hsüeh-an Ch‘Uan added accounts of some of his ancestors. In ch‘Uan seventy-four, Ch‘Uan inserted Ch‘Uan Ch‘ien-sun and Ch‘Uan Chin-sun as students of Ch‘en Hsüan. He also included Ch‘Uan Ch‘i, Ch‘Uan Yen, and Ch‘Uan Cheng as students of the same tradition.
Ch'üan seventy-four is devoted to Yang Chien (1140-1226) and his followers. Yang Chien, one of the Four Masters of Ningpo, came from Ch'üan's hometown of Yin but later moved to Tz'u-hsi. Both Ch'üan Chin-sun and Ch'üan Ch'ien-sun were students of Ch'en Hsüan, who was a self-proclaimed disciple of Lu Chiu-yüan and Yang Chien (also a disciple of Lu Chiu-yüan). Huang Jun-yü (1389-1477), mentioned in Huang Tsung-hsi's Ming-ju hsüeh-an, transmitted this tradition. Ch'üan noted that Huang Tsung-hsi neglected to include the origins of Huang Jun-yü's learning, and he wished to fill that omission.

During the reign of Emperor Hsiao-tsung (r.p. 1163-1189) the learning of the Four Masters illuminated the wisdom of "Chu Hsi, Chang Ch'i'ih and Lu Chiu-yüan." After Emperor Hsiao-tsung there were three distinct schools of learning: the followers of Chu Hsi, Lü Tsuch'ien, and Lu Chiu-yüan. Ch'üan added that in Ningpo all three traditions were transmitted, but that the teachings of Lu Chiu-yüan predominated. "Yang Chien, Yuan Chiao, Shu Lin, and Shen Huan were his followers in Eastern Chekiang ... Yang Chien and Yuan Chiao made the greatest contribution in promoting his teachings." According to Ch'üan, beside Yuan Chuch, Lu's staunchest disciple was Ch'en Hsüan.

Ch'üan placed his Sung ancestors firmly within the school of Lu Chiu-yüan. In his youth, Ch'üan's father and uncle had instructed him
to make offerings to the Three Masters of T'ung-ku (Wang Ying-lin (1223-1296), Huang Chen (chin-shih c. 1253), and Lou Fang (chin-shih c. 1190)). Ch'üan requested that the name of Ch'en Hsilan be added to the Three Masters. He often said that Ch'en Hsilan was the foremost follower of Yang Chien.150

Ch'üan has advised us that his family and ancestors were within the Lu Chiu-yüan tradition. Beyond what has been shown, he did not, however, state his own convictions. Ch'üan showed that he could be impartial when dealing with the intellectual traditions of the Sung and Yüan.151

Ch'üan's Contribution to the *Sung Yüan hsüeh-an*

The *Sung Yüan hsüeh-an* was begun by Huang Tsung-hsi (1610-1695) as a complement to his *Ming-ju hsüeh-an*. After Huang's death his son, Huang Po-chia (d. 1643) made some revisions. It was, however, largely through Ch'üan's efforts that the *Sung Yüan hsüeh-an* reached its present form. He began editing Huang's manuscript in 1745,152 When he died nine years later the task was still unfinished. Ch'üan never used the present title (*Sung Yüan hsüeh-an*). When he wrote Huang Tsung-hsi's epitaph in 1736 Ch'üan referred to the *Sung-ju hsüeh-an* (Anthology of Confucian Scholars of the Sung) and the *Yüan ju hsüeh-an*153 Later on he used the titles *Sung-ju hsüeh-an*154 and *Sung Yüan ju-an* (Confucian Scholars of the Sung and Yüan)155

When Ch'üan received Huang's manuscript in 1745 it had not been separated into chu'an. After he died his manuscript *Sung Yüan*
hsüeh-an, as well as a copy of Huang Tsung-hsi's manuscript, passed to Ch'uan's student Lu Kao. Another manuscript Sung Yuan hsüeh-an of Ch'uan was held by Chiang Hsüeh-yung (also Ch'uan's student). This copy was divided into sixty chüan. Ch'uan's preface to his manuscript Sung Yuan hsüeh-an outlined a work of 100 chüan. This preface is used in the Tsang-pu Sung Yuan hsüeh-an edited by Feng Yun-hao and Wang Tsu-ts'ai and printed in 1846.156

Ch'uan's expanded Sung Yuan hsüeh-an incorporated balance and impartiality. Each school and each branch of learning, including those not in the School of the Study of Principle (li-hsüeh) were treated equally. Ch'uan wrote thirty-two supplementary chüan, adding well over two hundred biographies. A few of these chüan seem to reveal Ch'uan's partiality to men of his own hometown. However, if all thirty-two supplementary chüan as well as the additions and revisions he made to Huang's text are taken into consideration this bias is less pronounced.

Ch'uan maintained Huang's method of analysis. A brief biography of the primary scholar(s) and excerpts of their works formed the basis of a school-category (hsüeh-an). This was supplemented with critiques by contemporaries and students. Each branch of learning was evaluated through the works of contemporaries as well as later scholars.

The editors of the Tsang-pu Sung Yuan hsüeh-an collated the works of Huang Tsung-hsi, Huang Po-chia and Ch'uan Tsu-wang. Authorship of each chüan is indicated in one of four ways: hsiu-ting if
it was originally written by Huang and revised by Ch'üan; Ch'üan pu-pen (Ch'üan's supplementary text) if it was written by Ch'üan as a supplement to the Huang text (there are thirty-two of these supplementary chüan); tz'u-ting if it was written by Huang but rearranged by Ch'üan; pu-ting if it was written by Huang but rearranged by Ch'üan into a separate chüan.

Within each chüan an author's contribution is clearly identified. A hsiu (revision) or pu (supplement) after passages indicates Ch'üan authorship. There are also footnotes. The author's personal name appears before each note. Ch'üan wrote a brief introduction at the beginning of each chüan. These notes were originally a preface to the entire work. However, the editors have inserted the appropriate passages at the beginning of each line.

Ch'üan's historical accounts often overlapped. The editors knew there were articles in his Collected Works which supplemented Ch'üan's revisions and additions to the Sung Yuan hsüeh-an. They used eighty-three articles from the Collected Works as supplementary material. The titles used to identify these articles sometimes vary significantly from those used by Ch'üan. Frequently, only part of the original essay is given, or it appears in truncated form in various parts of the text. There are three articles attributed to Ch'üan Tsu-wang in the Ts'eng-pu Sung Yuan hsüeh-an which do not appear in his Collected Works.

The following table is a key to the location of articles in Ch'üan's Collected Works. His records were used in the Tseng-pu
Sung Yuan hsüeh-an. Only sixteen of the thirty-two chüan in the Sung Yuan hsüeh-an attributed to Ch'üan have back-up articles in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and wai-p'ien. There are, therefore, an equal number of chüan which have no such supportive material in the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi. The remaining sixty-one articles supplement Huang Tsung-hsi's original work. Ch'üan's contribution to the Sung Yuan hsüeh-an, therefore, was research done specifically for that text.
**Table 1:**

*Chi-ch'i t'ing chi Articles Which Supplement the Sung Yuan hsueh-an*

**KEY**

First digit of reference either (A) Chi-ch'i t'ing chi or (B) Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-p'ien. Second digit indicates chuan number; numbers following [:] indicate pagination (Hua-shih edition and final digit in []) refers to the numerical placement of the article within the chuan. Entries in italics indicate multiple listing. Original entry indicated in bracketed (I) number. An asterisk (*) denotes when entry is used in/as a foot-note. Initial appearance in the Tseng-pu Sung Yuan hsueh-an.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sung Yuan hsueh-an</th>
<th>Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and wai-p'ien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1:17a-b; 58:4a-b + 25b-26a 74:10a(<em>); 75:3b(</em>); 76:5b(*)+8b.</td>
<td>B.14:839-840(1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2:26b.</td>
<td>B.31:1096-1097(4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3:2a; 3:6b; 6:4a+5b.</td>
<td>B.16:865-866(1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3:5a.</td>
<td>B.34:1147(19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 4:17b.</td>
<td>B.24:977-978(1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 6:4a-b.</td>
<td>B.48:1408(5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 6:10b-11a.</td>
<td>B.34:1148-1149(23).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>25:19b.</td>
<td>B.34:1149(24).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>30:9a; 31:15b(*); 58:25a-b.</td>
<td>B.47:1383-1384(4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>31:15b(*)</td>
<td>B.47:1383-1384(4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>36:3a-b.</td>
<td>NOT IN CH'UAN'S COLLECTED WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>44:14a.</td>
<td>B.27:1032(2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>49:16b-17a.</td>
<td>B.34:1140(3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>51:2a; 74:16a; 85:2a.</td>
<td>B.16:871-872(7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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40. 52:5b.
41. 53:7b.
42. 53:10a; 61:1b-2a; 71:11a(*);
   77:19b-20a.
43. 55:9b.
44. 55:17a.
45. 56:9a-b.
46. 58:4a-b + 25b-26a. [1]
47. 58:25a-b. [19]
48. 60:6a-b.
49. 61:1b-2a. [41]
50. 63:12b.
51. 64:9a.
52. 71:9a(*).
53. 71:11a(*). [41]
54. 72:8a.
55. 73:12b.
56. 74:10a.
57. 74:13a(*); 87:2b-3a.
58. 74:10a(*). [1]
59. 74:15a(*).
60. 74:23a.
61. 74:16a. [36]
63. 74:17a-b + 26b; 86:2b.

