

INTRODUCTION

How have political conflicts impacted philosophical concepts and the rise of particular intellectual lineages in China? This question is part of a contested issue—the relative strength or dominance of state power and cultural authority—upon which considerable discussion continues.² A definitive answer applicable to all situations and periods of Chinese history would not only be quite impossible but also certainly more ideologically, than empirically, grounded. Nevertheless, we think that our two case studies, especially taken together, shed new light on this question. In contrast to most existing studies, we will also provide a more nuanced fathoming of Confucian intellectual currents in Zhu Xi's 朱熹 (1130–1200) wake that will reveal that his ideas were not as rapidly or universally accepted in the thirteenth century as they have retrospectively been portrayed in most existing studies. By exploring views of the *Zhongyong* 中庸 (often, but problematically, labeled by Western scholars the *Doctrine of the Mean*) and the succession and transmission of the Dao 道 (Way) of the ancient sages (i.e., the *daotong* 道統) in the diverse political and cultural contexts of North and South China, we anticipate demonstrating some of the complexity of the relationship between cultural authority and political culture during the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries and beyond. The *Zhongyong* has long been regarded as a crucial text in the *daotong*; moreover, these two together are major symbolic concepts for cultural authority, and their precedence over state power (as we will see) has been asserted by some Confucian scholars.

We focus on an era when China was fragmented, and various states and cultures struggled for supremacy. Such contention is captured in our studies by including not only the Song (960–1279), which becomes the residual Southern Song (1127–1279) after the Jurchen conquest of the Northern Song (960–1127), but also the Jurchen Jin dynasty (1115–1234) and the Yuan dynasty (1260–1368) of the Mongols, who conquered the Jin and the Southern Song. Chinese scholars have almost always taken the native Han Chinese option of centering attention on the Song, largely ignoring the Jin and often somewhat begrudgingly paying some attention to the Yuan after the Mongol conquest of the Southern Song and until the Mongols withdrew in the face of Han Chinese resurgence under the Ming dynasty (1368–1644). We pause to explore how scholars under both Song regimes and the early Yuan wrestled with the political and ideological instabilities of their

2 The contemporary scholar whose publications have for many years served as significant catalysts to wide-ranging discussions on such issues is Yu Yingshi 余英時. See especially his *Zhu Xi de lishi shijie* 朱熹的歷史世界, 2 vols. (Beijing: Sanlian shuju, 2004). From a different perspective, see also Peter K. Bol, *Neo-Confucianism in History* (Cambridge: Harvard University, Asia Center, 2008), especially pp. 115–152.

times and thus sought to enhance their own particular dynastic state's claim to historic legitimacy as China's orthodox standard (i.e., the *zhengtong* 正統). We also study major Confucian thinkers from contending "schools of thought" in the Northern Song, the Southern Song, and the early Yuan (with a little contextual discussion of the Jin). Chinese and Western scholars have highlighted the continuity and ever increasing dominance of the Zhu-Xi-centered school of thought from the Northern Song to the Southern Song into the Yuan; moreover, they have emphasized the broad recognition given to the Four Books and the *daotong* as promoted by Zhu Xi. For instance, scholars have often accepted Zhu Xi's account of the *daotong* and the *Zhongyong* and thus have largely passed over the doubts and alternatives raised by other Song Confucians.

We will highlight that diversity of views and show how even some of Zhu Xi's most devoted disciples, particularly Wang Bo 王柏 (1197–1274), had serious questions about his views on the *Zhongyong*, a text which was so crucial to Zhu's claims about the *daotong*. Due in part to the unresolved status for the *Zhongyong* in the Song, the stance of Confucian scholars under the Yuan was of pivotal importance in the eventual orthodoxy of Zhu's interpretations in late Imperial China. Our case study for the Yuan centers on Hao Jing 郝經 (also known as Hao Bochang 字伯常, 1223–1275), a significant North China follower of Zhu Xi. Even though his overall intellectual evolution was in the direction of Zhu Xi, we will show that he retained considerable independence, especially regarding the northern cultural tradition, the *Zhongyong* and the *daotong*. Discussing Hao Jing's views of the *daotong* and *zhengtong* will also underscore similarities and differences with Song Confucians in ways that will help address the pervasive interconnections between dynastic political agendas and Confucian philosophical concepts. In short, whereas some major historical overviews of Chinese philosophy even skip over the centuries between the death of Zhu Xi in 1200 and the rise of Wang Shouren 王守仁 (better known as Wang Yangming 王陽明, 1472–1529), our book seeks to shed light on how Zhu Xi's legacy survived and evolved in the thirteenth century in both South and North China.

Scholars have often described intellectual history in terms of certain "traditions" or "schools" or various "-isms," waxing and waning and mutually influencing one another to various degrees. Both recent and older publications in the field of Chinese studies are flooded with terms like Confucianism, Daoism (also spelled Taoism) and Buddhism. Although this division into three major schools itself has a notable tradition and doubtlessly provides a useful means to convey some major trends in the history of thought, it is always necessary to keep in mind the difficulties that arise from such language. It is always debatable, whether or not a description of the matter at hand in terms of distinct boundaries between certain "traditions" is preferable to a more continuous or holistic view, emphasizing mutual connectivity of persons and ideas shared across conventionally postulated "borders" between these "traditions."

Enhanced alertness is necessary when using value laden terminology, such as keywords like "mainstream," "main tradition," and "orthodoxy," or Chinese terms like *zhuliu* 主流, *da chuantong* 大傳統 or *zhengtong* 正統, and thereby privileg-

ing a certain group of scholars. The application of these terms to history (both intellectual and political) from any contemporary point of view constitutes not only a conscious distinction from “non-mainstream” scholars, but also suggests that these “mainstream” schools and traditions excel in a certain way. While most historical personages embraced a certain consciousness of traditions either to which they associated or against which they fought, the label “mainstream” is very often retrospectively applied later when the importance of a certain “lineage” manifests itself. Furthermore, value judgments obviously depend largely on particular viewpoints; hence, it is not surprising that various social groups and intellectual circles focus on different “traditions” and specific lineages within these “traditions.”

