

# The Encyclopedia of Confucianism

2-volume set

*Edited by*  
**Xinzhong Yao**



**ROUTLEDGE CURZON  
ENCYCLOPEDIA OF  
CONFUCIANISM**

## **RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedias of Religion**

Available in the series:

### **RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedia of Confucianism**

*Edited by Xinzhong Yao*

Forthcoming in the series:

### **RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedia of Taoism**

*Edited by Fabrizio Pregadio*

### **RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedia of Islam**

*Edited by Ian Richard Netton*

### **RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedia of Hinduism**

*Edited by Denise Cush, Catherine Robinson and Michael York*

### **RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedia of Sikhism**

*Edited by Arvind-pal S. Mandair and Christopher Shackle*

# ROUTLEDGE CURZON ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CONFUCIANISM

Edited by  
**Xinzhong Yao**

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2003  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada  
by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group*

Transferred to Digital Printing 2008

First issued in paperback 2013

© 2003 Selection and editorial matter, Xinzhong Yao;  
individual contributors their contributions

Typeset in Baskerville by Graphicraft

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

The publisher makes no representation, express or implied, with regard to the accuracy of the information contained in this book and cannot accept any legal responsibility or liability for any errors or omissions that may be made.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*  
Routledge encyclopedia of Confucianism / Edited by Xinzhong Yao.  
p. cm. — (Routledge encyclopedias of religion ; 1)  
Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Confucianism—Encyclopedias. I. Title: Encyclopedia of Confucianism. II. Yao, Xinzhong. III. Series.

BL1840 .R68 2003  
181'.112'03—dc21  
2002068250

ISBN 978-0-415-51522-1 (set)

To Michael Loewe for his friendship and unwavering support  
and  
To Alice, my daughter

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Contents

<i>Editor's preface</i>	viii–xii
<i>Note on entries, cross-references and bibliographies</i>	xiii
<i>List of contributors</i>	xiv–xix
<i>Timeline</i>	xx
<b>Confucianism</b>	1–12
<b>A–Z entries</b>	13–855
<i>Bibliography</i>	856–900
<i>Name index</i>	901–912
<i>Subject index</i>	913–924
<i>Text index</i>	925–932



## Editor's preface

In May 1997, Jonathan Price, the editor of Curzon Press, came to Lampeter and invited me to edit one of the proposed five encyclopedias on Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, Sikhism and Taoism. After hesitating for a few weeks, I accepted this invitation, not fully aware that this would take me about five years to complete.

Why an encyclopedia on Confucianism? The study of Confucianism in the West can be traced to the Jesuits of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who came to China as missionaries, and studied the Confucian Classics from a Christian viewpoint and mainly for the purpose of evangelising Chinese intellectuals. The real start of Confucian studies as a subject for the Sinologist, however, was probably the translation of the Chinese Classics into English by James Legge, and his subsequent appointment as the Chair of Chinese Studies in Oxford (see **Confucianism in the West**). Departing from the Christian studies of Confucianism in earlier ages, the twentieth century saw a great number of philosophers, historians, anthropologists and sociologists taking part in the studies of Confucian texts, values and practices, not merely as those appreciated in the light of Christian doctrines but as part of a distinctive tradition held or practised in East Asia. Many aspects of Confucian studies underwent enormous development in the second half of the twentieth century; monographs, translations and research projects have substantially enlarged and deepened our understanding of this philosophical, ethical, religious, educational and political tradition. Confucianism as a political ideology has long lost its dominance in China, Korea and Japan. The three major regions that were traditionally under the strong influence of Confucianism and the fountainheads of Confucian values, scholarship and learning, are prompting modern scholars in the West to now engage in research in Confucianism with the conviction that it continues to be one of the most important topics in philosophy, religion, politics, ethics, education and cultural studies. Either as an independent course or as a component of a course on Chinese history, philosophy, religion or culture, Confucianism is now taught in many universities in Europe, North America and Australasia. On the other hand, Confucian studies in the West can never be totally detached from those produced in Mainland China, Japan, Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan. In one sense, the textual studies or research projects undertaken in East Asia have been the sources from which western scholarship has developed. Western scholars therefore always keep a keen eye on what has been and is being done in the East, and wherever possible incorporate the new findings, either archaeological or hermeneutical, into their own studies. However, this does not mean that the study of Confucianism in the West is merely a reflection, modelled upon that in the East. Employing phenomenological and analytic methodology, scholars in the West critically examine the original texts and the second-hand material, whereby a new scholarship is produced and develops further. Nowadays the line between the East and the West, as far as scholarly work is concerned, is no longer demarcated as clearly as it used to be. Western scholars engage in various kinds of research in China, Japan and Korea, while scholars from Eastern regions study, teach and research in the West, either in universities or at research centres. In addition, a number of academic institutions have been generous in their sponsorships, and have therefore effectively enhanced and facilitated the communication and exchange between the two sides. These institutions include the Harvard Yen-ching Institute, the Center of Philosophy East and West at Hawaii, and the New Asia College, Hong Kong. The wide spread of Confucian studies among the general public and students calls

for a professional handbook to assess what has been achieved in the West and to throw light on the current scholarship of Confucianism in the East.

How can one justify the selection of entries? With a history as long as 2,500 years and a wide geographical spread from China to Europe and North America, Confucianism is both a tradition and a subject of study. I was thus faced with the daunting task of how to draw up a balanced list of entries that would be right for the volume, bearing in mind that this work on Confucianism is medium-sized, standing somewhere between a concise dictionary and a full-blown encyclopedia. This required a very careful selection when deciding which entries should be included and which should be left out. Making references to a number of existing dictionaries and encyclopedias on Confucianism in Chinese and other languages, notably *Zhongguo ruxue baike quanshu* 中國儒學百科全書 (*Encyclopedia of Confucianism in China*, ed. Confucius Foundation of China, Beijing: China Great Encyclopedia Press, 1997) and *Kongzi wenhua dadian* 孔子文化大典, (*The Great Dictionary of Confucian Culture*, ed. by Kong Fanjin 孔範今, San Sifen 桑思奮, Kong Xianglin 孔祥林, Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 1994), I first tentatively listed about 1,235 entries on Confucian scholars, writings, rituals, events and places in China, Korea and Japan. I then used this preliminary list to carry out my initial ground work, which involved contacting contributors and providing illustrations for the book. This list was constantly revised over the following years, sometimes as the result of my own research and sometimes in the light of advice from contributors and colleagues. I am now content with the present composition because I believe that it covers the most important areas and distinctive contributions made both in the past and by modern scholarship. Having said this, I must add that limited by the available space, I constantly had to exercise restraint over the number of entries and the allocated number of words for each entry. Although this in my opinion helped to provide a clear and balanced view of Confucianism, it may have appeared to be arbitrary on some occasions, and may have left aside many important figures or events or texts in history as well as in the contemporary field of scholarship that I would otherwise have liked to include. For example, I only list those scholars who in my judgement made a distinctive contribution in one way or another to the development of Confucian doctrines and practices, and include only a very small number of historical figures who played a role in promoting Confucianism or fostering Confucian ideas, for example, Han Wudi 漢武帝 (r. 141–87 BCE) and Wang Mang 王莽 (46 BCE–23 CE). In terms of the Confucian evolution in China, I was only able to enlist specific entries for two important stages, namely, the Han and the Wei–Jin period, while reluctantly allowing various other entries to account for Confucianism in other periods, such as in the Tang, Song and Ming dynasties.

How does one balance different views of Confucianism? Just as in history, Confucian Learning and scholarship in the contemporary world demonstrate a dynamic and diverse character, full of difference, disagreement and argument, which on the negative side makes Confucian studies appear to be chaotic, unsystematic and difficult to harmonise, but on the positive side demonstrates that Confucian studies is not static; it is open to new understanding and methodology which would therefore induce more people to engage in relevant research projects. Different views frequently facilitate, rather than obstruct, further development in our knowledge about the Confucian tradition and its modern meanings. In the light of this, I do not intend to impose or enforce a unified view on articles and on the contributors' assessment of Confucian Learning and tradition. Instead, I make every effort to maintain a methodological standard as applied to Confucianism throughout the volume, but at the same time allow each contributor to have his/her own evaluation of historical figures, texts and events. This is in order to strike a balance between unity and individuality, between innovation and accepted scholarship, and between phenomenological studies and hermeneutic interpretations. As far as the content of the volume is concerned, the encyclopedia deals primarily with the questions of what 'Confucianism' was/is, and how 'Confucian' a person, text or event can be. Entries are intended to reveal different aspects or parts of the tradition, and it is my expectation that having read through or consulted this volume, the reader should acquire a fair knowledge of the Confucian tradition

and its various presentations, and should then be able to answer such questions as what Confucianism was/is, how it originated, evolved, transmitted and was transformed in history and in the contemporary world. As to whether or not Confucius (Kong Fuzi) is taken as the founder of the tradition, I pay special attention to him and his influence, and similarly, Roger Ames starts his article on this man with the statement that 'Confucius has probably affected the ways of living, thinking and dying of more people than any other person in human history'.

Taking the answers to the above questions as underlying guidelines for editing the volume, I intend the encyclopedia to become as comprehensive a reference book as possible within the constraints of a medium-sized volume, to be used by western scholars and students in their study and research in the field of Confucianism and in other relevant subject areas such as history, philosophy and religion. Its intention is to examine the long history and wide range of scholarship in the Confucian tradition, to explore the scholarship in Confucian studies in the East and West and to evaluate the new developments achieved through communication between these two sides. Having worked on it for five years, I am pleased to see that the *RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedia of Confucianism* is the first of its kind in English, and assembles the most reliable information possible on Confucian history, scholars, doctrines, schools, rituals, sacred places and terminologies, and I am confident that it will become an indispensable reference tool for scholars and students when exploring Confucianism both as a tradition and as a subject.

In the process of editing, I was also confronted with many problems and difficulties. The most frequently encountered difficulty lies in the diverse ways of the translating or rendering Chinese terms and phrases, which poses a real challenge to the editor. Due to the differences of etymological and hermeneutical meanings between Chinese and English words, different contributors have their own preferred translations of the same character or phrase. Each one of these reveals one or more important aspects and therefore merits careful consideration and attention by an editor. To deal with this difficulty, I have adopted one of the following two approaches. Where possible, the number of renderings of a word or term is reduced to one which I feel is probably accepted by the majority of the contributors; for example, *xin* 心, translated variously as the mind, the heart, the mind-heart, the mind-and-heart, is now given as the 'heart/mind' in most cases, especially in a Neo-Confucian context. However, if there is no better way to translate a term, title or institute into English, I am happy to simply use its transliteration; for example, *jinshi* 進士, the title for a successful candidate in the highest level of the traditional civil service examinations, has been translated variously as 'doctorate' or 'advanced scholar' or even Ph.D., but I am determined not to confuse traditional education and examinations with modern higher education and its degrees, and have decided to preserve it simply as '*jinshi* (degree)'. A compromise between these two approaches is sometimes needed in order to present the true meaning and implication of a term. For example, a key word of this volume is '*ru*' 儒, the meaning and values of which in fact the whole encyclopedia seeks to explore. However, there is not yet an agreed translation for this, some suggesting that it means 'classicists', while others prefer to translate it as the 'school of scholars'. For the reader's convenience, I give a lengthy discussion of its original meanings and references in the opening introduction. Considering that 'Confucianism', although with obvious shortcomings, has become a widely accepted English word, I have translated the character *ru* either as 'Confucian' or 'Confucians' rather than '*ruists*' or 'classicists' when referring to individual intellectuals who devoted themselves to the study of the Classics, or as 'Confucianism' or 'the Confucian tradition' rather than '*ruism*' or 'classicism' or 'school of literati' when referring to the learning tradition associated with Confucius, although I admit that these translations may have distorted what it originally meant, and that there was indeed no clear-cut 'Confucian school' before the early Han dynasty.

In other cases, it is apparent that however reluctant, we have to accommodate several translations of the same concept or term. Many terms and phrases in the Confucian tradition have been used differently in different contexts, or by different scholars or in different ages. Instead of enforcing a unified translation for a term throughout the volume, I have adopted a flexible

way of dealing with differences in translation or interpretation, consciously leaving the clarification of the important implications of each translation to the context where it is used. Wherever possible, I have reduced the number of translations for one term to no more than two or three, as in the case of '*ren* 仁' which is translated two ways in English throughout the volume – 'humaneness' and 'benevolence' – but I do admit that there are certain merits in other translations such as 'humanity', 'human-heartedness', 'human-to-human-ness'. Wherever it is not possible to make this kind of decision, I have pointed the reader to main entries where a number of possible translations for a term or concept are examined and discussed, for example *li* 禮 whose meanings extend from 'approved behaviour', propriety or the rules of propriety, moral codes or codes of conduct to rites, ritual, decorum, customs and law, etc., and also *Guozhi jian* 國子監, the state institute of education in traditional China and Korea, which is translated variously as Directorate of Education, National College, National University, or State Academy Directorate.

Reflecting upon the five years of compiling and editing these two volumes, I am greatly indebted to the contributors, whose short biographies are included in the list of contributors. Needless to say, many of them are distinguished scholars and well-known authorities, and their excellent scholarship contributed enormously to the completion and the quality of this encyclopedia. Without their conscientious work and tolerance of the editorial process, the encyclopedia now in front of readers would never have been of such high quality, even after a much delayed time schedule. I particularly wish to thank the following colleagues, friends and scholars for their generous help and scholarly support. My first thanks go to Dr Michael Loewe of Cambridge, who not only undertook a substantial number of entries on subjects for which he is well known throughout the world of Sinology, but he also pointed me in the right direction for contacting the right people, and gave me permission to mention his name when inviting some of the 'big names' in Chinese Studies. His unwavering support and tireless guidance helped me through various stages of the editing process. My special thanks go to Todd Cameron Thacker who I 'met' first in cyberspace where he organised an Internet discussion group on the *Analects of Confucius*. Upon my invitation, Todd happily agreed to assist me with this project, taking on such responsibilities as contacting contributors, proofreading articles and doing the primary editing of a large number of entries. Todd came via Canada to Lampeter in the summer of 2000 and spent more than a month with me editing entries. What Todd did was more than this. In the process of editing, much help was enlisted for entries on Korean and Japanese Confucianism. Todd took responsibility for the Korean section and together with Dr Michael Ralston (Ph.D., University of British Columbia) he translated all the entries contributed by our Korean colleagues. Todd also first contacted Dr Barry Steben of the National University of Singapore, whose participation has significantly increased the quantity of the articles on Japanese Confucianism. My heartfelt gratitude is also given to the following scholars who in one way or another lent me a hand whenever I needed it: Professor Tim Barrett of SOAS, London, provided many important insights into how the encyclopedia should be organised; Professor Wm Theodore de Bary of Princeton University, although unable to commit himself to writing entries, recommended a number of good scholars for entries; Dr Nicholas Bunnin of Oxford made a number of good suggestions concerning some of the entries on modern Confucianism; Dr Deborah Sommer came to rescue the project on a number of occasions and agreed to undertake unfinished or outstanding entries; Professor Glen Dudbridge of Oxford kindly allowed me to sit in his postgraduate course on the methodology of Sinology – his teachings on how to deal with terms, editions of texts and other sources enabled me to put final touches to the manuscript before I submitted it to the publisher. The following scholars also deserve mention for accepting certain assignments, even though they were not able to complete them for a variety of reasons: Professor Anne Birdwhistell of Stockton State College, Professor Henry Rosemont Jr of St Mary's College, Maryland; Denis Twitchett of Cambridge, and in particular the late Professor John Knoblock who passed away before being able to finish his contributions on Xunzi.

I also wish to thank a number of institutions of higher education for their generous support which enabled me to complete this volume: University of Wales, Lampeter where I was given permission to take sabbatical leaves and which funded some of the necessary expenditures I encountered while preparing the volume; Clare Hall, Cambridge, where I was elected a visiting fellow in 1998 and subsequently elected a life member; Wolfson College, Oxford, who conferred on me the title of visiting fellow in 2002 to enable me to complete the final editing process; Renmin University of China 中國人民大學 and Hunan Normal University 湖南師範大學 appointed me as an Adjunct Professor so that I was able to carry out my research in China, and finally Curzon Press and Routledge for commissioning, copy-editing and publishing this encyclopedia.

With so much help and support from so many quarters and from so many people, the process of editing the encyclopedia has become a most enjoyable process, and I have indeed learned a great deal from it. While all the articles must be credited to their authors, I take full responsibility for any errors or mistakes that may remain.

Xinzhong Yao  
Professor of Religion and Ethics  
University of Wales, Lampeter  
May 2002

## Note on entries, cross-references and bibliographies

The encyclopedia contains over 950 alphabetically arranged entries, with the length of each ranging from 200 to 5,000 words. The reader can search for a specific entry alphabetically, or use the three indexes at the end of the [second volume](#) to locate the entries where a particular term, name or text is discussed or used.

Each entry is intended to be an independent article, in which the reader can find necessary information, interpretations and evaluation provided by a distinguished contributor. The contributor's name appears at the end of the main body of an entry, while his/her institutional affiliation and short autobiography are provided in the list of contributors found on pages xiv–xix.

The long introductory article at the beginning is intended to introduce Confucianism both as a tradition and as a subject of study. The remaining entries can be divided roughly into two categories: general surveys or overviews for major subjects or themes, and short articles on a specific person, text or event. A longer entry is normally divided into multiple subsections and subheadings.

All Chinese characters are romanised using the *Pinyin* system, except for Confucius (rather than Kongzi), and some modern scholars who are well known, such as Fung Yu-lan, Wing-tsit Chan, Tu Wei-ming (rather than Feng Youlan, Chen Rongjie, Du Weiming), while Korean and Japanese names and terms are transliterated by adopting their own accepted systems. The convention of transliterating bi-syllabic Chinese terms as separate pinyin words has been followed, except in the case of those which are widely used as one word such as Daxue, *Lunyu*, Zhongyong, and those which are part of a long phrase or book title, such as Shiqu ge huiyi, *Zhushu jinian*. Chinese characters are provided after the first occurrence of names, titles, places, terms, etc., in an entry, but not for those that have become widely used in English, e.g., yin–yang.

Biographical entries on Chinese, Korean and Japanese scholars provide not only the name with surname first, but also if possible, the style name (字, *zi* in Chinese and *azana* in Japanese), and an alternative name (*hao* 號 in Chinese), and also some with *shi* 諡, the posthumous name. In addition, in some entries on Japanese scholars we have also provided information on *na* 名, and *tsûshô* 通稱. For those whose dates are unknown, we provide some information about the year that they passed their examinations, such as juren 舉人 1578 or jinshi 進士 1130. Alternate names are given in parentheses.

The title of a text is translated on its first appearance, e.g. *Chunqiu Zuozhuan* 春秋左傳 (*Zuo's Commentaries on the Annals of Spring and Autumn*), and is then used in an abbreviated form, e.g. the *Zuo's Commentaries* subsequently. Longer entries are sometimes provided with bibliographical references in a separate section at the end of the entry, which include representative works in western languages, Chinese and Japanese, for example, Eber, 1986; Graham, 1989; Kitagawa, 1960 – using the author/date system. A full bibliography is given at the end of the second volume where books and articles are listed according to the alphabetical order of the authors' surname or the titles of works in the event of no clearly recognised author(s).

Cross-references are given in bold throughout the volume and in this way names, terms or titles can be located in other entries.

To assist the reader with the historical context of an entry, a timeline of Chinese, Korean and Japanese history is given on page xx.

## List of contributors

**Roger T. Ames** is Professor of Philosophy and Director of the Center for Chinese Studies at the University of Hawaii. He is editor of *Philosophy East & West* and *China Review International*. His recent publications include translations of Chinese classics: *Sun-tzu: The Art of Warfare* (1993); *Sun Pin: The Art of Warfare* (1996) and *Tracing Dao to its Source* (1997, both with D.C. Lau); and the *Confucian Analects* (with H. Rosemont, 1998). He has also authored many interpretative studies of Chinese philosophy and culture: *Thinking Through Confucius* (1987), *Anticipating China: Thinking Through the Narratives of Chinese and Western Culture* (1995), and *Thinking From the Han: Self, Truth, and Transcendence in Chinese and Western Culture* (1997) (all with D.L. Hall).

**James A. Anderson** is Assistant Professor of Asian History at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro. He received his doctoral degree from the University of Washington in 1999. His current research focuses on the interaction between indigenous communities and the Chinese and Vietnamese courts along China's southwestern border during the eleventh century.

**Nguyễn Thê Anh** is a Professor at École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris.

**Gary Arbuckle** received his Ph.D. from the University of British Columbia in 1991 with a thesis entitled 'Restoring Dong Zhongshu (BCE 195–115): An Experiment in Historical and Philosophical Reconstruction'.

**Mark Laurent Asselin** received an M.A. in Art History from the University of Colorado, Boulder in 1987, and an M.A. (1991) and Ph.D. (1997) in Chinese Language and Literature from the University of Washington. He currently teaches at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. Publications include 'The Lu School Reading of "Guanju" as Preserved in an Eastern Han Fu', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 117 (July–September 1997): 427–43, and an annotated translation of 'A Critical Biography of Cai Yong,' in *Studies on the Han 'Fu'*, by Gong Kechang, edited and translated by David R. Knechtges *et al.*, 339–89 (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1997).

**Tim H. Barrett** graduated in Chinese Studies from Cambridge and has a doctorate in Buddhist Studies from Yale. He has been Professor of East Asian History at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, since 1986, researching mainly the Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism of the Tang period.

**Daniel Bouchez** is Directeur de Recherches at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris.

**Hui-Shan Chen** is Assistant Professor of Musicology at the National Sun Yat-Sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan. She also teaches music history and aesthetics at Shih Chien University, Taipei. She is a member of the music committee of the National Chiang Kai-Shek Cultural Centre in Taiwan. Her translation into Chinese of Eduard Hanslick's *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* with a critical introduction and profile of the author was published in 1997.

**Anne Cheng** was born in 1955. After graduating from the École Normale Supérieure in Paris, she studied successively at Oxford, Fudan (Shanghai) and Cambridge. She is at present Full Professor in classical Chinese studies at I.N.A.L.C.O. (Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales), Paris. Her publications include: *Entretiens de Confucius* (complete translation into French



of the *Analects*, 1981), *Etude sur le Confucianisme Han: l'elaboration d'une tradition exegetique sur les Classiques* (1985) and *Histoire de la pensée chinoise* (1997).

**Chung-ying Cheng** received his doctorate in Philosophy from Harvard University. He has taught at the University of Hawaii, Manoa (since 1964) and other universities and written on major areas of Chinese philosophy (metaphysics, epistemology and ethics in connection with classical Chinese philosophy and Neo-Confucianism), onto-hermeneutics and the philosophy of logic and language. His writings include *New Dimensions of Confucian/Neo-Confucianism* and *Inquiries into Knowledge and Value* etc. He was the founder and editor of *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* (and has been since 1973), and is the founder of both the International Society for Chinese Philosophy and the International Society for the *Yi jing* Studies.

**Kai-wing Chow** is an Associate Professor of History and East Asian Languages and Cultures, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign. He specialises in intellectual and cultural history of Ming–Qing China. His current research focuses on the social history of popular religions and intellectual developments in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Selected publications include *The Rise of Confucian Ritualism in Late Imperial China: Ethics, Classics and Lineage Discourse* (Stanford University Press, 1994). He received his doctorate from the University of California, Davis in 1988.

**Anthony DeBlasi** received his Ph.D. from Harvard University. He is currently an Assistant Professor of East Asian Studies at the University at Albany. He has published 'A Parallel World: A Case Study of Monastic Society, Northern Song to Ming' in *Journal of Song-Yuan Studies* 28 (1998): 155–75 and is revising a manuscript on ninth-century intellectual history.

**Michael Dillon** is Senior Lecturer in Modern Chinese History in the Department of East Asian Studies and Director of the Centre for Contemporary Chinese Studies, University of Durham, UK. He is the author of *China's Muslims*, Oxford University Press, Hong Kong (1996), *China's Muslim Hui Community: Migration, Settlement and Sects*, Curzon Press, 1999 and *Chinese Xinjiang or Eastern Turkestan: Ethnicity, Separatism and Control in Central Asia* (in preparation).

**Patricia Ebrey**, Professor of History and International Studies at the University of Washington, specialises in Chinese social and cultural history, especially of the Song period. Her publications include *Confucianism and Family Rituals: The Writing of Rites* (1991), *The Inner Quarters: Marriage and the Lives of Chinese Women in the Sung Period* (1993), and *The Cambridge Illustrated History of China* (1996).

**Hans van Ess** was born in the Frankfurt region, grew up in Tübingen and studied in Hamburg. He received his M.A. degree in 1986 and after studying for two years in Shanghai his Ph.D. in 1992. He worked between 1992 and 1994 for the German Asia Pacific Business Association and between 1995 and 1998 as an assistant professor in Heidelberg. Since 1998 he has been a full professor at Munich.

**David Gedalecia** is the Michael O. Professor of History at the College of Wooster, Ohio, where he teaches courses in Chinese and Japanese history and thought. He received his graduate training at Harvard University in Chinese intellectual history and is the author of *The Philosophy of Wu Ch'eng: A Neo-Confucian of the Yuan Dynasty* (Indiana, 1999) and *Solitary Crane in a Spring Grove* (Harrassowitz, 2000).

**Chad Hansen** received his doctorate from the University of Michigan. He has held visiting posts at Michigan, the University of Hong Kong, the University of Hawaii and U.C.L.A. He was appointed Chair Professor of Chinese Philosophy at the University of Hong Kong in 1995. He concentrates on applied theory of interpretation, Chinese theories of language, mind, metaphysics, ethics and political theory.

**Donald Holzman** has taught at various universities in the United States for short periods of time and for most of his life at the École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris. His main



interest has been the study of Early Medieval Chinese literature; some of the articles he has published have most recently been collected in two volumes and reprinted by Variorum/Ashgate.

**Tze-ki Hon** teaches history at the State University of New York, Geneseo. He has published articles and essays on the interpretations of the *Yi jing*, Confucianism and Chinese historiography. He is currently writing a book on the development of Chinese historical writings from 1890 to 1949.

**Nam-jin Huh** is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Seoul National University. He was also Visiting Fellow at the Harvard-Yenching Institute from 1996. His publications (in Korean) include 'Sirhak and the Introduction of Western Thought' *Philosophical Thought* 4, SNU Institute of Philosophical Thought (1993); 'Hong Dae-yong's Scientific Thought' *Asian Culture* 9, Hallim University, Institute of Asian Culture (1993); and 'A Study on Im Sng-ju's Philosophical Thought' *Korean Culture* 11, SNU Institute of Korean Culture (1992).

**Ouyang Kang** is Professor of Philosophy and Assistant President, Director of Institute of Philosophy at Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China. He has published *An Introduction to Social Epistemology* (1990), *The Methodology of Philosophy Research* (1998), *The Methodology of Social Cognition* (1998), *Ouyang Kang's Collection* (1999), and more than 150 research papers in English and Chinese.

**Martin Kern** is Assistant Professor of Chinese Literature at Princeton University, specialising on early Chinese poetry. His recent work focuses on the interplay of poetry, ritual, and political representation under the Qin and Former Han dynasties as well as on issues of canonisation, textuality and text performance in early China.

**Jang-tae Keum** received his doctorate (1978) from Sung Gyun Gwan University in Seoul, South Korea, and is a Professor of Religious Studies at Seoul National University. He is the author of more than seventeen books on Korean Confucianism, including (in Korean) *The Challenge of Modern Korean Thought*, 1995; *The Thought and Culture of Confucianism*, 1995; *The Thought of the Toegyan School of Korea*, vol. I, 1995; *Understanding of Confucian Thought*, 1996; and *Confucian Thought of the Early Chosen Dynasty*, 1997.

**M.H. Kim** is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of History, Honam University, South Korea. She received her doctorate (1995) in Chinese History at Kyunghee University, South Korea. She is coauthor of *History and Culture of the East*, Seoul, 1993, as well as *Research on History of the Sui-Tang Dynasty: China* (中國隋唐史研究), Seoul, 1998.

**T.C. Kline III** is Assistant Professor in Philosophy and Religious Studies at St Mary's College of Maryland. He received an M.A. in East Asian Languages and Civilisations from the University of Chicago, and a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Stanford University. His primary area of research is early Chinese Confucianism and Daoism. He is coeditor of *Virtue, Nature, and Moral Agency in the Xunzi*, and editor of *Ritual and Religion in the Xunzi*.

**Keith Knapp** received his doctorate from the University of California, Berkeley, and now teaches history at the Citadel. His publications include, 'The *Ru* Reinterpretation of *Xiao*,' *Early China* 20, and 'New Approaches to Teaching Early Confucianism,' *Teaching Theology & Religion* 2: 1. He is now preparing a manuscript entitled *Accounts of Dutiful Offspring: The Parent-Child Relationship in Early Medieval Confucianism*.

**Thomas H.C. Lee**, Professor of History and Asian Studies at City College of New York, CUNY, holds a Ph.D. from Yale, and has taught in Hong Kong, Taiwan and the United States. He has published *Government Education and Examinations in Sung China, China and Europe: Images and Influences in the Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries* and most recently *Education in Traditional China: A History*.

**Yuli Liu** is a post-doctoral research fellow in the Department of philosophy, the National University of Singapore. She received her B.A. (1994) and M.A. (1997) from the People's University of China, Beijing, and Ph.D. from the University of Hull, England. Her doctoral thesis is entitled *The Unity of Rule and Virtue – A Critical Study of Virtue Ethics from an Early Confucian Perspective*.

**Michael Loewe** held appointments in Chinese Studies in London and Cambridge from 1956 until 1990. His main work has concerned the history of the early Chinese empires (221 BCE–220 CE), as studied both from the literary sources and the archaeological evidence. His latest publication (2000) is entitled *A Biographical Dictionary of the Qin, Former Han and Xin Periods*.

**David McMullen** first started to learn Chinese as a National Serviceman in the Royal Air Force, and then studied at St John's College, Cambridge, at Taiwan National University and at Harvard. His main research interests are in the history of the Tang dynasty. He has published *State and Scholars in T'ang China* and numerous articles on the institutions of government, the imperial rituals, the educational system and the political philosophy and literary history of the Tang. He was elected Professor of Chinese at the University of Cambridge in 1989 and a Fellow of the British Academy in 1994.

**John Makeham** is Reader in Chinese in the Centre for Asian Studies, the University of Adelaide, Australia. Forthcoming publications include: *Balanced Discourses: An Annotated Translation of Xu Gan's Zhong lun*; *Transmitters and Creators: Chinese Commentaries on the Analects*; an annotated translation of the *Analects*.

**Steven Miles** is an Assistant Professor at the Department of History, Southern Illinois University. He obtained his Ph.D. from the Department of History at the University of Washington in 2000. His research is on the Xuehaitang Academy and evidential research in nineteenth-century China.

**Julia K. Murray** (Ph.D. Princeton University, 1981) is Professor of Chinese Art History, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Among her publications are *Ma Hezhi and the Illustration of the Book of Odes* (1993), *Last of the Mandarins* (1987), and numerous articles on Chinese art, particularly narrative illustration, including pictorial biographies of Confucius.

**Wai-ming Ng** (Ph.D., East Asian Studies, Princeton University) is a professor at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, in the department of Japanese Studies. His research areas include Japanese popular Culture, Sino-Japanese cultural interchange. Recent publications include *The I Ching in Tokugawa Thought and Culture* (University of Hawaii Press, 2000) and 'The I Ching in Shinto Thought of Tokugawa Japan' (*Philosophy East and West*, 48:4, 1998).

**Pu Niu** graduated from Beijing University with a Master's degree in Chinese history in 1985, focusing on the field of minority history. Pu Niu received his Ph.D. in Chinese history from Arizona State University in 1998 with a dissertation discussing Ye Shi (1150–1223) and the Yongjia School, the Confucian statecraft school in Southern Song (1127–1279) China.

**Peter Erling Nosco** is Professor of East Asian Languages and Cultures, and History at the University of Southern California. He is the editor of *Confucianism and Tokugawa Culture* (Hawaii 1997), the guest editor of a special issue of *Philosophy East and West* (January 1998) on 'The Religious Dimension of Confucianism in Japan,' and the author of *Remembering Paradise: Nativism and Nostalgia in Eighteenth-Century Japan* (Harvard, 1990).

**Michael Nylan** (Ph.D. Princeton University, 1983) currently teaches history at the University of California at Berkeley. A specialist in the Ru culture of the Zhanguo-Han periods, her major research interests to date have included three classical masters of the Han period (Jia Yi, Yang Xiong and Ying Shao), Sichuan ('the periphery as cultural center'), and the history of text formation. Future projects include domestic life in early China.

**Margaret Pearson** chairs the History Department of Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, New York. She is the author of *Wang Fu and the Comments of a Recluse: A Study with Translations*. (Tempe: Arizona State University Press, 1989). She received her degrees from Smith College and the University of Washington.

**Lauren Pfister** is an Associate Professor at Hong Kong Baptist University. His research and writings explore themes in Chinese philosophies and religions in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Currently he serves as the Associate Editor and book review coordinator for the *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, and is a Guest Professor of the Sinology Institute of Bonn University.

**Andrew Plaks** is Professor of East Asian Studies at Princeton University. He is currently the General Editor of the Yale University Press translation series: 'Classics of Chinese Thought'. He has worked extensively on the textual and commentarial history of the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong*.

