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. 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
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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 dao tong as promoted by Zhu Xi. For instance, scholars have often accepted Zhu Xi’s account of the dao tong 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 dao tong. 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 dao tong. Discussing Hao Jing’s views of the dao tong 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 reevaluations 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 et 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. 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). 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), Pangguan 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); 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
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6 SS juan 427–430.

7 For an interesting recent article on this concept, see Chang Chisher (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.

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. 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.” 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
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8 Zhu Xi, Zhongyong zhangju 中庸章句, ZZQS 6:1.32.
9 For details see below, pp. 57–59.
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. Furthermore, Hilde de Weerdt 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.

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. Hence, we may question Hilde de Weerdt’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.

Secondly, Zhou Mi 周密 (1232–1298) stated that after 1244 the Four Books and other works of Daoxue scholars dominated governmental examinations, 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.
應麟 (1223–1296), who was heavily involved in examination issues 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 Xiao xue ganzhu 小學絳珠; 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. 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. Our perspective does not devalue the importance of these

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 Yu 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. 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.

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.

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.

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’s 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-

---


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 zhuang 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’i-ch’ing) 蕭啓慶: Yuandai de zuqunwenhua yu keju 元代的族群文化與科舉 (Taipei: Lian-jing, 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?”

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 (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. 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 (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 edition in the Peking University Rare Books Collection, 37.11a; photo reproduction made by the Beijing tushuguan guji zhenben congkan 北京圖書館古籍珍本文集刊 (Beijing: Shumu wenxuan chuban she, 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.

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 in Zezhou 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 Baoshou in Baoding (called Baoding since 1275) in the circuit (dao) or superior prefecture (fu) of Shuntian in modern Hebei province. Thus, Hao Jing was born in Xuzhou in Henan province, though he and his family lived mostly in Baoding from the time he was about ten sui. 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 (now known as Yizheng City in Jiangsu Province), the Southern Song government would allow him neither to proceed to the capital city of Lin’an nor to return to the North; consequently, he remained in Zhenzhou for sixteen years, until 1275.

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* in the *Ershiwu bieshi* (Jinan: Qi Lu shushe, 2000), or the *SKQS* edition. According to research by Qiu Juli, this work’s original title, *Sanguo zhi* 三國志, 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* 2003 special issue: 51–53. Born in 1954, Qiu is a professor at Beijing shifan and is one of the daughters of CASS historian Qiu Hansheng.

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
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. 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 preeminent role in Chinese history and government.

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, 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. 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 張學誠 (1738–1801) similar slogan, “all the Six Classics are history” 六經皆史. Whether or not Hao Jing represents the earliest precedent, this example points out that his classical scholarship and historical judgments are worth further consideration.

---

31 Qin Hongchang, especially p. 200.
32 See the discussion in the last paragraph of chapter 5.
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

---


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. 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...
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 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.