A.31:391-392(2).
B.28:1058(28).
B.44:1322-1323(2).
B.34:1142(8).
B.31:1098(7).
A.29:373-374(9).
B.14:839-840(1).
B.47:1383-1384(4).
B.24:978(2).
B.44:1322-1323(2).
B.44:1321-1322(1).
B.44:1333-1334(10).
A.38:489(29).
B.44:1322-1323(2).
A.31:392-393(3).
B.16:874-875(10).
B.16:870-871(6).
B.16:875-876(11).
B.14:839-840(1).
B.45:1355-1356(19).
A.38:488(24).
B.16:871-872(17).
B.44:1325-1326(4).
B.16:873-874(9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>96:6a-7a.</td>
<td>A.38:487-488(22).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>96:21a-b.</td>
<td>NOT IN CH'UAN'S COLLECTED WORKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>97:14b-15a.</td>
<td>NOT IN CH'UAN'S COLLECTED WORKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>98:11a.</td>
<td>B.49:1422(3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>100:1b.</td>
<td>B.34:1155(41).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>100:2a-b.</td>
<td>A.38:490(33).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chüan rarely discussed the political implementation of a philosophy. He did, however, consider the philosophies of the schools which influenced reform measures during the Northern Sung. There were impressive personalities on all sides.

Wang An-shih's (1021-1086) New Policies (hsin-fa) were opposed by Ou-yang Hsiu (1007-1072), Lü Kung-chu (1018-1089), Su-ma Kuang (1019-1086), Su Shih (1036-1101), Su Ch'ae (1039-1112) and Lu Ta-fang (1028-1097), as well as many other scholars and officials. Chüan recorded these participants of the reform movement as he did other scholars. The basic information about an individual was always in the biography. However, this could be supplemented in another man's biography. (Chüan introduced a dialogue between Su-ma Kuang and Wang An-shih which was critical of Wang's method of implementing his reform programs.)

Wang An-shih's life, philosophy, and followers were considered in one of the three special hsüeh-lüeh (sketches of learning) that Chüan appended to the end of the Sung Yüan hsüeh-an. Chüan believed that Wang An-shih's greatest contribution was his commentaries on the classics, because they "most consistently captured the essence of the sages." Chüan was referring to Wang's commentaries in his Chou kuan hsin-i. He said that this was personally written by Wang An-shih, and was the work he most applied himself too. Chüan said that it provided the basis for his New Policies. It had become lost to the world, said Chüan, but "In 1735 I found it in the Yung-lo ta-tien."
Ch'üan was overjoyed and discussed his find with the directors of the bureau (Fang Pao and Li Fu).\(^{161}\) Ch'üan said that they "directed that all the commentaries to the classics written by Wang An-shih be copied."\(^{162}\) Ch'üan said, "Wang An-shih's explanation of the classic is in the truest tradition of K'ung Ying-ta (T'ang) and Cheng K'ang-Ch'ang (Han)."\(^{163}\) They were terse and accurate. Wang An-shih epitomizes Ch'üan's virtue of kung-hsing. He said:

Wang An-shih's teachings and undertakings were derived from the classics,...they most consistently captured the essence of the sages,... and because of this the emperor established it as a way of learning.\(^{164}\)
NOTES

1. Li Tz'u-ming. Žuoh-man t'ang jih-chi. (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1921. (51 vols.) See chuăn 3, pp. 21a-b; chuăn 7, pp. 6a-6b; chuăn 29, p. 36a. See also Chang Shun-hui. Ch'ing jen wen-chi pieh-1u (2 vols), (Peking: Chung-hua, 1980), vol. 1, pp. 159-161.

2. In the Chi-ch'i t'ing chi the title of this collection is known as Ching-shih wen-ta. However, Juan Yuan's (1764-1849) preface, written in 1794, used Ching-shih ta-wen. Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period used the latter. In Tung Ping-ch'un's preface to the wai-p'ien he refers to Ching-shih wen-ta as Ching-shih wen-mu.


4. The following is a translation of Juan Yuan's preface to the Ching-shih wen-ta.

If one achieves eminence in either the classics, the belle-lettres, or has an ability for history this is sufficient for him to be remembered. However, Master Ch'üan Tsu-wang of the Yin District has united these three principles. When the po-hsueh hung-tzu examination was held [The second special po-hsueh hung-tzu examination of 1736] Ch'üan was already holding an official position as a Bachelor of the Department of Study at the Hanlin Academy. He did not take the examination. [For a description of events surrounding this situation see this thesis, chapter 1, pp. 10-11.] He intended to submit two prose-poems (fu) discussing the subtle intricacies in the i-wen-chih of the Han-shu and [Hsin] T'ang-shu before the examination.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ch’ing-li wu hsien-sheng shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
<td>Sun 3,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ta-han Chiao hsien-sheng shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
<td>Sun -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ch’ang-ch’un shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
<td>Sun 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chu-chou san hsien-sheng shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
<td>Sun 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ch’eng-nan shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
<td>Sun 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Pi-chih Yang wen-yüan kung shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
<td>Sun 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;T’ung-ku san hsien-sheng shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Sun 74</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td>Sun 73</td>
<td></td>
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<td>&quot;Yung-tung Ching-ch’ing shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
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<tr>
<td>&quot;Tse-shan shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
<td>Sun 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Heng-hsi nan shan shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
<td>Ming -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ch’eng-pei Ching-ch’uan shu-yüan chi&quot;</td>
<td>Ming -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Chapter Seven

Historical Geography

Ch'üan's essay on the P'u-yang River may be regarded as an example of his historical geography. He wrote many short essays on the physical geography of Chekiang which dovetailed with his lifelong interest, the annotating of the Shui-ching chu, a topic too complex to be analyzed effectively within this work. Ch'üan's contribution to the Shui-ching chu, moreover, has already been documented by other scholars.¹

In his many years of research on the "century-old controversy concerning the Shui-ching chu shih," Hu Shih (1891-1969) came to the conclusion that there was no thievery or collusion committed by Tai Chen (1724-1777), Chao I-ch'ing (1710-1764), or Ch'üan Tsu-wang.² Each man had reached the same conclusions independently. In his research, however, Hu Shih did discover what he believed to be solid evidence of Ch'üan's incompetence and unreliability.³ Moreover, Hu Shih believed that this unreliability permeated the whole corpus of Ch'üan's writing. In a passage preserved among his unpublished papers, Hu Shih stated, "sometime in the future much of the work published by Hsieh-shan [Ch'üan Tsu-wang] should be completely reviewed."⁴

There is no question that the work of all great scholars should be reviewed from time to time, but Hu Shih's opinion went further than that. He was convinced that Ch'üan's basic methodology was so flawed,
regardless of whether he was writing history or geography, that he regarded all his work as suspect. His appraisal of Ch'üan's scholarship, however, begins and ends with the various questions relating to the clarification and understanding of the Shui-ching chu.

Hu Shih reviewed in detail only the "P'u-yang ch'iang chi" (A Note on the P'u-yang River) from Ch'üan's Chi-ch'i t'ing chi. This essay, while specifically related to the study of the Shui-ching chu, may also be discussed independently. Although it deals with only one item, it does exemplify Ch'üan's basic methodology in the history of physical geography, and exhibits the traits which Hu Shih condemned. The analysis of Ch'üan's "P'u-yang ch'iang chi," therefore, is presented as a specific example of the accuracy and the defects of Ch'üan's work.

The three main river systems examined in this study are: the P'u-yang, the Ts'ao-o, and the Ch'ien-ch'ing, all having their sources and mouths within Chekiang. The map on page 327 shows their courses during the periods under consideration. The P'u-yang and the Ts'ao-o flow north toward the southern coast of Hang-chou Bay. The Ch'ien-ch'ing flows between the P'u-yang and the Ts'ao-o in the lower coastal areas. The low-lying coastal regions of Hang-chou Bay were particular liable to change, the river courses in this area being affected by irrigation and canal systems, and at some points the Ch'ien-ch'ing River itself becomes part of the canal system. Needless to say, the P'u-yang River changed radically its course between the Six Dynasties
and that of the Ch'ing.

In 1749 Ch'üan was crossing Lake Liang near Shang-yü Prefecture. During his journey he met the magistrate of Shan-yin and in the course of conversation they discussed historical records of the P'u-yang River. The "P'u-yang chiang chi" recorded this event. Two hundred years later, in a colophon to this article, Hu Shih criticized Ch'üan's methodology.

Any study of river systems in this area is fraught with difficulties. Ch'üan is dealing with almost two thousand years of historical geography in an essay of less than one thousand characters. In those two thousand years not only did the P'u-yang River change its course, but its tributaries also changed. Sometimes the situation as described was the result of an author's imagination: he might never have visited the places in question, his understanding of the area being based completely on secondary authorities. As mentioned above, the construction of levees, dikes and canals complicated the issue, since it significantly altered the paths of rivers and streams in the coastal area. This helps explain why accounts written at different times may differ radically in their location of the path of a certain river. Further difficulties arise over the very names of these rivers. For one example, the name of a city was often used to indicate the stretch of a river which flowed through its environs. This could result in the river having several names, and the old names often remained long after the cities themselves had changed their own name or been resettled elsewhere.
These difficulties, however, are not insurmountable. Ch'üan's work showed that he was aware of them and tried to disentangle them. He described rivers in the traditional manner, his approach being the same as that used by Li Tao-yüan in his Shui-ch'ing chu. The main river was described from its source to the point where it ceased to be a separate stream. At each place where the main river was joined by a tributary, that tributary was described from its source to the junction. This process was continued until the whole length of the main river, and all its tributaries, were accounted for. In Ch'üan's essay three main rivers were discussed: the P'u-yang, the Ts'ao-o and the Ch'ien-ch'ing. In his colophon, Hu Shih quoted long passages from Ch'üan's text, and follows them with his own commentary, either documentary or expository. Since Ch'üan did not identify his authorities any more specifically than by their title, Hu Shih paid particular attention to identifying the specific reference within the text which Ch'üan was quoting. Hu Shih does not fault Ch'üan's authorities, nor does he object to the conclusions Ch'üan reached; he does, however, object to the way Ch'üan used those authorities and presented his sources.