**J. Thomas Rimer** is Chair and Professor in the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures, University of Pittsburgh. His publications include *Traditions in Modern Japanese Fiction: An Introduction* (1978); *On the Art of the Noh Drama, The Major Treatises of Zeami (with Masakazu)* (Princeton University Press, 1984); *Pilgrimages, Aspects of Japanese Literature and Culture* (University of Hawaii Press, 1988); *A Reader's Guide to Japanese Literature* (Kodansha International, 1988).

**Dennis Schilling** is an Assistant Professor at the University of Munich. He received his doctorate under the tuition of Professor Wolfgang Bauer at the University of Munich in 1996. His publications include a revised Ph.D. thesis, and a book coedited with Jianfei Krallé, entitled *Die Frau im alten China. Bild und Wirklichkeit. Studien zu den Quellen der Zhou- und Han-Zeit* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001).

**Conrad Schirokauer**, Senior Scholar and Adjunct Professor at Columbia University, also Professor Emeritus at The City University of New York, has written on Southern Song intellectual/political history and is currently working on Song ideas concerning history and historiography with a focus on Hu Hong.

**Thomas Selover** (Ph.D., Harvard) is Associate Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Saskatchewan, Canada. He writes on Song-dynasty intellectual history and contemporary Confucian spirituality, most recently in *The Kernel of Humanity* (Oxford University Press, forthcoming). His current research is on 'Fluctuations in Confucian Values, 1980–2000'.

**Edward L. Shaughnessy** is the Lorraine J. and Herrlee G. Creel Professor of Early China at the University of Chicago. He works on the cultural history of the Western Zhou dynasty, with special interests in the literature of the period (both received and paleographic). At present, he has special research interests in both the *Yi jing* and the *Shi jing*.

**Christian Soffel** has studied Sinology, Slavistics and Mathematics at Munich University since 1986 and is currently preparing his Ph.D. dissertation 'Wang Yinglin and his "Recordings of Observances from Arduous Studies" (*Kunxue jiwén*)' under the supervision of Professor Ptak and Professor van Ess.

**Deborah Sommer** received her doctorate in Chinese intellectual history from Columbia University in 1993. The editor of *Chinese Religion: An Anthology of Sources* (Oxford University Press, 1995), she is completing a monograph on the religious significance of visual depictions of Confucius. Current projects include a study of the shadow in Chinese thought.

**Nicolas Standaert**, Ph.D. Leiden University (The Netherlands), is Professor of Chinese Studies (Belgium) and specialises in cultural contacts between China and Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He is editor of the *Handbook of Christianity in China: Volume One (635–1800)*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000).

**Barry D. Steben** has studied East Asian languages (modern and premodern) and the history of East Asian thought since the early 1970s, after first majoring in history. His doctoral thesis (University of Toronto) was entitled 'From *Samurai* to *Shishi*: The Development of Ethical Idealism in the Yōmeigaku School of Japanese Confucianism.' He now teaches Japanese thought, history, language and art at the National University of Singapore.

**Sor-hoon Tan** is an Assistant Professor at the Philosophy Department, National University of Singapore. She holds degrees from Oxford University, National University of Singapore and University of Hawaii. Her research interests include Eastern and Western Moral and Political Philosophy, and her recent publications are mainly on Dewey's philosophy and Confucianism.

**Todd Cameron Thacker** is pursuing his graduate studies in Confucianism at Pusan National University, Pusan, Republic of Korea.

**Hoyt Tillman** Since receiving his Ph.D. from Harvard in 1976, Hoyt Cleveland Tillman (田浩) has taught Chinese thought and cultural history at Arizona State University. His books include: *Utilitarian Confucianism* (Harvard, 1992); and *Confucian Discourse* (Hawaii, 1992); *Ch'en Liang on Public Interest and the Law* (Hawaii, 1994); and *Business as a Vocation* (Harvard, 2000); as well as a coedited volume, *China under Jurchen Rule* (SUNY, 1996).

**John A. Tucker** is an Associate Professor of Asian history at East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina. He finished his Ph.D. at Columbia University in 1990. He is the author of *Ito Jinsai's Gomo jigi and the Philosophical Definition of Early Modern Japan* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998).

**Thomas A. Wilson** is Associate Professor of History at Hamilton College, Clinton, NY. He received a Ph.D. (1988) in History from the University of Chicago. He has recently edited *On Sacred Grounds: Culture, Society, Politics, and the Formation of the Cult of Confucius* (Institute for East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 2001).

**Alan T. Wood** is a Professor at the University of Washington, Bothell. He is the author of *Limits to Autocracy: From Sung Neo-Confucianism to a Doctrine of Political Rights; What Does It Mean To Be Human?: A New Interpretation of Freedom in World History*; and a coauthor of *World Civilizations*.

**Don J. Wyatt** is Professor of History at Middlebury College, Vermont. He is the author of *The Recluse of Loyang: Shao Yung and the Moral Evolution of Early Sung Thought* and numerous essays on the history of Chinese philosophical and political thought. He has most recently coedited *Political Frontiers, Ethnic Boundaries, and Human Geographies in Chinese History* and is now completing a book on the cultural influence of Chinese ideas of prescience before and during the Song dynasty.

**Xinzhong Yao** is Professor of Religion and Ethics in the Department of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Wales, Lampeter. He is the author of *Confucianism and Christianity* (Sussex Academic Press, 1996) and *An Introduction to Confucianism* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), and is currently working on a comparative study of early Jewish and Confucian understandings of wisdom.

**Rebekah X. Zhao** Born in Sichuan, China, Rebekah Zhao received her B.A. and M.A. degrees from Sichuan University in Chinese Language and Literature, and Ph.D. from Shandong University in Chinese Ancient History. She currently works in the Brotherton Library of Leeds University, United Kingdom.

**Angela Zito** is an Associate Professor in Anthropology and the Program in Religious Studies at New York University, and received her Ph.D. in Far Eastern Languages and Civilisations from the University of Chicago in 1989. She has published *Of Body and Brush: Grand Sacrifice as Text/Performance in 18th Century China* (University of Chicago Press, 1997) and serves on the editorial board of the journal *East Asia Cultures Critique*.

## Timeline of Chinese, Korean and Japanese history

China	Korea	Japan
Xia 夏 <i>c.</i> 2100– <i>c.</i> 1600 BCE		
Shang 商 <i>c.</i> 1600– <i>c.</i> 1045 BCE		
Zhou 周 Western Zhou <i>c.</i> 1045–771 BCE Eastern Zhou 770–256 BCE Chun Qiu 春秋 (Spring–Autumn) 770–476 BCE Zhan Guo 戰國 (Warring States) 475–221 BCE		
Qin 秦 221–206 BCE		
Han 漢 Former Han 前漢 206 BCE–8 CE Later Han 後漢 25–220	Samkuk 三國 (Three Kingdoms) Koguryō 高句麗 37 BCE–668 CE Paekche 百濟 20 BCE–660 CE Silla 新羅 365–935 CE	Yayoi 彌生 <i>c.</i> 300 BCE– <i>c.</i> 300 CE
San Guo 三國 (Three Kingdoms) 220–265		Kofun 告墳 <i>c.</i> 300–710
Jin 晉 West Jin 西晉 265–316 East Jin 東晉 317–420		
Sixteen Kingdoms 十六國 304–439		
South and North Dynasties 南北朝 South Dynasties 南朝 420–589 North Dynasties 北朝 386–581		
Sui 隋 581–618		
Tang 唐 618–907		Nara 奈良 710–794
Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms 五代十國 Five Dynasties 五代 907–960 Ten Kingdoms 十國 902–979		Heian 平安 794–1185
Song 宋 North Song 北宋 960–1127 South Song 南宋 1127–1279		Kamakura 鎌倉 1185–1333
Yuan 元 1271–1368		Kuromachi 室町 1336–1568
Ming 明 1368–1644	Choson Dynasty 朝鮮 (1392–1910)	Azuchi-Momoyama 安土桃山 1568–1600
Qing 清 1644–1911		Tokugawa 德川 (Edo 江戸) 1600–1868 Meiji 明治 1868–1912
Republic of China 中華民國 1912–		Taishō 大正 1912–1926
People's Republic of China 中華人民共和國 1949–	Japanese Occupation (1910–45) Republic of Korea (1948– ) People's Republic of Korea (1948– )	Shōwa 昭和 1926–1989 Heisei 平成 1989–

# Confucianism

Xinzhong Yao

The origin of the word ‘Confucianism’ can be traced to the writings of the sixteenth century, where the Jesuits used ‘Confucius’ as the Latin transliteration of Kong Fu zi. To ‘Confucius’ an ‘-ism’ was added probably not much earlier than the nineteenth century, probably in order to enable ‘Confucius-ism’ to be parallel with many other ‘isms’ such as Buddhism, Hinduism and Judaism. The newly coined word ‘Confucianism’ quickly became popular among intellectuals, and was understood as the term for the religio-ethical tradition that dominated China and other parts of East Asia for many centuries. Confucius indeed explored deeply, and elaborated extensively on, the basic principles of what was to become ‘Confucianism’, and succeeded in transmitting and transforming the ancient tradition that placed particular emphases on the interaction between politics, ethics and religion through the enhancement of ritual, education and personal cultivation. However, Confucianism was not ‘created’ solely by Confucius, nor was it sustained exclusively by the faith in Confucius. In this sense, some scholars strongly suggest that ‘Confucianism’ is no more than ‘a symbol manufactured’ in ‘a theology of Christian/Confucian syncretism’ (Jensen, 1997). Whether or not this argument is acceptable, more and more scholars have become aware of the cultural differences between ‘Confucianism’ and its original names, *ru* or *ru jia* 儒家, *ru jiao* 儒教, *ru xue* 儒學 or *ru shu* 儒術 that are used in China and other East Asian countries.

## The *ru* tradition

Although in its later uses the term *ru* may be translated both as ‘Confucian scholars’ and as ‘the school or tradition or doctrine of literati or scholars’, there appears to be no consensus about its original application. A traditionally influential view concerning where the *ru* tradition originated was put forward by **Liu Xin** (?–23 CE). Liu claimed that the formation of the *ru* took place in the early years of the Zhou Dynasty (1045?–256 BCE) and traced its origin to a then government office (*situ zhi guan* 司徒之官, Ministry of Education) whose function was to ‘assist the ruler to follow the way of the yin-yang and to enlighten [the people] by education’ (*Han shu*, 1962: 1728). The various references of the term used in history were classified into three categories by a modern scholar, **Zhang Binlin**: the *ru* that was used as a general term designating intellectuals and scholars who served the state with their knowledge and skills; the *ru* that applied to teachers who taught in the subjects of six arts (**liu yi**); and the *ru* referring to the followers of Confucius who studied and propagated the **Confucian Classics**. In general twentieth century scholars can be divided into two groups with regard to when the *ru* became a distinctive profession. One group claims that the *ru* had been a tradition long before the time of Confucius and can probably be dated to the Shang era (1600?–1045? BCE), while the other group argues that although groups of professional men skilled in ceremonial practice had existed prior to Confucius’ time, the character ‘*ru*’ post-dated Confucius and was in fact coined as a name for the followers of Confucius.

We have reasons to believe that although not totally identified with the later *ru* tradition, *ru* and the profession it described predated Confucius, and Confucius himself classified ‘*ru*’ scholars into two categories, *junzi ru* 君子儒 and *xiaoren ru* 小人儒 (*Lunyu*, 6:13). A number of modern scholars have proposed that what *ru* represented went through a few key stages in early China. Firstly, as dancers and musicians in religious rituals in the late Shang (1600?–1045? BCE) and



the early Zhou (1045?–771 BCE), *ru* were roughly equivalent to what we mean by shamans, magicians and sorcerers. Secondly, as specialists in religious ceremonies, *ru* were masters of rites and performed, or assisted in the performance of, various kinds of ritual. Thirdly, ritual masters were given positions in official education and took charge of teaching such subjects as history, poetry, music, astrology, archery and mathematics which at that time were closely related to ritual, and for training young dancers, musicians and performers. By the time of the Spring and Autumn period (770–476 BCE), the character *ru* referred to those who had skills in rituals, music and archery, and who made a living off their knowledge of all kinds of ceremonies and of many other subjects (Chen, 1996: 350). A new profession gradually emerged in which these masters not only conducted various kinds of rituals and rites, but also acted as consultants to rulers and officials on religious, social, political and international matters. Thanks to Confucius, the primary task of a *ru* was then redefined to transmit ancient culture and to establish private schools in which earlier texts on ritual, history, poetry and music were taught and preserved. During the Warring States period (475–221 BCE), an increasing number of students followed suit, studying ancient texts, setting up private schools, offering advice to those who were in position, or directly engaging in state administration. Gradually a distinctive ‘profession’ emerged that was closely related to the doctrines interpreted and propagated by Confucius, as indicated by Han Fei (280?–233 BCE), a leading Legalist philosopher and a well-known critic of the political philosophy of the *ru*: ‘In the present age, the celebrities for learning are the literati [*ru*] and the Mohists. The highest figure of the literati was K’ung Ch’iu [Kong Qiu or Confucius]; the highest figure of the Mohists was Mo Ti’ (Liao, 1960, vol. 2: 298). It is evident that ‘the rituals of the *ru*’ and ‘the Way of Confucius’ are interchangeable in some texts of the Former Han Dynasty (206 BCE–8 CE), and that a final formation of a distinctive ‘school’ was to come.

**The *ru* school** Modern scholars have debated the point at which Confucian followers were finally ‘organised’ into, or became recognised as, a Confucian **jia** 家 (‘school’ or ‘scholastic lineage’). Before the Former Han era (206 BCE–8 CE), scholars and students who devoted themselves to the study of traditional ideas and texts and who provided tuition and advice to ruling classes were simply addressed as ‘*ru*’. **Sima Tan** clearly indicated the *ru* was one of the six major groups of intellectuals, and called them *liu jia* 六家 (six ‘schools’ or ‘households’). Some modern scholars take this as evidence that by the time of the Former Han, Confucian scholars and students had gained a distinctive identity as members of a school based on textual tradition, while others argue that the use of *jia* to connote a focus on textual transmission did not predate the Later Han (25–220 CE) (see **jia**). It seems evident that before the Former Han some of the scholars or intellectuals concerned with various earlier traditions had consciously acknowledged themselves as the devoted followers of Confucius, but their differences in approach and methodology led to a variety of sections within the broad category of the *ru*, of which eight became prominent during the Warring States period (see **rujia bapai**). The eight sections of *ru* scholars (*ru shi* 儒士) constantly engaged in a two-front fight. On the one hand they criticised each other for distorting the *ru* tradition, and blamed each other for the failure to carry out the true Way in the world; on the other hand, they together formed a united force in defence of the Confucian doctrine and competed, unsuccessfully, for the favour of the ruling classes with many other schools. In the Qin and the Former Han dynasties (221 BCE–8 CE), leading interpreters of the tradition and explorers of the doctrine received recognition as distinguished masters (*ru zong* 儒宗), and some of them were appointed academicians (**boshi**) in educational institutes of the state. These masters and academicians subsequently became well-known fountainheads of different transmission traditions focusing on particular texts or commentaries, primarily the *Book of Documents*, the *Book of Poetry*, and the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. Each of these interpretative traditions formed among its members a seemingly unbroken chain from masters to disciples in transmitting the Way of ancient sages, and attempted to apply the ‘Way of Confucius’ to political and social fields. Although not strictly ‘Confucian’, **Shusun Tong** and **Lu Jia**, for example, played an important

part in getting Confucian values recognised at the court, and having ritual, rites and rules of conduct preserved in early texts accepted as necessary tools for administration. The political identity of the *ru* was also given a clearer explanation in the works of **Dong Zhongshu**, whose replies to the emperor's queries paved the way for the *ru* to be placed above other 'schools' of thought. It was the self-consciousness of *ru* scholars and the political recognition for the *ru* tradition that led to the formation of a *ru jia*, a school of thinking and learning later underlying the state administration and state education.

**The *ru* teaching** As far as we know, the two characters *ru* 儒 and *jiao* 教 are first used together in the *Records of the Historian* of **Sima Qian**, in which it is stated that 'The people of Lu 魯 educated themselves with *ru* teaching' (*Shi ji*, 1962: 3184). They do not refer here to a systematic teaching or a religious way of practice, which is how we would normally interpret these two characters today. Rather, they indicate a particular way of life that contrasts with those who held personal bravery or proficiency in arms as a way of life. During the Warring States period various sections of the *ru* significantly developed *ru* teaching. The doctrine that Confucius and his followers had elaborated was further expanded and enriched, and became one of the distinctive 'ways' that were propagated and followed. The First Emperor of the Qin dynasty (r. 221–210 BCE) resorted to the teaching of Legalism (*fa jia* 法家) as ideological and administrative tools to facilitate his campaign to unify and govern the empire. Highly critical of the *ru*'s 'conservative' political blueprint for an ideal society, Legalists encouraged the Emperor to humiliate and suppress *ru* scholars. With a gradual recovery in the first few decades of the Former Han dynasty, *ru* scholars gained the trust of the ruling class, and in various ways demonstrated that their teaching was better and more useful than all others for consolidating a strong and unified empire. Thus *ru* scholars and politicians for the first time since the time of Confucius realised their ambition to 'educate' the whole nation with *ru* teaching. This teaching was characterised by a commitment to the way of the ancients, to the study of the **Confucian Classics**, and to the observation of ritual and the rules of conduct. Closely associated with sacrifices and ceremonies of the state, a clearly religious dimension was added to the *ru* teaching, which later paralleled other established teachings, notably, Daoism and Buddhism. As one of the three profound religious traditions, *ru jiao* refers both to Confucian scholars who devoted themselves to the transmission and practice of the Way of ancient sages, and to a particular kind of religious teaching and doctrine which were believed to have been transmitted from Confucius and illustrated in the classics. With the rising of the status of Confucius to the top rank in the hierarchy of state ceremonies (see **Sacrifice to Confucius**), *kong jiao* (孔教, the cult or teaching of Confucius) became an alternative name for *ru jiao*, with an emphasis on the figure of Confucius and his teaching as the fountainhead of the tradition.

**The *ru* learning** The main object of the *ru* was education, with the reputation of *ru* scholars being associated with the learning they strove to promote. For early *ru* masters, learning is a life-long process of personal transformation and character improvement. Confucius once said metaphorically that he set his mind on learning when 15 years old, gained the knowledge of Heaven's Mandate at 50, and achieved the highest possible goal at 70 (*Lunyu*, 2:4). Focusing on the internal dimension of learning and believing that all human beings were born with the roots of goodness in the heart, **Mengzi** understood the way of learning to be nothing other than 'seeking the lost heart' (*Mengzi*, 6A:11). Insisting that the way to goodness was both observing **li** (rules of propriety, rites, ritual and decorum) and studying the instruction of sages, **Xunzi** required that 'Learning must never cease' (*Xunzi*, 1:1). However, by the time of the Former Han, when the first instance of the term *ru xue* 儒學 appears (*Shi ji*, 1962: 2093), the broad meaning of *ru* learning became dramatically focused, and the masters and scholars who laboured hard in the field of classical learning were therefore rightly called classicists. Each would normally concentrate on one version of a specified text and transmit it to his students, and *ru* learning thus came to mean an



intellectual lineage through which particular interpretations and commentaries of the classics were transmitted. This finally led to the formation of different traditions in terms of which version of the texts was more original and how a particular text should be read and interpreted. Among these traditions were New Text learning (see **jinwen jingxue**) and Old Text learning (see **guwen jingxue**), which dominated the intellectual arena of the Han era. *Ru* learning was also deliberately adopted by the state as the ‘official learning’ and enforced, tightly or loosely, on all schools and students. *Ru* learning changed constantly throughout the history of China to meet the needs of the empire and face challenges from different kinds of imported learning, particularly Buddhism (see **Confucianism and Buddhism**) and Western learning (**xi xue**), and as a result of this interaction expanded its own boundaries.

**The *ru* art** As members of the tradition that placed great emphases on practical matters, the *ru* functioned in a variety of ways to serve the state and society at large, and Confucian doctrines and learning skills were therefore known as ‘*ru shu*’ 儒術, the art of Confucians that could be used to understand the world and to administrate social affairs. One of the earliest instances in which Confucianism is referred to as one of the *Dao shu* 道術 (the art of the Way) is found in the *Zhuangzi* 莊子 where it is stated that the unified ‘art of the Way’ in ancient times was ‘torn apart by the world’ and divided into separate arts along with the rising of various philosophers, in which the so-called Confucian art, Daoist art, Moist art etc. competed with each other. The Confucian art is demonstrated in the Six Classics: ‘*The Book of Odes* describes the will; *the Book of Documents* describes events; *The Book of Ritual* speaks of conduct; *The Book of Music* speaks of harmony; *the Book of Changes* describes the yin and yang; *The Spring and Autumn Annals* describes titles and functions’ (Watson, 1968: 363). The New Text tradition (see **Jinwen jingxue**) of the Han period elevated Confucius to the Supreme Sage and the Uncrowned King (**Su wang**). Subsequently the Confucian art was identified with the art of Confucius (*Kongzi zhi shu* 孔子之術), to recognise the central position of Confucius in transmitting the ancient culture. **Dong Zhongshu** called on the government to abolish all other arts that are not included in the subjects of the Six Classics and to revere the art of Confucius only (*Han shu*, 1962: 2523). Focusing on the study and transmission of the Classics, Confucian scholars were known for their knowledge of *The Book of Poetry*, *The Book of History*, *The Book of Rites* etc. . . . and the Confucian art was equated with the art of the Classics (*jing shu* 經術) which started with Confucius: ‘Confucius deplored the corruption of the rites and the abandoning of music, and cultivated the arts of the Classics in order to attain to the Way of the Sage-Kings’ (*Shi ji*, 1962: 3310). Gradually Confucian scholars who specialised in the Classics became ready candidates from whom the government recruited officials, and it is recorded in the **Hou Han shu** (*The History of the Later Han Dynasty*) that the founding emperor of the Later Han dynasty ‘respected the arts of the Classics’ and as the state policy, it was stipulated that ‘all those who have penetrated the art of the Classics (*tong jingshu* 通經術) would be recommended and promoted (*cha ju* 察舉) [to be government officials]’ (*Hou Han shu*, 1965: 2545, 2547). As a practical doctrine, the *ru* naturally stresses the importance of engaging in political administration (*shi* 仕) as the way to realise their ideal or ambition, although in the eyes of Confucius, one does not have to take part in government in order to exert one’s influence on government: ‘simply by being a good son and friendly to his brothers, a man can exert an influence upon government’ (*Lunyu*, 2: 21). For Confucian followers, the most important thing is to manifest the Way. Therefore, according to Zi Xia (see **Bu Shang**), the engagement in administration and the study of the Classics should be alternatively applied: ‘When a man in office finds that he can more than cope with his duties, then he studies; when a student finds that he can more than cope with his studies, then he takes office’ (*Lunyu*, 19:13). However, after becoming the state orthodoxy and especially after the state adopted the **civil service examinations** as the way to recruit talents as government officials, the Confucian Learning became more and more the art of securing a good political career for individual Confucian scholars.

### Confucian ideas and ideals

'Confucianism' is never a clear-cut notion that can be defined in terms of one or another western discipline. Like all other Eastern traditions Confucianism contains within itself multidimensional ideas and ideals, ethical, political, religious, philosophical, educational etc. These values are intertwined with each other, and are explored and manifested in Confucian doctrines concerning human nature and destiny, familial relationships and virtues, community norms and disciplines, social structure and political cohesion, and religious beliefs and spiritual practices. In history, Confucian ideas and ideals were the basics of the way of life in China and other East Asian countries, and to some extent they continue to function as such in modern times.

**Philosophical framework** Confucian philosophy, if we can use this word to describe its contemplation or deliberation on metaphysical, ethical and epistemological matters, is centred on the interactive relationship between *Tian* (Heaven), *di* (earth) and *ren* (humans), or more frequently between *Tian* and *ren* (see *Tian ren*), from which Confucians develop various theories to interpret natural and social phenomena, to answer such questions as how the universe runs its course, what kind of position humans have in the universe, and whether or not the world can be known. Heaven, earth and humans represent all the realms of the Confucian universe, with Heaven above, earth below and humans in the middle. The Confucian Heaven is understood variously, from the religious ultimate to natural environment, and different meanings of Heaven lead to different appreciations of the human position in the universe. As the religious ultimate, Heaven represents the source of humans; the Way of Heaven (*Tian dao*) is the foundation of all the ways of humans, and the change of the Mandate of Heaven (*Tian ming*) is the reason and cause for the replacement of one dynasty by another. As the source of moral virtues, Heaven sets up fundamental principles for humans and human society, and exerts powerful moral influences over human behaviour and relationships. As Nature, Heaven represents all non-human phenomena and the environment in which humans live and act, and it is believed that the law governing the movements and evolution of Heaven and Earth does not change according to the wishes of humans. In Neo-Confucianism, Heaven is identified variously with *tai ji* (the Supreme Ultimate), *li* (Principle), *qi* (Vital Force or Material Force), *xin* (Heart-Mind). Confucians in general understand the relationship between Heaven and humans as dynamic and dialectic, believing that humans have a positive role to play in the harmony of Heaven and humans. Most of them confirm that Heaven, however mysterious it would be, can be studied, observed and grasped, either through investigating natural phenomena, social affairs and the study of Classics, or via self-reflection within one's own heart/mind. Some further believe that the principles of Heaven are not totally an external object outside of the human subject; Heaven exists in the human self, human society and human relationships, and the ideal is to be one body with Heaven.

**Ethical values** Confucianism is fundamentally concerned with moral principles and ethical virtues, and develops itself around moral issues and problems. Taking the cultivation of humane persons as the foundation of all theories and practices, Confucians have explored at various levels how human beings can realise their potential through developing self-dignity, and fulfil their responsibilities by following ethical norms. These ideas are closely related to what we can broadly term as philosophical, religious and political understandings, since Confucians strongly believe that ethical norms are derived from the Way of Heaven, that moral virtues originate from Heaven, and that failure to manifest virtues in the ruler's character is the reason for political failures. Central to the Confucian understanding of human persons and human society are such principles as *ren* (humaneness), *yi* (rightness), *li* (ritual, propriety) and *cheng* (sincerity), on which all moral issues are examined and all social problems are solved. Confucians also put forward a good number of ethical values as ways to moral perfection, such as *xin* (trustfulness) for personal integrity and interpersonal relations, *zhong* (loyalty) for social coherence, *xiao* as the foundation of the family and the state, *zhong yong* (the mean in common practice) for moral practices and

personal cultivation. Guided by principles and values, Confucians make a dialectic approach to social and moral issues, such as *yi li* 義利 (rightness and profit), *li qi* 理氣 (principle and vital force), *li yu* 理欲 (principle and desires), *xing li* 性理 (the nature and principle), *xin xing* 心性 (the heart/mind and the nature). In dealing with the problems that arise from personal and interpersonal relations, Confucians place emphases on *xiu shen* 修身 (personal cultivation, self-cultivation), and elevate it to be the foundation of human existence, arguing that once all the members of society cultivate their own characters then the world would be in peace and harmony. Confucian values provided the imperial state with the means and tools for acquiring social conformity. It was on the foundation of Confucian principles and values that various codes of conduct, rules of propriety, patterns of behaviour and guidelines for social and daily life were produced and enhanced. In this way, Confucianism underlined the basic structure of society, community and family, functioning as the inspiration and aspiration for the people and as standards, norms and ideals in most parts of East Asia.

**Political ideals** Confucianism as an influential ‘school’ originated in the Spring and Autumn period (770–476 BCE) and was reshaped in the Warring States period (475–221 BCE) in which the old system was breaking up and the new one was to be established. Confucians attempted to find a way to political peace and harmony by giving a particular attention to how the society was organised and how the state governed. As political ideals, peace and harmony were believed to have been realised in the past when the sage-kings ruled the world, which was well summarised in a later document entitled **Li yun** (*The Evolution of Rites*) in the *Book of Rites* as the Grand Commonalty: ‘When the Great Way was practised, the world was shared by all alike. The worthy and the able were promoted to office and men practiced good faith and lived in affection. Therefore they did not regard as parents only their own parents, or as sons only their own sons. The aged found a fitting close their lives, the robust their proper employment; the young were provided with an upbringing, and the widow and widower, the orphaned and the sick, with proper care ...’ (de Bary & Bloom, 1999: 343). How to realise such an ideal? Confucians in general agree that politics must be based on moral virtues, and the realization of political ideal is ‘to manifest the illustrious virtues in the world’ (*ming mingde*). In opposition to the Legalist policy to inflict severe punishments on wrongdoers, Confucians sought to regulate the people by the influence of moral power through establishing a humane government (*ren zheng*), in which the ruler is required to cultivate his character so that he sets up a moral example which the people naturally follow. Succeeding to the tradition and yet attempting to transform it, Confucians adopted *li* as the way to political ideals. *Li* or rites or codes of conduct or ‘custom laws’ were the traditional means to regulate human behaviour and human relations in a hierarchical society, where each member of community had his or her own role to play, as delineated by the *li*: a ruler was to act as a ruler, a minister as a minister, a father as a father, a son as a son, a friend as a friend and so on. At a deeper layer, Confucians stressed that to fulfil one’s responsibilities was the same as to realise one’s potential as a human being and was therefore the sign of a virtuous character. They believed that when all members of the state, especially the rulers and ministers who had a sweeping influence over common people’s way of life like wind over grass, cultivated their characters and behaved virtuously, then, as it was argued, the state would be in harmony and the world in peace. The moral and political requirements of Confucianism were in due time crystallised as the three guiding principles (*san gang*) and the five constant regulations (*wu chang*), on which Confucian states were established. In this way Confucianism extended the boundaries of moral codes from individual and family matters to social and political structures, not only providing the state with an ideological outline, but also equipping the authority with the means to sanction behaviour and thoughts.

**Religious beliefs** Confucian ethics and politics cannot be fully understood without an appreciation of its religious commitments and beliefs. Whether or not Confucianism is a religious

tradition has been hotly debated among modern scholars. Some strongly reject any suggestion that Confucianism was ever religious, while others, believing that Confucianism was religious and continues to be a religious tradition, painfully examine what kind of religion it can be, putting forward various propositions, such as ‘a religion of wisdom’ (Küng & Ching, 1989), ‘a religion of harmony’ (Ching, 1993), ‘a humanistic religion’ (Yao, 1996), or a ‘secular religion, this-worldly in emphasis yet appealing to transcendent values embodied in the concept of “heaven”’ (Rule, 1986: 31). All these propositions suggest that as a religious tradition Confucianism is closely related to what is normally regarded as the secular realms in the West, and that Confucian spiritual longing and discipline lead to a religious destination that answers human ultimate concerns, expressed through individual and communal commitments and revealed by the desires to transform the self and society according to certain moral and political vision. As a religious humanism, Confucianism is characterised by its belief that humanity can achieve perfection and live up to heavenly principles. Believing that humans are endowed with a mission by Heaven to carry out the Way of Heaven in the human world, Confucian scholars insist, albeit in different ways, that this mission cannot be fulfilled unless men and women have done their best to fulfil their ethical and moral duties, from which there develops a unique understanding of the moral as the transcendental and the secular as the sacred, in which self-consciousness and self-cultivation are considered to be the pathway leading to ‘self-transformation’ or ‘self-transcendence’. Confucian religious beliefs are also manifest in its doctrine of ancestral worship. Early Confucians believed that the life of human beings came from the combination of two parts, the *hun* 魂, the spirit from Heaven, and the *po* 魄, the soul from the earth. When a person was born, these two parts combined and life began, and when a person died they departed, with the *hun* ascending to Heaven and the *po* descending to the earth. During sacrifice to ancestors, the descendant would recall the deceased: the spirit from Heaven by music and the soul from the earth with wine. Along with the rise of rationalism within Confucianism, more attention was given to the values of moral education in ancestral worship. Sacrifice to ancestors is taken as a way in which descendants submit themselves to the ancestors and demonstrate their reverence to the past. In this way sacrifice to ancestors is believed to lead to the perfection of moral virtues, as stated by Zeng Shen 曾參 (see **Zong sheng**) that ‘the virtue of the common people will reach its fullness when the dead are looked after carefully and sacrifice is extended to the ancestors of the past’ (*Lunyu*, 1:9). In Confucianism there are also implicit or explicit beliefs in natural spirits, such as those of the celestial bodies like the sun, moon, stars, and earthly phenomena like mountains and rivers, as demonstrated in their participation in ritual practices in such religious places as the temples of the sun, the moon, the soil and grains. It is recorded that Confucius did not speak of ‘prodigies, miracle powers, disorders and spirits’ (*Lunyu*, 7:21), and that he defined wisdom as to ‘devote oneself earnestly to human duties, and respect spiritual beings (*guei* and *shen*), but keep them at a distance’ (6:21). Some scholars say that the fact that Confucius did not talk about these things must prove that he believed such things existed, and that what Confucius would like to do was not to allow these things to distract his attention from human affairs. The Confucian understanding that religion is based on secularity is well explained in Confucius’ replies to the questions of what is death and how to serve spirits: ‘If not yet able to serve humans, how can one serve spiritual beings? If not yet understanding life, how can one understand death?’ (11:12). Later Confucians integrated the beliefs in natural spirits into a broadly defined moral system. By offering sacrifice to celestial and earthly bodies and by observing various rituals, Confucians submit themselves to a higher reality, recognise the values of the unity between the human and the natural, and therefore promote the harmony between the social and the environmental.