For the Song, some academics consider Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 (1017–1073), Cheng Hao 程顥 (1032–1086), Cheng Yi 程頤 (1033–1107) Zhang Zai 張載 (1022–1077), Shao Yong 邵雍 (1011–1077), Zhu Xi and Lu Jiuyuan 陸九淵 (1139–1192) as the main tradition in this dynasty, and sometimes Western scholars bestow on these men the embellishing label “Neo-Confucians.” Marxist orientated minds, as well as some Sinologists in the West, have favored Song scholar-officials like Wang Anshi 王安石 (1021–1086), Chen Liang 陳亮 (1143–1194) and Ye Shi 葉適 (1050–1223) who focused on practical political issues; thus, an alternative “mainstream” of this time period emerges. Other Western scholars have enlarged the “Neo-Confucian” label to also encompass this opposition lineage, as well as any and all Confucians from the middle of the eighth century to the early twentieth century. In this latter case, all contending Confucian lineages (however mutually opposed their ideas and programs) are lumped together under the same banner of Neo-Confucianism. East Asians often use the term “lixue” 理學 (Learning or School of Principle) in comparably confusing ways—ranging from a narrow focus on the purists within Cheng-Zhu orthodoxy to an inclusive umbrella or “big tent” term for any and all varieties of Confucians from the Song through the Ming, and sometimes even to the twentieth century. Most often, however, Chinese use the term “lixue” in a medium range way to refer to all of those associated with the new philosophical trends during the Song and Ming dynasties. With such shared, but vague labels, scholars often think they are communicating effectively; however, with often polar opposite conceptions of what the labels actually refer to, we sense that scholars are often talking past one another without realizing it. Regardless of their diverse methodological or ideological presuppositions, modern authors tend to blur the border between the ideas which were important for the people of a certain historical period, on the one hand, and the ideas of that period which were cherished during later centuries, on the other hand.³

3 The difficulty of defining “Chinese tradition(s)” is part of a larger issue and reflects re-evaluations currently in progress—as reflected in recent research literature and linked to recent archaeological findings (like Guodian and Mawangdui texts) from the Warring States Period and the Han dynasty, which can be used to show the impact of the Han dynasty on subsequent views of early Chinese intellectual trends. What had for centuries seemed to be a rather clear picture of the origins different traditions (in particular the statements by Sima Tan 司馬談 [died 110 B.C.] on the “Six schools” [*liu jia* 六家] in *juan* 130 of the *Shiji* 史記) is

In our study, our broader rubric for the period will be Song Confucians and Yuan Confucians. Even though “*ru*-ist” or “classicists” would be more appropriate for 儒 during earlier dynastic periods, Song and Yuan scholars and officials used the term “*ru*” in the more ideological or sectarian way that is conveyed in the English term “Confucian.” Furthermore, the general label “Confucian” appears useful for Western audiences as long as it is further specified by era or by group. Much of our focus will be on Daoxue 道學 (Learning of the Way) Confucians. As historians, we utilize this rubric because it was the most pervasive label used by Song and Yuan intellectuals to identify a fellowship or faction which included a considerable number of major figures in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This rubric is not without difficulty or complexity. First, the term was initially utilized in the early Northern Song to identify Daoist learning, and this usage continued well into the Yuan period. Although it is amazing that a lineage of Confucian intellectuals would adopt this Daoist marker as their own, we think that we should follow their own self-identifying label.

Second, even within this particular lineage or subgroup of Song and Yuan Confucians, the scope or inclusiveness of the label changed significantly from the late Northern Song, through the Southern Song and into the Yuan. During most of the twelfth century, those identifying with, and identified as, Daoxue had relatively diverse philosophical ideas, but cooperated together for political reforms. Indeed, as Professor Yu Yingshi 余英時 observes, political ideas and issues were far more important to them (even to Zhu Xi) than abstract philosophical concepts. For instance, even Zhou Dunyi’s “Supreme Ultimate and yet the Non-Ultimate” (*wuji er taiji* 無極而太極) was initially part of a political debate and an alternative to centralization of the emperor’s power (or the August Royal Ultimate, *huangji* 皇極), rather than an abstract metaphysical issue.⁴ In Zhu Xi’s 1181 eulogy to his two closest friends with whom he had shared the leadership of Daoxue, he proclaimed that no one remained who could continue their leadership, so he would assume the leading role. In contrast to his relatively equal exchanges with Zhang Shi 張栻 (1133–1180) and Lü Zuqian 呂祖謙 (1137–1181) in the previous two decades, Zhu Xi was rarely receptive to corrections and alternative views set forth by other intellectuals during his last two decades. Having set himself up as the authoritative reader of the Classics and Confucian traditions, he worked to enhance philosophical uniformity within his group of “pure Confucians” (*chun ru* 醇儒).⁵ Some other modern scholars date the beginning of Daoxue only with Zhu Xi’s assumption of leadership in the 1180s; however, such a narrow view ignores the evolution of the group earlier in the century and also takes for granted much of Zhu Xi’s own perceptions and claims. Although Zhu Xi com-

now suspected to be largely a product of the imaginative constructions by Han dynasty literati. See *SJ* 10:130.3288–3292.

4 Yu Yingshi, *Zhu Xi de lishi shijie*, pp. 809–845.

5 For instance, Zhu Xi 朱熹: *Hui’an xiansheng Zhu Wengong wenji* 晦庵先生朱文公文集, *ZZQS* 20:36.1501. In addition to Hoyt Tillman’s earlier expositions, see the recent one in Tian Hao 田浩 (Hoyt Tillman), *Panguan Zhuzi xue* 旁觀朱子學 (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2011), pp. 223–244.

manded the loyalty of a significant number of followers, other intellectuals became increasingly alienated from the Daoxue fellowship in which they had earlier participated. This trend toward exclusiveness became even more pronounced among Zhu's followers, and his narrow view of Daoxue was enshrined in the *Daoxue Biographies* of the official *Song History* (*Songshi daoxue zhuan* 宋史道學傳),⁶ which was completed under Mongol rule in 1345. Thereafter, Daoxue has meant a narrow intellectual lineage leading directly to and from Zhu Xi and determined by loyalty to his philosophical doctrines. Even major twelfth century leaders of the group were retrospectively excluded from the group because they no longer appeared sufficiently "pure Confucian." In short, Daoxue evolved from a loose reform oriented political fellowship to a school of thought that became increasingly narrow and exclusively orthodox. Such major changes during Daoxue's evolution make it inconvenient for philosophers to use Daoxue as a rubric; however, we believe such evolution is helpful to our understanding of the history of thought during the Song and Yuan periods.

To recount intellectual developments during the Song era, there are two principal reasons for examining Song views of an earlier Classical text, the *Zhongyong*. Firstly, the importance of the *Zhongyong* to Song intellectuals varied widely. Many saw it just as a chapter of the canonical *Record of Rites* (*Liji* 禮記) with no special importance on its own, while others studied it intensively, most prominently of course Zhu Xi, who included this text into his famous collection of the Four Books (*Sishu* 四書). One might feel tempted to describe this change in significance as a more or less natural development; however, any such evolution is evident only retrospectively. Song literati themselves would have been largely unaware of such a natural evolution; moreover, most of them did not actively take part in such a trend. Secondly, the *Zhongyong* is of particular interest because it is a controversial text. We will show that its metaphysical contents were subject to a wide range of interpretations, and its origin and authorship had always been a matter of dispute.

Unlike some of his contemporaries, Zhu Xi tended to ignore most of the difficulties in the *Zhongyong* text. In fact, Zhu Xi's writings often show traces of deliberate attempts to create an illusion of a very streamlined *Zhongyong* tradition. For example, at the beginning of the *Zhongyong zhangju* 中庸章句, one of the basic compulsory textbooks for school students in China during the Ming and Qing dynasties and one which is still quite influential today, Zhu Xi quoted Master Cheng as having said:

Being not inclined [to anything] is what is meant by *zhong* 中, and not changing is what is meant by *yong* 庸. *Zhong* is the correct, proper Dao of All Under the Heavens (*tianxia* 天下 or the Chinese World);⁷ *yong* is the set principle of All Under the Heavens. This text is the method of mind (*xin fa* 心法), transmitted by the Confucian house. Zisi 子思 was afraid that

6 *SS juan* 427–430.