The basic problem is whether the P'u-yang River can be identified with the whole or a part of the Ts'ao-o River. As has already been intimated, the answer depends on what period of time is under consideration. Ch'üan used authorities from the Han, Six Dynasties, T'ang, and Sung to show how the courses and names of the P'u-yang, Ts'ao-o and other rivers changed during these periods.
In his "P'u-yang chiang chi" Ch'üan presented three basic points of view. The position of Li Tao-yüan was viewed through his Shui-ching chu and that of Huang Tsung-hsi was presented through his Chin (new) Shui-ching. Ch'üan's own position diverged from both these scholars. His conclusion was achieved, not merely by a consolidation of the theories of Li Tao-yüan and Huang Tsung-hsi, but from a consultation of other authorities not used by those two men, while the description of the P'u-yang, Ts'ao-o and Ch'ien-ch'ing rivers was also based upon his own observations in the field. Ch'üan states his position in the first few lines of his essay:

The source of the P'u-yang River system lies in I-wu, in the area of Chu-chi. There are two distinct rivers. These are the Ts'ao-o and the Ch'ien-ch'ing. The one which has its source on the southern slopes of the mountain at I-wu and flows through Kao-pa, is the so-called Tung-hsiao River whose lower reaches are known as the Ts'ao-o.

The river which rises from the northern slopes of the I-wu mountain and flows through I-ch'iao is the so-called Hsi-hsiao River. Its lower reaches are known as the Ch'ien-ch'ing.

The Ts'ao-o River bends eastward from Chu-chi and flows to Sheng and to Yü-yao. It then curves to the north reaching Shang-yü for the first time. From Kuei-chi it empties into the ocean.

The Ch'ien-ch'ing River, from the western borders of Chu-chi goes past Hsiao-shan, flows back on itself east to Shan-yin, and empties into the ocean.

One of these rivers is crooked and one is straight. Their sources are different. However, during the Six Dynasties (222-589) they were both known by the name P'u-yang.9

These few paragraphs describe the locations of the P'u-yang, Ts'ao-o and Ch'ien-ch'ing rivers during Ch'üan's time. "One of these rivers is crooked and one is straight. Their sources are different," describes a condition some 1,200 years after Li Tao-yüan's Shui-ching chu was compiled.
Ch'üan went on to give an account of the P'u-yang from the time of the Han dynasty. He believed Li Tao-yüan confused his rivers: "What he [Li Tao-yüan] records as the P'u-yang is actually the Ts'ao-o" 10 and that this occurred because Li had misconstrued his authorities. Li Tao-yüan's belief that the P'u-yang was the Ts'ao-o was based on a line in the "Shan chü fu" (Fu on Dwelling in the Mountains)," by the celebrated poet, Hsieh Ling-yün, Duke of K'ang-le (385-433). 11 Ch'üan had earlier stated that, "At this time both the Ts'ao-o and the Ch'ien-ch'ing were called P'u-yang. When Hsieh Ling-yün says P'u-yang in his "Shan chü fu" he is always referring to the Ts'ao-o."12 Ch'üan believed "Li Tao-yüan himself never went south of the Yangtse, and that is why he made these mistakes."13 His reliance on first hand information is again reaffirmed. His writings recognized the need to go, to seek, and to see.

As to Huang Tsung-hsi's position, Ch'üan summarized it only to reject it:

In modern times, the people of Yüeh [i.e., the people of the region of southern Chekiang] say: "The P'u-yang is not the Ts'ao-o but rather is the Ch'ien-ch'ing," and that is used to correct Li Tao-yüan. Even though Huang Tsung-hsi's Chin Shui-ch'ing also follows this same argument, it is still wrong.14.

It seems that Ch'üan might have included Huang's argument because it differed from both his own and Li Tao-yüan's. Put simply, the three positions assumed by the three men may be summarized as follows:

1. Li Tao-yüan. The P'u-yang is the Ts'ao-o.
2. Huang Tsung-hsi. The P'u-yang is not the the Ts'ao-o, it is a part of the Ch'ien-ch'ing.
3. Ch'üan Tsu-wang.

A. Six Dynasties: The name P'u-yang is used to describe two rivers in this region: the Ts'ao-o is the main river of the P'u-yang River system and the Ch'ien-ch'ing is a secondary stream.

B. The present day (1749) P'u-yang and Ts'ao-o are separate rivers.

Having stated that the two rivers were separate, Ch'üan then traced the name P'u-yang and Ts'ao-o back to the point when they were used to identify place names rather than rivers.

In the Yiian fang chiu yü chih [Northern Sung gazetteers] Ts'ao-o appears as a township under the entry for Kuei-chi and the Ch'ien-ch'ing as a township under the entry for Shan-yin. These names of townships were not, however, used as names of rivers.15

He found that Pan Ku's Treatise of Geography in the Han shu does not have the name P'u-yang, but it "does refer to the eastern stream of the P'u-yang, calling this the K'o River, and citing it under the entry for Shang-yü. This was the [modern] Ts'ao-o."16 Furthermore, he contended that Pan Ku referred to the western river as the P'an River, and "cites it under the entry for Yü-chi. This is the [modern] Ch'ien-ch'ing River."17 According to Ch'üan, it was Wei Chao (204-273) who first used "Pu-yang" to name a river. Ch'üan further stated:
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The name P'u-yang, however, became well-known during the Sung (420-479) and Ch'i (479-502) periods. At this time both the Ts'ao-o and the Ch'ien-ch'ing were called P'u-yang.18

Ch'üan used the Nan-shih and the Tzu-chih t'ung-chien to support his argument that during the Six Dynasties "the P'u-yang River had used the Ts'ao-o as its eastern course and as its main stream."19 He agreed with Li Tao-yüan on the significance of the canals and levees.

It appears that when the P'u-yang River flowed eastward, that was the time before the levees were built. It would have flowed from Yü-yao to reach the borders of Chu-chi.20

Ch'üan stated that in the Nan-shih there is the passage, "the north and south ferry piers on the P'u-yang each have an official to inspect [cargo]."21 He also quoted Hu San-hsing's commentary to the Tzu-chih t'ung-chien: "The southern ferry pier is the present-day Lake Liang levee. The northern ferry pier is the present day Ts'ao-o levee."22

In 1749 when Ch'üan was crossing Lake Liang he met the magistrate of Shan-yin. The account of their conversation given by Ch'üan in the "P'u-yang chiang chi" is criticized by Hu Shih in his thirteen page colophon entitled "Hsien-tseng-kung yu Liu-p'u [(Ch'üan's) Late Grandfather and Liu-p'u].23

Hu Shih faults Ch'üan on four basic points.24 Firstly, he claims that Ch'üan read and quoted from the preface of Huang Tsung-hsi's Chin Shui-ch'ing, but he has not read the entire work.25 In that preface Huang decried the practice of quoting out of context, a practice which, he claimed destroyed an author's original intention.
Huang illuminated this point with an example. In his preface there is a line which reads "The Ts'ao-o River is the P'u-yang River." According to Huang this is an example of a distortion perpetuated by scholars who lifted passages out of context to suit their own purposes.

Hu Shih quotes a line from Ch'üan's essay, which suggests that Huang Tsung-hsi had said, "what is called the P'u-yang is not the Ts'ao-o, but is rather a part of the Ch'ien-ch'ing." Hu Shih further quotes from Huang's full text, which concluded with the assertion that the P'u-yang was neither the Ts'ao-o nor the Ch'ien-ch'ing.

Ch'üan, however, actually did believe that the P'u-yang was a part of the Ts'ao-o, although in his preface Huang stated that that premise was the offspring of faulty scholarship. Ch'üan never maintained that Huang Tsung-hsi subscribed to his own argument. On the contrary, he faulted both Huang and Li Tao-yüan for their mistaken identification of these rivers. Had Ch'üan read only the preface, he could not have inserted the "not" preceding "the Ts'ao-o River," nor could he have included the reference to the Ch'ien-ch'ing River in his statements; this information was only mentioned in the main text of Huang's Chin Shui-ching. Ch'üan disagreed with Huang's statement, saying "Even though Huang's Chin Shui-ching also follows this same argument, it is still wrong." If he had simply quoted from Huang's preface, as Hu Shih insists he did, he would have been in agreement with Huang. So Hu Shih's first point lacks substance, and
actually represents a misreading of Ch'üan's argument.

The second point raised by Hu Shih rests on the passage in which Ch'üan invites the reader to consider Hsieh Ling-yün's famous "Shan chü fu," as corroborating evidence of the truth of his argument, and points out that the P'u-yang referred to by Hsieh Ling-yün was that part of the river called the Ts'ao-o. Ch'üan was emphatic about the value of this evidence saying, "Hsieh Ling-yün lived at this place. Is it possible he could mistakenly employ the name of a river over 100 li away and use it to name the river near his home..."31

Hu Shih held that in Hsieh Ling-yün's "Shan chü fu" the P'u-yang is never specifically mentioned. He therefore concluded that Ch'üan's citing of this reference "was very inaccurate."32 In this, Hu Shih is partially correct, for there is no place in the "Shan chü fu" where the two characters p'u (甫) and yang (揚) appear together as the name of the river.