**Educational principles** Ethical, political and religious dimensions of Confucianism cannot be separated from its practices in education, the ultimate goal of which is to cultivate noble persons (*junzi*). Confucius was the first person who established the private school in China and extended

education to a wide range of people, insisting that in education there were no classes (*Lunyu*, 15:39), and admitting into school anybody who could give him as tuition fees a number of dried pieces of meat (7:7). Both because of his contribution to the education system in China and because of his emphasis on moral training, he was later considered the patron sage of education and patron god of culture and civilisation. The primary profession of Confucians was in education, with a great number of them acting for a longer or shorter period as school masters. Schools supported and administered by scholars were transformed into Confucian academies (*Shu yuan*) during the Song–Ming period, where Confucian Classics were taught, ethical and philosophical issues examined, and the civil service examinations prepared. Education in Confucianism is understood in a broad way and is emphasised for its multidimensional values. **Confucian education** is based on the teachings of the sages, who use the divine way to give instruction (*Shendao shejiao*), while the divine way can be interpreted both as the Way of the spirits and the Way of a mysterious nature that can be known through observing natural and historical changes. While Confucius instructed his students under the four subjects, ‘culture, conduct, loyalty and faithfulness’ (7:25), the Way (*Dao*) is so fundamental to the meaning of life that Confucius said that ‘I would die content in the evening if I have heard the Way in the morning’ (4:8). Confucian education focuses on the cultivation of moral virtues and on the application of one’s virtues and knowledge to the world, and its ultimate goals are set in the *Great Learning* (*Da xue*) as ‘manifesting the clear character, loving the people, and abiding in the highest good’ (Chan, 1963d: 86). It is believed that the teachings of sages are transmitted through teachers to pupils and therefore teachers or masters have a crucial role, not only in passing on knowledge but also in sustaining a political order, as *Xunzi* put it that ‘When a country is on the verge of a great florescence, it is certain to prize its teachers and give great importance to breadth of learning . . . When a country is on the verge of decay, then it is sure to show contempt for teachers and slight masters’ (Knoblock, 1994, vol. III: 231). Confucian education is primarily learner-centred self-education, requiring students to ‘study the Way extensively, inquire into it accurately, think over it carefully, sift it clearly, and practice it earnestly’ (*Zhong yong*, 20).

### Confucianism in history

Confucianism arose and developed in history. Modern scholars vary in how to describe the 2,500 year history in which Confucianism existed and evolved, depending what methods they use to interpret the relationship between Confucianism and history. **Fung Yu-lan** summarises the whole history into two ages, the creative and the interpretative. The creative age, from Confucius to the Prince of Huainan (died in 122 BCE), he calls the Period of the Philosophers (*zi xue*); and the interpretative age, from **Dong Zhongshu** to **Kang Youwei**, he calls the Period of Classical Learning (*jing xue*) (Fung, 1952, vol. II: 2). **Mou Zongsan**, **Tu Wei-ming** and others formulated a theory of ‘three periods or epochs’, the first starting with Confucius and ending with Dong Zhongshu, the second from the renaissance of **Neo-Confucianism** and its spread to other parts of East Asia to the end of the Confucian dominance in China and East Asia, and the third beginning with the May 4 movement (1919) and manifested in the works of Modern New Confucians (Tu, 1993a, 1996). Confucianism in Chinese history was marked by its success in the following stages, in each of which it managed to extend its coverage and enriched its doctrines.

**Formation in the pre-Qin period (551–221 BCE)** Although the *ru* had existed before Confucius, Confucianism as a systematic doctrine started with Confucius, was expanded in the hands of such scholars as **Mengzi** and **Xunzi**, and was elaborated in works by other Confucian followers and scholars. The main contributions the early Confucian masters made to Confucianism include the formation of the basic doctrines and the systemisation of ethical, political and religious understanding. They established the fundamental principles of Confucianism through editing and interpreting the Classics. When facing life-threatening dangers, Confucius revoked his faith in a heavenly endowed mission to transmit ancient culture: ‘With



King Wen dead, is not culture invested here in me? If Heaven intends culture to be destroyed, those who come after me will not be able to have any part of it. If Heaven does not intend this culture to be destroyed, then what can the men of Kuang do to me?' (*Lunyu*, 9.5). Confucius was credited with the editing and preserving of what is known as the **Confucian Classics**, and was later revered as the First Sage. Many of Confucius' disciples developed distinctive ways in interpreting the *ru* tradition, and became known as the 'founders' of the Confucian sects during the Warring States period and were credited with the authorship of various early texts. Among whom Zengzi (Zeng Shen, 505–435 BCE) was of particular importance in sustaining the tradition, because he was believed to be the transmitter of *The Great Learning* and the author of *The Book of Filial Piety*, two of the most popular Confucian texts in late imperial China. One of his pupils was Zisi (**Kong Ji**), the grandson of Confucius, who was considered the compiler of the *Doctrine of the Mean*. Mengzi, a follower of Zisi, developed the Confucian tradition further in the direction of moral humanism. Recognising the great contribution Mengzi made to the transmission of Confucian teaching, the Confucian scholars of the Song Dynasty included the work attributed to him in the Four Books. Coming from a different lineage of transmitting Confucian doctrines, Xunzi developed the naturalistic dimension of Confucianism that regarded human nature as evil and Heaven as an impersonal power or natural principle, placing a great importance on ritual/propriety (*li*) rather than humaneness (*ren*) and righteousness (*yi*).

**Development in the Han-Jin period (206 BCE–420 CE)** Politically Confucianism was not honoured until the reign of **Han Wudi**, as described by Sima Qian (145–86 BCE): 'From the time of Confucius' death there was no one even in the capital who honoured the teachings of the ancient schools. Only in the early year of the present emperor's reign did literature once more being to flourish' (*Shi ji*, 1962: 3318). Following the replacement of the Qin by the Han, Confucianism recovered gradually from the setback under the Qin persecution and the Legalist discrimination. Having clearly realised that they were in an eclectic culture, Han Confucians started a long process of adapting their doctrines to the need of the empire, and distinguished scholars such as Dong Zhongshu incorporated into their own systems various useful elements from the schools of Legalism, **Yin-yang** and the Five Phases (**Wu xing**), Moism and Daoism. A theological and metaphysical doctrine of interaction between Heaven and humans (**Tian ren ganying**) was established and consequently became the cornerstone of the revived Confucianism. There were two major schools of the time: the New Text School and the Old Text School. Debates between them resulted in new interpretations of Confucius and the Confucian Classics. This led to what is known as Classical Learning, or more accurately, 'scholastic studies of the Classics' (*jing xue*). Attention was given to minute interpretation of words and sentences in the Classics and by the end of the Later Han dynasty (25–220 CE) the extensive exegesis had nearly exhausted all the life energy of Confucian scholars. To eliminate this stagnation of learning, scholars of the Wei-Jin period (220–420) adopted one of the two courses. Some introduced Daoist philosophy into Confucianism while others adapted Confucian world views to Daoist principles (Yao, 2000: 8). In either way Confucianism was transformed into a new type, known as Dark Learning or Mysterious Learning (*xuan xue* 玄學).

**Interaction with Daoism and Buddhism** This is not a strictly defined period; rather it is present throughout the whole history of Confucianism. Interaction between Confucianism and Daoism started from the supposed meeting between Confucius and Laozi, which according to tradition took place when Confucius was thirty-four years old. In the *Analects* and other early texts such as the *Mengzi* and the *Xunzi* we find evidence of parting ways of Confucians and Daoists, and the *Zhuangzi* 莊子 records the early Daoist (mis)interpretations of Confucian doctrines and the Confucian way of life. Han Confucians interacted intensively with the scholars of the Huang-Lao tradition, while the masters of religious Daoism consciously took a good deal of Confucian elements into their reform of Daoist theories and practices. Interaction between

Confucianism and Buddhism started as early as the introduction of Buddhism into China in the first century CE, and the early debates of these two traditions demonstrated clearly differences between the Chinese and the Indian culture. Deeply embedded in the family and society, Confucians found it intolerable that Buddhists called people to abandon their families in order to devote themselves to the worship of the Buddha and disregarded their duties as the children of the parents and as the subjects of the ruler. Through the debates, Buddhists gradually transformed their theories and practices and adapted them to the Chinese culture where the family and the state were of significance to personal spiritual journeys. The Confucian engagement with Buddhist doctrines also deepened the Confucian understanding of the world and of life, which bore glorious fruits in Neo-Confucianism. With distrust and misperception of each other, Confucians, Daoists and Buddhists frequently came to conflict with each other which led to the persecution of one religion or another from time to time. But the majority of them eventually came to realise that the three religions/doctrines (*san jiao*) would benefit greatly from peaceful coexistence and mutual supplementation. This further developed into an understanding that the three religions/doctrines were the same in essence and differed only in their functions and appearances. Based on this understanding, a new religion called '*San yi jiao*' 三一教 (the Three-in-one Religion) was created and practised.

**Renaissance and decline (960–1911)** With Buddhism and Daoism alternatively dominating intellectual and political arenas in the most part of the Sui–Tang period (598–907), Confucians found their own influence more or less to have been confined to education and to some aspects of the state administration. Making use of the needs of the civil service examinations, Confucians gradually built up their strength and demonstrated the values of Confucianism in the works of such scholars as **Han Yu**, **Liu Yuxi** and **Liu Zongyuan**. The renaissance of Confucianism took place in the Song dynasty when Confucians exerted powerful influence in all respects of social and religious life. Inspired by Buddhist philosophy and Daoist metaphysics, Confucian scholars especially **Zhang Zai**, **Cheng Hao**, **Cheng Yi**, **Lu Jiuyuan**, **Zhu Xi**, and **Wang Shouren**, reformulated the Confucian view of the universe, society and the self on the one hand, and endeavoured to strip Confucian Learning of the elements which they considered to be Buddhist–Daoist superstitions on the other. Their efforts produced comprehensive systems of new Confucian doctrines in the names of *Dao xue* (the Learning of the Way), *Li xue* (the Learning of the Principle), and *Xin xue* (the Learning of the Heart/Mind), which are generally translated in the West as **Neo-Confucianism**. The Learning of the Principle places more emphasis on the principle as the universal law and the source of the moral norms, and insists that to grasp the principle one must study the Classics. The Learning of the Heart/Mind goes to a different direction, arguing that the heart/mind contains all sources of moral values and looking into the heart/mind is the only way to enlightenment. The debates and mutual accommodation between these two 'schools' dominated the intellectual life for the rest of the history of Imperial China. The Zhu Xi's version of Neo-Confucianism became the state orthodoxy in the Yuan, Ming and Qing dynasties, and its emphasis on *li* (the principle) was used as the political tool to maintain a particular order of society. In order to break through the limitation of Confucian Learning, some Confucian scholars made various approaches to the Classics and the Classical Learning, elevating the values of *jingshi zhiyong* to supplement the emptiness of Neo-Confucianism, using '*Han xue*' 漢學 (the Learning of the Han) to confront *Song xue* 宋學 (the Learning of the Song), or devoting themselves to 'the evidential studies' (*Kao zheng xue* 考證學) of the Classics, although these did not change the overall trend that Confucianism became more and more stagnant and ossified.

**Modern transformation (1912– )** Towards the end of the Qing dynasty, the Cheng-Zhu version of Confucianism was taken as the ideological support to the Manchu rulers, but was associated by new-thinking intellectuals with the weakness of China. A number of leading scholars such as **Kang Youwei**, **Tan Sitong** and **Liang Qichao** pushed for the reform of the political constitution,

and to support their political activities they looked for new resources within Confucianism. In the New Text tradition of the Han dynasty, they found the ideas that Confucius was a reformer who established new laws for the world and the new political ideal for the people. Following the collapse of the Qing and the founding of the Republic, Confucianism was abolished as the state ideology and separated from public education. Radical revolutionaries attacked Confucianism as the cause of decay and disorder, and liberal intellectuals blamed it as the anti-progressive agency that attempted to block the progress of China into a new, modern country in which democracy and science were the only two standards to measure ideas and behaviour. Other scholars, who saw both negative and positive elements in the Confucian tradition attempted to transform it in the light of other world religious and philosophical traditions, especially European philosophy and Christian spirituality. Prominent scholars of the twentieth century, such as **Xiong Shili**, **Liang Shuming**, **Fung Yu-lan**, **Tang Junyi**, and **Mou Zongsan**, pioneered the new direction of the Confucian development and reinterpret and reconstruct Confucian philosophies. Their work was carried forward by many other well-known twentieth-century scholars and is continued in a variety of ways by contemporary intellectuals such as **Cheng Chung-ying** and **Tu Wei-ming**. Efforts are also made to revive Confucian values and adapt Confucian ideas and ideals to the contemporary world through vigorously reinterpreting and reexploring how Confucian values agree with those of modernity, such as democracy, science, human rights and universality. All these constitute a significant part of **Modern New Confucianism**. Modern New Confucianism should not be confined to the scholarship of intellectuals who explore and examine Confucian philosophies. Confucianism in the modern era also has a wider appeal to the general public. On the one hand, part of the Confucian values are still highly appreciated in family and community, and on the other, a number of religious groups develop Confucianism in the direction of a religious institute, as evidenced in the case of the Confucian Academy (*Kongjiao xueyuan*) of Hong Kong. In all these dimensions modern Confucians continue to transmit and transform Confucian ideas and ideals, to enable them to become part of the global way of life (Yao, 2001).

**Confucianism in East Asia** Confucianism is not only a tradition of China; it was also in due course introduced to other East and Southeast Asian countries, and was further developed and extended in the cultural contexts of these countries to acquire new forms of presentation such as Korean Confucianism and Japanese Confucianism (see **Confucianism in Korea** and **Confucianism in Japan**). According to historical records, Confucian doctrines and institutions were introduced to Vietnam, Korea and Japan as early as the Former Han dynasty, but it was **Neo-Confucianism** that became dominant in these countries for a longer or shorter period. In the beginning scholars in these countries simply replicated the Chinese system but gradually eminent native scholars emerged who, taking the Chinese masters as their guides, reinterpreted the Confucian Classics and commentaries in the light of their own understanding, experience and insight. In this way, they successfully recreated a new scholarship by introducing new forms and content into Confucian Learning to meet the social and political needs of their own countries (Yao, 2000: 9).

**References:** Berthrong, 1998; Chan, 1963d; Chen Lai, 1996; Cheng & Bunnin, 2002; Creel, 1960; Eno, 1990; Fingarette, 1972; Fung, 1952; Hall & Ames, 1987; *Han shu*, 1962; Jensen, 1997; Knoblock, vols. I–III, 1988–94; Kūng & Ching, 1989; Liao, W.K., 1959; Munro, 1969; Pang Pu, 1997; Roetz, 1993; Rule, 1986; Schwartz, 1985; Taylor, 1986; Tu, 1989; Twitchett and Loewe, 1986; Watson, 1964; Watson, tr. 1968; Watson, tr. 1993; Yao, 1996, 2000, 2001; *Zhongguo ruixue baike quanshu*, 1997.



*This page intentionally left blank*

# A

## Ai 愛

(To cherish)

Although usually translated as ‘to love’, *ai*’s meaning is closer to ‘to hold something dear’. Hence, when his disciple wanted to save expenses by doing away with the sacrifice of a sheep, Confucius demurred, ‘You cherish (*ai*) the sheep; I cherish (*ai*) the ritual (*li*)’ (*Analects*, *Lunyu* 3: 17). Like *qin* (to love), *ai* is a manifestation of benevolence (*ren*). Unlike *qin*, it is more general in its application. Whereas *qin* is usually applied to the people most dear to oneself, one can cherish (*ai*) the people and even things. Hence, the *Analects* states, ‘One should broadly cherish (*ai*) all men, but only love (*qin*) those who are benevolent (*ren*)’ (1: 6). The *Mengzi* states that, ‘[a gentleman (*junzi*)] loves one’s beloved (*qin qin*), but is only benevolent (*ren*) towards the people. He is benevolent towards the people, but only cherishes (*ai*) things’ (*Mengzi* 7A: 45).

Confucian writers often pair *ai* (to cherish) with *jing* 敬 (to respect) as complementary and dependent terms. One must both cherish and respect others. *Mengzi* stated that, ‘To feed but not cherish someone is to treat him or her like a pig. To cherish but not respect someone is like raising wild beasts’ (*Mengzi*, 7A: 38). The *Li ji* (*Book of Rites*) even argues that cherishing and respecting the people is the basis of

government. It relates that, ‘If one does not cherish, one cannot love (*qin*); if one does not respect, one cannot rectify. Cherishing and respect are the foundation of governance (*zheng*)’ (*Li ji*, 28.2).

**References:** Hung, 1972a, 1972b; Lau and Chen Fong Ching, 1992a.

KEITH KNAPP

## Altar of Earth

(*Di tan* 地壇)

The Altar of Earth, matching the **Altar of Heaven** (*Tian tan*), is located in today’s Beijing north and slightly east of the Forbidden City. Called either the *fangqiu* 方丘 ‘Square Mound’ or the *fangtan* 方潭 ‘Square Pool’, its shape reflected the traditional belief that Heaven was round, while Earth was square. Enlarged when rebuilt in 1748, its dimensions are cast in yin/even numbers, symbolic of earth. It was the site of the Grand Sacrifice to Earth, and its ceremonies differed from the elaborate **Ji Tian** or Sacrifice to Heaven in the details that ritualists felt would distinguish yin/Earth from yang/Heaven. Its main ceremony took place at the Summer solstice.

**References:** Bouilliard, 1923: 53–67; *Da Qing huidian*, 1899: ch. 38; *Da Qing tongli*,

1756: ch. 2; Qin Huitian, 1761. Zito, 1997: 125, 142–50.

ANGELA ZITO

## Altar of Heaven

(*Tian tan* 天壇)

Currently found south of the Forbidden City in Beijing, to the east of the main axis bisecting the city. The entire large enclosure is now a public park, square on the south side and rounded to the north. It was the site of the most spectacular of the emperor's yearly ritual round, the Sacrifice to Heaven (*Ji Tian*), on the winter solstice.

The custom of building an Altar of Heaven outside the city walls is first recorded in the *Zhou li* (*Rites of Zhou*), where its Round Mound was paired with a Square Pool dedicated to Earth and north of the king's city walls. Today's Tian tan complex contains not only the 'round mound', wedding-cake-like three-tiered open-air altar, the Tian tan proper, but also a number of other structures. The most iconically famous of these is the *Qinian dian* or Hall of Prayer for Good Harvest whose triple, round roof is covered in blue tiles and topped with a golden ball. It is a masterpiece of traditional wooden architecture, using no nails.

The entire *Tian tan* complex was built under the Ming through the fifteenth century. It was then extensively renovated by edict from the Qianlong emperor (r. 1736–1799). The altar upon which the actual solstice *Ji Tian* sacrifice took place had three tiers and four flights of stairs giving access to it from each of the four cardinal directions. The dimensions of the altar had been changed in response to an edict of 1749 complaining that it was too small. Architects were careful to preserve, at the emperor's behest, relations in odd numbers, dimensions that were considered yang or 'heavenly'. The number nine was itself a sign of emperorship, since it was a perfect and powerful yang number (3×3). The reconstructed altar featured multiples of odd

numbers. Its balustrade panels totalled 360 to correspond to the 360 degrees of a 'heavenly circle.' Between each terrace there were nine steps. When the sacrifice was performed, the altar came to life with spirit tablets of deities – of course, of Heaven, and various accompanying ancestors of the emperor, but also the sun, moon, stars, planets and other heavenly phenomena like rain, thunder and clouds.

The placement of the Altar of Heaven had ritual significance. It sits in the southeastern quadrant of the greater area of Beijing. The toponymy of the Forbidden City was taken from the disposition of the king's body as he faced south in audience. Thus, a north–south axis ran through him and his left hand was in the East, with his right hand in the West. The temples of his Grand Sacrifices were arranged thus: Heaven (*Tian tan*) in the southeast, Earth (*Di miao*) northeast, Ancestors (*Tai miao*) east and Soil and Grain (*Sheji tan*) west. East and south were both considered superior, initiatory and yang-oriented directions. No surprise that the altar of Heaven, the premier imperial ritual setting, should occupy a doubly exalted position in the ritual topography of the king's city.

**References:** Bouillard, 1923: 34 (Jan–Mar): 53–67; *Da Qing huidian* (Assembled Canon of the Qing), 1899; *Da Qing tongli* (Comprehensive rites of the Qing), 1756; Wechsler, 1985: 107–22; Williams, 1913: 44: 11–45; Zito, 1997.

ANGELA ZITO

## Altar to the Moon

(*Yue tan* 月壇)

The Altar to the Moon, due west of the Forbidden City, and outside the old city walls, is matched with the *Ri tan* or **Altar to the Sun**. An old cult mentioned in the *Li ji* whose sacrifices took place at the Autumn equinox, between six and eight in the evening, which is to complement that of the Sacrifice to the Sun between six and eight

in the morning, which reminds us that these rituals were conceived systematically within **yin–yang** frameworks of polar logic. The present-day Yue tan was built in the Ming, around 1531 and restored in the eighteenth century.

ANGELA ZITO

## Altar of Soil and Grain

(*Sheji tan* 社稷壇)

In present-day Beijing, opposite the Ancestral Temple to the southwest of the Forbidden City, we find the *Sheji tan*, or Altar of Soil and Grain (in a park area known as the *Zhongshan gongyuan*). Its altar is a square-raised platform of tamped earth in five colours, coded to the five directions: white to the west, green to the east, black to the north, red to the south and yellow in the centre. Always left open to the air to receive yang influences upon its yin-earth substance, the altar was covered over by conquering enemies. The character *she* became synonymous with ‘community’ itself.

The colour-coding of the soil that composed the altar was deliberate: During the Zhou, when underlords were enfeoffed, the king gave them a clod of the appropriate colour from his own *sheji tan*, and they set off in the direction of the new fief to found their own miniature version. (Chavannes, 1910: 442–3) Thus the cult is older than the Sacrifices to Heaven and Earth. Lester Bilskey dated the importance of the Altars of Soil and Grain to the Eastern Zhou, when deities connected to the land of each underlord of the declining Zhou king were emphasised at the expense of the king’s ancestral spirits. We might think of the Zhou kings as literally parcelling out the kingly, central power.

In the Qing period, millennia after the introduction of centrally controlled administrative districts had replaced locally ruled fiefs, the Sacrifice to Soil and Grain was classified as a Grand Sacrifice, or *Da si*, as part of the emperor’s yearly ritual obliga-

tions. As such, its form was a lesser version of *Ji Tian* or Sacrifice to Heaven. The rites connected the emperor to the officials of his *imperium* in a relation of whole/part. When the ceremonies were performed all over the empire in mid-spring and mid-autumn, the emperor sacrificed in Beijing, governors sacrificed in provincial capitals, prefectures in their cities and magistrates in county seats. (Zito, 1997: 131) Sacrifice at the *Sheji tan* thus marked the highest ranked sacrifice of the state cult in any of these outer regions, as one can clearly see in the listings of local gazetteers.

This simultaneity of performance allows us to see how sacrifice and administration overlapped but were not identical. In everyday matters such as tax collection and adjudication in the courts, an administrator acted as the metaphorical substitute for the emperor, his equivalent on the local scene. Yet, in the details of what they did during the ritual, their actions often differed from the emperor’s celebration. On the *Sheji tan*, administrators appeared as bit players in the rite taken as physical expression of the power of the emperor, played out over the whole territory of the empire. For example, officials presented incense, and the meat and wine of prosperity, but did not offer the central Three Oblations.

Thus, and ironically, altars that were once the scene for playing out the monarchical disintegration of the Zhou, ‘sacrificed’ to community distinction, became later imperial markers for the centralisation of the authority of empire.

**References:** Bilskey, 1975: I: 169–71; Chavannes, 1910; *Da Qing huidian*, 1899; *Da Qing tongli*, 1756: 6.1a–21.b; Williams, 1936: 24–59; *Wuli tongkao*: 2376–638; Zito, 1997.

ANGELA ZITO

## Altar to the Sun

(*Ri tan* 日壇)

The Altar to the Sun, found in present-day Beijing due east of the Forbidden City,

outside the old city walls surrounding the old city. The present-day Temple of the Sun was built in the Ming era, around 1531 and restored in the eighteenth century. Its matching temple is the *Yue tan*, **Altar to the Moon**. The sacrifices to the sun held there took place at the spring equinox, between six and eight in the morning, and were classified as Middle Sacrifices.

**References:** *Da Qing huidian*, 1899; *Da Qing tongli*, 1756: 6.1a–21.b.

ANGELA ZITO

## Arai Hakuseki 新井白石

1657–1725

(*na*: Kinmi 君美 *tsûshô*: Kageyu 勘解由)

Arai Hakuseki is remembered not only for the deep mark he made on Tokugawa-period scholarship and political theory, but also for achieving, albeit briefly, a degree of influence on government policy extremely rare among Japanese Confucian scholars. His career and that of his father clearly illustrate the difficulties the *bushi* were facing in the seventeenth century in their transformation from warriors to reservists, civilian bureaucrats, and scholars. His father, Masanari, was a samurai who had roamed Japan for eighteen years before finding a stable position in the service of Tsuchiya Toshinao, daimyo of Kazusa 上總 domain. At the time of Hakuseki's birth, he was stationed in Edo as a police officer in the Tsuchiya residence. In 1677, after Toshinao died, a factional dispute led to Masanari's expulsion, making Hakuseki a *rônin*. It was difficult for *rônin* to obtain reemployment, but the Tsuchiya domain was later confiscated due to the successor's mental imbalance, making it possible for Hakuseki to secure a position with the reformist senior councillor (*rôjû*) Hotta Masatoshi in 1682. After Masatoshi was assassinated in 1684, however, the Hotta house went into financial decline, and Hakuseki left its service in 1691, setting up a private school on the

banks of the Sumida River. Back in his seventeenth year (1673), Hakuseki had come across a copy of Nakae Tōju's *Okina Mondō*, which inspired him to devote himself to the Way of the Sages. Since 1686 he had been studying under a well-known Zhu Xi-school scholar, Kinoshita Jun'an 木下順庵 (1621–1698), who was brought into bakufu service by the shogun Tsunayoshi 綱吉 in 1692. Through Kinoshita's recommendation, in 1693 Hakuseki obtained a position as a Confucian scholar in the service of Tsunayoshi's nephew, eldest son of the daimyo of Kōfu 甲府 domain. In this period Hakuseki wrote his first major work, *Hankanpu* 藩翰譜 (1702), a history of the daimyo houses from 1600 to 1680. His lord was designated Tsunayoshi's heir and named Ienobu 家宣 in 1704, becoming shogun in 1709. Hakuseki was made a *hatamoto* 旗本, and though holding no position within the bakufu bureaucracy or Ienobu's personal retinue, as Ienobu's adviser he took part in major policy decisions concerning currency reform, foreign trade and local administration. He formulated a plan for the reorganisation of the state that began with changing the shogun's designation to 'king' (*kokuō* 國王) in Japan's diplomatic relations with Korea. His policy of amnesty for unjustly imprisoned prisoners and some of his economic reforms designed to curb the impoverishment of the samurai class were put into effect, but his policies for currency stabilisation and the restriction of foreign trade were left incomplete due to Ienobu's sudden death in 1712. Hakuseki continued to serve the bakufu, though with decreasing influence, under the child shogun Ietsugu 家継, but he retired amidst an upsurge of opposition to his policies after Ietsugu was succeeded by Yoshimune 吉宗 in 1716. During his period of service he had been able to meet repeatedly with foreigners able to tell him about the world outside Japan: a Jesuit missionary from Italy named Sidotti (1709), a learned Confucian scholar from the Ryukyu Kingdom (1710), Dutch merchants from the Dutch trading

factory at Deshima (1712), and well-educated envoys from Korea (1682, 1711). These meetings provided much of the information for Hakuseki's path-breaking works on cultural geography, *Sairan igen* 采覽異言 (1713, 1725) and *Seiyô kibun* 西洋紀聞 (1715) and ethnography, *Nantôshi* 南島志 (1719) and *Ezoshi* 蝦夷志 (1720). His autobiography, *Oritaku shiba no ki* 折柴の記 (1717), 'ranks as one of the greatest autobiographies of Japanese literature as well as a unique historical adjunct to official records for the first half of the Tokugawa period'. His Chinese poetry collection came to be widely read in Korea, and even the editor of China's Hanlin Academy wrote a preface for it. Hakuseki also produced first-rate works in the fields of Japanese etymology (*Tôga* 東雅, 1719) and critical historiography. His direct knowledge of foreign cultures, unusual in the age of *sakoku* 鎖國 (national isolation), nourished a view of Japanese history that transcended Japan's national boundaries, emphasising the importance of utilising Chinese and Korean sources. His historical works, written to provide justification for his political programme, are highly regarded for their exhaustive documentation and scrupulous examination of texts, a practice which led him to the euhemerist view of the ancient myths regarding the founding of the imperial line that he develops in *Koshitsû* 古史通, *Koshitsû wakumon* 或問 (1716) and the lost *Shigi* 史疑 (1724). His most famous history, *Tokushi yoron* 讀史余論 (1712, 1724), based on lectures given to Ienobu, presents an analysis of the phases by which power passed from the emperor to the Fujiwara to the military houses (*buke* 武家). Based on the *Book of Changes*' association of a combination of the numbers 9 and 5 with the appearance of a virtuous ruler, he identified nine stages in the decline of imperial authority (from early Heian to the reign of Godaigo, 1318–1339) and five stages in the devolution of rule to the *bushi*, identifying the fundamental cause of institutional decay and political disorder as the impoverishment of

the people (and the daimyo) due to extravagant spending on palaces and temples on the part of the ruler. While he expressed deep reverence for the imperial throne, he argued that the loss of Heaven's Mandate due to Godaigo's incompetent rule was irreversible, meaning that the existing line of *tennô* were no longer the legitimate sovereigns of Japan. Pre-Tokugawa *buke* rulers, in his analysis, had been nothing but hegemonies (*ba* 霸), attempting to legitimate the power they seized by force by usurping some of the authority of the nominal sovereign. **Tokugawa Ieyasu**, in contrast, had truly received the Mandate, both through his own merit and through the merit of his putative ancestor, Godaigo's loyal general Nitta Yoshisada. Accordingly, in accord with Ieyasu's 'real intent', the tradition of bifurcated sovereignty should be terminated through the *tennô*'s 'voluntary yielding' (*zenjô* 禪讓) of his sovereign authority to the shogunate, and Ieyasu's heirs should assume a title and status that accord with their real position as autonomous monarchs, taking over the performance of the courtly rituals appropriate to this status from the imperial court.

In contrast to his obsession with the political rectification of names, Hakuseki took little interest in the philosophical and metaphysical questions emphasised in Song Learning, and in *Kishinron* 鬼神論 (On Ghosts and Spirits) he promoted ancient Confucian, rather than Song, conceptions of ancestral spirits as an alternative to the Shinto-Buddhist concepts that had been used in the legitimisation of shogunal authority and the divination of Ieyasu. While he lectured for years to Ienobu on Zhu Xi's moralistic redaction of **Sima Guang**'s great history of China, *Zizhi tongjian*, personally he was more inclined to Sima's more realistic analysis of the dynamics of political change. On the other hand, he often argued against the anti-Zhu Xi interpretations put forth by his younger contemporary, **Ogyû Sorai**, and against the whole idea of Confucianism as a system

of competing schools. Thus it is difficult to classify Hakuseki with any particular school of Tokugawa Confucianism, and in spite of a fondness for polemics and an ambitious but principled personality described by contemporaries as heroic, he established no lineage of followers. The contradictions that emerged from his unwillingness to modify Confucian political theory to fit the different political and intellectual traditions of Japan, combined with his development of the idea that Japan should replace China as the focus of world order, did much to stimulate the maturation of the theory of the Japanese *kokutai*, specifically the concept that the powers of the shogun rest on a delegation (*inin* 委任) of authority from the *tennô* while ultimate sovereignty remains with the *tennô*. Yet this rearticulation of the tradition of bifurcated sovereignty was finally unable to destroy the appeal of the Confucian principle that the name and substance of authority should be one, which asserted itself again in the ideology of the **Meiji Restoration**.