7 For an interesting recent article on this concept, see Chang Chishen (Zhang Qixian) 張其賢: "The formation of two key concepts: 'Zhongguo' and 'Tianxia'" 「中國」與「天下」概念探源, *Soochow Journal of Political Science* 東吳政治學報 27.3 (2009):169–256.

it would deteriorate over time; therefore, he formed it into a book and transmitted it to Mencius. This book begins talking about a single principle, expands later onto the myriad things, and in the end is unified again to a single principle. If you open it freely, it will fill all six dimensions, if you roll it up it can be hidden in the most secret places. Its flavor has no limits; everything in it is solid learning. A proficient reader can obtain something by reflecting on it; however, using it throughout one's whole life, one still cannot exhaust it.

不偏之謂中，不易之謂庸。中者，天下之正道；庸者，天下之定理。此篇乃孔門傳授心法，子思恐其久而差也，故筆之於書，以授孟子。其書始言一理，中散為萬事，未復合為一理，放之則彌六合，卷之則退藏於密，其味無窮，皆實學也。善讀者玩索而有得焉，則終身用之，有不能盡者矣。⁸

Firstly, we observe Zhu's clear-cut attribution of the *Zhongyong* to Zisi; thus, he ignored the doubts voiced by Song contemporaries. Secondly, the source of "Master Cheng's" statement itself is easily misunderstood. At first glance, it seems to be a single quotation from one of the Cheng brothers, probably Cheng Yi, since he is reported to have been especially interested in the *Zhongyong*. But by tracing the above quotation back to its roots, we will show that it is impossible to determine which brother spoke these sentences. These statements are actually a compilation of several quotations from the *Er Cheng yishu* 二程遺書, obviously conflated intentionally during Zhu Xi's editing, but even he admitted elsewhere that he was unable to assess the true originator of these particular sayings.⁹ This example shows Zhu Xi's streamlining of a canonical text, which made it easier to comprehend for students—all at the expense of scholarly carefulness.

The *Zhongyong* had a very colorful, but changing, history within the Confucian tradition. It is surely one of the most well-known texts in the history of Chinese philosophy, and no Confucian scholar since the Song era could turn a blind eye to it. As Andrew Plaks states, it "exerted an influence on the hearts and minds of men so profound and far-reaching as to bear comparison with none but the greatest monuments of the world's major scriptural traditions."¹⁰ In spite of this prominence, it was already during the Song period the object of substantial doubts expressed in the context of significant philosophical debates. Modern research quite unanimously dates the formation of the *Zhongyong* text several hundred years after the death of its alleged author, Zisi, but several Song scholars already considered the *Zhongyong* to be a much more questionable canonical text than, for example, the *Lunyu* (the *Analects* of Confucius) or the *Mengzi*. This current study will show that Zhu Xi's clean image of the *Zhongyong* as the authoritative model for the Song Confucian mainstream is only an illusion, or at best, Zhu Xi's own projected reality.

As one of the Four Books, which constitute the standard canon for Confucian education in late Imperial China, the *Zhongyong* has drawn wide attention. But we

8 Zhu Xi, *Zhongyong zhangju* 中庸章句, ZZQS 6:1.32.

9 For details see below, pp. 57–59.

10 Andrew Plaks, *Ta Hsüeh and Chung Yung—The Highest Order of Cultivation and On the Practice of the Mean* (London: Penguin, 2003), pp. xxvi–xxvii. See also Bruce Rusk, "Not Written in Stone: Ming Readers of the Great Learning and the Impact of Forgery," *HJAS* 66.1 (2006):189–231, especially p. 192.

should be careful about the appealing assumption that all Confucian scholars had become passionately concerned with the Four Books (including the *Zhongyong*) by the time of Zhu Xi's death. Hoyt Tillman has outlined the basic sequence by which Zhu Xi's commentaries and the Four Books were progressively adopted by the Southern Song government from 1212 to 1241.¹¹ Furthermore, Hilde de Weerdts has shown in detail how Zhu Xi's followers integrated Daoxue learning successfully into the official Southern Song civil service curriculum during the early and mid-thirteenth century, as can be clearly seen from some encyclopedias.¹²

Nevertheless, several difficult puzzle pieces remain. An example is Chen Chun 陳淳 (1159–1223), one of the major early apologists of Zhu Xi's legacy. When expounding on essay composition, he was more concerned about writing treatises in accordance with “principle and righteousness,” than about competing in the civil service examinations.¹³ Hence, we may question Hilde de Weerdts's argument, that Chen's book, *Beixi ziyi* 北溪字義, which chiefly propagates the use of the Four Books, was basically an attempt “to oppose the enemy” in the examinations.¹⁴

Secondly, Zhou Mi 周密 (1232–1298) stated that after 1244 the Four Books and other works of Daoxue scholars dominated governmental examinations,¹⁵ while in the very next sentence, he complained that during the last years of the Southern Song, the significance of the Four Books was surpassed by the Daoist writings *Zhuangzi* 莊子 and *Liezi* 列子.

Thirdly, the uneven impact of Zhu Xi's core curriculum during the thirteenth century is also displayed in the works of the late Song polymath Wang Yinglin 王

11 Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, *Confucian Discourse and Chu Hsi's Ascendancy* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1992), pp. 231–234.

12 Hilde de Weerdts, *Competition Over Content: Negotiating Standards for the Civil Service Examinations in Imperial China (1127–1279)* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), especially pp. 271–273.

13 In a letter to his study companion, he wrote: “Principle and righteousness are not conflicting with essay composition. The fact that contemporary scholars mutually attack the weaknesses and faults of one another's theories should neither be reason to confuse us, nor should we overly criticize this behavior. You have already developed your own style of composing. The foundation of your words is sufficiently stringent; the cutting edge of them is sufficiently sharp; they are more than enough to face the opponent. When composing examination essays, it suffices to face the opponent; success and failure are just a matter of fate. If someone thinks that striving for still more ingenuity is a secure method to win [in the exams], he is a fool. Principle and righteousness, however, may not be neglected in our bodies and minds for even a single day.”

理義於文章果不相為悖，而世儒交攻卑陋之說無足惑，亦無足責也。吾子於文已成一機軸，詞源之正駛，詞鋒之正銳，其於對敵有餘也。科舉之文足以對敵則已，其得失有命焉。若於其上求之益工為必得之計，則惑矣。理義在吾身心不可一日闕者。Chen Chun 陳淳: *Beixi daquan ji* 北溪大全集 (*SKQS*), 34.7a. This translation differs from de Weerdts's (p. 252f.).