Hsieh Ling-yün, however, had a younger brother, Hsieh Hui-lien, who wrote a poem specifically mentioning the P'u-yang, and the text in the Wen-hsuan where this poem is found has a footnote by Li Shan as well as a reference to Li Tao-yuan's Shui-ching chu.33 Hu Shih suggested that Ch'üan used the information in Hsieh Hui-lien's poems and decided it was the landscape depicted in the "Shan chü fu."34

As Hu Shih saw it, Ch'üan confused his references. This would indeed seem to be the case, since Hsieh Ling-yün's "Shan chü fu" does not appear in the Wen-hsuan. However, Hu Shih does concede the possibility that Ch'üan was referring to Hsieh Hui-lien's poem. Both
Ch'Uan and Hsieh Ling-yün were well acquainted with the geography of the region in question. When Ch'Uan read the "Shan chü fu" he knew the area described by Hsieh Ling-yün, and although the river's name was never mentioned, both men knew it was the P'u-yang. Ch'Uan continued this vagueness which had already been incorporated into Li Tao-yüan's Shui-ching chu, to support his argument. Ch'Uan said, "Li Tao-yüan's belief that the P'u-yang is the Ts'ao-o, is based on Hsieh K'ang-le's 'Shan chü fu'." He thus continued the vagueness of definition begun by Li Tao-yüan.

Thirdly, Ch'Uan does not say that the agreement of Li Shan (a commentator of the Wen-hsüan) had appeared as a footnote to the "Shan chü fu." This is an interpretation, or assumption, made by Hu Shih. Inasmuch as the comment by Li Shan appears as a note to a poem written by Hsieh Hui-lien and that the "Shan chü fu" itself is not in the Wen-hsüan, it is reasonable to assume that Ch'Uan had not expected that the reader would understand the line in his essay "Li Shan is in accordance" as referring to a footnote to the "Shan chü fu." What might have been very clear to Ch'Uan who knew the region geographically, was not so clear to readers removed from the region and separated from it in time by two hundred years. In order to be assured of an accurate understanding of the P'u-yang ch'ieng ch'i, therefore, it is necessary to read the authorities which Ch'Uan cited in concert with his essay.

The fourth and final point made by Hu Shih's colophon hinges on Ch'Uan's inadequate citing of authorities. The Nan-shih, wrote
Ch'üan, contained the accounts of battle(s) which took place on the P'u-yang River, "and those, he asserted, were references to the Ch'ien-ch'ing."37 A thorough reading of the Nan-shih, says Hu Shih, reveals no direct reference to any such battle.38 Ch'üan did not say which battle(s) he was referring to and, moreover, the Nan-shih at no place uses the names P'u-yang or Ch'ien-ch'ing. It is possible that Ch'üan was again referring to topographical descriptions which he knew to be the P'u-yang, but it would appear that in this instance Hu Shih's argument must be upheld.

Of Hu Shih's four criticisms of Ch'üan, it has been shown that only the fourth is valid. Ch'üan should have identified the battle(s) in the Nan-shih more specifically. It is the unjustified rhetoric in the first three points of his colophon, however, that Hu Shih has used for denouncing Ch'üan's historiography. Asking the reader to discount the whole body of Ch'üan T'ou-wang's scholarly work, based only on the criticism given above, appears quite unjustified. Hu Shih himself should have been embarrassed to press such a charge upon such slight evidence.

Moreover, the title of Hu Shih's colophon, "Hsien-teung-kung y'u Liu-p'u," ([Ch'üan's] Late Grandfather and Liu-p'u) deserves some attention. Halfway through this colophon Hu Shih discusses the "Four Piers" of the Southern Dynasties, stating Ch'üan "cited Hu San-hsing's commentary to the Tzu-chih t'ung-chien, but he did not mention his own ancestors."39 Hu Shih gives no explanation for the connection between this statement and the title of his colophon.
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In other articles, however, Hu Shih states his conviction that Ch'üan attributed the results of his scholarship to his own ancestors. This was to add credence to Ch'üan's argument that the Shui-ching chu had been the object of scholarly attention by his family for three generations. Hu Shih berates such methods as being "very dishonest." This does not, however, explain the title of Hu Shih's colophon, nor do his other articles show any connection between Ch'üan's grandfather and one of the "Four Piers" known as Liu-p'u.

Ch'üan wrote five brief colophons to the "Chien-chiang shui-p'ien" of the Shui-ching chu. According to Hu Shih when Ch'üan visited Chao I-ch'ing in 1754 he showed him three of these colophons, which represented a small part of Ch'üan's writing on the Shui-ching chu. Hu Shih argued that the three colophons Ch'üan showed Chao I-ch'ing were part of Ch'üan's Ch'i-chiao Shui-ching chu (The Seventh Collation of the Water Classic Commentaries). Hu Shih cited the second, third and fourth colophons. However, it was only in Ch'üan's first colophon that he mentioned his grandfather in connection with the identification of Liu-p'u. From the text and footnotes of Hu Shih's colophons dealing with the Shui-ching chu, the reader could not know the meaning of the title of his colophon, nor could the sentence in his colophon "He did not, however, mention his ancestors" have any significance.

The following annotated translations provide the background material essential to understanding the points stated above.
Translation of Hu Shih's Colophon, "Hsien-ts'ang-kung yu Liu-p'u"

([Ch'uan's] Late Grandfather and Liu-p'u)

In about 1750 (14th year of Ch'ien-lung reign-period) Ch'Uan Hsieh-shan "was crossing Lake Liang in the same boat with Shu Shu-t'ien (Shu Chan), the magistrate of Shan-yin." They discussed the problem of the P'u-yang River and as a result of this discussion Hsieh-shan wrote the "P'u-yang chiang chi." [Hu's note: According to the Shan-yin Prefecture Gazetteer (8th year of the Chia-ch'ing reign-period, 1804.) Shu Chan held the position of magistrate in Shan-yin from the 14th to the 16th years of the Ch'ien-lung reign-period (1750-1752). Hsieh-shan was the principal of the Chi-shan College in Shao-hsing in the 13th year of the Ch'ien-lung reign-period (1749). In the following year he quit and returned home. Because of his students' exhortations, however, he still went to Shao-hsing to live for three months. Lake Liang is located in Shang-yü Prefecture. Therefore, it would seem that his article was written in the 14th year of the Ch'ien-lung reign period when Ch'Uan was travelling between Ning-po and Shao-hsing.]

The general idea of the article is as follows:

The source of the P'u-yang River system lies in I-wu in the area of Chu-chi. There are two distinct rivers. These are the Ts'ao-o and the Ch'ien-ch'ing. The one which has its source on the southern slopes of the mountain at I-wu, and then flows through Kao-pa, is the so-called Tung-hsiao River, whose lower reaches are known as the Ts'ao-o.

The river which rises from the northern slopes of the I-wu mountain and then flows through I-ch'iao, is the so-called Hsi-hsiao River. Its lower reaches are known as the Ch'ien-ch'ing.

The Ts'ao-o River bends eastward from Chu-chi and flows to
Sheng and to Yü-yao. It then curves to the north reaching Shang-yü for the first time. From Kuei-ch'i it empties into the ocean.

The Ch'ien-ch'ing River, from the western borders of Chu-ch'i, goes past Hsiao-shan, flows back on itself and east to Shan-yin and empties into the ocean.

One of these rivers is crooked and one is straight. Their sources are different. However, during the Six Dynasties [222-589] they were both known by the name P'u-yang. Now if we examine the name P'u-yang, during Han the name P'u-yang had not yet appeared. Therefore Pan Ku does not record it in the Treatises. However, Pan Ku's Treatise of Geography does refer to the eastern section of the P'u-yang, calling this the K'o River, and citing it under the entry for Shang-yü. This was the Ts'ao-o.

Pan Ku refers to the western river as the P'an River, and cites it under the entry for Yü-ch'i. This is the Ch'ien-ch'ing River.

In the Hsü-chih of the Book of the Later Han [i.e. Chun-huo chih (Treatise of Commanderies and Kingdoms) taken from the Hsü Han shu of Ssu-ma Piao and inserted as a part of the Hou Han shu] the P'an River is noted but the K'o River is missing.

P'u-yang as the name of a river was first used by Wei Chao [204-272]. The Hsü-chih appeared after Wei Chao, but still Ssu-ma Piao had evidently not recorded it. This shows that it was not a common name at the time.

The name P'u-yang, however, it was well-known during the Sung [420-479] and Ch'i [479-502] periods. At this time both the Ts'ao-o and the Ch'ien-ch'ing were called P'u-yang. When Hsieh Ling-yün said "P'u-yang" in his "Shan chü fu" he always refers to the Ts'ao-o. Li Shan follows this interpretation.

The military battle(s) on the P'u-yang mentioned in the Nan-shih all refer to the Ch'ien-ch'ing. I have examined the gazetteers Shih tao chih and Yüan-ho chun hsien chih written during the T'ang and there is no mention of the names of these two rivers.

In the Yüan-feng chiu yü chih [Northern Sung gazetteers] Ts'ao-o appears as a township under the entry for Kuei-ch'i and the Ch'ien-ch'ing as a township under the entry for Shan-yin. They were not, however, used as names of rivers.

When I read Li Tao-yüan's Shui-ching chu, what he records as the P'u-yang River is actually the Ts'ao-o; he then discusses the P'an River of Haiao-shan. This is the upper reaches of the Ch'ien-ch'ing. He does not realize that it has been divided into two and thinks that they were one. This is due to his lack of careful analysis. Therefore he said, "The river Shang-yü flows east to Yung-hsing and joins with the Che River," that means the waters of T'ai-k'ang hu and the Hu tributary can reach I-Ch'iao and Ma-hsi and empty into the ocean.

With such erratic changes from east to west, his blunders are
great. Evidently, Li Tao-yüan himself never went south of the Yangtse, and that is why he made these mistakes. Or it could be that during the period of the Six Dynasties the levees were not complete and as a result the Tung-hsiao River was still able to flow west. The eastern tributaries could then have reached to Yung-hsing. [Hu's note: The Han Yü-chi district name was changed to Yung-hsing during the Wu. It is east of the present-day Hsiao-shan district. But this must not be taken as absolute.]