**References:** de Bary, Tsunoda (ed.), & Keene, 1958: 459–70.

BARRY D. STEBEN

## Asaka Tanpaku 安積澹泊

1656–1737

(*na*: Kaku 覺; *azana*: Shisen 子先; *tsûshô*: Kakubei 覺兵衛)

Asaka Tanpaku was born into a family that had served the lord of Mito domain since the time of his grandfather. His father was educated in Confucian Learning and skilled in literary writing in Chinese. From 1665 Tanpaku studied under Zhu Shunshui, the great scholar-refugee from China, and five years later he took up his first employment with the domain. A *protégé* of Mitsukuni, in 1683 he joined the editorial staff of the *Dai Nihonshi* project (see **Mito School and the *Dai Nihon-shi* Project**) at the Shôkôkn historiographical institute,

and became a director of the institute in 1693. In this position he was able to get to know many of the greatest Confucian scholars of his day, including Kinoshita Jun'an (1621–1699), **Arai Hakuseki**, **Muro Kyûsô** and **Ogyû Sorai**. Tanpaku resigned as director in 1714, but he continued to work on the revision of the basic annals and biographies. At the behest of Mitsukuni's successor, Tsunaeda 綱條, between 1716 and 1720 he also wrote the Appraisals (*ronsan* 論贊) to the basic annals and biographies. (The *Dai Nihonshi* Appraisals were originally supposed to be written by Kuriyama Senpô (1671–1706) and Miyake Kanran (1674–1718), but Senpô died in 1706 and Kanran left to take up a bakufu post in 1711, leaving only Tanpaku to do the work. When the first completed portion of the *Dai Nihonshi* was presented to the bakufu in 1720, in 250 fascicles, these Appraisals were included. After a long and heated debate, however, in 1890 Tanpaku's Appraisals ended up getting excised from the *Dai Nihonshi*, because it was judged by Miyake Kanran (1674–1718), Fujita Yûkoku (1774–1826) and Takahashi Tanshitsu (1771–1823) that in Japan, where there had never been and could never be a change of dynasties, it was a violation of *meibun* (名分, duty defined by status) for an official history to contain judgements regarding historical emperors put forth by a mere private individual – a subject of the imperial line who could by definition never stand above the imperial house as its judge. Nevertheless, Tanpaku's appraisals were subsequently circulated in manuscript form in a non-official capacity, and they came into the hands of **Rai Sanyô**, exerting strong influence on Sanyô's own passion for writing appraisals (*ronsan* 論贊). Tanpaku's appraisal regarding Emperor Go-Daigo (1288–1339) already romanticises Go-Daigo's 'unfulfilled will' in his failed restoration and claims that the spirit of the restoration of power to the imperial house that motivated him will never die. After frankly recognising Go-Daigo's many faults in character, strategy and intelligence that



led to his defeat, Tanpaku nevertheless concludes that, 'With anxiousness and hard work it is possible to restore the fortunes of one's country; with a life of ease and comfort it is possible to forget one's responsibilities. How could the emperor have failed to think on this? Nevertheless, the emperor's intrepid spirit would not give up even if broken a hundred times. His declaration refusing to hand over the regalia to the new king (the puppet northern emperor set up by Ashikaga Takauji) was correct in rectitude and rigorous in its choice of words. His decree dispatching a prince to pacify Mutsu did not split the civil and military arts into two paths... This is something that rulers have not been able to achieve since middle antiquity. The thought of restoration only grows more intense when it is frustrated. Facing death he took hold of his sword and braced himself for battle. Thus he was able to keep the regalia safe among deep mountain crags, and lay down the foundation for a court that held out for more than fifty years. The place where the legitimate line (*seitô* 正統) dwells shines bright like the sun and the moon! Was this not a magnificent accomplishment?' (*Dai Nihon shi sansô*, in NST 48, 66–7).

The imperial line has here become the symbol, not just of the unquestioning loyalty of the vassal to his lord and his country, as in the Kimon School (see **Yamazaki Ansai and the Kimon School**), but of an indomitable spirit determined against all odds to *overthrow* the bakufu that has unjustly usurped the authority of the

imperial throne and upset the proper balance in the realm between military and civil authority. Moreover, Tanpaku's concept of legitimacy held a legitimate ruler must possess *both* the imperial regalia *and* virtue. Thus he wrote that 'the importance of the regalia depends on whether people's hearts are turned toward or against [the person who possesses them]'. In other words, as in Mencius' teachings, even a ruler who possessed the correct pedigree and all the objective trappings of legitimacy could lose the legitimacy to rule if he lost 'the hearts of the people'. Those who insisted on the excision of Tanpaku's Appraisals from the national history seem to have some inkling of the dangers such a line of thinking might conceivably pose for the maintainance of the legitimacy of the Tokugawa bakufu.

**Further reading:** Brownlee, John S., 1997. *Japanese Historians and the National Myths, 1600–1945: The Age of the Gods and Emperor Jimmu*. Vancouver: UBC Press and Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press; Nakai, Kate Wildman, 1984. 'Tokugawa Confucian Historiography: The Hayashi, Early Mito School, and Arai Hakuseki' In Peter Nosco, ed., *Confucianism and Tokugawa Culture*. University of Hawaii Press, pp. 62–91.

**References:** Matsumoto, Sannosuke, 'Kinsei ni okeru rekishi jojutsu to sono shisô,' in *Kinsei shironshû*, NST, vol. 48, pp. 578–615; Ogura, Yoshihiko, 'Kaidai,' in *Kinsei shironshû*, NST, vol. 48, pp. 543–77.

BARRY D. STEBEN



# B

## Ba tiaomu 八條目 (Eight specific points)

The elaboration of the Way (*dao*) of self-cultivation set forth in the opening chapter of the *Great Learning* (*Daxue*) is presented as a set of eight separate spheres of Confucian endeavour: 'bringing peace to the entire world' (*ping tianxia* 平天下), 'ordering the state' (*zhi guo* 治國), 'stabilising the family' (*qi jia* 齊家), 'cultivating one's individual character' (*xiu shen* 修身) 'setting straight one's mental faculties' (*zheng xin* 正心), 'attaining wholeness in one's inner consciousness' (*cheng yi* 誠意), 'extending to the utmost one's range of comprehension' (*zhi zhi* 致知), and 'putting all things into the correct categorical grid' (*ge wu* 格物). As elucidated in the 'expansion chapters' of the text, the central philosophical issues embodied in these formulations include the sequential ordering of the separate spheres of cultivation versus their simultaneous fulfilment as interlocking aspects of Confucian self-realisation, their matching to the separate phases of the 'three basic principles' (*san gangling* 三綱領) the conjoining of interiority and external enactment, and the logical direction of the progression from one phase to the next.

ANDREW PLAKS

## Ba yi 八佾 (Eight rows of dancers)

The liturgy of imperial sacrifices includes the ritual offering of a feast to the gods and spirits, instrumental music accompanied by hymns and a dance or pantomime, performed by ritual dancers. The rank held by the principal spirit who receives sacrifice determined the number of rows of dancers. According to canonical sources, e.g., *Rites of Zhou*, *Zuo's Commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals* (Duke Yin, the ninth year), eight rows of eight dancers performed in sacrifices to the Son of Heaven, totalling sixty-four in all. Six rows of six dancers (*liu yi* 六佾) performed at sacrifices for feudal lords, four rows of four dancers performed for grand masters (*dafu* 大夫), and two rows of two for low-ranking officials (*shi* 士). The dancers were novices, usually selected from local schools, held long pheasant feathers – the canonical sources also use the metonym 'feather' (*yu* 羽) to refer to the number of dancers – and reed pipes while they executed a series of exactly prescribed steps and postures.

Six rows of dancers were used in sacrifices to Confucius during the early years of the imperial cult in the fifth century because he held the posthumous title of duke (see **Baocheng Xuan Ni Gong**). As early as the

mid-fifth century, some officials advocated use of the royal eight rows in veneration of Confucius provoking a debate that endured for a thousand years. This number was increased to eight in 1477 in the midst of a long debate in the Ming on the rites to Confucius and his posthumous status. Confucius' posthumous title of king was eliminated during the reforms of 1530 and the number of rows of dancers was set at six.

THOMAS A. WILSON

## Bai jia 百家

(Hundred households)

In the Warring States period (475–221 BCE), the term *bai jia* referred loosely to 'wise men' who had knowledge of historical events. The Qin dynasty (221–210 BCE) sought to suppress the proverbial sayings of the *bai jia*, which only encouraged scholars' propensity to invoke the authority of the past in order to criticise the present regime. In the Former Han dynasty (206 BCE–8 CE), the term was extended to include specialists in various fields, including experts in the latest philosophical speculation. Though the term has usually been (mis)translated as the 'Hundred [Philosophical] Schools', it did not refer to discrete academic schools, as no such schools existed in the preHan or Han era.

**Reference:** Petersen, Jens Ostergard, 1995: 43, 1–52.

MICHAEL NYLAN

## Bai Juyi 白居易

772–846

(*zi* Letian 樂天, *hao* Xiangshan jushi 香山居士, The Retired Scholar of Fragrant Mountain)

Bai Juyi was one of the best-known men of the Tang period (618–907). His fame, based largely on his literary skill, extended beyond the empire's borders reaching as

far as Japan. He first manifested his intellectual abilities in a series of civil service examination successes. Having passed the *jinshi* examination in 800, he then passed two decree examinations (in 803 and 806 respectively). During this period, he also held official positions in the capital. Although his time in the capital coincided with Wang Shuwen's 王叔文 (753–806) reform effort in 805, he did not actively participate in it.

In the years following, however, he enjoyed some prominence. In 807, he was given the post of Reminder on the Left (*zuo shiyi* 左拾遺). This post, despite its relatively low rank (8B1), afforded Bai the opportunity to forthrightly address the major issues of the day. His memorials, which have been translated by Eugene Feifel (Feifel, 1961), reveal the issues that concerned Bai the most: the threat that powerful military figures posed to the central government, the impropriety of eunuch interference in government, and the need for the dynasty to encourage civil values by supporting civil officials.

His forthrightness, however, eventually got him into trouble. After further promotions, Bai responded to the assassination of the Prime Minister, Wu Yuanheng 武元衡 (758–815), by overstepping his authority and submitting a premature request for the court to apprehend the culprits. As a result, Bai was demoted and exiled. Between 819 and 832, Bai alternated between responsible capital and provincial posts. He spent much of the last thirteen years of his life, however, in more relaxed positions in the secondary capital of Luoyang. Although he was intermittently ill during these years, he also seems to have preferred Luoyang because it was somewhat removed from the factional struggles that then dominated the Chang'an bureaucracy. Ironically, the origins of that struggle lie in examinations which Bai was forced to investigate in 808 and 821. Nevertheless, Bai actually had close friends in both the

**Niu Sengru** and Li Deyu 李德裕 (787–850, *zi* Wenrao 文饒) factions.

Bai is best known for his literary output. He and Yuan Zhen 元稹 (779–831, *zi* Weizhi 微之) formed the nucleus of a poetic circle that explored poetry's role as an instrument of social criticism. Bai's 'New Music Bureau' (*xin yuefu* 新樂府) style poems developed this the furthest. These poems often focus on the devastating impact of official corruption on the lives of common people. In a letter to Yuan Zhen, Bai explicitly stated his willingness to use poetry to influence government policy (Bai Juyi 1988: 45.2792). Besides his literary relationship with Yuan, Bai was also a close friend of **Liu Yuxi**. A collection of the verse they exchanged is still extant.

Bai did, however, also address broader intellectual issues. As he and Yuan Zhen were preparing for the decree examination of 806, he composed a series of practice essays expressing his views. The *Celin* 策林 draws heavily on the *Wu jing* (Five Classics) to analyse contemporary problems addressing topics as varied as economic policy, the role of the emperor in the state, literary theory and the importance of ritual.

His literary theory makes his debt to the Classics particularly clear. In several texts, he drew on ideas from the *Shi jing*. He used the concept of the Six Principles (*Liu yi* 六義) from its Great Preface both to indicate proper qualities of literature and to explain the decline of literature during the Han–Tang interregnum (Bai Juyi 1988: 45.2790–1). Elsewhere, he emphasised the way that the odes of the *Shi jing* used language that perfectly matched contemporary social conditions (Bai Juyi 1988: 65.3551). Despite this emphasis on social context, Bai was also able to articulate the need for and successfully compose highly personal poetry that often elegantly expressed the mundane experience of everyday life.

Bai shared with most of his contemporaries a general interest in Buddhist and Daoist teachings. Nevertheless, his identification with the Confucian Classics was

also strong. In 827, for example, he represented the Classicist (*ru*) side in a court debate over the 'three teachings' (*san jiao* 三教).

Bai's impact on the literary culture of both China and Japan has resulted in the development of broad appreciation of his work and an extensive scholarly literature on him throughout the world.

**References:** Bai Juyi, 1988; Feifel, 1961; Hanabusa, 1971; Waley, 1949; Wang Shiyi, 1983.

ANTHONY DEBLASI

## Baihu guan huiyi 白虎觀會議

(The Conference in the White Tiger Hall)

The court conference on the interpretation of the Classics in the White Tiger Hall (*Baihu guan* 白虎觀) within the Later Han imperial palace at Luoyang was summoned in December 79 CE and lasted for several months into early 80 CE. In both its purpose and its format, it was modelled on the conference of 51 BCE at Stone Canal Pavilion (*Shiquge huiyi*): devoted to debating the imperially sponsored canon of the Five Classics (*Wu jing*), it was personally presided over by the emperor (in this case, Emperor Zhang 章帝 (r. 75–88 CE)) who, after listening to the debate of an issue, would pronounce the final decision on the matter. Later, following a set of extensive 'discussion memorials' (*yizou* 議奏) in which the issues under debate were recorded, Ban Gu 班固 (32–92; *zi* Mengjian 孟堅) was ordered to compile an account of the conference which has been transmitted, albeit not in undamaged form, under the title *Baihu tong*. The discussions in the White Tiger Hall were mainly devoted to issues of ritual, music, questions of correct naming and cosmology, many of which were directly related to the role of the ruler as an agent of cosmic order. Drawing on a broad range of exegetical traditions that had grown around the Five Classics

and involving experts of various texts, the debate was concerned with the ‘differences and accordances’ in opinion on concrete topics. The attempt towards a unified exegesis of the ancient texts ‘to provide the standards for later generations’ apparently failed: only four years later, Emperor Zhang again lamented the situation of canonical scholarship at court and – following the suggestions by **Jia Kui** – ordered the teaching of additional exegetical traditions.

**Reference:** Tjan, 1949.

MARTIN KERN

### **Baihu tong** 白虎通

(*The Comprehensive Discussions in the White Tiger Hall*)

In 79 CE, noting the disagreements over interpretation that had arisen since the establishment of the Imperial Academy in 124 BCE, the Han throne convened a court conference at the White Tiger Hall, attended by court dignitaries and scholastics, who were to reexamine the outstanding issues (chiefly ritual matters) relating to the Five Classics (*Wu jing*) and bearing upon its legitimacy. This court conference lasted several months, and Ban Gu 班固 (39–92) was ordered to compile a summary of its principal findings.

Received editions of this summary, undoubtedly based on a fuller account, are divided into either 2, 4, or 10 *juan* 卷, which are in turn always subdivided into 43 or 44 *pian* (titles). Some doubts have been raised regarding the authenticity of the extant text. The scholar William Hong 洪業 (1893–1980), for example, suggested that a few citations included in the present *Baihu tong* are likely to derive from the work of late Eastern Han classical masters, e.g., **Cai Yong** and Song Zhong 宋衷 (d. 219 CE), resident scholar at the Jingzhou Academy under Liu Biao 劉表 in the first half of the third century CE. Late interpolations in the text may exist, but there is no reason to doubt

the authenticity of the whole, as Tjan Tjoe Som (1903–1969) argued persuasively in his classic study of the text. For lacunae, Zhuang Shuzu 莊述祖 (1751–1816) and Lu Wenchao 盧文弨 (1717–1796) have ransacked a great number of encyclopedias and compendia, in the process showing that the work has been transmitted without interruption since the third century CE.

Lu Wenchao complained bitterly in his edition (2: 11a) that the ‘the *Baihu tong* never states anything clearly’. Certainly the *Baihu tong* in its analysis often departs from the text of the actual Five Classics, preoccupied as it is to reconcile divergent hermeneutic traditions that derived from those Classics. Typically, the text employs a tri-partite formula, though parts of the formula are missing at points: a question is followed by an answer, whose correctness is then proven by the citation to a specific canonical tradition, the vast majority from two *Rites* classics, the *Yi li* 儀禮 (*Rites of Literati*) or the *Li ji* 禮記 (*Book of Rites*). Many explanations based on sound-analogies or correlative thinking are added. Wherever differing traditions were accorded a measure of authority, they have been introduced by the phrase, ‘Another opinion says’.

The text, therefore, represents a generally reliable compendium of contemporary thinking about the administrative and ritual institutions of the Han, which were thought to reflect the cosmological orders of Yin–Yang and the Five Phases (*Wu xing*). The necessity of maintaining a balance between contrary impulses via ritual is emphasised, lest disharmony in state and society introduce cosmic imbalance. As the king serves as intermediary between Heaven and humankind, it is particularly important that he, aided by the members of his court, brilliantly exemplify the Way and its Mean for his subjects, who are to be organised in a series of overlapping hierarchies by age, generation, gender, birth, and merit. It is taken for granted that the king will be guided in his decisions by a variety of aids, including wise advisers, portents, historical lessons

encapsulated in the Five Classics, the apocrypha attached to them, and related commentaries; also that he will be socialised into full humanity by a rigorous education in ritual and music. Such socialisation is possible only because the king, in company with his other fellow human beings, represents a microcosm of the universe, toward whose innate perfection he tends.

The text faithfully reproduces as well the official Han dynasty line on the relation between Confucius, the Classics, and the ruling house. Though destined to be a king, Confucius, miraculously descended from both the star-gods and the ancient sage-kings, could not found the successor state to Zhou (1046?–256 BCE), as he had been born in the wrong time. Therefore, Heaven conveyed to Confucius a revelation entitled *Plan for the Practice of Confucius' Teachings* (Baihu tong 56.46a), which ordered Confucius to write or compile Six Classics (*Liu jing*) (the usual five plus the *Classic of Filial Piety*, the *Xiao jing*), which together constituted a comprehensive guide for moral behaviour, along with various apocryphal books. Heaven then sent a second revelation, by which Confucius knew that one Liu Ji (Liu Bang, founder of the western Han dynasty), also a demi-god despite his apparently low family status, would come to rule in his name. That prophecy was fulfilled during the Former Han when the Five Classics and their interpretive traditions were made the core curriculum of the Imperial Academy in 124 BCE.

**References:** Lu Wenchao, 1784; Tjan, 1949.

MICHAEL NYLAN

### Baisha xuepai 白沙學派

(The School of Chen Xianzhang)

A school of philosophical thought inspired by **Chen Xianzhang**, also known as Chen Baisha 陳白沙. The name derives from the village of Baisha (white sand) located

near Jiangmen 江門, a prosperous town in Guangdong province where Chen's family moved from his home village of Duhui 都會 (also in Guangdong province). His school was also referred to as the Jiangmen xuepai 江門學派. Although Chen never wrote a systematic exposition of his philosophy, he did leave a number of prose poems and letters.

He is often credited with beginning the current of thought, focusing on the agency of the mind, *xin*, as the principal path to sagehood, that culminated in the thought of **Wang Shouren**. He is also important in contributing to a new awareness of the importance of self-reliance in achieving complete self-realisation. The most important student of Chen Xianzhang was **Zhan Ruoshui**. Other disciples include Zhang Xu 張詡 (1455–1514), Liang Chu 梁儲 (1451–1527), and He Qin 賀欽 (1437–1510).

**References:** Jen Yu-wen, 1970: 53–92; Jiang, Paul Yun-Ming, 1980, 1983: 229–50.

ALAN T. WOOD

### Baiyuan xuepai 百源學派

(The School of Shao Yong)

This is the philosophical school that derives its name from the famous Hundred Springs of Sumen 蘇門 Mountain (in modern northern Henan 河南), where **Shao Yong** briefly resided and experienced his earliest intellectual awakening. Thus, 'Hundred Springs' became closely identified with Shao and even a sobriquet for him (*Baiyuan Xiansheng* 百源先生). While he was alive, the relatively small group of obscure scholars that comprised Shao Yong's School generally adhered to his established principles – such as his *jingshi* 經世 (world-ordering) methodology (see *Jingshi zhi yong*). However, in the subsequent centuries following his death, Shao Yong's professed followers infused his school with many disparate and spurious theories.

**Reference:** Wyatt, 1996: 12, 20, 21, 42, 223, 224–7.

DON J. WYATT

## Bakufu 幕府

The term ‘bakufu’ is commonly used in Japanese and English writings to refer to the military governments of Japan that held *de facto* political authority in the Kamakura 鎌倉, Muromachi 室町 and Edo 江戸 periods. The word itself is of Chinese origin, and appears in the *Shi ji*, for instance, in the meaning of the temporary command headquarters of a general while in the field. That is, the word literally means ‘the government in a tent’. By extension the word came to be used for the headquarters of a military commander stationed in a border region, and even for a government office in general. *Mufu* 幕府 was also a Chinese term for the government office of inner palace guards charged with protecting the emperor (近衛府), and by extension to the chief of these palace guards (近衛大將), and this institution was adopted in Japan from Heian 平安 times. Since Minamoto no Yoritomo 源頼朝, founder of the Kamakura military government, held the rank of ‘Major Captain of the Right Inner Palace Guards’ (*ukon’e no daishô* 右近衛大將), even after he was appointed Seii Taishôgun 征匈奴大將軍 (Barbarian-subduing Great General) by the emperor in 1192, the word bakufu continued to be used for his official residence, or for Yoritomo himself. By extension the word thus came to be used for the shogunal government itself. However, the authorities in the Kamakura, Muromachi and Edo periods did not themselves call their government a bakufu, and the term was rarely used by officials and historians in referring to either the shogunate or the Shogun. At least until the Kansei 寛政 period (1789–1800), the word was rarely used, and some early nineteenth-century lists of terms used to refer to the Tokugawa government did not even include bakufu. It

became a common term under the influence of the **Later Mito School** of historical philosophy, gaining currency in approximately the same period as the Mito phrase *sonnô jôi* 尊王攘夷 (revere the sovereign and expel the barbarian). Mito scholars used the word bakufu as a result of their intense concern for the correct use of political terminology, which is a traditional Confucian preoccupation that goes right back to Confucius himself (see *Analects* 13: 3). Fujita Yûkoku 藤田幽谷, in his *Seimeiron* 正名論 (Discourse on the Rectification of Names, 1791), wrote ‘If the bakufu reveres the emperor, then each lord reveres the bakufu. If each lord reveres the bakufu, then the higher and lesser retainers will revere each lord. If this is carried out then high and low will keep their place and all of the countries will be in harmony.’ The Mito scholars, that is, wanted to use a humble term for the Tokugawa government to emphasise that it was a government of the ‘shôgun’ appointed by the emperor in Kyoto. Previously, the shogunate (or the shogun himself) had been referred to by respectful terms such as *go-kôgi* 御公儀 (the honourable government), *ôfu* 王府 (the royal government), *chôtei* 朝廷 (the Court), and *kubô* 公方, terms which had originally referred to the imperial court in the pre-Yoritomo age when the court actually constituted the supreme political authority in the land. The Mito scholars insisted that such terms, especially *chôtei*, could not properly be used to refer to anything but the imperial court. As Watanabe argues, the entrenchment of the term bakufu from the Meiji period ‘reinforced a historical image of the emperor as being the only legitimate ruling authority throughout the history of “Japan”’. Moreover, its use ‘makes it difficult to perceive that there was a major shift in relations between Edo and Kyoto in the middle of the Edo period’. He suggests, at least in Japanese historical writings, using the word that was most commonly used in the Edo period, *kôgi*. In English we are fortunate to have the



word ‘shogunate’, which is considerably less burdened with subliminal ideological presuppositions than the word ‘bakufu’.

**Reference:** Ng, 2000.

BARRY D. STEBEN

## Bao Ba 保巴

d. 1311

(*zi* Gongmeng 公孟, *hao* Puan 普菴)

Bao was a Central Asian (*semu ren* 色目人) who resided in Loyang 洛陽 and served as a minister under Emperor Khaishan (Wuzong 武宗, r. 1307–1311) and as a general administrator in Hubei. In 1309, along with his colleague Yue Shi 樂實 (d. 1311), Bao Ba recommended to the throne the reestablishment of the Department of State Affairs, the Shangshu sheng 尚書省, a bureau that functioned during the reign of Khubilai (r. 1260–1294) to increase state revenue but which had been abolished because of corruption. Bao was appointed to the bureau because of his financial background. Monetary and tax reforms were undertaken to increase state revenue, but after Khaishan’s death and the accession of his younger brother, Ayurbarwada (Renzong 仁宗, r. 1311–1320), the bureau was abolished and the personnel purged. Bao and Yue Shi were executed and the various policies rescinded.

Bao was also a scholar of some note. His extensive commentary on the *Book of Changes* is found in the Four Treasuries catalogue under the title *Substance and Function of the Changes* (*Yi tiyong* 易體用), with a preface by the early Yuan scholar Ren Shilin 任士林 (1253–1309), but actually comprises the following works: *The Hidden Meanings in the Origin of the Changes* (*Yiyuan aoyi* 易原奧義), *The Essentials in the Origin of the Changes* (*Zhouyi yuanzhi* 周易原旨), and *The Sacred Signs in the Changes* (*Zhouyi shangzhan* 周易尚占).

Considering his fate in the realm of practical affairs, it is unfortunate that he did

not have a chance to develop further as a classicist. Many of the Central Asian scholars who studied with **Xu Heng** and **Wu Cheng** were quite distinguished and highly praised in such endeavours.

**References:** Chen Yuan, 1966: 304–5; Franke & Twitchett, 1994: 510–11.

DAVID GEDALECIA

## Baocheng Xuan Ni Gong

褒成宣尼公

(Exalted Ni, Duke of Consummate Perfection)

Baocheng Xuan Ni Gong is a posthumous title given to Confucius in the year 1 CE, the first posthumous title conferred upon Confucius by imperial authorities. Confucius, whose Chinese name was Kong Qiu, took the style name Zhong Ni, or Second son Ni. Confucius’ mother was said to have prayed for a son at Mt Ni when she conceived Confucius. Xuan is an honorific title meaning eminent or exalted. At the same time, Confucius’ sixteenth-generation descendant was ennobled as Marquis of Consummate Perfection (*Baocheng hou*) and invested with 2,000 serf households.

THOMAS A. WILSON

## Baopuzi 抱樸子

(*The Master Who Embraces Simplicity*)

*Baopuzi* is the chief work of **Ge Hong** (283–343) and was written late in his life. It is divided into two portions, *nei*, ‘Inner’ and *wai*, ‘Outer’, of twenty and fifty fascicles respectively. The former he characterises as Daoist, the latter as Confucian. Since Daoism for Ge consists overwhelmingly of the pursuit of immortality by a variety of means, chiefly alchemical, and Confucianism a series of complaints about the trends of his times, he has generally not impressed



western readers with his intellectual rigour.

This is unfortunate. His simultaneous support for both of the older established intellectual traditions of his day (ignoring the newfangled *xuanxue*, the 'Mysterious Learning') reflect for him the encyclopedic scope of **Wang Chong** (fl. c. 80 CE), a fellow-southerner. His Confucian arguments for monarchy against anarchism, for example, actually jettison much of the macrocosmic setting for emperorship erected under the Han and stress expedient justifications, offering a strictly minimalist justification for the Jin's rule. His Daoism even more explicitly places the fate of the individual within the microcosm of his own body, defending the ancient legacy of occult lore which survived in the south and ignoring totally the mass religions of the late Han with their soteriologies based on the revelations of messianic figures.

True, he failed in all his objectives: political thinkers never again confronted the anarchist alternative; within his own later family, the production of revelations soon moved Daoism irrevocably beyond the confines of the *zi* 子 ('Masters') literature. Yet without him we would be deprived of invaluable historical evidence, now available for both 'Inner' and 'Outer' sections in good Chinese editions; the existing English translations (incomplete for the latter section) leave room for improvement.

**References:** Sailey, 1978; Wang Ming, 1983; Ware, 1967; Yang Mingzhao, 1991.

TIM H. BARRETT

## Beixi ziyi 北溪字義

(Chen Chun's Explanation of Terms)

**Chen Chun's** *Explanation of Terms* is also known as *Xingli Ziyi* 性理字義 (*Explanation of Terms on the Nature and Principle*) and, less frequently, as *Jingshu Ziyi* 經書字義 or *Sishu Ziyi* 四書字義, although not all the terms derive from either the Classics (*Jing*) or

the Four Books (*Si shu*). Compiled by Chen's disciple Wang Jun 王雱, it consisted of discussions of twenty-five keywords until a twenty-sixth (*yiguan* 一貫, one thread running through all) was inserted as No.11 in 1247. A description of various editions is included in the first bibliographical reference below.

Sometimes known simply as the *Ziyi*, this book was widely used in Korea and Japan as well as China as an authoritative compilation of the essential ideas of **Zhu Xi**. It thus occupies an important place in the transmission of Zhu's ideas. With the exception of the final entry which deals with Buddhism and Daoism, each item deals with the meaning of terms prominent in Song theoretical discourse. Prominent as the first term is *ming* 命, which Chen defines as an order. He then goes on to distinguish between the *li* (principle) and the *qi* (material force) that is transmitted to all beings and things.

Like *ming* most of the terms in the *Ziyi* are sufficiently prominent as to merit separate entries in the present encyclopedia. Exceptions include *zhi* 志, purpose (No.6) and *yi* 意, intention (No.7) which reflect Chen Chun's emphasis on practice. Another, *huangji* 皇極, August Polarity or August Ultimate (No.19) immediately following *taiji* 太極 (Great Ultimate No.18) is interpreted by Chen as pertaining to the emperor. Here Chen rejects the metaphysical interpretation of **Kong Anguo** but does not cite **Shao Yong** who, however, is quoted on *taiji*. The longest entry concerns *gui shen* which here receives greater emphasis than in Zhu Xi. Chen treats *gui shen* both as impersonal forces and as ghosts and spirits. He includes under this heading a discussion of *hun po* 魂魄 (the two components of the soul) and evidences a concern for determining which spirits may be worshipped and by whom. In keeping with his philosophical tradition, there is a section on *li*, but although *qi* figures quite prominently in a number of discussions, Chen Chun apparently did not consider it sufficiently

problematic to warrant a separate entry. *zhong* 忠 is treated in two entries, once coupled with *xin* 信 and once with *shu* 恕. *Jing* 敬 is discussed both in its own entry and in another coupled with *gong* 恭.

In the introduction to his English translation of *Beixi Ziyi* Wing-tsit Chan notes that while **Wu Cheng** and **Yamazaki Ansai** dismissed it as of little interest and superficial, the general consensus was very positive. Frequently reprinted, the place of this book in the tradition was secure. Chan himself praises the work as a 'fresh approach to **Neo-Confucianism**' (Chan, 1986: 20). The *Explanations of Terms* hardly exhausts the discussion of the keywords of Cheng-Zhu thought, but it continues to provide a convenient introduction to the vocabulary and ideas of this tradition.

**References:** Chan, Wing-tsit, 1986b; Sato Hitoshi, 1996.

CONRAD SCHIROKAUER

## Benran zhixing 本然之性 (Original human nature)

According to the dualistic theory of human nature (*xing er yuan lun* 性二元論), principle (*li*) and material force (*qi*) are mixed and nature (*xing*) is that which is our character (*qi zhi* 氣質). From **Mengzi's** theory of the original goodness of human nature (*xing shan lun*), to **Xunzi's** theory of its evilness (*xing e lun*), their opposing views sparked many subsequent debates and viewpoints, but in the case of the philosophers **Zhang Zai** and **Cheng Yi**, they attempted to illustrate human nature by combining the theories of Mengzi and Xunzi into the theory of the original nature and the derived nature. For them, the innate or original human nature is the same as the Nature of Heaven and Earth, which is universal, pure and good, while the derived nature is the nature generated by material force and is therefore particular and changeable. Through learning one is able to correct the evil elements of

the derived nature and to restore the goodness of the original nature.

**Reference:** *Yugyo Sajon Pyonchan Wiwonhoe*, 1990.

TODD CAMERON THACKER

## Bi yong 辟雍 (Jade-ring moat)

The *bi yong* was considered in the Han period to be a western Zhou ritual building established by the Son of Heaven (the Zhou king). It has been likened to the *Ming tang*. The first archaeological evidence of the *bi yong* dates from **Wang Mang's** reign (9–23 CE). It was modelled on the *ya*- (亞) shaped tombs of Shang royalty and comprised a four-square room on a round raised platform in a square courtyard, surrounded in turn by a circular moat. Wang Mang performed rituals in each season according to *Wu xing* (Five Phases) theories of correlative cosmology. In effect, the *bi yong* ritual signals the full subjection to a moralised cosmic authority of emperorship in the Han.

**Reference:** Wang Aihe, 2000: 169–71.

ANGELA ZITO

## Bloom, Irene

Bloom is one of the leading scholars of East Asian Confucianism and **Neo-Confucianism** in the West. Bloom's translation of **Luo Qinchun's** *Kunzhi ji* 困知記 (*Knowledge Painfully Acquired*), pioneered western scholarship on Luo, a Ming-dynasty exponent of Cheng-Zhu teachings (see **Cheng-Zhu xuepai**). Bloom's study reveals how Luo's monistic, materialistic philosophy, via questioning some of **Zhu Xi's** more controversial claims, impacted later Chinese Neo-Confucian thought, and patterns of Neo-Confucian philosophical understanding evident among both Korean scholars and those in Tokugawa Japan (1600–1868).

Bloom has also contributed significantly to scholarly discussions of the relationship between Confucianism, religion and human rights.

JOHN A. TUCKER

## Boshi 博士

(Erudites or academicians)

*Boshi* literally meant ‘broadly [learned] educated persons’. The term went back to the Warring States times, but the establishment of a *boshi* office was under the Qin dynasty (221–210 BCE). The Qin *boshi* were learned men in the service of the emperor and often were consulted on knowledge that regular bureaucrats did not possess.