14 Hilde de Weerdts, p. 258.

15 Hilde de Weerdts, p. 332, quoting Zhou Mi 周密: *Guixin zazhi* 癸辛雜識 (*SKQS*), *houji* 後集, p. 10b.

應麟 (1223–1296), who was heavily involved in examination issues¹⁶ and quite respectful toward Zhu Xi,¹⁷ but did not give any special attention to the Four Books. In fact, the Chinese term *Sishu* does not even appear a single time in Wang Yinglin's abundant writings. Moreover, the collection's original name, *Si zi* 四子 (“Four Masters”), is mentioned only briefly in his list of numbered items, the *Xiaoxue ganzhu* 小學紺珠; but since this work was meant to be encyclopedic, it does not mean that these “Four Masters” were of any special importance to him. The indifference of such a well-educated scholar toward the Four Books suggests that they did not yet play the dominant role that they did in later centuries, when they virtually eclipsed the Five Classics and other canonical works.

Obviously the Four Books required a considerable length of time to exert their influence within the broader Confucian community. The period of Zhu Xi orthodoxy in the Yuan, which lasted around 1313–1345, certainly had a strong impact, but it was short-lived, too. Only around the mid-fifteenth century, when mass book printing gained even greater popularity than during the Song and Yuan, were the Four Books uncontested among general educational institutions throughout the empire, not just in the elite circles aiming directly for the civil service examinations.¹⁸

Still, scholars in modern times are prone to look back at China's intellectual history through the lens of the Four Books. This is not just true for the study of Song intellectual history, which most often focuses on the “Neo-Confucians” in the most narrow usage of that label—a group of scholars that is more or less circumscribed by the *Daoxue zhuan* in the *Songshi* (juan 427–430); it also affects the studies of previous dynasties, where scholars often try to locate forerunners of later developments.¹⁹ Our perspective does not devalue the importance of these

16 Christian Soffel, *Ein Universalgelehrter verarbeitet das Ende seiner Dynastie—Eine Exegese des Kunxue Jiwen von Wang Yinglin* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), pp. 6–10.

17 Sufei Xiang 蘇費翔 (Christian Soffel), “Lun Wang Yinglin xuetong wenti” 論王應麟學統問題, in Shi Xiaofeng 施孝峰 and Fu Xuancong 傅璇琮, eds., *Wang Yinglin xueshu taolunji* 王應麟學術討論集 (Beijing: Qinghua daxue, 2009), pp. 181–201.

18 See Benjamin Elman's review of Hoyt Cleveland Tillman's *Confucian Discourse and Chu Hsi's Ascendancy*, *HJAS* 54.2 (1994.12):575–586, p. 585. This rising status of the Four Books coincides with an evolution of the honorary titles granted to Confucius by the emperors. In previous dynasties since the Han, Confucius had mostly been referred to in the Confucian Temple as “Father” (*fu* 父), “Duke” (*gong* 公) or “King” (*wang* 王); moreover, only under Tang Gaozong 唐高宗 (r. 650–684) from 666–689 was Confucius called “Premier Teacher” (*taishi* 太師), which reflected more of his political role. In a remarkable shift beginning in 1530, all titles from the emperor honored Confucius as “First Teacher” (*xianshi* 先師) and thus endorsed his role in popular education.

19 A good example would be Charles Hartman, who writes: “Concentration on those texts later to be known as the Four Books ... is already well advanced in Han Yu's writings.” See Charles Hartman, *Han Yü and the T'ang Search for Unity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), p. 178; see more detail on pp. 176–179. On the one hand, it is clear that the *Zhongyong* was important for Han Yu. See also Xia Changpu 夏長樸: “Lun *Zhongyong* xingqi yu Songdai ruxue fazhan de guanxi” 論《中庸》興起與宋代儒學發展的關係, *Zhongguo Jingxue* 中國經學 2 (2007.7):131–187, p. 137. On the other hand, placing the *Zhongyong* in the context of what would become the Four Books was of course only done

studies, for they definitely show great depth of scholarship; moreover, we have no doubt that Zhu Xi's successful attempt to put the Four Books together as a whole had a prior history that is important for their understanding. Nor are we making the claim that the *Zhongyong* does not represent genuine Confucian thought.²⁰ The question is not, whether the *Zhongyong* is a Confucian text, but rather the prominence it deserves or was given within the Confucian tradition prior to and immediately after Zhu Xi.

In other words, one goal of the present study is to understand the role of the *Zhongyong* during the Song dynasty, widely seen as the formative stage of the canon of the Four Books, and then to use these results to gain additional perspective on the issue of cultural authority and the formation of "Confucian traditions." Examining the expressed goals and the employed techniques of those supporting and opposing the canonization of the *Zhongyong*, the focus will be on scholars both inside and outside of the so-called "Cheng-Zhu orthodoxy." To demonstrate some general trends, we will examine three major issues: first, the interpretation of the title characters *zhong* 中 and *yong* 庸 before and during the Song; second, how the question of authorship was viewed during this period; and third, the ways in which the *Zhongyong* was connected to Confucian lineages, particularly the *daotong*, "the succession and transmission of the Way."

Difficulty understanding the ambiguous core characters *zhong* and *yong* is neither limited to Western sinologists nor merely a modern phenomenon. Chinese intellectuals past and present have not been confronted with the challenge of translating the title into a foreign language, which would have augmented their attention to the ontology of the "Mean." Nevertheless, they engaged in vivid discussions based on late Han and contemporary Song understandings of the characters in the title, which we analyze in the first chapter of Part One. Though not directly related to the issue of "traditions" and "schools," this investigation will provide insight into some of the argumentation employed by a variety of Song scholars.

As for the question of authorship and authenticity, the origins of the *Zhongyong* itself have always been obscure. Many traditional Chinese sources have attributed it to Confucius' grandson and second-generation disciple Kong Ji 孔伋,

from a later perspective. Another example would be David McMullen, *State and Scholars in T'ang China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 97, who writes: "Quan Deyu even foreshadowed the later Neo-Confucian grouping of the Four Books, when he asked about the attitude to self-cultivation of the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong*." Here and elsewhere in quotations used in the text, we have changed Wade-Giles to *pinyin* spelling for the readers' convenience.

20 The Confucian imprint is readily apparent from the frequent usage of phrases starting with "the master says" (*zi yue* 子曰), or "Zhongni (i.e., Confucius) says" (*Zhongni yue* 仲尼曰), thus suggesting that a large part of the text is attributed to Confucius by its authors. This imprint is also seen in the use of Confucian key terms from the *Lunyu* (like "Superior Man" vs. "Little Man," i.e., *junzi* 君子 vs. *xiaoren* 小人), as well as inter-textual similarities with the *Lunyu* and the *Mencius* (*Mengzi*). See Chen Zhaorong 陳兆榮: *Zhongyong tanwei* 中庸探微 (Taipei: Zhengzhong, 1975), p. 117.

also known as Zisi or Master Zisi (Zisi zi 子思子). However, there is no contemporary account from that era about the people involved in its compilation; we only have a brief statement centuries later in the *Shiji* 史記 that Zisi was the author.²¹ As already mentioned, modern critical research has revealed that the *Zhongyong* was most likely compiled during the early Han dynasty (206 B.C.–A.D. 220). Although scholars at that time had only corrupted Confucian texts which were difficult for them to understand, some strove to transform Confucius' own teachings into a general philosophical system. Seeking to strengthen the status of Confucianism at court and in the empire, their goal was to ready Confucianism to become an official system of teachings. A principal means to attain this goal was writing a corpus of ritual and other canonical texts (specifically the *Liji* in this case) attributed to Confucius (or people in his tradition); these texts provided guidelines on how people should live, act, think and perfect themselves.