By this I am not in any way trying to justify Li Tao-yüan. Yet, if we consider the situation during his time, that is probably the way it was. Shih Su [Hu's note: Shih Su, tzu, Wu-tzu of Wu-hsing. An assistant prefectural magistrate of Shao-hsing. He wrote the Kuei-chi chi, also known as the Chia-t'ai kuei-chi chih, in the first year of the Chia-t'ai reign period (1201)] discussed this but not carefully.

In recent times, the people of Yüeh say:

"The P'ü-yang is not the Ts'ao-o but is rather the Ch'ien-ch'ing," and that is used to correct Li Tao-yüan. Even though Huang Tsung-hsi's Chin Shui-ching follows this same argument it is still wrong.

Li Tao-yüan's belief that the P'ü-yang is the Ts'ao-o was based on Hsieh Ling-yün's "Shan chü fu." Hsieh Ling-yün lived at this place.

In Huang Tsung-hsi's preface to his Chin Shui-ching he ridiculed the mistakes of Li Tao-yüan's Shui-ching chu. Huang used as an example of this faulty scholarship the statement under the Yueh River [sic]. Substantiating that "[the Pu'-yang River is the Ts'ao River]."45 Hsieh-shan only read this preface. He did not read the entire text of the Chin shui-ching, and as a result he stated that Huang's text also contained the passage "What is called P'ü-yang is not the Ts'ao-o, but is rather a part of the Ch'ien-ch'ing."

Actually on page thirty-one of the Chin Shui-ching it clearly states "The P'ü-yang River has its source at Mt Shen-niao sixty li west of P'ü-chiang Prefecture in Chin-hua prefect. It passes the boundaries of P'ü-chiang Prefecture and goes northward, at Fu-yang
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Che River." Huang Tsung-hsi's argument is that the P'u-yang River is neither the Ts'ao-o nor the Ch'ien-ch'ing and in fact has no connection at all with those two rivers.

Li Tao-yuan's belief that the P'u-yang is the Ts'ao-o was based on Hsieh Ling-yün's "Shan Chü fu". Hsieh Ling-yün lived at this place. Is it possible he could mistakenly employ the name of a river over 100 li away and use it to name a river near his own home? Such a suggestion is not even worthy of discussion.

Hsieh-shan has previously stated (I [Hu Shih] didn't cite it):

"When Hsieh Ling-yün spoke of P'u-yang in his "Shan chü fu" he was referring to the Ts'ao-o. Li Shan is in accordance with this interpretation." At this point the "Shan chü fu" is again mentioned. This is indeed very inaccurate. Li Tao-yüan's original notation was only "that Wang Yüan-lin said it's like the land of the gods." The circumstances are also clearly described in Hsieh Ling-yün's "Shan chü fu." The complete text of the "Shan chü fu" with notes by the author is in the "Biography of Hsieh Ling-yün" in Shen Yüeh's Sung-shu. Not once does it mention either the P'u-yang River or the Ts'ao-o River. This "Shan chü fu" was not included in the Wen-hsuan [Trans: Hsiao T'ung's, Wen-hsüan]. However, in Li Shan's commentary on Hsieh Ling-yün's poems he does cite the "Shan chü fu" twice, and he cites the "Shan chü t'u" once; none of these entries mentions the P'u-yang River. Hsieh-shan's "Li Shan is in accordance with this" is indeed inexplicable.

In chüan twenty-five of the Wen-hsuan there is a poem by Hsieh Hui-lien, "Hsi-ling yü feng hsien K'ang-le" (Hit By a Wind at Hsi-ling, a poem presented to K'ang-le) in which the line, "yesterday
we left the bend in the P'u-yang and today we stay overnight on the Che River," occurs. Li Shan quotes the *Shui-ching Chu* : "The P'u-yang River has its source at Wu-shang district and flows through Shang-yü district." Hsieh Ling-yün's grandfather, Hsieh Hsüan (343-388), and father Hsieh Huan, are buried at Shih-ning district. His land and residence were at Shih-ning. The landscape Hsieh Ling-yün described in his "Shan chú fu" was of this place. The *Shui-ching chu* states that

The P'u-yang river then turns northeast flowing by Ch'eng-kung Peak of Mt Hu in Shih-ning district. ... The P'u-yang turns northeast at Mt Hu flowing into T'ai-k'ang hu.

Moreover, in the *Man-shih* it is recorded that the north and south ferry piers on the P'u-yang each has an official to inspect [cargo]. Hu San-hsing said: The southern ferry pier is the present Lake Liang levee. The northern ferry pier is the present-day Ts'ao-o levee. During the Six Dynasties, these along with the Hsi-ling and Liu-p'u piers, were known collectively as the "Four Piers". Thus, it should be clear that the P'u-yang River [system] would use Ts'ao-o as its eastern course and its main stream, while the western channels converging at Ch'ien-ch'ing are secondary.

The administrative system of the Six Dynasties was surely able to distinguish its river systems clearly. How can one use this to contradict Li Tao-yüan [who agrees with these findings]? This may be described as the fault of not carefully examining the past, and thus making questionable statements. It appears that when the P'u-yang River flowed eastward, that was in the time before the levees were built. It would then have flowed from Yu-yao to reach the borders of Chu-chi. (Hu's note: The ancient Chu-chi district is in the region of the present-day Tsu-yü and Yin districts.) This isn't like the present-day Ts'ao-o, but what Li Tao-yüan said can be proven.

Hence, for these reasons, the P'u-yang was one of the three rivers of Wu and Yüeh. If we accept the argument that considers
the Ch'ien-ch'ing as being its tributary, it is much too narrow....

In the "P'u-yang ch'iang chi" by Hsieh-shan he has already mentioned the "Four Piers" of the Southern Dynasties. Among these four piers he mentioned the Liu-p'u pier. He has cited Hu San-hsing's commentary to the Tzu-chih t'ung chien. He did not mention his ancestors.48

In the Tzu-chih t'ung chien, ch'üan 131 [we read]: "The army of Wu Hsi arrived at Ch'ien-t'ang... Wu Hsi crossed over from Liu-p'u arriving at Hsi-ling." Hu San-hsing's commentary states:

Liu-p'u is the present-day confluence, which is to the east of P'u-ch'iao Chekiang Pavilion. Liu Hsü's T'ang shu stated, "During the Sui dynasty at Yu-hang district was located at Hang-chou. It was moved to Ch'ien-t'ang and was again moved to Liu-p'u. This is where the present-day Hang-chou is located.

Also in the Tzuchih t'ung chien, ch'üan 136 [we find]:

The garrison commander of Hsi-ling, Tu Yuan-i, suggested: "Wu-hsing has had a bad season, but Kuei-chi has had abundant harvests. The travelling merchants double in number in an ordinary year. The receipts from the Oxen Pier in Hsi-ling are 3,500 cash daily, according to official requirement; as far as I can see, they will increase daily. Together with the northern and southern piers on the P'u-yang as well as the Four Piers of Liu-p'u I hope the government will allow me to administer them for a year. Additional receipts on an annual basis could be raised to over four millions.

Hu San-hsing's commentary states:

Hsi-ling is twelve li west of Hsiao-shan district of present-day Yüeh-chou. This is the Hsi-ling ferry. The king of Wu-Yüeh, Ch'ien Ch'iu believed Hsi-ling not to be propitious and changed the name to Hsi-hsing. Oxen Pier is the present-day Hsi-hsing levee. Oxen Pier was so named because it used to use Oxen to pull the boats.

The southern ferry pier of the P'u-yang River is the present-day Lake Liang levee. The northern ferry pier is the present-day Ts'ao-o levee. The Liu-p'u pier is the present-day K'ua-p'u Bridge situated north of the Chekiang t'ing at Chiang-kan.49

This is what Hsieh-shan calls the "Four piers of the Six
Dynasties." Liu-p'u (pier) is on the northern shore of the Ch'ien-ch'ing River. Hsi-ling pier is on the southern shore of the Ch'ien-ch'ing River. The two piers stand across from each other. Therefore the soldiers of Wu Hsi "crossed from Liu-p'u reaching Hsi-ling."50

Two important points of the two north-south ferry crossing stations on the P'u-yang are: the northern pier during Southern Sung was times called the Ts'ao-o pier, [and] the southern pier was called Lake Liang pier.

Hsieh-shan cited Hu San-hsing's commentary to corroborate his position that the P'u-yang River of the Southern Dynasties "would regard the Tsao-o as its eastern course and main stream while the western channels converging at Ch'ien-ch'ing are secondary."51 The first part of the sentence would seem to be beyond doubt.

The Shui-ching chu also clearly states that at Shang-yü district the P'u-yang River arrived "at this place it was also known as the Shang-yü River... to the north of the river course there is the Ts'ao-o filial funerary stele."52 The second half of the sentence, "the western tributaries converging at Ch'ien-ch'ing are secondary (tributaries of the P'u-yang)" does not seem to be substantiated by proper historical evidence.

I have closely scrutinized military events which took place in Eastern Chekiang during the Southern Dynasties. From the end of Chin, with the chaos and social upheavals of Sun En, to the end of the Sui, not once did I see a military clash where the P'u-yang River or the P'u-yang name is mentioned. Hsieh-shan does not give
an example. We have no way of knowing about his so-called "clashes on the P'u-yang"... all refer to the Ch'ien-ch'ing.

Translation of "P'u-yang chiang chi" (A Note on the P'u-yang River).
by Ch'üan Tsu-wang

1 The source of the P'u-yang River system lies in I-wu in the area of Chu-chi. There are two distinct rivers. These are the Ts'ao-o and the Ch'ien-ch'ing. The one which has its source on the southern slopes of the mountain at I-wu, and then flows through Kao-pa, is the so-called Tung-hsiao River, whose lower reaches are known as the Ts'ao-o.