The system of *boshi* in the Han times changed with Emperor Wudi’s decision to make Confucianism state ideology. This act was accompanied by the establishment of Classical Learning as the content of Imperial Academy’s (**Tai xue** 太學) education. A total of five versions of commentaries to Confucian Classics were ordered as orthodox, and one *boshi* each was appointed to teach the commentaries. They are hence called *Wujing boshi* (erudites of the Five Classics). The number of *boshi* subjects subsequently increased, and by the Later Han, there were fourteen, representing fourteen schools of interpretations of the same Five Classics. Each version had five *boshi*, and there were thus all together seventy *boshi* in charge of instruction.

The *boshi* obviously were highly respected and their teachings strictly followed from generation to generation. They shaped the course and development of Classical Learning, which since the Han times was the very core of Chinese education.

As division of labour in bureaucracy increased, and with different government offices training their own personnel, some instructors also began to assume the name of *boshi*. Thus, the School of the Four Gates (*Simen xue*) which was an elementary school

founded during the Northern Wei Period (386–585) also had its erudites. But it was the *boshi* in charge of instructing the Classics in the Imperial University and subsequently Directorate School of National Youth (*Guozhi xue* 國子學) that was always the most visible and respected, although their official ranking varied in different times.

During the Sui and Tang times, the state ran a large complement of higher educational institutions, ranging from School of National Youth, Imperial University, School of the Four Gates, School of Law, to School of Mathematics and School of Calligraphy. The teaching officials in respective schools were called *boshi* of that school. Military School and Medical School, outside of the supervision of the Directorate of National Youth, also had their own *boshi*. The *boshi* title was even given to teachers in local government schools. The name therefore became increasingly ‘secularised’ and its significance for Confucian education diminished considerably.

This is even more evident in the Sung times, as Classical Learning underwent remarkable change and as government’s educational policy changed, especially after the twelfth century. New titles such as *jiao shou* 教授 (lit. to teach and transmit, professor) and *zhi jiang* 直講 (lit. in charge of lectures, lecturer) were created. While more traditional posts continued to be called *boshi*, new instruction staff members in the government schools often were called professors or lecturers. The Classical Learning dimension of *boshi* had by now all but evaporated.

Teaching officials who were called *boshi* decreased steadily after the Sung. By the Qing times, the Directorate School of National Youth had only three *boshi*. Meanwhile, the title of *wujing boshi* had become honorific, awarded to descendants of Confucian worthies inducted into the Confucian temples.

**Reference:** Lee, Thomas, 2000.

THOMAS H.C. LEE

**Bu Shang** 卜商

507–? BCE

(zi Zixia 子夏)

Better known by his style name, Zixia, Bu Shang was a native of Wenxian 溫縣 (eighty kilometres northeast of Luoyang, then the royal capital) and of humble origin. Bu was a prominent disciple of Confucius, eminent for his studies of the *Book of Poetry*. He received sacrifices in the temple as one of the **Ten Savants** in 712, was ennobled as Marquis of Wei 子夏魏侯 in 739, promoted to the rank of duke in 1009, given the title of Duke of Hedong 河東公卜商 in 1113, and called Master Bu Shang 卜子商 in 1530, when everyone enshrined in the temple was stripped of their noble titles. Temples and shrines were built to venerate him in modern Shanxi province.

THOMAS A. WILSON

**Bushidô** 武士道

(The proper way of life for the bushi)

The term bushidô refers to ethical and behavioural ideals held up as the proper way of life for the bushi 武士 or samurai 侍 of Japan. These ideals were developed gradually from the Kamakura period (1185–1333), when the bushi held control over government and cultural production and became conscious of having very different values from the court aristocracy. The original core consisted of an honour code among fighting men that included a deep respect for martial skills, undivided loyalty, iron courage, constant preparedness of mind and readiness (*kakugo* 覺悟) to die. Zen Buddhism was strongly patronised by the medieval shogunates, leading also to the deep permeation of Zen and other Buddhist teachings into samurai thinking. Even the concept of *kakugo* noted above is an evolution of the Buddhist word for ‘Enlightenment’. As an articulate philosophy of life emphasising selfless service (*messhi hôkô* 滅私奉公), unchanging loyalty (*chûgi* 忠義; *chûkô* 忠孝),

faithfulness (*shingi* 信義), honour and integrity (*meiyo* 名譽, *renchi* 廉恥, *sessô* 節操), and decorum (*reigi* 禮儀), however, ‘bushidô’ was not systematised until the Edo period, when samurai society was highly stratified by ritually expressed status distinctions and the bushi were no longer able to engage in actual warfare. In this period, as the above list of virtues clearly shows, the influence of Confucianism overtook the influence of Buddhism. However, modern scholars distinguish between two very different types of Edo period ‘bushidô’. One type, typified by the *Hagakure* 葉隠 (1716), remained strongly Zen influenced and emphasised deeply devoted, personal service to one’s lord, with a mind constantly prepared for death, thinking only of one’s lord, and cleansed of all judgemental thoughts of ‘good’ and ‘evil’ or ‘right’ and ‘wrong’. The other type, typified by **Yamaga Sokô**’s *shidô* 士道 teachings, focused on teaching each member of bushi society to be totally devoted to his own duty (*meibun* 名分; *shokubun* 職分) as defined by his rank and position, and it was suited to the development of an impersonal, bureaucratic structure of loyalty within each domain. This type of samurai morality emphasised that both lord and vassal are bound by the responsibilities dictated by Confucian morality, i.e., that a samurai should not continue to serve a lord who refuses all remonstrance and advice from his vassals regarding the correctness of his policies. The word ‘bushidô’ itself, actually, was not widely used until the Meiji period, when the Way of the samurai was even further idealised and promoted by certain nationalist writers as the essential morality of the Japanese people. As Japan developed in a militaristic direction from the time of the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905), various ‘bushidô’ concepts, particularly those associated with the first type, came to be emphasised in the education of the military, even though their way of life and technology of warfare were totally different from either the medieval or the Edo-period samurai.

BARRY D. STEBEN

# C

## Cai 才

(Capability, endowment)

The term *cai* is variously translated as capability, ability, endowment, capacity, talent or potential. In the *Analects* (*Lunyu*), *cai* was one's talent and capacity for government service, and rulers were challenged to locate people with ability. Such talents were possessed by figures such as the Duke of Zhou (see **Zhou Gong**).

*Cai* had similar usages in the *Mengzi*, which moreover emphasised the importance of training capable people. *Cai* was a potential, then, that required development and education. But for Mengzi, *cai* was also something more fundamental than a talent for official service: it was a Heaven-bestowed endowment, a potential capacity for development inherent to the human condition. This endowment was common to all people, and the reason some people became good and others did not was not due to an original difference in their endowment but to their failure to fully develop it; it could also be impeded by external circumstances beyond their control.

Scholars of the Song dynasty (960–1279) such as **Cheng Yi** and **Zhu Xi** understood capability in terms of the qualities of vital energy (*qi*). Human nature (*xing*) was good; *cai*, potentially problematic. If one's vital energy was lucid and clear, then so were one's capabilities. If it was muddled, then

one's capabilities were similarly obscured. In the Qing (1644–1911), **Dai Zhen** critiqued the views of Mengzi's thought. Dai asserted that because the nature was good, so was capability. Scholars of the Song, he believed, separated the nature and capability and thus implied that what was endowed by Heaven was flawed.

**References:** Ames & Rosemont, 1988: 8: 11, 8: 20, 9: 11, 11: 8, 13: 2; Chan, Wing-tsit, 1986: 64, 1996: 41–4; Chin & Freeman, 1990: 139–45; Lau, 1984: 1B: 7, 4B: 7, 6A: 6, 6A: 7, 6A: 8, 6B: 7, 7A: 20, 7B: 29; Shun, Kwong-loi, 1997a: 218–22.

DEBORAH SOMMER

## Cai Chen 蔡沈

1167–1230

(*zi* Zhongmo 仲默, *hao* Jiufeng xiansheng 九峰先生)

Cai Chen was born in Jianyang 建陽 (Fujian). He was the third son of **Cai Yuanding**, one of the leading pupils of **Zhu Xi**. The most valuable source for Cai Chen's biography is his epitaph written by **Zhen Dexiu** on request of Cai's oldest son Cai Mu 蔡模 (1188–1246).

Cai Chen and his brothers became students of Zhu Xi. When the attack on 'false learning' (*wei xue*) launched against Zhu Xi and other scholars reached its culmination

in 1198, Cai Yuanding was banished to Chongling 春陵, a remote area in present-day southern Hunan province. Cai Chen accompanied his father on this strenuous way and returned after his father's death back to Zhu Xi's place in Cangzhou 滄州 (Fujian). Zhu Xi could not complete a commentary on the *Shang shu* (*Book of Documents*) during his life as he had done on the *Shi jing* (*Book of Poetry*) and the *Yi jing* (*Book of Changes*). Therefore, he entrusted Cai Chen with this task. It is said in Cai Chen's record of his teacher's last days (*Zhu Wengong mengdian ji* 朱文公夢奠記) that they both worked on commenting passages of the *Book of Documents* until Zhu Xi's death in spring 1200.

After Zhu Xi's death Cai Chen changed his place of residue to the Nine-Peak Mountain (Jiufeng Shan) near Jianyang. He gave up all claims for a carrier. In 1209 Cai Chen published his *Shang shu jizhuan* 尚書集傳 (*Collected Commentaries on the Shang shu*).

The *Shang shu jizhuan* was presented to the throne by Cai Chen's son Cai Hang 蔡杭 (fl. 1229) in 1245. After the reintroduction of the examination system during the Yuan period (1260–1368) it became the orthodox interpretation of the *Book of Documents*. It does not delve into long and detailed explanations to strange passages but tries to give the general meaning in a straightforward manner. Difficult passages do not get a forced interpretation. Therefore, some scholars praised its sober temperament, but others noticed some inconsistencies in its explanations. Most of the Qing dynasty scholars did not assess it to be as good as Kong Yingda's *Shang shu zhengyi* 尚書正義 (*The Right Meaning of the Shang shu*) of the Tang Dynasty (618–907).

During his reclusion on the Nine-Peak Mountain Cai Chen composed his other great work, the *Hongfan huangji neipian* 洪範皇極內篇 (*The Inner Chapters of the Majestic Pole of the Great Plan*). This book is a continuation of his father's now lost studies of the legendary numeric system

hidden in the Great Plan (*Hongfan* 洪範), the famous chapter of the *Shang shu*. The *Hongfan huangji neipian* is an oracle book resembling the *Yi jing*, the *Taixuan jing* by Yang Xiong, or the *Qianxu* 潛虛 (*The Hidden Void*) by Sima Guang. It consists of eighty-one mantic charts and three chapters of philosophic explanations. There he set forth his philosophy of number 數 (*shu*).

Cai Chen believed that the overwhelming principle *li* passes into the myriad of things through the intermediate states of numbers and images (*xiang* 象). Therefore, numbers can reveal the way how principle functions and gets manifested. In his view, images are general situations in the process of manifestation. The numbers rank higher than the images because images can be reduced to numerical combinations. The row of uneven numbers symbolises the continuous flow and the permanent creating force of the unique principle. The even numbers, beginning with the number two on the other hand symbolises opposition by which the continuous flow comes to an itinerant stop which can be portrayed in an image. Thus the two intermediate states can be used to illuminate the functioning of principle and to foretell the future. According to the method of the *Yi jing* of doubling the eight trigrams to 64 hexagrams he constructed a system of 9 numbers and 81 pairs of numbers. He designated the *He tu* 河圖 (*Diagram of the River*) as the base of the system of the *Book of Changes* and the *Luo shu* 洛書 (*Script of the Luo*) as the base of the Great Plan chapter of the *Book of Documents*, and considered their intrinsic arithmetical laws to be furnishing evidence for his contemplations.

Since only a few oracular sayings had been phrased it might be possible that Cai Chen had no intention to complete all the sayings. During later dynasties several completions of his work were done, which became the backbone of a school called *Jiufeng xuepai*.

Cai Chen's ideas can be seen as a continuation of Shao Yong's work and as



a further development of the ideas of the traditional *Xiangshu* branch of the studies of the *Book of Changes* into the Neo-Confucian discourse on the cosmological principle and human nature. In his history of the *xiangshu* ideas **Huang Zongxi** gave credit to Cai Chen. A more critical and more detailed discussion of his ideas can be found in **Wang Fuzhi's** elaborations on the *Book of Documents*.

**References:** Chan, Wing-tsit, 1989; Gao & Chen 1986; Nylan, 1992; Schilling, 1998; Wang Fuzhi, 1962.

DENNIS SCHILLING

## Cai xing 才性

(Talent or ability and nature)

*Cai* refers to the inherent capacities for effective action (including the intellectual and moral), while *xing* refers to the first or second human nature, which is frequently related to virtue (*de*). The *Analects* (*Lunyu*) makes clear that virtue must always be valued more than *cai*, even when a person's talents are truly extraordinary. Accordingly, early *ru* theory acknowledges a potential conflict between the goals and methods of men of virtue and those of men selected for office on account of their *cai*, a conflict best ameliorated by a proper classical education. Centralising states, of course, always wished to identify, train, and utilise men of special *cai*, realising that such men pose a potential threat to the state if their particular talents are not harnessed to its use. The presumption that men of *cai* were seldom those espousing Confucian virtues found its greatest expression in the Three Kingdoms era (220–265), when many were quick to blame the disintegration of the Han empire upon the unrealistic policies of *ru* antiquarians. Liu Shao 劉劭 argued that one's *cai* comes from one's nature, that is, one's ability is rooted in one's virtue. The *Shishuo xinyu* mentions no fewer than four theories concerning the relation between *cai* and *xing*: namely, that arguing for the

identity between them, that arguing for differentiating them, that for the unity of them, and that for separating them. (*Shishuo xinyu*, *Literature* chapter)

In the Northern Song (960–1126), **Cheng Hao**, **Cheng Yi** and **Zhu Xi** argued against the general presumption regarding the inherent conflict between virtue and *cai* – and more specifically against the elegant articulation of that notion in **Sima Guang's** essay '*De cai lun*' 德才論 ('On virtue and ability'). Sima Guang had envisioned four categories of human beings, each defined by the relation of virtue and *cai*: only in the sages are virtue and *cai* conjoined and the worst sort of human beings has neither virtue nor *cai*. The gentleman is one in whom virtue predominates over ability; and the petty man is one in whom ability predominates over virtue. Excluding the case of the sages from consideration, Sima Guang urges men of his class to focus on the development of their virtues, rather than their capacities.

Believing instead that the capacities and the virtues are mutually supportive mechanisms inherent in the human nature endowed by Heaven (*tian*), Zhu Xi responded to a disciple's question about 'cultivating the self through reverence' by insisting that true cultivation of the virtues required the full exercise of the imaginative capacities, and that the process of self-cultivation in turn hones the capacities. When the great sage-kings Yao and Shun (see **Yao Shun**) were said to be 'intelligent' and 'cultured', this did not refer merely to their capacities! Intelligence and culture are themselves aspects of virtue, for virtue varies from *cai* chiefly in its different point of reference. The term 'virtue' refers to the internal qualities while *cai* refers to what one can do with them (*Zhuzi yulei*, *juan* 44, 134). To speak of virtue that has no utility is an oxymoron. Therefore, to accurately assess the worth of a person, one should factor in both his talents and his virtues. According to the Cheng brothers, the very best rulers can employ even evil men in their courts, since they are wise enough to



prevent immoral acts and to utilise the talents of evil men fully (*Er Cheng ji*, 'Za yan' chapter). Zhu Xi concurred, believing that 'When Heaven engenders one generation's worth of human talent, it suffices naturally for that generation's needs. From antiquity to the present, men have been more or less the same. But so long as there is a sage ruler above . . . then eight or nine parts of the battle have been won, for the ordinary person will refine himself and improve . . . and set his own heart to the public business, cultivating and nourishing himself. Probably even the petty man has many talents' (*Zhuzi yulei*, *juan* 108) of use to state and society.

Wang Shouren disagreed with the Cheng-Zhu approach to the problem of *de* and *cai*. For Wang, the mere acquisition of knowledge and talents through an 'investigation of things' designed to gain insight into the divine principles of the cosmos was not necessarily of any use to human development. He argued that in many cases, an increase in knowledge and abilities merely increased the strength of a person's desires and his capacity to achieve them at the expense of human virtue. Thus the sole function of schooling must be the perfection of human virtue rather than the search for greater knowledge and ability (*Chuanxi lu*, *shang juan* 1). Those theoretical goods would be attained – without danger to the soul – only when the self had been sufficiently trained in the practice of virtue. As Wang Fuzhi later formulated it in a commentary on the *Analects*, virtue must be the *ti* (substance) and *cai* its *yong* (application or function; *ti yong*).

MICHAEL NYLAN

## Cai Yong 蔡邕

132–192

(zi Bojie 伯喈)

Cai Yong was a late Eastern Han scholar, official, historian, musician, astronomer, calligrapher and poet. As a gentleman consultant (*yi lang* 議郎), he participated

in the collation and correction of the Five Classics (**Wu jing**); these were carved onto forty-six stone tablets, purportedly tracing Cai's brushwork, and erected in front of the Imperial Academy (**Tai xue**) in 175. For the Han History project of the Dongguan 東觀 imperial library, he produced the 'Annals of Emperor Ling', forty-two sections of supplementary biographies, and ten treatises including works on ritual, and on carriages and ceremonial dress, which have long been lost. In memorials criticising official policies and corrupt court practices, Cai followed the practice of interpreting calamities and unusual phenomena as portents; after one such memorial he was slandered and sent into exile for a year. He wrote *Du duan* 獨斷 (*Discretionary Judgements*), an exposition of the terms of address for the emperor, and the nomenclature and order of court documents, ritual, clothing and equipage, ritual music of earlier dynasties and posthumous names of emperors. Despite his criticism of *fu* 賦 composition as a serious pursuit, he was the era's outstanding writer of lyrical *fu* pieces. He was also renowned for his composition of *bei wen* 碑文 (stele inscriptions), whose popularity paralleled the rising emphasis placed on the value of filial piety (*xiao*). Cai was sentenced to death after making an inopportune remark at news of the assassination of the 'protector' Dong Zhuo 董卓 (*ob.* 192, *zi* Zhongying 仲穎).

**References:** Asselin, 1991, 1997; Beck, 1990; Loewe, 1993.

MARK L. ASSELIN

## Cai Yuanding 蔡元定

1135–1198

(zi Jitong 季通, hao Xishan Xiansheng 西山先生, posthum. Wenjie Gong 文節公)

Cai Yuanding was a native of Jianyang 建陽 (Fujian). At the end of the Tang dynasty (618–960) his ancestors followed the Tang

marshal Wang Chao 王潮 (fl. 896) to Fujian. His grandfather Cai Liang 蔡諒 once gained a scholarship from the county to study at the Imperial Academy (**Tai xue**) and then held a minor position in the local government. After criticising the government of Cai Jing 蔡京 (1047–1126) Cai Liang had to abandon his post. Cai Liang's son Cai Fa 蔡發 (1089–1152) did not engage in an official career but concentrated on the education of his children as Cai Yuanding did later, too, building up a branch of Neo-Confucian Learning of its own which became well known during the southern Song (1127–1279) and in the beginning of the Yuan dynasty (1260–1368) as the learning of the Cai family (see *Xishan xuepai*).

Cai Yuanding soon achieved high recommendation. But he declined the invitations to serve at court by **Yang Wanli** and You Mao 尤袤 (1124–1193). By the age of twenty-four he became a scholar among the pupils of **Zhu Xi**. As Cai Yuanding was held in very high esteem by Zhu Xi he ranked as a kind of tutor in Zhu Xi's school.

When the attack of false learning (*wei xue* 偽學) was launched against Zhu Xi and his circle, Cai Yuanding was accused of sorcery and sentenced to live in Chongling 春陵, a remote county in the district Daozhou 道州 (southern Hunan). On the way to his exile he was accompanied by his third son **Cai Chen**. Cai Yuanding died in exile in 1198.

Zhu Xi and Cai Yuanding frequently discussed various philosophical topics and Cai Yuanding helped Zhu Xi in composing his works. Numerous passages in Zhu Xi's letters to Cai prove their cooperation, regarding the Four Books (*Si shu*), the *Tongjian gangmu* 通鑑綱目 (*Summary of the comprehensive Mirror*) and the *Cantongqi* 參同契 (*Akinness of the Trio*) for example. They cooperated even more closely in their work on the *Yi jing*. Cai writing the first draft of the *Yixue qimeng* 易學啟蒙 (*Explanations of the Changes for Beginners*) set forth the explanations of his numerological theories. The seven charts in the beginning of Zhu Xi's

commentary on the *Yi jing*, the *Zhouyi benyi* 周易本義, might also reveal his influence.

Although Cai had no direct scholarly affiliation to the school of **Shao Yong**, he became one of the most outstanding thinkers of Shao Yong's ideas during the Southern Song. His influence in the so-called image and number learning (*Xiangshu xue*) of the *Yi jing* exceeded that of other scholars like Zhang Xingcheng 張行成 (fl. 1132), **Guo Yong** or **Zhu Zhen**. His interpretations of Shao Yong's ideas and his solution he presented to the problem of how to connect the *Yi jing* trigrams with the two legendary numerical diagrams *He tu* 河圖 (*Diagram of the River*) and *Luo shu* 洛書 (*Script of the Luo*) became part of the later orthodox exegesis of the *Yi jing*.

Cai's biography lists numerous works, but only two of them still exist in their full length. The first is a discussion about the principles of geography and their use for geomancy called 'Elaborating the Intimate [of the earth]' (*Fawei lun* 發微論), and the second is a treatise of some new inventions in the mathematical principles of music called *Lülü xinshuo* 律呂新說. Other theories of Cai Yuanding may be found in the work of his sons, for example his explanations of the Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate (*Tai ji tu shuo*) and of the numbers of the *Hongfan* 洪範 chapter of the *Shu jing* in the work of his sons Cai Yuan 蔡淵 (1156–1236) and **Cai Chen** (see *Xishan xuepai* and *Jiufeng xuepai*).

The *Lülü xinshuo* let Cai Yuanding become one of the outstanding scholars of mathematical theory of music in Song times. His intention to write the *Lülü xinshuo* came from the reinterpretation of rituals and music at the emperor's court. The problem Cai was confronted with was how to harmonise the naturally given difference between the tones created by the circle of perfect fifths and the octave (the so-called Pythagorean comma). In the eyes of Cai none of the solutions proposed by former scholars was supported by the theories presented in the old texts. Cai Yuanding

expanded the number of the twelve pitch pipes (*lǚ lǚ* 律呂) to eighteen, calling the additional six pipes ‘variated pipes’ (*bian lǚ* 變呂). Their pitches are a little bit higher than those of their corresponding regular pipes. Thus, it was possible to play the scale of the seven tones on the base of all of the twelve regular pipes.

**References:** Adler, 1984; Franke, Herbert, 1976; Gao & Chen, 1986; Haeger, 1972: 499–513; Li Xinchuan, 1935a; Li Xinchuan, 1935b; Pian, 1967; Schilling, 1998; Schirokauer, 1975; *Song Shi*, 1977; Tillman, 1992b; Wang Maohong, 1973; Zhu Bokun, 1991; Zhu Heng, *Dao Nan Weiyuan*; Zhu Xi, 1975.

DENNIS SCHILLING

## Cao Duan 曹端

1376–1434

(*zi* Zhengfu 正夫, *hao* Yuechuan 月川)

Cao Duan was a native of Mianchi 澠池 in Henan. As a child, Cao studied with Ma Zicai 馬子才 (?–?) of Yiyang 宜陽 and Peng Zonggu 彭宗古 (?–?) of Taiyuan 太原. In 1408 he successfully took the provincial examination, although he failed to pass the metropolitan examination in the following year. His highest position in government service was when he was appointed *xue zheng* 學正 (Director of Studies) in Huozhou 霍州 prefecture in Shanxi 山西. Cao served in the position for nine years before returning to his home region to mourn his parents’ deaths and to tend to their graves. In 1422 Cao was drawn out of retirement to take the same position in Puzhou 蒲州 prefecture (also in Shanxi). Due to Cao’s popularity among former students, petitioners competed for Cao in both Huozhou and Puzhou. Because Huozhou submitted their request first, Cao returned to that prefecture. He served at this position for ten years. Cao died at the age of fifty-eight.

Cao was the author of numerous commentaries on the Confucian Classics, and

his particular area of expertise was ritual and ancient music. **Huang Zongxi** noted that Cao was influenced by Xie Yingfang’s 謝應芳 (1296–1392) Yuan-period work *Disputing Errors* (*bian huo bian* 辯惑編), which was said to have protected Cao from the influences of the ‘prevalent teachings of transmigration, fortune-telling, sorcery, geomancy and divination’. Cao was allegedly often under attack from Buddhist and Daoist practitioners in his home region, including at one point his own father. However, the Confucian scholar managed somehow to emerge with his values intact. Cao was largely a devout follower of the Cheng–Zhu School, however, he did have his differences with **Zhu Xi**. Cao accepted the dualistic nature of the relationship between *li* (principle) and *qi* (material force), although he granted greater agency to *li* in its interaction with *qi*.

**References:** Giles, 1898: 763; Wu & Song, 1992: 1093–4.

JAMES A. ANDERSON

## Caolu xuepai 草廬學派

(The School of Wu Cheng)

Because he led such a long life, served at the Imperial Academy and Hanlin Academy, and travelled so widely north and south, **Wu Cheng** developed a large following of students and disciples. He was a prolific classical scholar and essayist, and his ideas were disseminated widely so that he was well known in the Ming and Qing eras.

Among Wu’s early disciples, the most influential was **Yu Ji** 虞集, whose father, Yu Ji 虞汲 (b. 1245), was friendly with Wu Cheng. From his youth, Yu Ji the son developed a deep appreciation of Wu’s teachings. In his *Record of Conduct* of Wu Cheng, Yu emphasises the following contributions made by Wu: Wu’s rescue of the scholarly tradition in the waning years of the Song and early Yuan, his contribution to education at the Imperial Academy and Hanlin

Academy, his contributions to classical scholarship, his interpretations of the Song Neo-Confucians and his individualised teaching style. Yu served with his mentor at the Classics Mat (*jingyan* 經筵) colloquium in 1324, and between 1329 and 1330, Yu served at the Academy of Scholars in the Kuizhang Pavilion (*Kuizhangge xueshi yuan* 奎章閣學士院). Yu was the mentor of the late Yuan *Spring and Autumn Annals* (*Chunqiu*) scholar **Zhao Fang** 趙汭 and introduced Zhao to Wu's philosophy, including Wu's attempts to reconcile the teachings of Zhu Xi and Lu Jiuyuan (*hehui zhulu* 和會朱陸). Another disciple, Yuan Mingshan 元明善 (1269–1322), who served in the Hanlin Academy, studied the Five Classics (*Wu jing*) with Wu Cheng and was deeply influenced by Wu's emphasis on the writings of the Cheng brothers.

Wu taught Hui Hui 回回 (1283–1333), the eldest son of Buqumu (不忽木, 1255–1300), a Central Asian student of **Xu Heng** who had tutored Khubilai (r. 1260–1294) and recommended Wu Cheng, Liu Yin and other Confucians to the court. Wu praised Hui Hui for his retiring attitude, comparing him favourably with careerists. Wu had an open-minded view of many of the *se-mu* 色目, or Central Asian people even when compared with Han Chinese, and was supported by, and promoted them.

Wu's later disciples include Pi Jin 皮晉 (?–?), the son-in-law of Yu Ji, whom Wu taught in 1307, at which time Wu probably wrote his essay *In Commemoration of the Studio [for Pi Jin] to Honour the Virtuous Nature and Maintain Constant Inquiry and Study*, attacking textual exegesis and championing moral enlightenment. A disciple with whom Wu had contact in his last years was the precocious Xie Guan 解觀 (1310–1360), who was familiar with Wu's historical work. Xie questioned the legitimacy of the Liao and Jin, and, indirectly, of Mongol rule prior to 1279. His opinion met with official opposition, and the Song history project was eventually completed without him (Xie wrote his own version of the

Song history before his death). Xie was a link in the chain of independent-minded scholars who did not accept official historical interpretations.

Other members of the school include the scholar-essayist Jie Xisi 揭傒斯 (1274–1344), who served with Yu Ji at the Academy of Scholars in the Kuizhang Pavilion and who composed Wu's funerary tablet (*shen dao bei* 神道碑), and Wei Su 危素 (1303–1372), who studied with Wu and had a distinguished career under the Yuan in the Hanlin Academy, the Imperial Academy, the Secretariat and the Bureau of History, where he set in motion the project culminating in the *History of the Yuan* in early Ming. Wei served in the Hanlin during the Ming, though he was criticised for having served the Mongols, and also composed Wu Cheng's chronological biography (*nian pu* 年譜). Another follower, Gong Shitai 貢師泰 (1289–1362), who served in the Imperial Academy, in the Hanlin Academy and as an official in Shaoxing, inherited Wu's penchant for synthesising Zhu and Lu and for criticising the emphasis on memorisation in the civil service examination system. Wu was also associated with **Huang Ze**, an independent-minded classicist who remained loyal to the Song, retired into private teaching in his early thirties, and became influential in his later years on the late Yuan *Annals* scholar Zhao Fang.

Wu had a significant impact on scholars associated with the Learning of the Heart/Mind (**xin xue** 心學) in the Ming era, without there being a direct line of transmission of his philosophy, because of the popularisation of his ideas through his many associates and disciples.

**References:** Franke & Twitchett, 1994: 554–6; Gedalecia, 1981: 188–90; Gedalecia, 1982: 291–300; Goodrich & Fang, 1976: II, 1464–7; Hu Qing, 1996: 249–55; Langlois, 1981: 89, 96 and 1978; *Song–Yuan xuean*, 1966: 92: 1a–58a; Yuan Ji, 1978.

DAVID GEDALECIA

## Chan, Wing-tsit 陳榮捷

1901–1994

Chan was one of the world's leading translators and interpreters of **Neo-Confucianism** in the second half of the twentieth century. Chan's early work focused on the religious and philosophical dimensions of Confucianism and Chinese thought generally. While the vast majority of his scholarship dealt with Confucianism, Chan also translated the ancient classic of Daoism, *The Laozi* and the Hui Neng's *Platform Sutra*, a Chan Buddhist text. Chan's work on *Sources of Chinese Tradition* and his own *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*, an anthology of readings, established him as one of the leading translator-explicators of the various philosophico-religious trends characterising the traditional Chinese mind. His translation of **Wang Shouren's** *Instructions for Practical Living* (1963), and **Zhu Xi's** and **Lü Zuqian's** *Reflections on Things at Hand* (1967) clarified Chan's status as the leading translator of Neo-Confucian texts into English. His translation of **Chen Chun's** *Neo-Confucian Terms Explained*, further strengthened Chan's standing as a translator. In his later work, Chan turned to explicating the thought of Zhu Xi and Neo-Confucianism more fully. While Chan's scholarship has highlighted philosophical topics and themes, it is always grounded in specific recognition of the historicity of the thinkers and/or notions being considered. Throughout his career, Chan was a leading figure in the promotion of East–West philosophical dialogue, often comparing or contrasting Confucian, Buddhist and Daoist texts and/or thinkers with those of the West.

JOHN A. TUCKER

## Chang Chi-yŏn 張志淵

1864–1921

(*zi* Sun So 舜韶, Hwa Myung 和明, *hao* Wiam 韋庵)

From the time of the disintegration of the Korean empire, Chang worked for the

movement towards the return of sovereignty and protection of his nation, as an advocate of patriotic enlightenment and Confucian reform. He was a student of Chang Bok-gu 張福樞 (1815–1900, *zi* Gyung Ha 景遐, *hao* Sa Min Hun 四未軒) and Huh Hun 許薰 (1836–1907, *zi* Sun Ga 舜歌, *hao* Bang San 舫山) in Yŏngnam province, and at the same time sought after various scholarly exchanges with the representative scholars **Kwak Chong-suk** and **Yi Sung-hŭi** 李承熙 (1847–1916, *zi* Gyae Do 啟道, *hao* Han Gyae 韓溪) forming the basis for his own Yŏngnam School of the Way (*Tohak* 道學). However, upon reading **Chŏng Yag-yong's** work, he relinquished *Tohak* and compiled the *Chŏngbo Taehan Gangyukgo* 增補大韓疆域考 as a supplement to Chŏng's *Jirishu* 地理書. Inheriting **Yi Ik** and Chŏng Yag-yong's *Sirhak*, Chang developed in his time a movement of patriotic enlightenment, devoting himself to this and forming the Korean Self-Empowerment Association (*Taehan Jaganghwae* 大韓自強會). By 1905, Japan had forced a one-sided 'protective' treaty with Korea, at which time Chang, as the president of the Sung Gyung Newspaper, wrote an article entitled 'Today We Weep With Abandon', for which he was imprisoned by the Japanese authorities.