However, doubts about the *Zhongyong*'s origin were common among Song dynasty scholars, especially Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072), Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037–1101), Ye Shi and Wang Bo. There is, however, a notable difference in the approaches of these intellectuals: some focused their critique on the question of the *Zhongyong*'s authenticity, while others mainly criticized its structure, rather than its contents. For example, Ouyang Xiu doubted its authenticity because it contradicts the *Lunyu*. Su Shi asserted that an original *Zhongyong* written by Confucius was distorted drastically by Zisi, and Ye Shi thought that the *Zhongyong* was possibly a forgery from the last years of the Warring States Period (403–221 B.C.). However, Wang Bo—a rather devoted follower of Zhu Xi—did not bring up the question of authenticity, but rather questioned the arrangement of its chapters.

Scholars like Ye Shi and Wang Bo, who wrote their major works after Zhu Xi had propagated his *daotong* orthodoxy in the late twelfth century, were well aware of the challenge that their skepticism about the *Zhongyong* posed for Zhu Xi and other Daoxue philosophers. Ye Shi had a very complicated relationship with Zhu Xi, one that worsened over time. In his youth, he regarded himself as a member of the Daoxue fellowship and also tried to appease Zhu, who was one generation senior. Nonetheless, Ye firmly stuck to his own ideas, which were often quite different from Zhu's. Later on, frustrated by Zhu Xi's intolerance of others' views and unwillingness to change his own, Ye Shi became an opponent of Zhu Xi.²² Ye's harsh criticism of the *Zhongyong* is best understood in that context.

Wang Bo's approach was very different. He was one of the most prominent thirteenth century figures in the Zhu Xi tradition, and his writings were always respectful toward the master. When he found himself in disagreement, Wang Bo frequently employed humble language, expressing a sense of guilt about his own

21 There is no further commentary by Sima Qian 司馬遷 (145–86 B.C.) to this ascription of the work to Zisi; it is merely an item of additional information to the account of the line of descendants of Confucius, which includes Zisi. See the biography of Confucius, *Kongzi shijia* 孔子世家, *SJ* 6:47.1946.

22 See Niu Pu, "Confucian Statecraft in Song China: Ye Shi and the Yongjia School" (Ph.D. diss., Arizona State University, 1998; Ann Arbor: UMI Microform, 1998), pp. 100–103.

contradictory findings and supposing, in the event that he happened to be right, that Zhu would have arrived at the same conclusions sooner or later anyway. Still, Wang Bo's proposed changes to the *Zhongyong* and the *daotong* tradition were quite radical.

Considering both the *Zhongyong*'s uncertain background and its problematic status during the Song, it is striking to note the degree to which the *Zhongyong* became a standard text in later Confucianism. It was included in standard curricula for a few decades during both the Song and the Yuan and then throughout the Ming and Qing. Many representatives of Confucian orthodoxy have used, and continue to use, the text as a starting point for the development of their philosophical ideas, but often ignore questions about its authority or authenticity. Even today, almost every student in Chinese communities throughout East and Southeast Asia will learn about the *Zhongyong* and read a few paragraphs. Teachers in those classes, however, rarely mention the fact that several Chinese scholars through the centuries have questioned the traditional narrative that Zisi wrote the *Zhongyong* to clarify Confucius' teachings. The belief in the authenticity of the text has even affected some of the strictest enemies of Confucianism: during the Cultural Revolution, books published to denigrate the Confucian canon also condemned Zisi, because they considered him to be the author of the *Zhongyong*.²³

The third chapter of our study will examine the connection between views of the *Zhongyong*'s background and the various Confucian lineages constructed during the Song period. We will explore how the so-called *daotong* was much more flexible and more widespread than people have conventionally assumed. Although Zhu Xi is generally proclaimed as the originator of the term *daotong*, we will demonstrate that this term was used to describe lineages long before him. Furthermore, some scholars in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries envisioned different versions of the *daotong* that conflicted with Zhu Xi's ideas and thus suggested alternative lines of cultural authority.

Part Two explores Hao Jing's²⁴ views of political power and cultural authority through his comments on Chinese and alien "barbarians," the legitimate succession of dynasties, the evolution of Daoxue Confucianism, and his views of the Five Classics, the *Zhongyong* and the *daotong*. The Chinese would continue to be confronted with terror and violence, according to Hao Jing, if intellectuals and officials of the day did not take the initiative to find peace with the Mongol conquerors. In his 1260 letter to Southern Song officials, he stated bluntly the conse-

23 See for example, Zhongshan daxue Zhongwenxi Hanyu zhuan yong nong bing xueyuan 中山大學中文系漢語專業工農兵學員: *Zhongyong pi zhu xuan* 中庸批注選 (Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, 1974), p. 1.

24 Hao Jing's official biography is in the *YS* 12:157.3698–3709; see also the modern biography, Qin Hongchang 秦鴻昌: *Hao Jing zhuan* 郝經傳 (Taiyuan: Shanxi guji chubanshe, 2001). For a noteworthy survey of traditional views of Yuan intellectuals on some of the issues we will explore, see Wang Mingsun 王明蓀: *Yuandai de shiren yu zhengzhi* 元代的士人與政治 (Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1992), especially pp. 149–275. See also Xiao Qiqing (Hsiao Ch'ing) 蕭啓慶: *Yuandai de zuqun wenhua yu keju* 元代的族群文化與科學 (Taipei: Lianjing, 2008).

quences of not resolving this issue: “Our people’s bodies will oil the executioners’ axes and become manure for the abandoned fields; how could there be survivors” 吾民將膏鈇鉞，糞土野，其無子遺矣!²⁵ At the time he issued this dire warning to Southern Song officials, Hao Jing was serving as the “peace envoy” from the Mongol ruler Khubilai 忽必烈 (1215–1294, Emperor Yuan Shizu 元世祖, reigned 1260–1294). Hao Jing’s ambitious quest for peace was in vain. Chinese scholars still remember him as a crucial advisor during Khubilai’s rise to power and as a giant among the most famous poets of the Yuan era.²⁶ Modern scholars researching Hao Jing’s poetic and political contributions are relatively numerous, but few modern scholars explore his thought. In his memorials advocating Han Chinese political institutions and humane governance while addressing statecraft issues, such as consolidation of authority and unification of China, he provided Khubilai with very practical advice. In addition to his poetry and prose writings, he wrote a wide range of books including three works on the classic *Chunqiu* 春秋 (*Spring and Autumn Annals*).