2 The river which rises from the northern slopes of the I-wu mountain and flows through I-ch'iao, is the so-called Hsi-hsiao River. Its lower reaches are known as the Ch'ien-ch'ing.

3 The Ts'ao-e River bends eastward from Chu-chi and flows to Sheng and to Yü-yao. It then curves to the north reaching Shang-yü for the first time. From Kuei-chi it empties into the ocean.

The Ch'ien-ch'ing River, from the western borders of Chu-chi, goes past Hsiao-shan, flows back on itself and east to Shan-yin and empties into the ocean.

4 One of these rivers is crooked and one is straight. Their sources are different. However, during the Six Dynasties (222-589) they were both known by the name P'u-yang. Now if we examine the
examine the name P'u-yang, during the Han [206 BC - AD 220] the name P'u-yang had not yet appeared. Therefore Pan Ku does not record it in the Treatises.

However, Pan Ku's Treatise of Geography does refer to the eastern reaches of the P'u-yang, calling this the K'o River, and cites it under the entry for Shang-yü. This was the Ts'ao-o-o.

Pan Ku refers to the western river as the P'an River, and cites it under the entry for Yü-ch'i. This is the Ch'ien-ch'ing River.

In the Hsü-chih of the Book of the Later Han the P'an River is noted but the K'o River is missing.

P'u-yang as the name of a river was first used by Wei Chao (204-272). The Hsü-chih appeared after Wei Chao, but still Ssu-ma Piao had evidently not recorded it. This shows that it was not a common name at the time.

The name P'u-yang, however, became well-known during the Sung (420-479) and Ch'i (479-502) periods. At this time both the Ts'ao-o-o and the Ch'ien-ch'ing were called P'u-yang.

When Hsieh Ling-yün said "P'u-yang" in his "Shan chü fu" (The fu on Dwelling in the Mountains) he is always referring to the Ts'ao-o-o. Li Shan [d. 689] follows this interpretation.

The military battle(s) on the P'u-yang mentioned in the Nan-shih all refer to the Ch'ien-ch'ing. I have examined the gazetteers Shih tao chih and Yuan-ho chun hsien chih written during the T'ang and there is no mention of the names of these
two rivers.

9 In the Yuan-feng chiu yu chih [Northern Sung gazetteers] Ts'ao-o appears as a township under the entry for Kuei-chi and the Ch'ien-ch'ing as a township under the entry for Shan-yin. They were not, however, used as names of rivers.

10 When I read Li Tao-yuan's Shui-ching chu, what he records as the P'u-yang River is actually the Ts'ao-o; he then discusses the P'an River of Hsiao-shan. This is the upper reaches of the Ch'ien-ch'ing. He does not realise that it has been divided into two and thinks that they were one. This is due to his lack of careful analysis. Therefore he said, "The river Shang-yü flows east to Yung-hsing and joins with the Che River," that means the waters of T'ai-k'ang lake and the Hu tributary can reach I-ch'iao [i.e. on the Che River south-west of Hsiao-shan] and Ma-hai and empty into the ocean.

11 With such erratic changes from east to west, his blunders are great. Evidently, Li Tao-yuan himself never went south of the Yangtse, and that is why he made these mistakes. Or it could be that during the period of the Six Dynasties the levees were not complete and as a result the Tung-hsiao River was still able to flow west. The eastern tributaries could then have reached to Yung-hsing.

12 By this I am not in any way trying to justify Li Tao-yuan [i.e. he is still wrong about the upper reaches being confused]. Yet, if we consider the situation during his time, that is probably the way it was [i.e. the] lower courses were
meanders, but Li Tao-yüan was still wrong about the upper
course].

14 Shih Su [Sung Dynasty] tried to discuss this, but not
carefully enough. In recent times, the people of Yüeh say; "The
P'ü-yang is not the Ts'ao-o but is rather the Ch'ien-ch'ing," and
that is used to correct Li Tao-yüan. Even though Huang Tsung-
hsi's Chin Shui-ching also follows this same argument, it is
still incorrect.

15 Li Tao-yüan's belief that the P'ü-yang is the Ts'ao-o was
based on Hsieh Ling-yün's "Shan chü fu." Hsieh Ling-yün lived
at this place. Is it possible he could mistakenly employ the name
of a river over 100 li away and use it to name the river near
his home? Such a suggestion is not even worthy of discussion.

Moreover, in the Nan-shih it is recorded that the north
and south ferry piers on the P'ü-yang each have an official to
inspect (cargo). Hu San-hsíng said:

The southern ferry pier is the present-day Lake Liang
levee. The northern ferry pier is the present-day Ts'ao-o
levee. In the Six Dynasties these along with the Hsi-ling
and Liu-p'u piers were known collectively as the "Four
Piers."

17 Thus it should be clear that the P'ü-yang River would use
Ts'ao-o our the eastern course and its main stream, while the
western channels converging at Ch'ien-ch'ing are secondary.

18 The administrative system of the Six Dynasties was surely
able to distinguish its river systems clearly. How can one use
this to contradict Li Tao-yüan [who agrees with these
findings]? This may be described as the fault of not carefully
examining the past, and thus making questionable statements.

-321-
It appears that when the P'u-yang River flowed eastward, that was in the time before the levees were built. It would then have flowed from Yü-yao to reach the borders of Chu-chi. Between Yü-yao and Chu-chi the Chu-p'u, Ta'o-p'u, Yü-p'u, Yen-hsi and Tien-hsi all emptied into the P'u-yang. From the K'o River eastward the waters flowed direct to the Chu-chi channel and stopped there. This isn't like the present-day Ts'ao-o, but what Li Tao-yüan said can be proven. Hence, for these reasons, the P'u-yang was one of the three rivers of Wu and Yüeh. If we accept the argument that considers the Ch'ien-ch'ing as being its tributary, it is much too narrow. How can those that support the opinion of the Yüeh people treat the Ts'ao-o like a ditch and refuse to recognise it? When Li Tao-yüan referred to the Shang-yü River, he was speaking of the Ts'ao-o, and he did not mention it when referring to the Ch'ien-ch'ing. Therefore we can see without any doubt that the Ts'ao-o is a main stream of the P'u-yang. So what the Han-shu Treatise called the K'o River of Shang-yü is the Ts'ao-o.

Chang Yüan-pien identified it with the river at K'o-chiao in Shan-yin. This is an even greater error. If he is thinking of the end of the Ch'ien-ch'ing River, and suggests that it may have reached to K'o-chiao, it might be possible. But in that case how could it have been described as being east of the Ts'ao-o?
Translation of passages in the Shui-ching chu relevant to the P'u-yang and Ts'ao-o rivers.

The Che River also flows passing to the north of Yung-heing district.\(^{59}\) Then it goes further east and is joined by the P'u-yang River. The P'u-yang River originates at Wushang district and flows east to Chu-chi district where it joins with the Hsieh Stream.\(^{60}\) The P'u-yang River continues flowing east and passes south of Chu-chi district.\(^{61}\) Here, where the river narrows, there are many river areas (\(p'\mu_i\) 卑) surrounding a large lake(s) which is swollen in the spring and summer and becomes dry in the autumn and winter.

The P'u-yang River flows southeast through Yen district where runoff from the Pai-shih shan forms a 30 chang [approximately 300 feet] waterfall which empties into the P'u-yang.\(^{62}\) The P'u-yang River then flows east and bends the south, later turning back on itself to the north. It then flows past the eastern border of the Yen district; the river here surrounds the city with channels to the east and the west... Six streams irrigate along its course before they flow in the P'u-yang.

The P'u-yang continues east past Shih-chiao (a natural rock formation) and then turns north passing Mt Sheng (in Ssu-ming Mountain range).\(^{63}\) The P'u-yang then turns
northeast flowing by Ch'eng-kung Peak of the the Mt Hu (¶) range in Shih-ning district.64

To the north of Ch'eng-kung Peak there is the Hu Embankment. From Mt Hu in the P'u-yang Range the P'u-yang River flows through T'ai-k'ang lake.

The P'u-yang then flows northeast passing west of Shih-ning district.65 Below the city there is a small river which has its source at Mt T'iao. The P'u-yang continues moving east passing south of Shang-yü district.66 At this point the river is also known as the Shang-yü River. Beyond there is the Wu Ditch breaking through the hills and bringing water from its source to flow into the Hsü River. The Shang-yü (The P'u-yang referred to then as the Shang-yü) River flows east through Chou-shih and on to Yung-hsing.67 The Treatise of Geography of the Han-shu states: "In the [Shang-yü] district there is the Ch'ou T'ing where the K'o River flows east into the sea."68 The Ch'ou t'ing is ten li northeast of the district. On the norther bank of the Shang-yü River is the K'o River, which I suspect could be the Shang-yü (which is the P'u-yang River).

The P'u-yang again flows to the northeast passing to the east of Yung-hsing district and joins with the Che River. Here it is again called the P'u-yang River. The Treatise of Geography further states: 'Hsiao-shan is in this district. The P'an River originates there and flows
east into the sea."69 I further suspect this is another name for the P'u-yang River, for there is no other river which corresponds to what is being described. The Che River continues to flow east to the sea.

Formerly, the Shan hai ching states: "The Che River goes into the sea at the northwest of Min."70 Wei Chao considered the Sung River, the Che River, and the P'u-yang River as the "Three Rivers".
CHEKIANG PROVINCE AND ITS RIVERS
NOTES

1. Hu Shih spent many years examining the Shui-ching chi as well as the contribution of various scholars to this classic. Hu Shih shou kao contains many articles on this subject, as do his public lectures, which are also in Hu Shih shou kao, 30 vols. (Taipei: 1966). See also his "A Note on Ch'üan Tsu-wang, Chao I-ch'ing and Tai Chen," by Hu Shih in Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period, pp. 970-982. Hu Shih wrote this article discussing research done on the Shui-ching chu during the Ch'ing dynasty, in May 1944, but later qualified some of his statements in a colophon (see Hu Shih shou kao, chi 6, chüan 1, pp. 8-25). The material basic to the conclusions reached in this colophon is to be found in Hu Shih shou kao, chi 2 and 6.