Chang's representative work *The Origins of Chosŏn Confucianism* (*Chosŏn Yugyo Yunwŏn* 朝鮮儒教淵源) was the first work detailing the history of Korean Confucianism, becoming a guide for later work in this area with his description of the formation and development of various schools and his systematisation of each perspective. Naturally he centred the text on the traditional *Sŏngnihak* of **Yi Hwang** and **Yi I** but he placed importance on **Chŏng Chedu's** learning of Wang Yangming (**Wang Shouren**) from which he gave a detailed description of the *Horak* Debate. He also drew attention to the elements of Confucian theory and practical economics in the *Sirhak* of **Yu Hyŏng-wŏn**, Chŏng Yag-yong, Pak Chi-wŏn 朴趾源 (1737–1805, *zi* Chong Mi 仲美, *hao* Yun Am 燕巖), and Hong



Tae-yong 洪大容 (1731–1783, *zi* Duk Bo 德保, *hao* Dam Hun 湛軒). One important characteristic of his understanding of Confucianism lies in his reappraisal of the religiosity of Confucianism. Due to Chang's work, **Pak Ŭn-sik** and others formed the Great Unity (*datong*) *Taetonggyo* 大同教 religious movement with the Confucian reformation. Chang's Confucian reformation movement also reformulated for the times various theories of the basic character of Confucianism.

**Reference:** Ch'oe Yŏng-sŏng, 1997.

JANG-TAE KEUM

## Changzhou Jinwen Jingxuepai

常州今文經學派

(The New Text School of Changzhou)

The Changzhou New Text School was a Confucian school based in Changzhou 常州 in the Qing dynasty (1644–1911) which advocated the New Text Learning (*Jinwen jingxue* 今文經學) of the Han dynasty (206 BCE–220 CE), focusing on *Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan* (*Gongyang's Commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals*).

The pioneer of the school was Zhuang Cunyu 庄存与 (1719–1788, *zi* Fang Geng 方耕, *hao* Yang Tian 養恬), a native of Changzhou 常州. Zhuang received his *jinshi* degree in 1745, and then served as a Hanlin Academy adviser and personal secretary to Emperor Qianlong (r. 1736–1795). Zhuang wrote several treatises based on the Old Text of the *Yi jing* (*Book of Changes*) and *Zhou li* (*The Rites of the Zhou*). Dissatisfied with the apolitical trend of his contemporaries of the Han Learning, Zhuang engaged on a work entitled *Chunqiu Zhengci* 春秋正辭 (*Corrections on the Spring and Autumn Annals*) which signalled the beginning of the reconnaissance of the New Text School.

Zhuang believed that the *Chunqiu* had encoded Confucius' vision of history and demonstrated Confucius' intention to pass judgement on the violence, lawlessness and

corruption of his age. Therefore the aim of the study on the *Chunqiu* was to disclose Confucius' statecraft intent (*jingshi zhizhi* 經世之旨) for the benefit of reforming the present world. According to Zhuang, the *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan* (*Zuo's Commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals*) is primarily no more than a historical record of facts while the *Gongyang Commentary* which represents the New Text School (*Jinwen xuepai* 今文學派) in the Han dynasty, contains historical interpretations that reveal the true vision of Confucius' chronicle of events. Zhuang's view was associated with the consensus of the New Text School that reads into the *Chunqiu* a political and moral lesson. Defying those who studied philologically the nomenclature of artefacts which pre-occupied the Han Learning School in the Qing dynasty, Zhuang was determined to clarify 'the great meanings conveyed in subtle words' (*Weiyen Dayi* 微言大義) in the *Gongyang Commentary*. He based his reconstruction of the meaning of the *Annals* on the annotations of New Text scholars such as **Dong Zhongshu**, in particular **He Xiu**. By stressing the *Chunqiu* as the mainstay to bear Confucius' authentic teaching, Zhuang pointed to a new direction and a new approach in opposition both to the Song Learning and to the Han Learning.

Zhuang Cunyu's studies on the New Text version of the *Gongyang Commentary* were carried forward by Zhuang Shuzu 庄述祖 (1751–1816), Zhuang Youke 庄有可 (?–?), and Zhuang Shoujia 庄壽甲 (1774–1828), and were especially promoted by Song Xiangfeng 宋翔鳳 (1776–1860, *zi* 于庭) and Liu Fenglu 劉逢祿 (1776–1829, *zi* 申受), all belonged to Zhuang's clan. They used the methods of evidential research (*kaozheng* 考證) of the Han Learning to support Zhuang Cunyu's rather theoretical studies.

Taking advantage of his etymological knowledge, Song Xiangfeng extended the coverage of New Text Confucian studies from the *Chunqiu* to the *Analects* (*Lunyu*). In his *Lunyu shuoyi* 論語說義 (*On the Meanings of the Analects*), he contended that Confucius had already presented his view of

human nature (*xing*) and the Way of Heaven (*Tian dao*) through esoteric words (*wei yan* 微言) in the *Analects*, and those words were best evaluated in light of the ‘learnings’ encoded in the *Chunqiu*. He affirmed that both texts were the depository of the true teachings bequeathed by Confucius as an uncrowned king (*su wang*), whose teaching was reemerging just in time for the people in a new period of chaos.

Liu Fenglu served as the director of the Ministry of Rites and Ceremony after he received his *jinshi* degree in 1814. With over a dozen of works on the *Chunqiu* and other classics, he successfully transformed the New Text tradition into an epistemological leverage, which was considered a higher quality method of learning than the empirical method, by employing his distinguished knowledge on the empirically based philological and phonological research.

Liu Fenglu again assumed that Confucius’ *Spring and Autumn Annals* was the key to find out ‘the intent of the sages’ and He Xiu represented the only surviving link between the New Text Confucianism of the Former Han dynasty and later New Text School. In *Chunqiu Gongyang jing heshi shili* (春秋公羊經何氏釋例, *Examples of He’s remarks on the Gongyang Commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals*) and *Gongyang Heshi jiegou jian* (公羊何氏解詁箋, *He’s Explanations and Evaluations on the Gongyang Commentary*), Liu made a systematic exposition of He Xiu’s doctrine and explained the meanings of some of He Xiu’s eccentric ideas such as the ‘Unfolding of the Three Periods’, and ‘Going through the Three Periods of Unity’. Liu’s research on He Xiu revealed the link between Han Confucian notions of political reform and the doctrines of laws and punishments advocated by early Legalism. The implications of this link between Legalism and *Gongyang* Confucianism were further developed by Liu’s students **Wei Yuan** and **Gong Zizhen**.

Along with Song Xiangfeng who raised questions concerning the authenticity of the *Rites of Zhou*, Liu Fenglu initiated an argument on the origin of the Old Text

portions of the *Zuo’s Commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals* by examining the discrepancies between the texts of Zuo’s Commentary and that of the *Chunqiu*. He accused **Liu Xin** of interpolating the *Zuo* chronicle as an interpretation of the Classics and even of having forged the title of the *Zuo Commentary*. Thereafter the dispute between the Old and New Texts of the Han Dynasty was reopened again, and those Classics’ texts were put into investigation on a large scale.

The rise of Changzhou School’s classical scholarship, particularly their turn to the *Gongyang* Commentary, was a response to the political corruption since the mid-Qing dynasty. Zhuang’s group focused on the attempt to use the language of Confucian politics in order to create a legitimate framework for correcting the wrongs of the contemporary world. The school indeed effectively influenced the academic and political life of the mid and late Qing dynasty. Gong Zizhen and Wei Yuan further developed the Changzhou School, particularly Liu Fenglu’s views of Legalism and *Gongyang* Confucianism. Other followers included **Shao Yichen**, Dai Wang 戴望 (1837–1873), **Pi Xirui**, and **Liao Ping** who all challenged the authenticity of the Old Texts from different aspects. Nineteenth-century successors shifted their interests from interpreting the Classics to reforming the present. Through their efforts, Changzhou New Text School transcended its geographical origin and became a powerful current in intellectual circles of the early nineteenth century, which led ultimately to great late Qing reformers, such as **Kang Youwei**.

**References:** Elman, 1990; Liang Qichao, 1920; Zhao & Guo, 1989.

REBEKAH X. ZHAO

**Chao Cuo** 晁錯  
200–154 BCE

Chao Cuo is listed as one of the Legalists in the *Book of the Former Han dynasty* (*Han shu*,



1962: 1735), mainly because Chao took the legal policies as the arts of government and was responsible for reenforcing many legal codes during the reigns of Han Wendi (r. 180–157 BCE) and Han Jingdi (r. 157–141 BCE). Being trained in the tradition of Legalism, Chao was also a student of **Fu Sheng** who specialised in the *Book of Documents*, and received orally the ‘New Text’ version of this Classic. Chao’s knowledge of history and politics enabled him to become influential during the early years of the Han, and served in one of the highest three offices of state, as imperial counsellor in 155–154 BCE. Accused wrongly by his rivals, Chao was condemned to public execution in 154 BCE.

Chao is generally considered an extremely capable statesman who paid good attention to practical matters such as how to increase agricultural production for the state and how to defend the country from invaders from the North. Many of his positive suggestions on how to consolidate the central government became accepted as state policies. Emphasising the importance of legal codes for a stable state, however, Chao incorporated some Confucian virtues into his proposals for government policies, arguing that virtues such as loyalty (*zhong*) and filial piety (*xiao*) should be established as the goals of legal punishments and awards. He modified the extreme Legalist policies based on severe punishing laws, and advocated that the ruler should be the benevolent ‘parent’ by demonstrating excellent virtues.

*Han shu* lists thirty-one *pian* of Chao’s writings, and contains extracts of Chao’s essays and his replies to the emperor’s queries on state policies.

**References:** *Han shu*, 1962: 2273–303; Twitchett & Loewe, 1986: 144–52.

XINZHONG YAO

## Chao Yuezhi 晁說之

1059–1129

(zi Yidao 以道, Boyi 伯以, or Jici 季此, hao Jingyu sheng 景迂生, the student of Jingyu (Sima Guang))

Chao Yuezhi was a late Northern Song literatus with broad and eclectic intellectual interests. Chao attracted the interest and recommendation of influential officials early in life. For example, after passing the *jinshi* examination in 1082, the breadth of his knowledge and his classical scholarship impressed both **Su Shi** and **Fan Zuyu**. His political career alternated characteristically between capital service and political exile or sinecures. This was mainly the result of his opposition to the New Policies of **Wang Anshi**. He submitted a long series of memorials to the throne in 1100 that discussed the need to reform government policy (*Song-Yuan Xuean*, 22: 1b).

Despite his periodic withdrawal into sinecures, Chao continued to take his political responsibilities seriously. Thus, when serving as Prefect of Chengzhou 成州 (Gansu), he responded to a drought by remitting its taxes on his own authority. When summoned to the capital in the fateful year of 1126, he advised the Emperor Qinzong 欽宗 (r. 1126) not to acquiesce to Jurchen Jin’s demands and not to abandon the capital city.

Chao participated in many of the important intellectual movements of his day, but he identified himself most clearly as a student of **Sima Guang**, hence his stylistic name, Jingyu sheng, the student of Jingyu (Sima Guang). His debt to Sima largely concerned his study of the Classics, especially his work on cosmology and the *Yi jing*. Chao’s opposition to the New Policies no doubt was related to his connection to Sima Guang. The *Song-Yuan xuean* notes that Chao was heavily influenced by Sima Guang’s critique of **Mengzi** and recognised the importance that Wang Anshi attached to that text. In fact, Chao succeeded in convincing Emperor Qinzong to eliminate the *Mengzi* from the imperial lectures on the Classics in 1126 (*Song-Yuan xuean*, 22: 1b).

Chao’s work on the *Yi jing* and cosmology also drew him to the work of **Shao Yong**. This was not, however, his only connection with figures who would become central to the *dao xue* movement. He also

became familiar with **Zhang Zai's** teachings and recorded some statements by the Cheng brothers in his miscellany, the *Chaoshi keyu* 晁氏客語 (*Polite Remarks of Mr Chao*). Nevertheless, he was later criticised for his interest in Buddhism (especially Tiantai 天台 teachings and the *Lotus sutra*) (*Song-Yuan xuean*, 22: 2a).

Chao's greatest intellectual legacy was his classical scholarship. This drew not only on Sima Guang and the early *dao xue* thinkers, but also on the thought of **Sun Fu** via the lectures on the *Shang shu* by Sun's student Jiang Qian 姜潛 (?-?). Chao's extant works include studies of the *Yi jing* as well as a *Commentary on the Doctrine of the Mean* (*Zhongyong zhuan* 中庸傳). His work on the *Yi jing* however made the biggest impression on those who came after him. **Lü Zuqian** drew on Chao for his own edition of that classic (Tillman 1992: 120). His literary collection, the *Jingyu sheng ji* 景迂生集 (*Collected Works of the Student of Jingyu*) is also extant.

**References:** *Song-Yuan xuean*, 1966: 22; Tillman, 1992a.

ANTHONY DEBLASI

## Chavannes, Edouard 1865–1918

Chavannes was editor of the Sinological journal, *T'oung pao*, between 1904 and 1916. He also translated **Sima Qian's** *Shiji* 史記 (*Les Memoires historiques*).

JOHN A. TUCKER

## Chen Chun 陳淳 1159–1223

(zi Anqing 安卿, hao Beixi 北溪, Wenan 文安)

Chen Chun, a native of southern Fujian where he spent most of his life, was first drawn to the thought of **Zhu Xi** in 1180 when he received a copy of the *Jinsi lu* (*Reflections on Things at Hand*). More than a decade

passed before he had an opportunity to meet and study with Zhu Xi. Chen revered Zhu Xi, but, including a second period in 1199, his personal contact with Zhu came to a total of only 217 days. Nevertheless, Zhu Xi thought very highly of him, and Chen became one of his most trusted disciples during the last decade of Zhu's life. Chen's marriage to a daughter of one of Zhu Xi's disciples provided a further personal bond between the two men. When his son was three he first arranged four-character sayings for him and, when that proved too difficult, wrote a three-character text.

After Zhu's death Chen dedicated himself to propagating Zhu Xi's ideas by teaching, lecturing and writing. Having failed the state examinations (which he held in low regard), he remained a local teacher but by 1217 when he travelled to the capital to participate in a special examination he enjoyed a wide reputation as a scholar. On his way home he delivered four lectures in Yanling 嚴陵 (Zhejiang). Although he did not receive a degree, he was honoured by the throne, given a low rank but died before he could assume an appointment as an assistant magistrate.

Chen Chun's writings include his highly regarded record of 600 conversations with Zhu Xi preserved in the latter's *Classified Conversations* (*Zhuzi yulei*) and his famous handbook of Neo-Confucian terms, *Beixi ziyi* as well as lectures, correspondence, poems, etc. gathered in his collected works. He also wrote a primer for his son and authored works on rites, poetry and learning for women, *nüxue* 女學, but these, as well as his discourses on *The Great Learning* (*Daxue*) and *The Doctrine of the Mean* (*Zhongyong*) have been lost.

At their first meeting Zhu encouraged Chen to study the source of filiality and of all virtues, namely *li* (principle), but during the second and last period of instruction concerned himself more with the application of principle in everyday life. In his devotion to teaching as well as in his writings Chen strove to exemplify and continue what he

had learned from Zhu Xi and in doing so influenced how others understood the *Learning of the Way* (*dao xue* 道學).

Chen, like others in the tradition (see *dao tong*), traced this teaching all the way back to Fu Xi and held that after **Mengzi** it had been lost 'for over 1400 years', to be retrieved only in his own Song dynasty when 'the original *qi* came together (*hui* 回) once more'. While Zhu Xi in his widely read preface to *The Doctrine of the Mean* credited the Cheng brothers (**Cheng Hao** and **Cheng Yi**) with the retrieval of the teaching, Chen assigned the key role to **Zhou Dunyi**, telling his audience in a lecture at Yanling that Zhou Dunyi received it straight from Heaven and then passed it on to the Cheng brothers. Next in line was Zhu Xi who 'refined and clarified' the ideas of the Chengs, synthesising the teaching which constitutes the only gate that can lead to success for anyone wishing to perfect himself and become a sage. (*Beixi daquanji*, 15: 4b–3a, in Chan, 1986b 179–81).

More specifically, Chen followed Zhu Xi in stressing the Four Books (*Si shu*) and followed Zhu in the sequence in which he said they should be read (*Great Learning*, *Analects* (*Lunyu*), *Mengzi* (*Mengzi*), *Doctrine of the Mean*). Chen no doubt would have been gratified by the statement in the 1695 preface to his *Beixi Ziyi* calling it a ladder to Zhu's commentaries on the Four Books. In an essay on how to read, Chen again agreed with Zhu Xi in advising that one should not allow oneself to be distracted by cleverly dissecting words but 'calmly ponder their meaning'. He also warned against examination learning which superficially resembles genuine learning. It involves the same texts but does so only to skim their surface hunting for expressions to stitch together for use on examination essays and fails to reach their inner meaning. Conversely, the learning of the sages and worthies is no obstacle to writing examination essays and will lead to literary discussions brilliant in spirit.

According to Chen the main threat to genuine learning came from Buddhism

whose *dao* falsely resembles the genuine Way (*dao*). Chen charged that Buddhism was being propagated by the followers of **Lu Jiuyuan** who Chen depicts as practising Chan Buddhist meditation and completely neglecting book learning. Chen attacked both Buddhism and Lu's followers in the lectures he gave at Yanling and also takes issue with them in the final section of the *Beixi ziyi*. Included among his objections is his criticism of the Buddhist idea of reincarnation. Chen affirms Cheng Yi's teaching that the *qi* disperses after death. Nevertheless, he also holds that since birth occurs from the union of *jing* (essence or man's semen) and *qi* (material force), ancestors and descendants are connected through life and death by the same *qi*. This forms the basis for ancestral rites and provides the standard by which Chen judges the propriety of such rites as well as the legitimacy of adoption.

Reflecting Zhu Xi's attitude late in life, Chen did not include an entry for quiet-sitting (*jing zuo*) in *Beixi ziyi* but, in a letter, he affirmed the Confucian practice of gathering the mind/heart that had strayed (*fang xin* 放心) and nourishing the basic source. This he contrasts with the selfishness of Daoists who seek to communicate with the spirits and attain long life and of Buddhists who seek to empty the mind of all thought and escape rebirth. Furthermore, Chen charges that Daoists and Buddhists do this day and night whereas Confucians engage in quiet-sitting only in their spare time (*Beixi daquanji*, 33, 7a–b).

Chen's concern for action is reflected in his claim that knowledge and action are one: 'If action is not energetic the fault lies not in acting but stems from knowledge not being genuinely acute'. He goes on to compare seeing the good to loving beauty, and seeing evil to hating a foul odour. Afterwards knowledge is to the point and the energy of action already exists within what (*The Great Learning*) calls the perfection of knowledge (*zhi zhi zhi* 知之至). (*Beixi daquanji* 26b–27a) Chen equates knowledge and vision in a passage included in

*Song-Yuan xuean* (Records of Song Yuan Scholars, Section 68), 'Knowledge and action are not two separate matters. It is like walking on a road: the eyes see and the feet walk, neither is dispensable. If a blind man without the use of his eyes relies only on his feet walking, he will not be able to walk an inch; and if a lame man without the use of his feet, relies only on his eyes to see, he too cannot get anywhere'.

In keeping with the prominence Chen assigns to Zhou Dunyi in reclaiming the long lost *Learning of the Way*, Chen praises Zhou's *Taijitu shuo* (*Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate*) saying that the meaning of *tai ji* was unclear until Zhou identified it with *li* (principle). *Tai ji* is in root and branch. It was present in the primordial, undifferentiated chaos, *hun lun* 渾淪 and is identified as the mysterious functioning, *miao yong* 妙用 of *hun lun*. It is there before there was any there (*wu* 無) and continues even when the world reverts to that condition. Like the North star around which the other stars revolve, *tai ji* is the axis for all principles (*li*). It is the apex, the point of convergence, similar to the ridgepole of a house or the tip of a pagoda where all the structural members converge except that the Supreme Ultimate has no physical form. As *principle* it is one and many. It is the source of dynamism. It is what makes the world go round, 'The reason Heaven forever rotates, the earth forever exists, and man and things forever produce and reproduce without cease, is not that each does so of its own accord but because all are directed by the principle within them'. (*Beixi ziyi* No.143, Chan, 1986b 117–18 modified.)

*Tai ji* is allotted more space than *li* in *Beixi ziyi*, but *li* remains a central concept. For Chen, as for his predecessors, *li* is unchanging. He quotes Zhu Xi in explaining that *li* has four aspects. It is possible or enabling (*neng ran* 能然), necessary (*bi ran* 必然), morally correct (*dang ran* 當然) and natural (*zi ran* 自然). For example *li* makes it possible, necessary, moral and natural for people to feel compassion when they

see an infant about to fall into a well. (*Beixi daquanji* 6, 14b–16b, reference to the *Mengzi* 2A: 6). *Li* enables people to feel compassion, and they necessarily feel compassion because they cannot bear to see the infant fall into the well. Rescuing the child is moral, not to do so is to defy the principles of Heaven and deny humanity. And it is natural because there is nothing artificial about it.

People, like everything else, are a combination of *li* and *qi*. In human beings, Chen like Zhu Xi, identifies *li* with the nature, *xing*, which thus is good. The nature is located in the heart/mind, *xin*, described as a vessel, but the heart/mind, also contains *qi*. In ordinary people, *xin* is prone to error, likely to be obstructed by *qi* which is not pure and clear. Only the original ancient sages possessed *qi* in its purest, clearest and most vital form, but ever since that time long ago, it has deteriorated. Even Confucius' *qi*, while pure and clear, was too weak for him to attain honour and wealth or to ensure him the longevity due a sage, for he lived only a little over seventy years far short of the lifespan allegedly attained by Yao or Shun, the legendary sage-kings. In his own dynasty Chen asserts that **Sima Guang**, though highly endowed, lacked 'bright and lofty insight' and thus stubbornly refused to be persuaded by the arguments of the Cheng brothers.

Although there are differences in their *qi*, everyone can purify himself and become a sage if he earnestly dedicates his heart/mind to this most noble and difficult task. The problem is to keep the feelings on the right track. Chen follows Cheng Yi in applying the conceptual pair *ti yong* 體用, conventionally translated 'substance and function', identifying the *ti* of the heart/mind with the state before the feelings are aroused, and its function (*yong*) with the active state. Or, more simply, he states that before it is aroused, the heart/mind contains only the nature but when activated the feelings issue from the nature. He also quotes **Zhang Zai**, whose *Western Inscription* he much admired, that 'the heart/mind

controls and unites (*tong*) the nature and the feelings' and, similarly, Zhu Xi that 'the nature is the *ti* of the heart/mind, the feelings its function, and the heart/mind is the master (*zhu* 主) of feelings and the nature'.

Since they issue from the nature, the feelings are good, and they each contain a moral norm (*dangran zhi ze*, 當然之則), but the heart/mind, as master, *zhuzai* 主宰, needs to control them lest they deviate into selfish human desires. These evidently do not originate from the original nature, but Chen does not say outright that they issue from the *qi*.

As Chen intended, his discussion of the nature of the universe and of human beings, as well as his views on questions concerning values and virtues, moral practice and practical/moral issues such as the relationship between standard conduct and situational weighing that departs from the standard (*jing/quan* 經權, see *quan*) are based on the positions maintained by Zhu Xi. He presents these ideas in a more compact and hence manageable form but did not claim to add to them. Since he thereby helped shape the tradition, his importance for the student of intellectual history is assured though his work may not be of equal interest to philosophers.

**References:** Chan, Wing-tsit, 1986a; de Bary, 1989; Tillman, 1992b.

CONRAD SCHIROKAUER

## Chen Feng 陳豐

1810–1882

(*zi* Lan Pu 蘭浦, *hao* Dongshu 東塾)

Chen Feng, born in Fanyu (Guangdong), was a Confucian classicist and thinker of the Qing dynasty. He was a successful candidate in the imperial examination at the provincial level in 1832. Later, he was appointed the magistrate of Heyuan county 河源縣 but he resigned from the position not long after due to ill health. He was interested in academic studies and participated in editing

the *Fanyu County Annual* 番禺縣志, and the *Guangdong Tongzhi* 廣東通志, among others. He was the president of *Xuehai Tang* school 學海堂 for twenty-seven years and was the head of *Longxi Shuyuan* 龍溪書院 and *Jupo Jingshe* 菊坡精舍 for some years. He was proficient in astronomy, geography, calculating calendars, mathematics, phonology, philology and music. He was especially good at geography and supervised the drawing of Guangdong provincial maps. Being a specialist in commentaries on classics himself, Chen criticised the academic trend of only paying attention to historical textual explanations and textual research while ignoring the social function and philosophical implications of classical studies. He thought that textual study is a means to enable researchers to acquire the underlying principles and to apply these principles to social life. He stressed that politics must be based on talented people, and the cultivation of such talents relies on classical studies. He insisted that both the Han Learning (*Han xue* 漢學) and the Song Learning (*Song xue* 宋學) are important and should be treated equally and be studied with diligence. He disagreed with **Xunzi's** theory that human nature is originally evil (*Xing e lun*) and agreed with **Mengzi's** theory that human nature is originally good (*Xing shan lun*). He went on to explain that human nature contains good elements but not yet pure goodness and that the nature of an evil person is not purely good, nor is it purely evil, but contains good elements. He took a positive attitude towards the study of western sciences and stressed the combination of the theory of human nature into education theory and educational practice in order to promote people's spiritual level. His main works include the *Dongshu ji* 東塾集 in six *juan* (volumes), *Dongshu dushu ji* 東塾讀書集 in fifteen *juan*, and the *Hanru tongyi* 漢儒通義 in seven *juan*.

**References:** Chan, Wing-tsit, 1963d; Wu & Song, 1992; *Zhongguo ruxue baike quanshu*, 1997.

OUYANG KANG



**Chen Fuliang** 陳傅良

1137–1203

(zi Junju 君舉, hao Zhizhai 止齋)

Chen Fuliang was a native of Rui-an 瑞安 in Wenzhou 溫州 County (Zhejiang). He was known to his students as Master Zhizhai 止齋先生. In his youth, Chen had already gained a strong reputation for scholarship. In 1172 he received his *jinshi* degree with the first rank. However, his first appointment was as a low-ranking instructor in the county of Taizhou 泰州 (Jiangsu). Before his taking up the position, he was called up to the court by the high official Gong Maoliang 龔茂良 (1121–1178, zi Shizhi 實之) to serve as the Recorder of the Imperial Academy (taixue lu 太學錄). However, when Gong was forced to resign, Chen was also demoted and served as Tea and Salt Supervisor (liti-juchang pingchayan 歷提舉常平茶鹽), among other lower-ranking positions. When Emperor Ningzong 寧宗 (r. 1195–1224) came to the throne, Chen was appointed to the concurrent high-ranking positions of Secretariat Drafter (zhongshu sheren 中書舍人), Expositor-in-Waiting (shi jiang 侍講), and a member of the Hanlin Academy. Chen died at home at the age of sixty-seven.

Chen's earliest teachers included the locally prominent scholars Zheng Boxiong 鄭伯熊 (?–?) and **Xue Jixuan**. Chen studied at the Imperial Academy with **Zhang Shi**, and later in life he became a friend and student of **Lü Zuqian** and a close associate of **Zhu Xi**. Chen also served as the chief examiner for the civil service examination session attended by fellow Zhejiang native **Chen Liang**, at which Chen Fuliang indicated personal approval for Chen Liang's opinionated essays. Chen Fuliang was strongly against empty talk about human nature and principles which he thought were typical of Confucian discourse in his day. He advocated that the aim of learning was the ordering of society and the governing of the state, and therefore paid great attention to practical matters such as agriculture, political institutions and military strategies.

Chen's own writings include *Explanation of the Rites of Zhou* 周禮說 (3 juan), *Later Commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals* 春秋後傳 and *A Guide to Edicts found in the Zuo Zhuan* 左氏章指 (collectively 40 juan), *Commentary on the Mao Shi* 毛詩解詁 (20 juan), *A Record of Reading* 讀書譜 (1 juan), *Notes on the History of the western Han* 西漢史鈔 (17 juan) and *Annals of the Jianlong Period* (960–963) 建隆編 (1 juan). Chen wrote this last work in 1195–1196 as a reading aid on the reign of Emperor Taizu 太祖 (r. 960–976) to be read in conjunction with Li Tao's 李燾 (1115–1184) *Continuation of the Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government* 續資治通鑑長編.

**Reference:** *Song–Yuan xuean*.

JAMES A. ANDERSON

**Chen Guan** 陳瓘

1060–1124

(zi Yingzhong 瑩中, hao Liaoweng 了翁)

Chen Guan was a literatus of the Northern Song dynasty (960–1126) whose career was inextricably tied to the factional struggles at the end of this period. He is described in somewhat conventional terms as being gifted as a youth and showing little personal interest in government service (e.g., *Song Shi*, 1977: 345.10961). Nevertheless, he passed the 1079 *jinshi* examination with the first rank. Although he initially made a good impression on Zhang Dun 章惇 (1035–1105, zi Zihou 子厚) when the two travelled together to the capital, as Zhang moved closer to Cai Jing 蔡京 (1047–1126, zi Yuanchang 元長) and Cai Bian 蔡卞 (1058–1117, zi Yuandu 元度), the main advocates of continuing **Wang Anshi's** New Policies, the differences became insurmountable. During his capital service, Chen repeatedly memorialised the throne to have the Wang partisans removed from power. His criticism earned him the enmity of these men, and he consequently spent much of his career in provincial exile.

His intellectual commitments were quite broad. For example, he defended **Sima Guang** a number of times, especially when Wang partisans suggested destroying the printing blocks for the *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑. In doing so, he seems to have been attempting to defend the place of historical studies in the tradition against the reliance on the Classics advocated by the New Policies regime (Li Qingbi: 7.4a).

Chen was also drawn to cosmological issues. He was influenced by **Shao Yong's** teachings when he compiled his own commentary on the *Yi jing*. His *Yi shuo* 易說 (Explanation of the *Book of Changes*) is still extant. The interest in Shao Yong was not his only connection to the emerging *dao xue* movement. He was introduced to the teachings of **Cheng Hao** by another student of Sima Guang, **Fan Zuyu** (Li Qingbi: 9.7b). Since he himself was from Fujian, he became associated with the Fujian branch of the movement. His descendants were mostly associated with **Yang Shi's** wing of the movement (*Song-Yuan Xuean*, 35: 2b).

Chen shared with many of the late Northern Song *Dao xue* figures an interest in Buddhism and internal questions. Thus, Chen once argued that *bodhi* (*jue* 覺) in the *Avatamsaka sutra* (*Huayan jing* 華嚴經) was identical to *cheng* (sincerity) in the *Zhong yong* (*Doctrine of the Mean*). Besides the *Yi shuo*, Chen's collected writings, under the title *Zun Yao ji* 尊堯集 (A Collection Honouring Yao), are still extant.

**References:** Chen Guan, 1995; *Song-Yuan Xuean*; Song Shi, 1977.

ANTHONY DEBLASI

## Chen Liang 陳亮

1143–1194

(zi Tongfu 同父, hao Longchuan 龍川)

Chen's family had been at the fringe of the literati social class for almost three generations. Although his grandfather and father married into a locally prominent family,

Chen was the first to pass the national civil service examinations; moreover, he passed only at the end of his life and died on his way to his first government post. When Chen Liang was in his early age, the family struggled under the loss of both his great grandfather, who died fighting the invading Jurchens in the 1120s, and most of the family's farmland. Although Chen gained some fame for his hawkish stance against the Jurchen and for his outspoken views as a student at the Imperial Academy, he had repeatedly failed the examinations and suffered beatings and was jailed for his unconventional statements and behaviour. Even though he founded a local academy, became the central figure in the Yongkang School of Confucianism (see **Yongkang xuepai**), and attained scholar-official status at the end of his life, his frustrated and conflicted life contributed to his penchant for bold expression of radical ideas. As a youth, he imitated heroic personalities, studied military strategies and wrote on martial geniuses in history. In his mid-twenties, his failures compelled him into *dao xue* cultivation and study, which was profound enough that his 1173 preface to three Northern Song masters' comments on governance has for centuries been included as part of **Zhu Xi's** own *Collected Works* (*Zhuzi wenji*). By his mid-thirties, he concluded that self-cultivation had not fundamentally altered his temperament and was thus wasted effort; however, **Lü Zuqian's** moderating influence in neighbouring Jinhua 金華 continued to serve as a restraint until Lü's death in 1181.

In 1182, Chen sent ten essays to Zhu Xi that sparked debate through an exchange of letters, for Zhu judged Chen's essays to be far too radical to circulate. Chen championed *quan*, i.e., flexibly weighing circumstances when addressing socio-political problems. While other Confucians had acknowledged the need to adjust normative classical standards (*jing*) to deal with new situations, Chen went farther in identifying situational judgement with integrity (*yi*)



itself. In other words, Chen found ethical value in expediency. Integrity was inherent in situational weighing because what was right evolved with changing times and circumstances. He saw Confucian polarities, such as integrity and utility, as unified in his utilitarian ethic of end results. Zhu noted that Chen's utilitarian ethic would make ethics relative to time and situation; therefore, Zhu sharpened the dichotomy between such polarities by enhancing the priority given to moral integrity. Moreover, Zhu sought to caricature Chen's position as a *realpolitik* endorsement of any and all regimes throughout history. Even though Chen did state that historical rulers achieving significant political successes were surely not devoid of all principles, he was actually quite critical of governmental policies throughout history. Nonetheless, Zhu's caricature of Chen's position has dominated mainstream scholarship.