Only his *Continuation of the History of the Later Han* 續後漢書 and his collected short works under the title *Hao Wenzhonggong Lingchuan wenji* 郝文忠公陵川文集 are still extant. This is the title of the earliest known extant edition of his collected works, a Ming edition from 1507 preserved in the Rare Books Collection of Peking University Library in Beijing, which were consulted for selected passages in 2004. There is also a photographed copy, published in 1988, but that edition has many unclear pages. We primarily used the far more convenient modern punctuated edition in the *Quan Yuan wen* series, which utilized the Ming 1507

- 25 Hao Jing 郝經: “Yu Songguo Liang Huai zhizhishi shu” 與宋國兩淮制置使書, from *Hao Wenzhonggong Lingchuan wenji* 郝文忠公陵川文集 (Ming Zhengde 明正德 2nd year [1507] edition in the Peking University Rare Books Collection, 37.11a; photo reproduction made by the Beijing tushuguan guji chuban bianjizu 北京圖書館古籍出版編輯組 under the title *Beijing tushuguan guji zhenben congkan* 北京圖書館古籍珍本叢刊 (Beijing: Shumu wenxuan chubanshe, preface 1988), vol. 91, p. 819. This Ming edition was the base text utilized by the editors in the *Quan Yuan wen* 全元文 (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1999), 4:122.104, which we primarily used, but secondarily the *Lingchuan ji* 陵川集 (*SKQS*), 37:13a. See comments on editions in the following paragraph of our text.
- 26 For example, Mu Dequan 穆德全: “Ping wei Zhongguo de tongyi zuochu gongxian de Yuan chu beifang daibiao Hao Jing” 評為中國的統一做出貢獻的元初北方代表郝經, *Henan daxue xuebao* (Philosophy Social Sciences section) 河南大學學報(哲學社會科學版) 4 (1989): 76 – 82; Wang Shunhua 王舜華 and Feng Rongzhen 馮榮珍: “Hao Jing ‘He Tao shi’ de yanjiu” 郝經 ‘和陶詩’ 的研究, *Gudai wenxue* 古代文學 9 (2009):62–64. Huo Yueren 火玥人: “Yuan ren Hao Jing qianqi shige nei yun” 元人郝經前期詩歌內蘊, *Huabei dianli daxue xuebao* (Social Sciences section) 華北電力大學學報(社會科學版) 1 (1997): 82–88, as well as her “Yuan ren Hao Jing wenxue zhuzhang yuanyuan ji qi neihan” 元人郝經文學主張淵源及其內涵, *Beijing dongli jingji xuexuan xuebao* (Social Sciences section) 北京動力經濟學院學報(社會科學版) 1 (1995):98–104. In English, a good account of Hao’s biography, highlighting his poetry and service to Khubilai, is provided by Richard J. Lynn, “Hao Ching,” in Igor de Rachewiltz, et al., eds., *In the Service to the Khan: Eminent Personalities of the Early Mongol-Yuan Period* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1993), pp. 348–370. On Khubilai, see especially Morris Rossabi, *Khubilai Kahn: His Life and Times* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

edition as its base text (with some suggested emendations included from two Qing editions, one from 1738 and the other, the famous *Siku Quanshu* edition). Though works published in the *Siku Quanshu* project were of course sometimes “rectified” to accord with Manchu Qing political and cultural sensitivities, Hao Jing’s works apparently were affected very little. Furthermore, the *SKQS* edition is the most readily available, and there are some letters, essays and poems (which we cite) that were not included by the editors of the *Quan Yuan wen* series. Even though the modern editors of this series refer to Hao Jing’s works as *Lingchuan wenji*, we will for convenience use the more widely known title within the *SKQS* series, i.e., *Lingchuan ji*, when providing page numbers to these two editions together. We will use the full title to refer to the 1507 edition when that edition is required. For the *Xu Hou Han shu*, we primarily utilized the modern punctuated edition in the supplemental series to the twenty-five dynastic histories; however, we also consulted the *SKQS* edition.²⁷

Hao Jing’s historical perspective and cultural thought deserve serious research for several reasons. In particular, Hao Jing was among the few scholars who lived for many years in three different regions, each ruled by one of the governments that held sway during his lifetime: the Jurchen Jin, the Mongol Yuan and the Han Chinese Song dynasties. His ancestors had lived in Lingchuan 陵川 in Zezhou 澤州 or Ze Prefecture, in the modern province of Shanxi; but as the Mongol armies invaded Lingchuan, his grandfather, father and mother escaped the disorder by fleeing into Henan behind Jin lines. Shortly before the Mongol armies destroyed the Jin dynasty, the Hao family migrated in 1232 to Baozhou 保州 (called Baoding 保定 since 1275) in the circuit (*dao* 道) or superior prefecture (*fu* 府) of Shuntian 順天 in modern Hebei province. Thus, Hao Jing was born in Xuzhou 許州 in Henan province, though he and his family lived mostly in Baoding from the time he was about ten *sui* 歲. In 1260, after becoming an intellectual and serving as an advisor to Khubilai, the Khan dispatched him as a special envoy to the Southern Song court to discuss proposals for peace and to convince the Song to acknowledge Mongol supremacy in the Chinese world. When he reached Zhenzhou 真州 (now known as Yizheng City 儀徵市 in Jiangsu Province), the Southern Song government would allow him neither to proceed to the capital city of Lin’an 臨安 (i.e., Hangzhou 杭州) nor to return to the North; consequently, he remained in Zhenzhou for sixteen years, until 1275.²⁸ To sum up, he lived for ten years of his

27 For details on editions of the collected works, see the footnote 25 above. For the historical work, see Hao Jing, *Xu Hou Han shu* 續後漢書 in the *Ershiwu bieshi* 二十五別史 (Jinan: Qi Lu shushe, 2000), or the *SKQS* edition. According to research by Qiu Juli 邱居里, this work’s original title, *Sanguo zhi* 三國誌, was changed by the Yuan government in 1318; see Qiu’s “Hao Jing Xu Hou Han shu pingyi” 郝經續後漢書評議, *Beijing shifan daxue xuebao* 北京師範大學學報 (2003 special issue): 51–53. Born in 1954, Qiu is a professor at Beijing shifan daxue and is one of the daughters of CASS historian Qiu Hansheng 邱漢生.

28 Regarding Hao Jing’s mission to the Southern Song, see especially Zhang Siqing 張思青 and Zhang Hongpo 張洪波: “Hao Jing zhuanlüe xinkao” 郝經傳略新考, *Xin Xiang Shifan gaodeng zhuanke xuebao* 新鄉師範高等專科學報 10.4 (1996):26–29; Ren Chongyue 任崇岳: “Hao Jing shi Song yu Song-Meng guanxi” 郝經使宋與宋蒙關係, *Huang Huai xuekan* 黃淮

childhood under the Jin, sixteen years of his last years under the Song, and the intervening twenty-seven years in areas controlled by the Mongols. As such, his life experience is something we should not overlook in our inquiries into the evolving intellectual developments during the transitions between the Jin, Song, and Yuan eras. Because of the diversity of his life experiences, his statements about native Han and alien conquest regimes are particularly noteworthy.