2. Hu Shih, "A Note on Ch'üan Tsu-wang, Chao I-ch'ing and Tai Chen.," in Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period, p. 970.

3. Hu Shih shou kao. Chi 6, chüan 1, pp. 8-25.

4. Ibid.


7. Ch'üan noted that Li Tao-yüan had never been south of the Yangtze. See note 13 below.
8. See note 11.


14. See Ku Tsu-yü, chüan 92, pp. 3830 and 3846. Ku Tsu-yü discusses the complexity of canal systems and their development as well as their affect on the courses of these rivers. See also p. 3831 where he says the Ch'ien-ch'ing "is also called the P'u-yang River." and p. 3837 where he says the Ch'ien-ch'ing "is also called the P'u-yang River and is also known as the Tung-hsiao River." Ku Tsu-yü further states on p. 3831 that "The upper reaches of the Ts'ao-o River form the main tributary of the P'u-yang River."

23. In 1737 when Ch'üan was a bachelor of the Hanlin Academy a ceremony was held honoring the Yung-cheng Emperor. By virtue of this Ch'üan then petitioned the throne (Ch'ien-lung Emperor) to extend his new title (shu chi shih, bachelor) to his father and grandfather. As a result, his grandfather, Ch'üan Wu-ch'i (1629-
1696) whose *tzu* (courtesy name) was Ch'ing and *hao* (literary name) was Pei-kung, was also known as *Hsien-ta-fu* *ts'eng-kung* or *Hsien ts'eng kung* (㝅). Liu P'u was identified as a place name by Ch'üan's grandfather [see B.32:1165-116(8)].

The pier took its name from the place name.

24. These four points have been considered in order of appearance in Hu Shih's colophon.

25. *Hu Shih shou kao*, chi 6, chüan 2, p. 245. [Translated text on page 314.]


28. *Chin-Shui ching*, pp. 31a-32a. See also *Hu Shih shou kao*, chi 6, chüan 2, pp. 245-246. [Translated text on page 314.]


32. *Hu Shih shou kao*, chi 6, chüan 2, p. 246. [Translated text on page 315.]
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34. *Hu Shih shou kao*, *chi* 6, *chüan* 2, p. 248. [Translated text on page 315.]


39. Ibid., p. 249. [Translated text on page 317.]

40. Ibid., *chi* 6, *chüan* 1, pp. 8–25.

41. B.32:1115–1116(8), B.32:1116(9), B.32:1116–1117(10)
   B.32:1117(11), B.32:1117–1118(12).

42. *Hu Shih shou kao*, *chi* 2, *chüan* 3, pp. 546–547. *Hu Shih* states Chao I-ch'ing only saw colophon Nos. 2, 3, and 4. Ch’üan did go to see Chao I-ch'ing in 1754.

43. All historians are capable of mistakes. It is irresponsible, however, to discredit a man's entire work before thorough research. *Hu Shih*’s colophon contains other flaws. One of the problems of studying the *Shui-ching chu* was the difficulty of separating the text from the commentary. Amazingly enough when *Hu Shih* quoted the *Shui-ching chu* in his colophon, he himself
did not separate text from commentary. The following example demonstrates this. [The italicized portions are from the commentary.]

The P'u-yang River then turns northeast flowing by Ch'eng-kung Peak of Mt Hu in the Shih-ning district. The P'u-yang turns northeast at Mt Hu flowing into T'ai-k'ang hu. The cavalry general Hsieh Hsüan's estate was here. On the right the P'u-yang, on the left a mountain range. [For translated text see page 316.]

The only plausible explanation for inconsistencies of this magnitude is that Hu Shih's colophon had not yet been prepared for publication. However, considering the care and exactness Hu Shih maintained otherwise throughout his colophon, this oversight is surprising.

44. Hu Shih was referring to the closing lines of the "P'u-yang chiang chi."


46. Li Tao-yüan, Shui-ching chu. Wang Hsien-ch'ien (1842-1917) edition, 16 vols (Ch'ang-sha, 1892), chuan 40, p. 14b. The "Shan chü fu" is sometimes referred to as the "Shan chü chi".

47. A.30:377(1). "Li Shan follows this interpretation." (Li Shan yin chih)

48. Hu Shih raised this point in other articles. He believed that Ch'üan's ancestors were important in forming the scope of his history. See Hu Shih shou kao, chi 6, chuan 2, p. 309.


51. A.30:378(1).

52. The first half of this quotation is from the text of the classic: see *Shui-ching chu*, chüan 40, p. 15b. The second half is from Li's commentary on the text. See chüan 40, p. 16a. Here Hu Shih made no distinction between the text and the commentary.


54. Ku Tsu-yü, *Tu-shih fang-yü chi-yao*, chüan 92, pp. 3830, 3831, and 3837 (Ch'ien-ching and Ts'ao-o rivers) and p. 3834 (Kao-pa).

55. *Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta tz'u-tien*, p. 1241. See also *Tu-shih fang-yü chia-yao*, chüan 92, p. 3839 (Chu-chi). See also *Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta tz'u-tien*, p. 1002 and *Tu-shih fang-yü chi-yao*, p. 3848 (Sheng).

56. *Tu-shih fang-yü chi-yao*, p. 3835 (Hsiao-shan district), also p. 3836 for Mt Hsiao.


58. *Tu-shih fang-yü chi-yao*, pp. 3846-3847 (Lake Liang levees) This entry coincides with Ch'üan's position.

60. Wu-shang prefecture is presently known as I-wu. See Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta t'zu-tien, p. 753.

61. Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta t'zu-tien p. 1241. City has same site now as then.

62. Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta ts'ou-tien p. 682. The former city is twelve li southwest of present day Sheng. Sheng is on the Ts'ao-o not the P'u-yang. It is at this point that Li Tao-yüan begins describing the Ts'ao-o River.

63. Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta ts'ou-tien p. 1002. Mt Sheng is now thirty-four li east of Sheng Prefecture: it is part of the Ssu-ming Range on the east of the Ts'ao-o River. It is one of the four famous peaks from which that range takes its name. See also Tu-shih fang-yü chi-yao, chüan 92, p. 3848. Li Shan is certainly referring to the modern Ts'ao-o, not the modern P'u-yang.

64. Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta ts'ou-tien p. 444. Shih-ning is now fifty li from present-day Shang-yü. Commentary notes to Shui-ching chu, chüan 40, p. 15a, states that this prefecture was formerly the southern district (hsiang) of Shang-yü, established as a prefecture in the time of Emperor Shun, (Yung-chien 4th year, AD. 129). The city was originally on the west bank of the river but it suffered so often from floods that in the early period of Eastern Chin it was moved to the opposite side.
65. See note 64.

66. *Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta tz'u-tien*, p. 46. Now west of the modern Shang-yü. During the Han period it was the center of a salt administration close to the sea.

67. *Chung ku-chin ti-ming ta tz'u-tien*, p. 230. In discussing Yung-hsing and the Shang-yü River, Li Tao-yüan now has in mind the modern P'u-yang River, which was then referred to as the Shang-yü.
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APPENDIX I

An Index to Primary Personalities of the Biographies and Epitaphs of Ch'uan Tsu-wang's
Chi-ch'i t'ing chi and
Chi-ch'i t'ing chi, wai-p'ien

CHA 查
Cha Ssu-lien 餘聯 (T. 夏重 H.) 1650-1727. [See next entry].

CH'AI 桂
Ch'ai Tzu-t'ing 椿庭 (T. 上林 H. 趙清) B.7:743-744(7).

CHANG 张
Chang Hsi-ts'ung 錫琮 (T. 德符 H.) 1662-1731. B.7:742-743(7).
Chang Hui 煙 (T. 禮亮) (47) A.20:244-245(5).
Chang K'en-t'ang 賓堂 (T. 載寧 H. 默禪) d. 1651. A.10:121-128(1).
Chang Meng-hsi 夢錫 (T. 魏生) d. 1650. A.8:105-106(6).
Chang T'ing-shou 延漣 (T. 琴達) 明一清 B.11:793-894(1).
Chang, Madame 姚人 (Ch'uan's 1st wife) Chang, Madame 姚人 (Ch'uan's 1st wife) 1702-1731. B.8:763-764(8).

CHAO 趙
Chao Tien-tsu 殿最 (T. 奏公) chin-shih 1703 A.18:213-215(1).
CH'EN

Ch'en Hsiao-piao 孝標 (T. 悠晶) 明-清 B.12:819-820(13).
Ch'en Kuang-lu 光祿 (T. 邵莫) 明-清 A.27:337-338(3).
Ch'en Huai 榜 (T. 耕陶) chin-shih 1505 A.23:290-292(9).
Ch'en Liang-mo 良謨 (T. 士亮) chin-shih 1631 A.6:69-71(1).
Ch'en Shih-liang 士良 (T. 宋獻) 清 A.21:258-259(6).
Ch'en Wang-pin 王賓 (T. 天倪) 明一清 B.12:816-817(10).

CH'ENG

Ch'eng Chiang 江 (T. 漢 R. 燕谷) 清 A.18:221-222(5).
Ch'eng Yuan-ch'ing 元慶 (T. 美時) 清 A.19:227-228(1).
Ch'eng Hsing 性 (T. 義門) 1665-1743. A.21:251-253(1).