Rather than justifying whatever past rulers had done, Chen sought to reconstruct and transform Han and Tang leaders into models from which to learn lessons for addressing current socio-political issues. Chen admitted that even the most heroic of Han and Tang rulers compared unfavourably to the sage-kings of the Three Dynasties of classical antiquity; however, he claimed that the stark difference was more apparent than real because the Han through Tang historical record was being unfairly compared to classical idealisations. According to Chen, Confucius had cleansed the historical records of the Three Dynasties while editing the Classics, but the sage had a noble purpose in creating an ideal model for rulers and governments. Unfortunately, later Confucians had mistakenly taken this cleansed master narrative to be historically true; thus, they unfairly judged the actual history of later dynasties by an idealised standard – even though the standard was constructed from a bowdlerised history. Chen's purpose was not to denigrate Confucius, but rather to justify his own freedom to rewrite history in order to formulate

more relevant models for resolving current and future problems in society and polity. As a historically minded scholar, Chen was aware that antiquity was far more complex and much less ideal than the paradigm championed by philosophically minded literati of his own day.

Chen's obsession with arousing his contemporaries to liberate North China from the Jurchen Jin regime provided a catalyst for his development of 'proto-nationalistic' ideas. Just as the *dao* (Way) had evolved through history, it had evolved in relation to particular places, circumstances, peoples and cultures. Thus, the *dao* of Chinese culture was an environmentally and historically conditioned reality that was distinct from the *dao* that had evolved elsewhere and among nomadic peoples. Likewise, the *qi* (material force) found in any particular place and the native peoples there had evolved a distinct character. The Central Plain was unique because it was the locus of the most pure or proper *qi*, which had contributed to the superior culture of the Han Chinese. When the Song lost North China and a remnant dynasty (Southern Song dynasty, 1127–1279) established its base in the lower Yangtze area, the dynasty was essentially trying to stuff China's *qi* into a peripheral corner of the world where it could not survive long in isolation from the North China heartland. Before the *qi* in North China became overly polluted by the odour of sheep and goats from the steppe, the Song should recover the heartland from Jurchen dominance in order to ensure the historical continuity of China's unique *qi* and *dao*. Here, Chen's notions sound similar to German nationalistic conceptions of *volk* and fatherland.

Another area where Chen differed from the mainstream of his day was his willingness to speak for the interest of the merchant class. He and his father had married into a literati family that engaged in mercantile activities; moreover, given the unexplained upturn in his fortunes, enabling him to repurchase the twenty-eight acres of family land lost over five decades earlier, he might

have personally benefited from mercantile investments in the early 1180s. Whatever his personal reasons, his endorsement of the integrity of profitability and pursuit of private interest was consistent with his larger philosophy of the integrity of an ethic of end results. Moreover, his conception of human nature as rooted in material concerns for life's necessities legitimised pursuit of self-interest and material benefits. He spoke out against tight government restrictions against merchants and advocated greater market autonomy. Both Chen and his friend **Ye Shi** were spokesmen for merchants and wealthy people; however, Ye tended to advocate policies that would enhance merchant contributions to the government's interests, while Chen appears more focused on the interests of merchants and other private households.

Even though Chen was an advocate of the interests of private households, he also sought a balance with public interest; moreover, he envisioned law as having a positive role to play in establishing a balance between private (*si*) and public (*gong*) interests. According to Chen, people were by nature self-regarding, but proper laws could orient people toward the greater public interest. Hence, Chen had an unusually positive conception about the role of law in traditional China. Such a positive attitude is all the more surprising because of his own experiences with judicial torture and punishment; only the emperor's intervention rescued him from confinement. Yet, his inclination to perceive a positive role for law was more fundamentally rooted in his view of human nature (*xing*). Instead of focusing, as **Mengzi** had, primarily on the beginnings of virtues innate within human nature, Chen focused on the material necessities for life that made people self-regarding. Since such self-regard was natural and necessary, pursuit of self-interest was quite legitimate. Still, Chen's concern for social welfare turned his attention to the need to balance such self-interest with the larger public good. **Xunzi** had moved in the direction

of having both a material conception of human nature and a positive conception of rituals (*li*) and laws (*fa*); however, there is tension within his writings about whether these normative standards transcended the sage-kings or were created by them.

Chen appears more resolute than Xunzi in clearly asserting a transformative role for law, perhaps because he had a resolution to the issue about natural norms and laws. Here again, his historical consciousness became useful. Because the *dao* evolved and was immanent in historical change, so laws were a part of historical evolution, too. Even though actual laws and their implementation had always been less than ideal, the evolution of law was not devoid of principle (*li*) or reason; thus, there was both a natural or objective aspect of law and a role for people to play in articulating and improving laws. Unfortunately, Chen's glorious pronouncement about the role of law in transforming self-regarding interests into the public interest was made a few months before his death; thus, he did not develop a sustained thesis on the subject that might have provided guidance to later generations. Still, positive views of law, private interests, profitability and historical studies, as well as reconciliation between integrity and advantage, did echo in the writings of some later Confucians, especially those from Zhejiang and the lower Yangtze. Thus, even though it would be difficult to prove direct influence, Chen might be studied as prefiguring such ideas developed in later centuries.

**Reference:** Tillman, 1982; 1992a: 135–7, 145–86; 1994: 9–37, 47–71, 85–7.

HOYT TILLMAN

## Chen Que 陳確

1604–1677

(*zi* Qianchu 乾初)

Chen Que, a native of Haining (Zhejiang) and a disciple of **Liu Zongzhou**, was among a few who waged a total war on *dao xue*

(*Learning of the Way*) in the early Qing. His teachings were emblematic of the trends of purist and ritualist reorientation of Confucian thought that came to prevail at the time. He was most well known for his strident assault on the *Great Learning* (*Daxue*), one of the Four Books (*Si shu*). Employing linguistic and textual arguments, Chen sought to demonstrate that the *Great Learning* was a text of Chan Buddhism. He pointed at terms like ‘original substance’ (*benti* 本體), ‘absence of desire’ (*wuyu* 無欲) as evidence for their origins in Buddhism, for they had been employed in rendering Confucian texts by Song *dao xue* scholars.

In tune with many Confucian thinkers in the early Qing, Chen endorsed a *qi* 氣 ontology, which formed the basis of his view of human nature (*xing*) and ethics. He underscored the role of forming patterns of practice (*xi* 習), which constituted one’s very nature. By stressing the idea that ‘nature’ was a process in the making, Chen came to champion a dynamic and developmental concept of human nature. He put it succinctly when he said: ‘[human] nature grows out of practice’ (*xi yi xing cheng* 習以性成).

Chen was a ritualist in his approach to ethics. The need to cultivate good practice led Chen to the study and reform of rites, which provided for him the best mechanisms for developing good practice. He wrote on a great variety of rites for both scholarly and practical purposes, including a manual for correct Confucian burial. He was involved in reforming the ancestral rites of the lineage to which he belonged. He also authored a *Xin fupu* 新婦譜 (*A New Manual for a Bride*) in order to reform the practice of women.

**Reference:** Chow, 1994.

KAI-WING CHOW

## Chen wei 讖緯

(Prognostication and apocryphal texts)

The term *chen wei* is used to denote two types of writings which should more

properly be treated separately. *Chen*, sometimes rendered as ‘prognostication texts’ were intended to give warnings of events that would change the fortunes of an individual. *Wei*, somewhat loosely termed ‘apocryphal texts’, included some material of the same type, that would serve fortune-tellers, but their main purpose was different. As contrasted with the classical texts (*jing* 經, or warp) the *wei* (woof) were of an esoteric nature and were treated as heterodox writings. Written to elucidate the meaning of the Classical texts, they drew on ideologies which were not approved, and applied them to the *Shang shu*, *Shi jing*, *Yue jing*, *Chunqiu*, *Yi jing* and *Xiao jing*, and also to the *Lunyu*. Although the highly respected **Zheng Xuan** paid attention to some of these writings, they had been bitterly criticised by **Huan Tan** and **Jia Kui**. Banned in the middle of the fifth century these books came under further proscription under Sui Yangdi 隋煬帝 (r. 604–617), some of those which concerned the *Yi jing* being the only ones to survive until Tang times. Thereafter no more than fragments can be found, such remnants being collected by a number of Ming and Qing scholars and being most easily available in a category of Ma Guohan’s 馬國翰 *Yuhan shan fang ji yi shu* 玉函山房輯佚書 of 1853.

In such circumstances it is not possible to determine the dates when the various texts of these two types were compiled. Possibly they may have drawn on preimperial material that had been circulating at a popular level. Some of the *wei* texts may have originated in Former Han times (206 BE–8 CE) but it is perhaps more likely that they took shape under the dispensation of **Wang Mang**. The first of the Later Han emperors (Guangwudi 光武帝, r. 25–57 CE) is said to have appreciated them and it is likely that they gained considerable currency during that dynasty.

**Reference:** Kramers, 1986.

M.H. KIM & MICHAEL LOEWE

## Chen Xianzhang 陳獻章

1428–1500

(*zi* Gongfu 公甫, *hao* Shizhai 石齋, Baisha 白沙)

Chen Xianzhang was a Ming dynasty philosopher, calligrapher and teacher. He was at the beginning of a new movement in Ming philosophy that placed greater emphasis on the cultivation of one's own innate abilities, in contrast to the orthodox **Zhu Xi** School which stressed the study of principle (*li*). In so doing Chen paved the way for **Wang Shouren**. The two were regarded by late Ming and early Qing scholars as the cofounders of Idealistic Confucianism (*xin xue*) in the Ming dynasty (1368–1644). In later times Chen received much less attention, as his writings were very limited in number.

Chen Xianzhang was born on 27 November 1428, in Duhui 都會, in Xinhui 新會 district in Guangdong. His father died shortly before he was born, leaving Chen to be raised by his mother, with whom he was very close throughout his life, and by his grandparents. He passed the provincial examinations at the age of nineteen but was never able to pass the metropolitan *jinshi* exams, though he tried several times. After years of concentrated study, he despaired of finding enlightenment through study alone and determined to seek the truth through meditation. After years of solitary meditation did not lead to his desired goal, he returned to everyday life. Only then did he have the liberating experience he had been seeking, at which point he began to attract students to his residence in search of instruction, among them **Zhan Ruoshui**, who was to become a leading philosopher in his own right. Except for brief visits to Beijing, Chen spent his life at home until he died on 10 March 1500. In 1585 he became the only native of Guangdong to have his tablet placed in the Confucian temple, at which time he was given the honorific title of Wengong 文恭.

The key to understanding Chen Xianzhang's philosophy lies in the manner by which he was able to achieve a liberating sense of understanding. Though study of the orthodox texts of Zhu Xi's Neo-Confucianism was an important part of his education, it was only when he began to realise the power of the individual human mind that he felt truly enlightened. That power filled him with a sense of joy and unity with nature. It led him as well to promote education not for the sake of passing the exams but for perfecting the body and the mind.

There are four terms that best characterise Chen Xianzhang's thought. The first is *ziran* 自然 (the natural). The term itself is Daoist in origin, meaning spontaneity, manifesting Chen's lifelong fascination with the *Zhuangzi*. It was incorporated into Confucianism by **Cheng Hao** in the early Song, but Chen is given credit for developing it into a view of nature that stressed its realistic and naturalistic qualities as opposed to the metaphysical overtones it had acquired in orthodox Neo-Confucianism, or the cyclical and purposeless meanings it had in the Daoist tradition. The second term is *li* (principle), of which Chen's understanding differed from that of the orthodox Neo-Confucian tradition by stressing less its metaphysical properties and more its unifying role as the underlying substance of the universe. Thus Chen rejected the dualism implied in the Neo-Confucian understanding of *li* and *qi* (material force). Nor could Chen accept **Lu Jiuyuan's** view of the mind as principle, since that implied there was no objective reality of principle outside of the mind. In that regard Chen also differed from **Wang Shouren**, who followed Lu's view of principle. This difference manifests Chen Xianzhang's impulse to see the world in terms of its fundamental unity. Chen believed strongly that it was neither objective reality alone, nor the mind acting on its own, that could produce true understanding, but rather a combination of the two:

subjective and objective, matter and mind, stimulus and response.

Chen's third contribution was in his exploration of the terms *xu* 虛 (emptiness) and *jing* 靜 (quiescence). Emptiness was a condition of receptiveness and openness that had to be achieved before real learning could take place, in the same way that a glass must be empty before it can be filled. Chen associated doubt with emptiness, and wrote that 'for learning it is essential to doubt. Little doubts beget little progress and great doubts, great progress. To doubt is the key to enlightenment and comprehension' (Jen Yu-wen, 1970: 76). Quiescence was the state of internal serenity, a freedom from the interference of daily anxieties that was a prerequisite to real knowledge and understanding. In both cases these practices were not an end in themselves but a means to reach not only enlightenment but also effective action in the world of affairs. The late Ming philosopher **Huang Zongxi** characterised Chen's thought as advocating 'emptiness as the foundation and quiescence as the doorway' (quoted in Jen Yu-wen, 1970: 78). To reach this state, Chen advocated the frequent habit of quiet-sitting (*jing zuo*).

Chen's fourth contribution was in his concept of *zide* 自得 (self-reliance or self-acquisition.) To some degree this view was a natural product of his reliance upon the individual mind as the pivot of understanding. But Chen also gave it a sense of independence from surrounding circumstance, saying that 'one who has accomplished self-acquisition is entangled neither by external things, nor by ears and eyes, nor by the pressures or dangers of the moment. Just as birds fly and fish jump, I hold the inner spring of action' (quoted in Jen Yu-wen, 1970: 82). By this he did not imply the desirability of escaping the responsibilities of everyday life, but of accepting them with joy and complete freedom.

**References:** Jen Yu-wen, 1970; Jiang, Paul Yun-Ming, 1980, 1983: 229–50.

ALAN T. WOOD

## **Chen Yuan** 陳苑

1256–1330

(*zi* Lida 立大, *hao* Jingming 靜明)

Chen Yuan hailed from Jiangxi and early on set his sights on becoming a scholar. Once he was introduced to the writings of **Lu Jiuyuan**, he felt that they were the pinnacle of wisdom, and therefore avidly studied them and the writings of Lu's disciple, **Yang Jian**.

As compared with those who followed **Zhu Xi** in the Yuan era (1260–1368), Lu's disciples were fewer, possibly because Lu's independent-minded philosophy did not lend itself to patriarchal lineage. Chen Yuan, for example, led a reclusive existence, which made it difficult for him to garner a following. Nevertheless, Lu's ideas were preserved and disseminated in the late Song and early Yuan eras through Fu Ziyun 傅子雲 (?–?), Yan Song 嚴松 (?–?), Liu Xun 劉壘 (1250–1319), and Chen Yuan in Jiangxi, and later through Zhao Jie 趙偕 (d. 1364), a lineal descendant of the Song royal house, in Eastern Zhejiang. Contemporaneous with the Jiangxi group was Hu Changru 胡長儒 (Hu Shitang 胡石塘, 1240–1314) from Zhejiang, who, like his contemporary, **Wu Cheng** (with whom he was in contact), is said to have shifted in his thinking from an emphasis on Zhu Xi's ideas to those of Lu. Wu Dingweng 吳定翁 (*fl.* 1280s), a Jiangxi friend of Wu, tried, like him, to reconcile the Zhu and Lu intellectual strains, which was the more indirect way that Lu's teachings were passed down.

Chen Yuan rejected the exegetical path in pursuit of a moral awakening, preferring to emphasise Lu's search for the original mind (*ben xin* 本心) by embracing the qualities of quiescence (*jing*) and vacuity (*xu* 虛), a meditative approach to Confucian self-cultivation. Naturally this was not an acceptable interpretation of Confucian doctrine for those in North China who subscribed to a more orthodox interpretation of Zhu Xi's ideas. Chen's principal disciples were Zhu Fan 祝蕃 (?–?), **Li Cun** 李存, Xu Yan 舒衍 (?–?), and Wu Qian 吳謙



(?–?), the so-called Four Masters of Eastern Jiangxi in late Yuan times.

**References:** Chan, Wing-tsit, 1982: 218; Chen Gaohua, 1983: 9: 277–81; Gedalecia, 1999: 124, 141–2 and 1982: 300–1; Goodrich and Fang, 1976: I, 436; Han Rulin, 1986: II, 328; Huang Zongxi, 1985: 93; Liu Ts'un-yan, 1986: 541; Tang Yuyuan, 1982: 3–12.

DAVID GEDALECIA

## Chen Zhi 陳埴

fl. 1230

(*zi* Qizhi 器之, *hao* Muzhong 木鐘)

Chen Zhi was a native of Yongjia 永嘉 (near modern-day Wenzhou, Zhejiang). His father was Chen Yu 陳煜, who had lived most of his life as a reclusive scholar. Following his father's distaste for fame-seeking ambitious scholars, Chen initially did not seek high office. When he was young, Chen Zhi studied in his hometown with the locally prominent scholar **Ye Shi**. Later, Chen became a student of **Zhu Xi** and at that time developed a strong reputation as a distinguished follower of *dao xue*. Another Yongjia native Ye Weidao 葉味道 (?–?, *zi* Xing 行, *zi* Zhidao 知道, *hao* Xishan 西山) had also become a student of Zhu Xi. Ye soon joined Chen in establishing a school in Zhejiang, where they combined Zhu Xi's teachings with Ye Shi's teachings to develop their own school. In about 1210 Chen received his *jinshi* degree and took the official position of Court Gentleman for Comprehensive Duty 通直郎. When the *zhishi* 制使 (Military Commissioner) of Jianghuai 江淮 (Jiangsu and Anhui) and imperial clan member Zhao Shanxiang 趙善湘 (?–?, *zi* Qingchen 清臣) established the Mingdao 明道 Academy, he invited Chen to be its *shanzhang* 山長 (the dean). Following that event, more and more people wished to study with Chen. He soon attracted a multitude of disciples from throughout Zhejiang, who formed the core of a school called *Muzhong xuepai*. Ye

Weidao would also eventually take employment as a lecturer in the same region, attracting a separate following and starting his own school.

From Zhu Xi, Chen and Ye had learned a discursive style of teaching that they would further develop with their own students. Chen advocated a deliberative method of Confucian studies and argued that friends who study together should always question one another. He advocated locating in any difficult matter the area between that which one finds difficult and that which one finds easy, and to strike at the heart of the issue as if one were striking with an axe. Chen's best-known comment to his students regarding superior learning was adapted from a passage in the *Xue ji* 學記 section of the Confucian classic *Li ji* (*Book of Rites*): 'To ask good questions is like taking an axe to hardwood, while posing clever responses is like striking a bell. Friends learn from discussions. Therefore, how can one not have questions and, when questioned, how can one not have answers?'

At the heart of Chen's teachings was a focus on *gui shen* 鬼神, or the interaction yin and yang cosmic forces as the essence of creation (see *yin-yang*). Chen agreed with Cheng-Zhu School founders in contending that *qi* (material force) collects in times of growth and separates in times of decline. The Cheng brothers and **Zhang Zai** had referred to this interaction as well. Furthermore, in times of collection and growth, *qi* may manifest itself in human form, while in times of separation and decline, *qi* appears in spirit form. Chen did believe that the death of a worthy individual resulted in a positive spirit force (*shen* 神), while the death of a petty individual resulted in a negative spirit force (*gui* 鬼). Chen also emphasised the conviction that human nature was the Heavenly Principle (*Tian li* 天理) as it is contained with the individual human heart/mind (*ren xin*). As Chen contended, scholarly discourse as a method of study was multi-faceted in its application yet limited in its effectiveness,



while a strict course of textual study and self-cultivation following the tenets of the Learning of the Way was narrowly defined, but limitless in potential achievements.

A collection of Chen's responses to students' questions was compiled later as *Muzhong ji* 木鐘集 (*The Wood and Bell Collection*). Chen's other works include *A Reflection on the Tribute of Yu* (禹貢辨) and *Hong Fan Jie* 洪範解 (*An Interpretation of the Great Plan from the Book of Documents*) and *Wangzhi zhangju* 王制章句 (*Sections of Kingly Regulations*).

**References:** Chen Chun, 1986: 142–4; Huang & Quan, 1966; Wu & Song, 1992: 1480.

JAMES A. ANDERSON

## Cheng 誠

(Self-completeness, sincerity)

This word appears in a variety of places in early Confucian texts in senses not too far removed from its range of meaning in later Chinese usage: 'truthfulness', 'honesty', 'sincerity' and the like. Its importance as a philosophical term, however, is based on its far more pointed use in Confucian discourse, beginning in the canonic treatises *Daxue* and *Zhongyong*, and culminating in the development of its meaning in the major writings of Song through Ming **Neo-Confucianism**. Here its primary focus shifts from the interpersonal to the interior dimension of Confucian cultivation, where it refers to the attainment of a profound and unwavering comprehension of the deepest bedrock of one's own inborn moral nature, from which one can then turn to the fullest actualisation of one's essential humanity in the sphere of external actions.

In the *Daxue*, the word *cheng* is highlighted among the 'eight specific points' (*ba tiaomu*) set forth in the opening chapter, and it is then elucidated in the 'expansion chapter' (chapter 6) devoted to this concept. The initial definition of this term offered at the opening of this chapter ('... to have no self-deception') appears

at first to bring its meaning closer to the colloquial sense of 'sincerity'. But the use of this word here as a transitive verb, yoked to the object 'one's inner consciousness', alerts us to the fact that this is more an issue of coming to terms with one's own internal self than of representing this faithfully to others. And so the remaining statements in this chapter emphasise the act of bringing one's inner moral self into line with its external manifestations, as a prerequisite for proceeding to 'set straight one's mental faculties' (*zheng xin*) and to 'cultivate one's personal character' (*xiu shen*) in the more outward-directed phases of self-cultivation.

This transitive meaning of the word *cheng* is further developed in the *Zhongyong*, notably in chapter 20, where the crucial distinction is made between the static 'self-completeness' attributed to the 'Way of Heaven (*tian dao*)' on the one side, and the dynamic process of 'self-completion' ascribed to the 'Way of Man (*ren dao*)' on the other. This understanding of *cheng* as the bringing to completion of one's inborn moral nature is shored up by the insertion in chapter 25 of a linguistically shaky, yet intellectually compelling attempt to relate this character etymologically to the word 'formation', or 'completion' (成, also pronounced *cheng*). Chapter 22 of the *Zhongyong* adds a deeper layer of meaning to this line of interpretation when it sets forth a two-directional movement of cultivation, between the fulfilment of one's inner moral self and the attainment of conscious understanding, the first direction ascribed to the spontaneous development of one's inner nature, and the latter describing the active process of Confucian moral training. In the last several chapters of the *Zhongyong* we are given glimpses of the 'maximum fulfilment' of the ideal of 'self-completeness' by the most perfect sages (*sheng ren*), that elevate the concept of *cheng* to a term of Confucian metaphysical speculation.

The use of the term *cheng* with respect to the realisation of the inner substance of the self gained particular currency within the context of Neo-Confucian philosophical dis-

course. In the writings of Song thinkers such as **Zhou Dunyi**, **Zhang Zai**, **Shao Yong**, and the Cheng brothers, discussions of *cheng* are often directed towards the new definition of 'principle' (*li*) as residing within the inborn moral nature of the individual.

**References:** Tang Junyi, 1966; Tu Wei-ming, 1976.

ANDREW PLAKS

### Cheng Chung-ying 成中英 1934–

Cheng is one of the world's leading interpreters of Neo-Confucian philosophy, especially its metaphysical and epistemological theories. In addition to his early translation and study of **Dai Zhen's** *Inquiry into goodness* (*Yuan shan*), Cheng is the author of a volume of rigorously philosophical essays, *New Dimensions of Confucian and Neo-Confucian Philosophy*, offering novel and penetrating interpretations of both ancient Confucianism and **Neo-Confucianism**. Equally significant has been Cheng's role as the founding editor of the *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, a biannual publication devoted to studies of Chinese philosophy, traditional and modern, as well as comparative studies involving Chinese philosophy. As the founder of the International Society of Chinese Philosophy, Cheng has served as one of the world's leading promoters of East–West philosophical dialogue. His own philosophical essays on topics related to Chinese thought often incorporate insights drawn from hermeneutics, postmodernism, poststructuralism, and literary theory.

JOHN A. TUCKER

### Cheng Duanli 程端禮 1271–1345

(*zi* Jingshu 敬叔, *hao* Weizhai 畏齋)

Cheng hailed from Ningbo and was a follower of Shi Mengqing 史蒙卿 (1247–

1306), a third-generation disciple of **Zhu Xi** who had shifted over from an early affinity for **Lu Jiuyuan**, declined official position and devoted his life to teaching. Cheng inherited Shi's predilection for Zhu Xi, but he had a more public educational career. Cheng became the director of the Jiangdong 江東 Academy, served in official educational positions, and was a major supporter of the revival of the examination system in 1315.

Cheng's most famous work is the *Chronological Syllabus for Study in the Cheng Family School* (*Chengshi jia shu dushu fen'nian richeng* 程氏家塾讀書分年日程), which used Zhu Xi's educational and curricular ideas to map out a route through the classical canon. Cheng advocated a focused reading method and a graded approach to learning, beginning with the *Elementary Learning* (*Xiao xue*), the Four Books (*Si shu*), and other classics, and proceeding to the study of history, poetry and prose. The work included Zhu's 'Private Opinion on the School and Examination Systems' (*Xuexiao gongju siyi* 學校貢舉私議), which was critical of favouritism and the emphasis on *belles-lettres* in education in Zhu's day, and this essay was especially influential on Cheng. Cheng's plan for the most part reflects the goals of those in the northern educational establishment, such as Cheng Jufu 程鉅夫 (1249–1318), who supported the reinstitution of the examination system in 1315 (the year Cheng's *Chronological Syllabus* is dated) on an idealistic Neo-Confucian curricular basis (with primary emphasis on the *Four Books*), rather than on a literary one. Even so, Cheng became disillusioned with the formulaic approach that was eventually adopted and declined to become an examiner and participate in the system.

**References:** de Bary & Chaffee, 1989: 212–16; Lao Yan-shuan, 1981: 120; Liu Ts'un-yan, 1986: 527, 535; *Song–Yuan xuean*, 1966: 87; Tang Yuyuan, 1982: 11; *Yuan shi*, 1976: 190.

DAVID GEDALECIA

## Cheng Duanmeng 程端蒙 1143–1191

Cheng Duanmeng was a native of Fanyang 鄱陽 (in modern-day Jiangxi). Cheng began his studies with Jiang Jie 江介 (1126–1183) of Raozhou 饒州, who was a follower of the Cheng brothers and **Yang Shi's** Guishan 龜山 School. Cheng soon became Jiang's favourite student. Later Cheng travelled to Wuyuan 婺源, where he received instruction from **Zhu Xi** and became a devoted follower of the Learning of Principle (*Li xue*). In 1180, Cheng was chosen as a prefectural nominee to become a lecturer at the Imperial Academy. However, Cheng came to the central court around the time of the Learning of the Way (*dao xue*) Controversy of 1182–83. This struggle at court culminated in an imperial ban on *daoxue* in 1194 and a release of a blacklist containing names of its fifty-nine leaders in 1197. Because Cheng disagreed with the official prohibition on the *daoxue* fellowship led by Wang Huai 王淮 (1127–1189), he retired from his position and returned to his home region. From that point, Cheng refused to take another official posting, but instead devoted himself to teaching for the rest of his life.

Among Cheng's best-known works are *Xingli zixun* 性理字訓 (*Lessons on Human Nature and Principle*) and *Cheng Dong er xiansheng xueze* 程董二先生學則 (*Lessons from the Teachings of the Two Masters Cheng Duanmeng and Dong Zhu*). Zhu Xi had nothing but praise for Cheng's writing. When Cheng died, Zhu Xi personally delivered a eulogy, in which he publicly mourned the premature death of a great scholar who 'took pursuing the *Dao* and cultivating his character as his personal responsibility'. In this Zhu referred to Cheng's devotion to ritual study, in which self-cultivation played as important a role as disciplined textual study did. Cheng described the two goals in his studies as 'clarifying principle' (*mingli* 明理) and 'preserving principle' (*Cunli* 存理). By these particular points, Cheng referred to the elucidation of the pattern of

behaviour required to become a sage and the personal means for preserving the good and rejecting the bad. In 'clarifying principle', Cheng selected humaneness (*ren*), social obligation (*yi*), ritual (*li*), innate knowledge (*zhi*), the Way (*dao*), virtue (*de*), sincerity (*cheng*), trustfulness (*xin*), and loyalty (*zhong*) for specific attention.

At the core of his teaching, Cheng argued that human nature (*xing*) and principle (*li*) were the same thing. In *Lessons on Human Nature and Principle* Cheng makes three points in this regard. Firstly, the origin of human nature is found in the Principle of Heaven (*Tian li* 天理). Secondly, human nature is necessarily expressed through the individual talents of all persons. Finally, the heart/mind dictates all human action. In this sense, Cheng's thinking departed somewhat from the School of the Cheng brothers, because these earlier Song philosophers made a distinction between heavenly nature (*tian xing* 天性) and physical nature (*qi zhi* 氣質).

**References:** Hou *et al.*, 1984: 539; Wu & Song, 1992.

JAMES A. ANDERSON

## Cheng Hao 程顥 1032–1085

(*zi* Bochun 伯淳, master Mingdao 明道先生)

Cheng Hao was one of the most inspiring exemplary teachers in the long Confucian tradition. As both a successful local administrator and a respected philosophical and spiritual teacher, he fulfilled the Confucian dual responsibilities for political service and moral education. Together with his younger brother **Cheng Yi**, he led a pioneering group of disciples on the path of Neo-Confucian renewal.

### Life

Cheng Hao was born in Huangpo 黃陂 in present-day Hubei, where his father Cheng Xiang 程 [王+向] (*zi* Bowen 伯溫 1006–1090) was serving as district defender (*xianwei*

縣尉). Cheng Hao's grandfather and great-grandfather had also been government officials, and his great-great-grandfather Cheng Yu 程羽 (913–984) had served the dynasty at its founding on the national level. His mother née Hou was literate and enjoyed reading historical books and took her sons' education extremely seriously.

Before he could talk, Cheng Hao was already being helpful; when his great-aunt's hairpin fell off unnoticed, toddler Cheng Hao found it for her. He was a bright child who could read poetry by age eight and write poems by age ten. At age twelve or thirteen, while boarding at the county school, his manner was uncommonly mature and likeable. The Vice Minister of Census Peng Siyong 彭思永 (?–?) paid a visit to the school and was so impressed that he arranged for his daughter to be engaged to him.

When he was about fifteen, his father sent him and Cheng Yi to study with **Zhou Dunyi**. Evidently, the main idea they learned from Zhou was to disregard the current standards for examination learning and focus on sagely learning as their personal intent. According to Cheng Yi, Cheng Hao set his heart on seeking the Way at this time, but 'before understanding its essentials' he roamed for nearly ten years among the teachings of various schools including Daoist and Buddhist studies. Apparently, Cheng Hao studied widely and then came to new conviction about the meaning and relevance of the Confucian Six Classics (*Liu jing*). During this time, his mother died in Jiangning 江宁 (present-day Jiangsu) at the age of forty-nine, and was later enfeoffed with an honorary court title. Cheng Hao decided to embark on an official career, and attained the *jinshi* degree in 1057.

For his first appointment, Cheng Hao was assigned as assistant magistrate (*zhubu* 主簿) in Hu county 鄮縣 (present-day Shaanxi), from 1060 to 1062. According to the preface to a series of his travel poems, he had requested appointment to that area because of its natural scenery. In 1063, he was reappointed as assistant magistrate for Shangyuan 上元 (present-day Jiangsu);

when the magistrate was dismissed in 1065, Cheng Hao filled in. He demonstrated concern for the common people's well-being by balancing land distribution and reducing taxes, and by arranging for ill soldiers to receive food and medicine promptly. In his next appointment, as magistrate of Jincheng 晉城 in Zezhou 澤州 (present-day Shaanxi), he was noted for promoting local education; his motto was 'every village should have a school' (*xiang bi you xiao* 鄉必有校). As a result of his influence, the atmosphere of moral and classical education flourished in the numerous village and community schools of Jincheng for decades.

From there, he was recommended for central government posts beginning in 1069, as Assistant Editorial Director (*zhuzuo zuolang* 著作左郎), as Companion to the Heir Apparent (*taizi zhongyun* 太子中允) and as Probationary Investigating Censor (*jiancha yushi lixing* 監察御史裏行). During this time, **Wang Anshi** was serving as Chief Counsellor and vigorously promoting his institutional reforms known as the 'new policies'. There was much controversy and opposition at court, but Wang had the emperor Shenzong's confidence and pressed ahead. During Cheng Hao's time in office, the major issue discussed by all policymakers was how to evaluate Wang's reforms. Though Cheng had originally got along with Wang and they had exchanged a series of poems, he disagreed with Wang's approach to government policy. Cheng submitted several memorials to the emperor, including one on 'Ten matters calling for reform' in which he argued that there are certain perennial patterns (*li* 理) of humane governing which do not change with the times. He used the classical legacy to critique current practice, a time-honoured rhetorical strategy in Chinese political culture.

Because he did not agree with Wang's administration, Cheng Hao was sent in 1070 to be probationary administrative assistant (*pan guan* 判官) in Zhenning commandery 鎮寧軍 and Caocun 曹村 in Chanzhou 澧州 (present-day Puyang county 濮陽縣

Henan). There was dangerous flooding along the Yellow River at this time (a major source of disaster throughout the Song period). Cheng took charge of emergency measures and successfully contained the floods and repaired the dikes. In the following year, his father retired from government service, so Cheng Hao resigned and went home to Luoyang.