Second, because the Mongol conquest represented a life-or-death crisis to the ethnic Han Chinese, Hao Jing felt compelled to reduce tensions between the Han Chinese and the alien “barbarians” and to resolve or overcome longstanding “strict defensive barriers between alien barbarians and Han Chinese” 嚴夷夏之防 (e.g., his words contained in the quotation below). As part of his efforts to address these issues that had become unavoidable, he championed the idea that the sages’ “succession and transmission of the Dao” (*daotong*) was superior to the rulers’ “tradition and succession of governmental legitimacy and authority” (*zhengtong*). Moreover, he called upon the scholars and officials of North China to regard “All Under the Heavens” or the Chinese notion of the “Imperial Realm” or “World” (*tianxia* 天下) as their responsibility, to cast away prejudices against alien rulers, and to work together with the new rulers to bring peace to the Realm of All Under the Heavens. In an exposition of Hao Jing’s ideas, Professor Yan Xuanjun 晏選軍 explains the confrontation and assimilation of different ethnic groups in China:

In the northern border areas, with the large amount of ethnic fusing during Fu Jian’s 苻堅 (337–384) Former Qin 前秦, the Northern Wei 北魏, and the Jurchen Jin dynasties, some intellectuals living in that area had already become indifferent to the notion of “strict defensive barriers between alien barbarians and Han Chinese,” and ethnic divisions in a narrow sense were no longer so clearly distinct. How to guide people to soberly recognize the reality of the ever quickening pace of the amalgamation of multiple ethnic groups, as well as how to inspire Confucian intellectuals to actively participate in the construction of a multiethnically coalesced political authority, were critically urgent intellectual issues to be resolved.²⁹

In Yan’s view, Hao Jing’s frame of reference not only became a “bridge for communication between different ethnic cultures,” but also served “to create public sentiment (among the Han Chinese) for cooperation” with the Mongols. Hao Jing’s inquiry into the issue of “defensive barriers between alien barbarians and

學刊 2 (1990):50–57; and Dietlinde Schlegel, *Hao Ching (1122–1275): Ein chinesischer Berater des Kaisers Kublai Khan* (Bamberg: Offsetdruckerei Kurt Urlaub, 1968), pp. 66–67. Traditionally, Jia Sidao 賈似道 has been blamed for detaining Hao; however, Herbert Franke questioned such charges against Jia. Herbert Franke, “Chia Ssu-tao (1213–1275): A ‘Bad Last Minister’?” in Arthur F. Wright and Denis Twitchett, eds., *Confucian Personalities* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962), pp. 217–234. Jennifer Jay suggests that the Huai River area administrator and general, Li Tingzhi 李庭芝 (died ca. 1274), was responsible; Jennifer W. Jay, *A Change in Dynasties: Loyalty in Thirteenth-Century China* (Bellingham: Western Washington University, Center for Chinese Studies, 1991), pp. 16–17.

29 Yan Xuanjun 晏選軍: “Nanbei lixue sixiang huihexia de Hao Jing” 南北理學思想匯合下的郝經, *Jinyang xuekan* 晉陽學刊 6 (2003):10–15, here p. 12. Yan was at Nankai 南開 University’s Chinese Department.

Han Chinese,” as well as his advocacy for the idea of the “succession and transmission of the Dao,” thus “provided an important Confucian theoretical basis for the establishment of a Mongol regime in the Han Chinese area of North China.”

In contrast, Professor Bai Gang 白鋼, a renowned scholar at the Political Science Institute of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, is of the opinion: although Hao Jing served as a major official for the Mongol state, he actually regarded the Southern Song as “the legitimate dynasty” 正統.³⁰ Moreover, Qin Hongchang 秦鴻昌, the modern author of *Hao Jing's Biography* 郝經傳, feels that Hao Jing gave fundamental expression to “the Han-centered tradition of thinking,” or “Han legacy thinking” 漢統思想, i.e., giving special status to the ethnic Han Chinese and their preminent role in Chinese history and government.³¹

Contemporary scholars in China disagree about the nature of Hao Jing's thought; however, with the exception of some young scholars publishing within the last five years,³² they have generally emphasized the existence of serious contradictions in his thought and political theories. Political circumstances did make it difficult for Hao Jing to avoid intellectual tensions, and we appreciate the analysis of these scholars. Nevertheless, our examination of Hao Jing's extant writings considers traces of an “inner logic” that might link his writings into a larger, coherent perspective.

Third, among the reasons for the importance of Hao Jing's thought are his creative contributions to historiography and classical studies. For instance, while explaining the relationship between the Confucian Six Classics and history, Hao Jing declared: “In antiquity there was no distinction between the Classics and history.... The Six Classics themselves have history” 古無經史之分。...六經自有史耳。³³ Bai Gang thinks that Hao Jing's insight, after transmission through Liu Yin 劉因 (1249–1293), influenced subsequent thinkers. However, later scholars did not notice that Hao Jing had already explained this relationship between the Classics and history. Instead, they venerated Zhang Xuecheng's 章學誠 (1738–1801) similar slogan, “all the Six Classics are history” 六經皆史。³⁴ Whether or not Hao Jing represents the earliest precedent, this example points out that his classical scholarship and historical judgments are worth further consideration.

30 Bai Gang 白鋼: “Lun Hao Jing de zhengzhi qingxiang” 論郝經的政治傾向, *Zhongguoshi yanjiu* 中國史研究 4 (1985):101–115, p. 107, also included in *Zhongguo renmin daxue shu bao ziliao zhongxin baokan ziliao xuanhui* 中國人民大學書報資料中心報刊資料選匯 2 (1986):83–96.

31 Qin Hongchang, especially p. 200.

32 See the discussion in the last paragraph of chapter 5.

33 Hao Jing, “Jing shi” 經史, *Lingchuan ji*, *QYW* 4:128.256, or (*SKQS*), 19:11b.

34 Bai Gang 白鋼: “Hao Jing de jingshi lun ji qi shehui yiyi (dai xu)” 郝經的經史論及其社會意義 (代序), in Qin Hongchang, *Hao Jing zhuan*, p. 3. On Zhang Xuecheng's views of the classics as “history,” see especially David S. Nivison, *The Life and Thought of Chang Hsüeh-ch'eng (1738–1801)* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966), pp. 98–100, 201–204, 271f.