CHIANG

Chiang Ch'eng-yung 容卿 (T. 漢 H. 燕國) 1627-1699. A.16:189-191(1).

CHIANG

Chiang Han 漢 (T. 子雲) 明-清 B.5:708-709(8).

CHIANG

Chiang Chao-lung 拋龍 (T. 御文) chin-shih 1691 A.21:253-255(2).

CH'IEN

Ch'i'en Ching-chung 敬忠 (T. 崇真) chin-shih 1619 A.6:71-83(2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien Chung-sheng</td>
<td>蔣宗盛 (T.又起)</td>
<td>清(73)</td>
<td>A.22:273-274(7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien K'ang-hsien</td>
<td>蔣康惠</td>
<td>宋</td>
<td>B.12:830-831(2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien Shih-su</td>
<td>蔣士誡 (T.席仲)</td>
<td>chü-jen 1627.</td>
<td>B.5:701-703(3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien Su-fan</td>
<td>蔣肅 (T.錫允)</td>
<td>1621-1649.</td>
<td>A.8:103-105(5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien Su-hsiu</td>
<td>蔣肅 (T.文卿)</td>
<td>明 - 清</td>
<td>B.5:707-708(7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien Su-t'ien</td>
<td>蔣肅 (T.叶廣)</td>
<td>明 - 清</td>
<td>B.5:706-707(6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien Su-yüeh</td>
<td>蔣樂 (T.廣聲)</td>
<td>d. 1655.</td>
<td>B.5:703-705(4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien, Madame</td>
<td>蔣人</td>
<td>1669-1732.</td>
<td>B.7:751-752(14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Chih-fan</td>
<td>周之藩 (T.長昇)</td>
<td>明 - 清</td>
<td>B.12:814(7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Ching</td>
<td>周京 (T.西穆)</td>
<td>清</td>
<td>A.19:228-229(2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Hsi</td>
<td>周西 (T.方人)</td>
<td>劉</td>
<td>A.27:345-347(8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Yuan-mo</td>
<td>周元 (T.柱礪)</td>
<td>明 - 清</td>
<td>A.27:335-337(2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Yung-you</td>
<td>朱永祿 (T.愛塔)</td>
<td>chin-shih 1694</td>
<td>B.9:770-772(2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu, Madame</td>
<td>朱人</td>
<td>1669-1732.</td>
<td>B.7:751-752(14).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HSIA
夏

HSIUNG
熊
Hsiung Hsiang-min 奧懌 明 A.26:331-332(7).

HSÜ
徐
Hsu Ch'i-jui 啓睿(T.聖恩) 明-清 A.8:99-100(2).
Hsü Fu-yüan 孝遠(T.聞公)復齋 1600-1665. B.12:808-810(2).

HSÜEH
薛

HU
胡
Hu Ch'i-heng 期恆(T.方方) 清(78) A.18:217-219(3).
Hu Te-mai 德藻(T.卓人) 1660-1716. A.7:737-739(3).

HUA
華
Hua Hsia 夏(T.吉甫) 明-清 B.10:781-785(1).

HUANG
黃
Huang Chih-ch'uan 之傅(T.集隱) 清 A.22:266-267(2).
Huang Tsung-hai 祁義(T.太沖) 1610-1695. A.11:131-141(1).

HUNG
洪
Hung Ch'ü 信諾(T.繼起)霞翁 明-清 A.14:176-177(7).

JEN
任
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>姓氏</th>
<th>名</th>
<th>时代</th>
<th>代表作</th>
<th>引用页码</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JU</td>
<td>Ying-yuan</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.4:696-697(5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung</td>
<td>Mao-ch'eng</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.7:750-751(13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Ching-lien</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.21:261-262(8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Ch'ang-hsiang</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.9:777-780(5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Fu</td>
<td>明-1750.</td>
<td>1673-1750.</td>
<td>A.17:207-211(3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Hsiang-chung</td>
<td>明-清 (41)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.9:772-774(3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Kang</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>1586-1648.</td>
<td>B.5:700-701(2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Kuo-piao</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>1622-1680.</td>
<td>B.12:817(11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Shih-fa</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.22:275-276(9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Tun</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>1627-1705.</td>
<td>A.21:255-256(3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Wen-tsuan</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.14:172-173(4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Yeh-ssu</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>1622-1680.</td>
<td>B.11:795-796(3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Yung</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>1627-1705.</td>
<td>A.12:147-151(2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>鲁</td>
<td></td>
<td>1692-1752.</td>
<td>A.20:242-244(4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIN 林

LIU 劉
Liu Yin-chih 劉缙之 明-清 B.14:847-848(9).
Liu Ying-ch'i 劉應期（T.瑞蘭） 明 A.24:297-300(2).

LOU 羅

LU 盧
Lu Jo-t'eng 劉若騰（T.牧舟） 明-清 B.14:846-847(8).

LU 陸
Lu Ch'i 劉材（T.麗京） 明-清 A.26:328-329(4).
Lu Hsi-ch'ou 劉锡畴（T.秋田） 漢(64) A.20:249-250(9).
Lu Kuan 劉觀（T.薰玉） 清(67) B.6:725-726(9).
Lu Kun 劉崑（T.蓮原） 明-清(27) B.12:815-816(9).

LÜ 吕

MAO 毛
Mao Ch'i-ling 姚鼎（T.鼎） 1623-1716. B.12:825-828(18).
Mao Ch'ü-k'uei 姚季（T.象來） 明-清 A.27:343-345(7).
PAO

Pao Ch'ien

SHAO

Shao Chi

Shao I-kuan

SHEN

Shen Keng-yen

Shen Kuang-wen

Shen Lan-hsien

Shen Ping-chen

Shen T'ung

Shen T'ing-yang

Shen Yin

SHIH

Shih Chung-mao

Shih Hsiang

Shih Nien-tseng

SHIH

Shih Lung

SHIH

Shih Jung

SUN

Sun Chia-ch'i

Sun Wu-wei
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Given Name</th>
<th>Stage of Life (if any)</th>
<th>Birth and/or Death Dates</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS'AO</td>
<td>Ts'ao I-shih</td>
<td>(T.譙愷)</td>
<td>d.1652</td>
<td>A.25:309-314(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>Tso Ch'eng-huang</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.7:736-737(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Tu Mao-chun</td>
<td>懋侯(T.英侯)</td>
<td>d.1652</td>
<td>A.8:106-108(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'U</td>
<td>T'u Hsien-ch'eng</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.10:788-790(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUNG</td>
<td>Tung Cheng-kuo</td>
<td>正國(T.次極)</td>
<td>清(72)</td>
<td>A.21:257-258(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tung Chih-ning</td>
<td>志寧(T.幼安)</td>
<td>d.1650</td>
<td>A.8:97-99(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ting Hsiao-shan</td>
<td>晓山(T.佩公)</td>
<td>1622-1703</td>
<td>B.6:724-725(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tung Shih</td>
<td>使</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>A.21:262-263(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tung Te-ch'in</td>
<td>德欽(T.幼思)</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>B.10:788-790(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tung Yün-pin</td>
<td>允譙(T.舉雲)</td>
<td>清(77)</td>
<td>B.7:744-745(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tung Yün-wei</td>
<td>允譙(T.舉雲)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.7:744-745(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tung Yung-ch'ang</td>
<td>永昌(T.山雲)</td>
<td>清</td>
<td>A.28:360-362(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZUNG</td>
<td>Tsung I</td>
<td>言宜(T.在公)</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>B.6:728-729(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsung Hsien</td>
<td>顯(T.必彰)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.12:822(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAN</td>
<td>Wan Ch'eng-ch'ang</td>
<td>承倉(T.宇光)</td>
<td>清</td>
<td>A.18:219-220(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan Ch'eng-hsun</td>
<td>王承麟 (T.西部)</td>
<td>清</td>
<td>A.22:265-266(1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan Ching</td>
<td>王澄 (T.陈北)</td>
<td>1659-1741.</td>
<td>A.16:196-199(3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan Kuang-t'ai</td>
<td>王刚 (T.存)</td>
<td>清(39)</td>
<td>A.20:245-246(6).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan Ssu-t'ung</td>
<td>王素 (T.素)</td>
<td>清(30)</td>
<td>A.28:353-355(2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Chih-lin</td>
<td>王之麟 (T.天石)</td>
<td>清(66)</td>
<td>B.7:749-750(12).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Chia-ch'in</td>
<td>王家训 (T.卢仁)</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>B.10:790-792(4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Chiang</td>
<td>王江 (T.岳升)</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>B.5:709-711(9).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Yu</td>
<td>王豫 (T.故)</td>
<td>清(41)</td>
<td>A.20:239-240(1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei Ch'i</td>
<td>魏    (T.文())-&gt;</td>
<td>宋</td>
<td>A.23:285-286(5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Huang</td>
<td>温    (T.文忠)</td>
<td>chin-shih 1643.</td>
<td>B.12:810-811(3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>吴</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>B.9:767-770(1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Chung-luan</td>
<td>鍾    (T.峻伯)</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>B.12:807-808(1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Tsu-hsi</td>
<td>祖锡 (T.佩遠)</td>
<td>d. 1679.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>楊</td>
<td>明-清</td>
<td>A.14:173-174(5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Shih</td>
<td>1661-1763</td>
<td>B.11:799-803(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Wen-chung</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.6:718-719(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Wen-ch'i</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.10:785-788(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Ch'i-sheng</td>
<td>1624-1686</td>
<td>A.15:179-188(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Hung-jen</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.26:330-331(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Shih-yü</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.20:240-241(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh Ch'ien</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.6:730-731(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh Chu-feng</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.7:748-749(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying Hui-ch'ien</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.12:152-154(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Ying</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.26:321-323(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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