Fourth, though Hao Jing provides considerable material with which to discuss the history of the Song, Jin and Yuan, scholars for several centuries have paid little attention to his significant claims therein. He emphasized that his forefathers in Lingchuan in Zezhou, Shanxi had for many generations—from the Northern Song, through the Jin, and straight into the Mongol period—continued the intellectual traditions of Cheng Hao. However, traditional Chinese scholars, following the official *Yuan History* 元史 and the *Song Yuan xue'an* 宋元學案, proclaimed that Jin intellectuals essentially had no knowledge of the philosophical theories of the two Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi; claiming instead that it was only after the Mongol forces captured the Southern Song scholar Zhao Fu 趙復 (ca. 1200–1277) and took him to North China in 1235, that people in the North began to become acquainted with Cheng-Zhu version of Daoxue Confucianism.³⁵ Hoyt Tillman's 1988 article in *Chinese Philosophy* 中國哲學, which presents considerable historical evidence to counter this traditional viewpoint, concludes:

Daoxue in North China began to flourish at least ten years before Zhao Fu was born and more than forty years before the traditional mainstream claims that Zhao brought the Cheng-Zhu version of Daoxue into the North.... Compared with Zhu Xi, the Zhu-Xi school of learning during the Yuan era placed greater emphasis on practical learning and self-cultivation and relatively less on abstract metaphysics; moreover, it was relatively more reconciled to alternative ideas and schools of thought. These special characterizations were the same as the concerns that Jin era intellectuals had about Daoxue; in other words, these were the same as the changes that Jin intellectual wished to see in Daoxue.³⁶

Since the publication of this article, some scholars in China have found additional evidence supporting the line of argument set forth in the above paragraph and also in Hao Jing's writings, particularly evidence that North China under the Jin and early Yuan continued the learning of the Cheng brothers. Nonetheless, Yan Xuanjun and Zha Hongde 查洪德 still emphasize differences between Hao Jing and Cheng-Zhu Daoxue.³⁷

35 *YS* 14:189.4314; *SYXA*, 4:90.2994, 4:100.3316 and 3326. For two influential modern restatements of this traditional view, see Yoshikawa Kōjirō 吉川幸次郎: "Shushi gaku hokuden zenshi—Kinchō to Shushigaku" 朱子學北傳前史—金朝と朱子學, in *Uno Tetsuo sensei hakuju shūkuga kinen Tōyōgaku ronsō* 宇野哲人先生百壽祝賀紀念東洋學論叢 (Tokyo: Uno Tetsuo sensei hakuju shūkuga kinen, 1974), pp. 1237–1258, and also Wing-tsit Chan, "Chu Hsi and Yüan Neo-Confucianism," in Chan Hok-lam and Wm. Theodore de Bary, eds., *Yüan Thought: Chinese Thought and Religion under the Mongols* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), pp. 197–231.

36 Tian Hao 田浩 (Hoyt Tillman), "Jindai de Rujiao: Daoxue zai beibu Zhongguo de yinji" 金代的儒教：道學在北部中國的印跡, in Bao Zunxin 包遵信 et al., eds., *Zhongguo zhexue* 中國哲學 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1988), vol. 14, pp. 107–141, especially pp. 138, 140. For an expanded version of this article, see Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, "Confucianism under the Chin and the Impact of Sung Confucian Tao-hsüeh," in Hoyt Cleveland Tillman and Stephen H. West, *China under Jurchen Rule: Essays on Chin Intellectual and Cultural History* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 71–114.

37 For secondary notice of Cheng Hao's legacy in Shanxi, besides Yan Xuanjun's article, see Zha Hongde 查洪德: "Hao Jing de xueshu yu wenyi" 郝經的學術與文藝, *Wenxue yichan* 文

Fifth, Hao Jing's comments on the Classics, especially the *Zhongyong*, and also on the *daotong* yield material to support the argument of Part One, below. We think that Hao Jing's initial hostility to the importation of Southern Song Daoxue and yet his evolving embrace of Zhu Xi's stance on these and other issues provides an important piece of the puzzle: how did Zhu Xi's views become even more orthodox to, and commonly accepted by, intellectuals in the late Yuan and early Ming than they had been in the late Song? It appears that Hao Jing and other early Yuan Confucians came to embrace Zhu Xi's views of such crucial issues as the *Zhongyong* and the *daotong* lineage in antiquity relatively more fully than some of Zhu's Southern Song disciples, such as Wang Bo, had done. Despite the obvious historic importance of Zhu Xi and Southern Song developments, attitudes and ideas continuing in North China from the Northern Song through the Jin and into the Yuan also probably played a significant role. However, the legacy of North China intellectual traditions during this period have been overshadowed by most scholars' intense concentration on Zhu Xi's creativity and the continuity of intellectual currents from the Northern Song to Zhu Xi and from him into the North during the Yuan. That continuity has been reinforced by assumptions about how universally Song Confucians accepted the Four Books and how completely they accepted Zhu's interpretations. Part One effectively calls such conventional assumptions into question and thus opens an avenue for greater appreciation for the role of Yuan Confucians. The two parts of this book can together illuminate the issues we have articulated. The broad range of philosophical figures in Part One is a foundation for the more closely focused consideration of Hao Jing in Part Two, and further research on other Yuan figures may further support the thesis and conclusions.

Part Two considers intellectual history through historical analysis and also by exploring Hao Jing's point of view on Daoxue's evolution through the Song, Jin and Yuan. When traditional mainstream and modern scholars explore the history of philosophy during the early Yuan, they customarily discuss Zhao Fu, Xu Heng 許衡 (1209–1281) and Liu Yin, but give much less consideration to Hao Jing.³⁸ Almost all of the few scholars who do discuss Hao Jing's thought now emphasize the contradictions in his thinking, not the general thrust of his argument. While we do not ignore tensions within his thinking, we seek to show the "inner logic" in his writings and probe the reasoning behind them. We also examine Hao Jing as

學遺產, 6 (1997):53–64; Yan Yun 燕筠: "Zhongxin chuan jia jiu, mingjie liu shi chang—ji Lingchuan Hao Tianting, Hao Jing wenxue shijia" 忠信傳家久名節流世長—記陵川郝天挺、郝經文學世家, *Shanxi jiaoyu xueyuan xuebao* 山西教育學院學報 4(2001):14–15. For earlier discussions of Li Junmin 李俊民 having been influenced by Cheng Hao's legacy in Shanxi, see Yao Dali 姚大力: "Jinmo Yuanchu lixue zai beifang de chuanbo" 金末元初理學在北方的傳播, in Yuanshi Yanjiuhui 元史研究會, ed., *Yuanshi luncong* 元史論叢 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), No. 2, pp. 217–218; and Tillman, "Confucianism under the Chin," p. 81.

38 For example, Hou Wailou 侯外廬, Qiu Hansheng 邱漢生, and Zhang Qizhi 張豈之, eds., *Song Ming lixueshi* 宋明理學史 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1984), vol. 1, pp. 679–720.

part of our inquiry into both Han Chinese interactions with Jurchens and Mongols, and more broadly into the complex relationship between political power and cultural authority in the late Song and early Yuan.³⁹

39 Responsibility for Part One, “The *Zhongyong* and the *Daotong* during the Southern Song,” is primarily that of Christian Soffel, while Part Two, “The Collision and Amalgamation of Song, Jin, and Yuan Cultural Thinking,” is primarily by Hoyt Tillman.