In 1075, he was again called to administrative service as magistrate of Fugou district 扶溝 in present-day Henan. When there was drought, he stabilised commodity prices and had wells dug for irrigation, so that the crop harvest was plentiful. His motto was 'treat the people as if treating the wounded' (*shimin rushang* 視民如傷); according to his disciple **Xie Liangzuo**, he kept the motto next to his official desk. He also established schools as he had in Jincheng. His leading students Xie, **You Zuo**, and **Lü Dalin** came to study with him at this time. Cheng Yi was with him during part of his time in Fugou, and together they became the centre of the Learning of the Way (*Dao xue*) revival.

In 1080, Cheng Hao was removed from office. He accompanied his father to Yingchang 潁昌 (in present-day Henan), where **Yang Shi** joined the group of his disciples. He then moved back to Luoyang to teach, and in 1084 his wife née Peng died. Finally, he was again appointed to national office as assistant in the Court of the Imperial Clan (*zongzheng sicheng* 宗正寺丞), but before he could take up the position, he fell ill and died in the sixth month of 1085. Posthumously, he was enfeoffed as Earl of Henan 河南伯 in 1241 and venerated in the temple of Confucius.

### Main teachings

Among the early Neo-Confucians, Cheng Hao is particularly noted for harmonising or blending the major concepts, such as human nature (*xing*), heart/mind (*xin*), Way (*Dao*), and principle or pattern (*li*). His most influential writing on *xing* is a letter to **Zhang Zai** known as *Dingxing shu*. In addition,

he gave a controversial discourse on 'what is inborn is called the *xing*' (*sheng zhi wei xing* 生之謂性). In it, Cheng identified *xing* with *qi* (vital force), whereas other Neo-Confucians identified *xing* with *li* (principle or pattern) in opposition to vital force. Cheng spoke of evil in *xing*, saying that 'it cannot be said that evil is not nature (*xing*)'. To solve this problem, later Confucians distinguished between the *li* nature, and the nature of one's *qi*-endowment.

Cheng Hao elevated the discussion of humanity (*ren* 仁) to the level of the cosmos, the heart/mind of Heaven and Earth (*tian di*). As described in his *Shiren pian*, he taught that *ren* is the sensitive bond that forms one body with all things (*wanwu yiti*). His most characteristic explanation of *ren* draws on a medical description found in the *Huangdi neijing suwen* 黃帝內經素問 (*The Yellow Emperor's Internal Medicine Classic*): 'A book on medicine describes numbness and paralysis of the four limbs as *bu ren* (不仁, not-*ren*); this is the best description. The person of *ren* regards Heaven and Earth and all things as one body; nothing is not oneself. Recognised as one's own, what is not included? If it is not in oneself, then there is no mutual concern. Like the hands and feet being 'bu ren', the *qi* no longer penetrates them, and they no longer belong to oneself.'

In Cheng Hao's view, *ren* is fundamental for understanding society. To ensure the health of the body politic, there must be open communication from the extremities to the centre, on the analogy of 'pain and itch' in the extremities of the body; the feedback system is crucial. Based on this sensitivity, it is within the power and range of the imperial court's conscientious awareness to be sympathetic to the people's plight. Cheng Hao taught, and exemplified, that all people can develop this humane awareness.

### Legacy

The relatively few writings in Cheng Hao's *wenji* (literary collection) include official



memorials, poems and letters, and other occasional writings. He is most noted for his comments and discussions with disciples and friends, recorded in the *Ercheng Yishu* and *Ercheng Waishu*, which often do not distinguish between the two brothers. These are now part of *Ercheng quanshu*, the brothers' collected works. The most extensive English translations of Cheng Hao's sayings are found in Graham 1992 and Chan 1963d.

It has become common to distinguish two lines of Neo-Confucian teaching, Cheng-Zhu and Lu-Wang (see **Cheng-Zhu xuepai**; **Lu-Wang xuepai**), in a way that treats the two Chengs as one figure. On the other hand, it is sometimes said that Cheng Hao was the intellectual forebear of the 'subjective' tendency to focus on the heart/mind in Neo-Confucian thought, while Cheng Yi sired the 'objective' tendency of looking for the *li* (pattern or principle) in things, later developed by **Zhu Xi** and his followers. The modern Confucian scholar **Mou Zongsan** paid particular attention to the teachings of Cheng Hao and traced the authentic lineage through his disciples, particularly Xie Liangzuo, to the Hunan School (*Huxiang xuepai* 湖湘學派) of **Hu Hong** and his successors. In the Chengs' own time, though, the differences between them were mostly matters of nuance and temperament. In his intellectual and personal style, Cheng Hao was warm, affable and synthetic or unitive, whereas his brother was cooler and more analytic.

Like **Wang Shouren**, with whom his intellectual tendencies are often linked, Cheng Hao spent much of his time in office, attempting to solve practical problems. In the various places that Cheng Hao served, there are records and remembrances of his benevolent administration. The local academy he set up in Fugou has been preserved for nine hundred years, and is today known as Dacheng Shuyuan 大程書院 (Elder Cheng Academy; see Hao 1993). As the winds of political fortune in contemporary China become more favourable to Confucian traditions,

the academy is being treated as a valuable historical and cultural landmark.

Cheng Hao was eulogised by his younger brother as having discovered, and made available, the 'untransmitted learning' (*buchuan zhi xue* 不傳之學) that had been obscured for fourteen hundred years since the time of **Mengzi**, a claim that the elder Cheng would perhaps not have made for himself. But this estimation of Cheng Hao's singular achievement was shared by various disciples and friends who wrote eulogistic comments in his memory, and became part of the official history of Neo-Confucian orthodoxy. Even with allowances for respectful hyperbole, there is still a remarkable and historically long-lasting sense that Cheng Hao was a key figure in the rejuvenation of authentic Confucian humane learning.

**References:** Cai Fanglu, 1996; Chan, Wing-tsit, 1963d: 518–43 and 1967; Cheng & Cheng, 1981; Chiang, 1997; de Bary, *et al.*, 1960: 453–8; Franke, 1976: 169–74; Graham, 1992; Hao, 1993; Huang & Quan, 1966: 535–84; Li, 1986; Mou, 1963; Veith, 1966: 252; Zhang Delin, 1986.

THOMAS SELOVER

## Cheng ren 成人

(Becoming a whole person)

The significance of this compound term (成人, literally, 'the formation of a person', or 'a fully-formed person') in Confucian thought goes far beyond its common meaning as a colloquial expression for an adult, or for the process of biological and social maturation. The idea of 'becoming a whole person' in the sense of bringing to realisation one's inborn moral potential constitutes a crucial tenet in the teachings presented in the *Zhongyong*. In chapter 25 of this text, it is taught that the process of 'completion of the self' (*cheng ji* 成己) provides the grounding for the broader aims of contributing to the 'completion of other



people', also expressed with the same words *cheng ren*, and ultimately to the metaphysical status of participating in the 'completion of all things' (*cheng wu* 成物).

ANDREW PLAKS

## Cheng Ruoyong 程若庸

?-?

(zi Fengyuan 逢原, hao Huian xiansheng 徽庵先生)

Cheng was a native of Xiuning 休寧 (in modern-day Zhejiang). As a young man Cheng studied with Rao Lu 饒魯 (*fl.* 1256), who had been a student of **Huang Gan**, Li Fan 李燾 (*fl.* 1198) and Chai Zhongxing 柴中行 (obtaining his *jinshi* degree in 1190) at different points in time. Through his studies with Rao, Cheng became strongly influenced by **Zhu Xi**'s teachings. Cheng later served in academic positions as *shangzhang* 山長 (the Dean) of the Anding 安定 Academy in Huzhou and of the Linru 臨汝 Academy, founded in 1248 in Fuzhou 撫州. After receiving his *jinshi* degree in 1268, Cheng also led the Wuyi 武夷 Academy in Fujian.

Cheng had a great respect for Zhu's teaching, although it is noted that Cheng's teacher Rao Lu had instilled in him a dose of scepticism regarding the scholarly circles in his day that uncritically embraced the Cheng-Zhu School's Confucianism. One of Cheng's most influential works was *Xingli zixun jiangyi* 性理字訓講義 (*Clarification of Words Describing Nature and Principle*), an extension of the work by **Cheng Duanmeng**. Under the influence of Huang Gan through his teacher Rao, Cheng also wrote a study of the *tai ji* 太極 (Supreme Ultimate) entitled *Taiji hongfantu shuo* 太極洪範圖說 (*Schematic Elucidation of the Supreme Ultimate in the Grand Plan of the Book of History*). This text remains faithful to Zhu Xi's understanding of this concept in which *li* (principle) is equated with *taiji* and *qi* (material force) with the forces of yin and yang (see **yin-yang**).

One of Cheng's best students was **Wu Cheng**, who would be a strong force in preserving the vitality of Neo-Confucian thought during the early years of the Yuan period.

**Reference:** Chan, Wing-tsit, 1986a: 524–5.  
JAMES A. ANDERSON

## Cheng Yi 程頤

1033–1107

(zi Zhengshu 正叔, master Yichuan 伊川先生)

Known as one of China's finest thinkers, Cheng Yi, along with his elder brother **Cheng Hao**, provided the impetus and set the agenda for the Neo-Confucian revival that eventually became state-sponsored learning in China, Korea and Japan for many centuries. In particular, Cheng Yi's understanding of *li* (pattern, principle) as the key to knowing *dao* became the hallmark of later Confucian philosophy.

### Life and activities

Cheng Yi was born in Huangpo 黃陂 in present-day Hubei province, where his father Cheng Xiang was serving as district defender (*xianwei* 縣尉) responsible for police matters. In all, there were ten children in the family (six boys and four girls). Their mother, née Hou 侯 (1004–1052), was herself learned in histories and Classics, and paid particular attention to the boys' education. In 1056, Cheng Xiang transferred his ancestral graves to Yichuan 伊川 (present-day Henan) and moved the family to the secondary capital of Luoyang, also in Henan. Because they lived and taught in Luoyang, the teachings of Cheng Hao and Cheng Yi came to be known as **Luo xue**.

In 1046, Cheng Xiang sent the two brothers to study with **Zhou Dunyi**, who whetted their enthusiasm for study by teaching that it was possible to become sages (*sheng ren*) through learning. In 1050 (or perhaps 1057), Cheng Yi submitted a long memorial advising Emperor Renzong

(r. 1022–1063) to avoid mundane theories and follow the kingly way. In it, he made a startling claim: 'Your subject humbly suggests that the learning [of the sages] has not been transmitted for a long time. Fortunately, your subject has been able to obtain it from the Classics that have been handed down . . . because he took upon himself the responsibility for the Way'. Though he could be accused of a certain solemn self-righteousness, Cheng Yi's youthful memorial evinces a passionate concern for the well-being of ordinary people.

While he was attending the Imperial Academy (*Tai xue*), Cheng Yi wrote a remarkable essay in response to **Hu Yuan's** question, 'What was the learning that Yan Hui 顏回 (see **Fu sheng**) loved?' (*Lunyu* 6: 3), forcefully contrasting the learning that seeks sagehood with the scholarship of his time. On receiving Cheng's essay, Hu granted him an interview and gave him special status. His classmate **Lü Xizhe** immediately began to treat him with rituals proper to a teacher, thus becoming Cheng Yi's first disciple. The Chengs' uncle **Zhang Zai** was lecturing in the capital at the time and when he met the brothers, according to one version of **Lü Dalin's** life-record for Zhang, he gave up his own lectures and sent his students to them.

Cheng Yi did not pass the *jinshi* examination of 1059, after which he turned aside from the examination system and pursued his own study and teaching. Though he was eligible for office through hereditary privilege based on the court service of his great-great grandfather Cheng Yu 程羽 (913–984), he did not seek appointment. In the 1060s, senior ministers recommended him many times, but he declined. Cheng Yi did not take official position until he was fifty-four, after his elder brother Cheng Hao had already passed away.

At the beginning of Emperor Zhezong's reign in 1086, **Sima Guang** and **Lü Gongzhu** 呂公著 (1018–1089) reported on Cheng's upright conduct to the new emperor. Cheng Yi was appointed as lecturer to the emperor himself in 1086–1087, giv-

ing him a kind of national prominence. He took his role quite seriously, and lectured the young emperor on rectifying the royal person. For example, he wrote to the young emperor, 'If each day Your Majesty were more often surrounded by worthies and gentlemen, and less often by eunuchs and palace women, then Your Majesty's moral disposition would naturally be transformed and your capacity for virtue perfected'. He discoursed on 'Yan Hui not changing his joy' under impoverished circumstances (*Lunyu* 6: 11) as a lesson to the emperor not to be swayed by wealth and honour. Cheng considered the affairs of the whole empire to be his responsibility, and numerous members of the cultural *elite* came to study with him. However, his uncompromising attitude of moral superiority also won him enemies at court. **Su Shi** was then in the Hanlin Academy and very famous, drawing the literary *elite* of that time to his circle. Rivalry developed between Cheng's followers and Su's group, exacerbating various officials' dislike for Cheng. In his second year at court, Cheng was dismissed and temporarily posted to the Luoyang branch of the Directorate of Education.

In 1097, Cheng Yi was exiled to Fuzhou 涪州 (in present-day Sichuan) when the advocates of **Wang Anshi's** New Policies returned to power. Though he was recalled to office in Luoyang in 1101, Cheng was soon accused of promoting perverted theories and evil conduct, with **Yin Chun** and other disciples as accomplices. Under government investigation, Cheng sent his followers away, telling them to respect what they had heard and practice what they knew, and not to come to him anymore. His name was included in the 'blacklist' of the Yuanyou period faction and in 1103 his books were destroyed and his teachings proscribed. When Cheng Yi died in 1107, only four people dared attend his funeral. The denouement, however, was that Cheng Yi was posthumously rehabilitated and became the main intellectual forebear of the later Neo-Confucian movement.

### Character and teachings

In contrast to his older brother's affable disposition, Cheng Yi was stern to the point of severity. His seriousness was a corollary to his seemingly boundless self-assurance in relation to his knowledge of, and commitment to, the *dao*. There are some poems in Cheng Hao's literary corpus, but none in Cheng Yi's. There is, however, an early essay called 'Record of Raising Fish' (*Yangyu ji* 養魚記), written when he was about twenty-one. In it, the youthful Cheng's reflections are somewhere between *Zhuangzi* (chapter 17) enjoying the joy of fish and *Mengzi* (1A: 3) urging a ban on fine-meshed fishing nets, between appreciation for the myriad things in their natural state and a sense of human responsibility for resource management. Later he would condemn such literary efforts as wasteful, and would revise his sense of communion with all things, depending less on feelings and more on comprehensive pattern or principle (*li*).

In the Cheng brothers' teaching, *li* became the 'philosopher's stone' linking the prominent concepts in the classical Confucian tradition, such as *xing* (human nature), *Dao*, and *xin* (heart/mind). *Li* was foregrounded as key to both canonical structure and affective content. Understanding or 'seeing' *li* was a matter of *gewu*, parsing things and affairs one at a time, building up one's ability to discern the *li* as an immediate perception. Cheng Yi was concerned with a systematic understanding of *li*, including the *ti yong* (substance/function) pattern. Running through Cheng's writings is a dual structure of substance and function, in pairs such as *xing* and *qing* (feelings and emotions), *li* and *qi* (vital force), *Dao* and *yin-yang*. His thought is not a form of dualism, because the two aspects are inseparable. Cheng Yi's shorthand statement of this relationship is *liyi fenshu* (one principle, many manifestations).

Following the tradition of *Mengzi*, Cheng views human nature as wholly good, and identifies it with *li*. Thus, evil or rottenness

was relegated to differences in *qi* (vital force, or psycho-physical make-up). Later Confucians have been vexed by the question of how to distinguish *li* and *qi*, without divorcing the two entirely. The relation of *li* and *qi* in Neo-Confucian thought is a problem analogous in its complexity to the mind/body problem in western thought.

Cheng Yi's emphasis on principle led to a certain rigidity in the area of social policies; a notorious example is his teaching against the remarriage of widows. To the objection that remaining single would be a financial hardship for the widow, Cheng Yi rejoined that 'starvation is a small matter, loss of chastity is a great matter'. He was nearly always intense, strict with his students as he was strict with himself, keenly aware of the internal confrontation between heaven-endowed principle and self-centred desire (*Tianli renyu*). It was perhaps easier to resonate with Cheng Hao's more attractive personality, but Cheng Yi's way of thinking proved to be pedagogically more sound, more easily taught. Based on an observable universal principle that could be articulated and learned, Cheng Yi's system provided orientation and guidelines for learning that widely influenced later Confucian study and self-cultivation.

### Legacy

Cheng Yi laid special claim to authority in the transmission of the learning of the Way (*dao xue*), and set this learning as the sole criterion for cultural elite status. He wrote glosses and notes on several classic texts, as well as a full-length commentary on *Yi jing* (the Book of Changes), known as the *Yichuan yizhuan* 伊川易傳. In this commentary, Cheng explicates the *Yi jing* as the most complete written expression of the ordered pattern of *li*, through which one can learn to actually see the pattern in daily life. Like his brother Cheng Hao, Cheng Yi is most remembered for his comments and discussions with disciples and friends, particularly those recorded in sections 15–25 of the *Ercheng yishu* (see *Ercheng quanshu*).

Cheng Yi and Cheng Hao are sometimes referred to collectively as ‘Master Cheng’ 程子 without differentiation, on the assumption that both brothers agreed with Cheng Yi’s more analytic approach. However, there were differences between the two Cheng brothers, partly as a matter of temperament and intellectual style, and partly because there was still a relatively fluid relation among the principal concepts of the Confucian legacy with which they were working. Subtle differences in emphasis between the two Chengs developed into diverging approaches to Confucian Learning, such as those of **Hu Hong**, **Zhu Xi**, **Lu Jiuyuan**, and **Wang Shouren**. It is a mark of the fruitfulness of their thought that all later Neo-Confucians have claimed the Chengs as their authorities.

Posthumous honours were bestowed on Cheng Yi by Emperor Gaozong (r. 1127–1162) during the Southern Song (1127–1279), beginning a gradual process of rehabilitation that reached near apotheosis. From the Yuan (1260–1368) to the Qing (1644–1911), and for long periods in Korea and Japan as well, the intellectual tradition beginning from Cheng Yi, systematised and promoted by Zhu Xi and his followers, was the standard for the civil service examination system, as well as the standard against which all other thought was measured. A.C. Graham and Wing-tsit **Chan** have rendered particular service in making the Chengs’ thinking accessible in English translation.

**References:** Cai Fanglu, 1996; Chan, Wing-tsit, 1963d: 544–71 and 1967; Cheng & Cheng, 1981; de Bary & Bloom, 1999: 598–600, 637; Franke, 1976: 174–9; Graham, 1992; Huang & Quan, 1966: 585–653; Li Rizhang, 1986, Smith, *et al.*, 1990: 136–68.

THOMAS SELOVER

### Chengyi zhengxin 誠意正心

(‘Attaining a state of wholeness in one’s inner consciousness’; ‘setting straight one’s mental faculties’)

These two levels of self-cultivation enumerated in the ‘eight specific points’ (*ba tiaomu*) in the opening chapter of the *Daxue* encompass the inner dimensions of the perfecting of individual character. Within the sequence of spheres of cultivation presented in the text, it is clear that the ambiguous term *xin* (literally ‘heart’ and/or ‘mind’) refers here to the seat of cognitive and emotive faculties governing one’s interaction with the world of external reality, while *yi* 意 (literally, ‘thought’ or ‘intentions’) is reserved for the inner depths of consciousness. The verb *zheng* 正 is easily glossed as rectifying or ‘setting straight’, a usage analogous to the chain of verbs of ordering used at each of the ‘higher’ (i.e. more external) levels of cultivation, but the verbal function of the word *cheng* 誠 here presents formidable problems of interpretation. The common practice of translating this term, in accordance with its modern usage, in the sense of making one’s mind more ‘sincere’, fails to grasp its usage in this text, where it apparently describes the attainment of an inner foundation of moral self-awareness that can serve as a sound basis for integrity in all one’s more outward-oriented spheres of interaction.

This sense becomes clear in the elucidation of the ideals of *cheng yi* and *zheng xin* in the ‘expansion chapters’ of the text (chapters 6 and 7). There the former term is explicitly defined as ‘avoiding all self-deception’, that is, being true to the spontaneous inclinations of one’s inherent moral consciousness, while the latter is explained as avoiding or correcting the destabilising influence of impulsive emotional responses.

ANDREW PLAKS

### Cheng-Zhu xuepai 程朱學派

(The School of the Cheng Brothers and Zhu Xi)

The Neo-Confucian School of Cheng Brothers and **Zhu Xi** refers to the group of Neo-Confucian scholars who developed the

Learning of the Way (*dao xue*) of **Zhou Dunyi**, and the Learning of Principle (*Li xue*) of the Cheng Brothers and found its full articulation in Zhu Xi. The crucial factor for founding this school is the formation of the concept of principle (*li*) as both the source and form of things in nature and humans. For **Cheng Hao** it is the direct experience of how things naturally come to be, which he calls the Heavenly Principle (*Tian li*), but for **Cheng Yi** principle is the reason or cause by which a thing becomes what it is and principle alone can explain the existence and nature of a thing in the human mind. Zhu Xi integrates the *li* concepts of both into a comprehensive theory of *li* and *qi* (material force) interaction and combination in terms of which both momentum and structure of things are to be explained. Although Zhu Xi has integrated the *li* concept from the Cheng brothers and the *qi* concept from the **Zhang Zai** as well as the *Dao* metaphysics of Zhou Dunyi, he contrasts sharply with **Lu Jiuyuan** in conceiving *li* as objective and inactive entities whereas Lu conceives *li* as residing in an active heart/mind (*xin*) whose feelings and reflections should embody the *li*. Zhu and Lu even debated on this matter but came to no agreement. This contrast and debate has continued to the present-day as can be seen in the works of the famous contemporary Neo-Confucian **Mou Zongsan** who decries Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi for their inaction theory of *li* and applauds the action theory of *li* in Cheng Hao, Lu Jiuyuan and Wang Yangming (**Wang Shouren**). But the Cheng–Zhu School of *li* as objective principles and reasons also continues to attract philosophers because of its realist overtones and its dynamic theory of *li* and *qi* as inseparable and distinct entities.

CHUNG-YING CHENG

## Chi 恥

(Shame, sense of shame)

In early Confucian texts, one of the qualities of a developed person was a keenly felt

sense of shame, that is, a sense that one should avoid shame and disgrace. This sense of shame was understood largely in terms of one's relations to other people rather than to suprahuman beings. Confucius and **Mengzi** in particular enumerated the importance of this quality and outlined the kinds of behaviour that might lead either to ignominy or commendation. According to Mengzi, a sense of shame was crucial to a person and its absence was itself entirely shameless.

Shame was embedded in a strict code of behaviour. It might befall those whose perceived social and political accomplishments did not measure up to their own expectations or the expectations of others, no matter how unrealistic. The *Shang shu*, for example, describes how a minister once lamented how ashamed he would be if he could not transform his ruler into a culture hero like Yao or Shun. In Warring States times (475–221 BCE), the very essence of being a *shi*, or knight, lay in behaving toward others with a sense of shame. Duplicity, artifice, guile, sycophancy and obsequiousness were all considered shameful. Shame could be avoided by respectfulness, which advanced one toward proper ritual behaviour. Shame moreover befell noble persons or gentlemen (*junzi*), when their actions did not measure up to their deeds; hence, the people of antiquity spoke little for fear that they could not live up to their own words. Similarly, having an undeserved reputation was also shameful.

Whether one had a sense of shame was further evidenced by one's attitudes toward material possessions and the circumstances of their acquisition. Accumulating wealth when the way did not prevail in a state was shameful, but it was also shameful to be unemployed when it did. Knights who were ashamed of bad clothes and food were beneath contempt; Confucius' disciple Zilu, on the other hand, was commended for not being ashamed of his poor dress when in the company of people attired richly. **Xunzi**, too, remarked that those who did not let material concerns interfere with



their moral lives would not be subject to shame or disgrace.

It was necessary not only for the knights but also the people to have a sense of shame in order to maintain a stable society. Confucius noted that the masses, if guided by the way and by *de*, or virtue, could be encouraged to develop a sense of shame; if they were instead governed by fear of punishments, the people would merely learn to avoid them and moreover would not develop that sense. Shame, then, was deeply associated with the way and virtue.

It was also associated with the dignity of humaneness. In one conversation with King Hui of Liang, who felt he had been shamed by military defeats and the diminution of his territory, Mengzi implies that the lack of humane governance, rather than martial defeat, was the real source of shame, for military defeat could be transformed into dignity with the implementation of benevolent rule.

**References:** Ames & Rosemont, 1998: 1: 13, 2: 3, 4: 22, 5: 25, 8: 13, 9: 27, 13: 20, 14: 1, 14: 27; Lau, 1984: 1A: 5, 4B: 18, 5B: 5, 7A: 6, 7A: 7; Legge, 1985c: 262; Knoblock, 1988–94, vol. III: 257; Wang Xianqian, 1988: 535.

DEBORAH SOMMER

## Chi jing 持敬

(Holding or maintaining seriousness)

*Jing* conveys the reverent attitude of the heart/mind (*xin*), as well as the seriousness and inner mental attentiveness, with which one should concentrate one's study and self-cultivation. According to **Zhu Xi**, unless one held steadfastly to this inner mental attentiveness, one's efforts to read or to take moral action would lack focus and be of little value. Zhu Xi advocated cultivating serious attentiveness as an active discipline to counter an emphasis on tranquillity that prevailed in Buddhist and Daoist meditation. One could maintain this serious attentiveness of mind as one reverently read texts, meditated or took action.

**Reference:** Chen Chun, 1986: 100–3.

HOYT TILLMAN

## Ching, Julia 秦家懿

1934–2001

Ching is one of the leading interpreters and translators of Confucianism in the West. Her early scholarship focused on the philosophical thought of the Ming Neo-Confucian theorist, **Wang Shouren**. In addition to many of Wang's philosophical letters, Ching has translated much of the *Mingru xuean* 明儒學案 (*Records of Ming Scholars*) by the late-Ming, early-Qing scholar **Huang Zongxi**. Ching explored Confucianism as a religious teaching, and promoted Christian–Confucian dialogue. Noteworthy is her view that there was a notion of God in ancient Confucianism, and something akin to God, a notion of the Absolute, in Neo-Confucianism. The last post she held was the University Professor at the University of Toronto, named incumbent of the R.C. and E.Y. Lee Chair of Chinese Thought and Culture.

JOHN A. TUCKER

## Cho Kwŏng-cho 趙光祖

1482–1519

(*zi* Hyochik 孝直, *hao* Chŏng'am 靜菴)

Cho was a Confucian scholar of the early sixteenth century, who played a leading role in Confucian (Kr. *Sarimpa* 士林派) influence in government and investigated the practical theory of the Learning of the Way (*Tohak* 道學, i.e. **Neo-Confucian** metaphysics, *Sŏngnihak* 性理學) in Chosŏn society. Cho was a member of a succession of scholars from **Chŏng Mong-ju**, through Kil Chae 吉再 (1353–1419), Kim Suk-ja 金叔滋 (1389–1456) and Kim Jiong-jik 金宗直 (1431–1492), to his teacher Kim Gwing-pil 金宏弼 (1454–1504). **Yi I** respected Cho as the founder of Korean *Tohak*. His aspirations for *Tohak* were presented in four articles.



Firstly, he sought to 'set the king's mind on the proper path', 'bestow a political way for the king's rule (*wangdao*, Kr. *wangdo* 王道)', 'open a just path of discussion (*Öllo* 言路)' and 'prevent the origins of selfishness and greed'. Cho investigated the possibility of the realisation in Chosŏn society of the ideal rule of the ancient Chinese sage-kings Yao and Shun (see **Yao Shun**). In his advice and lectures to the king, he endeavoured to maintain the source and foundation for keeping the king's mind on the proper path, and emphatically asserted what amounted to a kind of democratic government. In addition, he endorsed the cultivation of a moral courage of Chosŏn scholars, to help widen the path of honesty and justice in the ruling of the nation, suggesting that a system of merit (Kr. *Hyŏnyanggwa* 賢良科) should be implemented to enlist the aid of these sorts of virtuous scholars in politics. He was also active in Korean translations of the Confucian Classics. In 1610 he was canonised into the National Temple of Confucius (Kr. *Munmyo* 文廟).

**Reference:** Keum Jang-t'ae, 1997.

JANG-TAE KEUM

## Cho Sik 曹植

1501–1572

(*zi* Gunchong 楫仲, *hao* Nammyŏng 南冥)

Cho was contemporaneous with **Yi Hwang** and both were influential Kyŏngsang Confucian scholars. Their different views on Neo-Confucian metaphysics (*Sŏngnihak* 性理學) led to the divisions in the Eastern Faction into North and South in 1589. Early in Cho's youth, the fundamentals of his education included an emphasis on reverence (*qing*, Kr. *Gyŏng*) in his studies and cultivation. While in his prime, he devoted himself to his principles in his scholarly work and teachings, particularly against corruption in government. At the age of sixty-one, Cho constructed a small hut at the

foot of Mt Jiri, which he called *Mountain Heaven Study* (Kr. *Sanch'ŏnchae* 山天齋), and where he dedicated the remaining years of his life to the cultivation of learning. He took the name of his hut from a line in a chapter of the same name in the *Book of Changes* (*Yi jing*), emphasising that the cultivation of virtue and firm intention involves scholarly investigation, and cultivating sincerity in practical attitude must be renewed daily. Cho never took a government post, and he led a life of seclusion not due to apathy but in the quest for a clear theory outlining the ideal rule of the Kingly Way (*wangdao*, Kr. *wangdo*).

Not only were reverence and a proper method of self-cultivation central to his work, but also the concept of righteousness (*yi*, Kr. *ŭi*) based on ethical and social justice was a core theme of his teaching. Cho's scholarship and virtue brought forth in many of his students unusually talented individuals, many of whom fought bravely to defend the nation against the Japanese invasion of 1592. Cho's successor was his student Chŏng In-hong 鄭仁弘 (1535–1623, *zi* Tŏkwŏn 德源, *hao* Naeam 萊庵), who took Cho's work to great heights.

**Reference:** *Chosŏn Yuhakŭi Hakh'adul*, 1996.

JANG-TAE KEUM

## Ch'oe Han-gi 崔漢綺

1803–1873

(*zi* Jiro 芝老, *hao* Haekang 惠岡)

Ch'oe was the last Practical Learning (*Sirhak*) scholar in the late Chosŏn Dynasty (c. 1600–1860). He developed the creative philosophical system based on material force (*qi*, Kr. *gi*) and played a role in fostering ideas to open the country to the outside world. Little known in his lifetime, he interacted with Kim Chŏng-ho 金正浩 (d. 1864), famous for his creating the first detailed map of Korea, and Yi Kyu-gyŏng 李圭景 (1788–1856), a Practical Learning scholar associated with the Northern Learning

faction. These men, like Ch'oe Han-gi, lacked the full status of other literati due to the status of their parents, placing them instead under the literati but above commoners. Ch'oe tried to restore the naturalistic, philosophical concepts of yin-yang and the Five Phases (*wu xing*) based on traditional Neo-Confucian metaphysics (*Sōngnihak* 性理學), and he did so by incorporating western science and thus created a new worldview based on his philosophy of material force. Moreover, while he incorporated western perspectives and scientific techniques into his own theory, he rejected the religious metaphysics of the West. Ch'oe continued to use the idea of material force as the basis for explaining the world and restoring the traditional, naturalistic concepts of yin-yang and the Five Phases. At the age of fifty-three he wrote the *Records of Inferences* (Kr. *Ch'uch'ŭngnok* 推測錄) and the *Penetrating the Spiritual Material Force* (Kr. *Shin-git'ong* 神氣通). At the age of fifty-four he wrote the *Philosophy of Material Force* (Kr. *Kihak* 氣學) where he completed a system of thought combining western scientific knowledge and the traditional concept of material force.

Ch'oe Han-gi divided material force into two types, creating and realising (materialising). Other key concepts he employed include 'spiritual force' (Kr. *Shingi* 神氣), 'creative transformation' (Kr. *Unhwa* 運化) and 'inference' (Kr. *Ch'uch'ŭk* 推測), all of which became technical terms in his philosophy. The 'spiritual material force' refers to the creative, transforming force animating the cosmic matter that is made up of material force. 'Creative transformation' refers to the cosmological dimension where the former concept plays out and its potential is realised. 'Inference' is the human dimension where both these concepts are understood in the interplay between knowledge and experience. It is through experience itself that material force and its applications are understood. In addition, minor differences at a particular level mask a more

important underlying unity based on material force.

In 1860 Ch'oe Han-gi completed *On Governing the People* (*Injung*) dealing with the mutual relationship between people and society, people and things and humanity and the cosmos. He also wrote *Diagrammatic Explanation of the Heart-Mind's Instrumentality* (Kr. *Shin-gi dosŏl* 心器圖說) and a general scientific treatise tying together some of his major concepts. Besides all these, some of his earlier works revealed his interest in applying technical skills to solving agricultural problems facing peasants.

**References:** Ch'oe Yōng-jin, 2000; Keum Jang-t'ae, 1987.

JANG-TAE KEUM

## Chǒng Che-du 鄭齊斗

1649–1736

(zi Sa'ang 士仰, hao Hagok 霞谷)

Chǒng was a representative Chosŏn scholar of the Learning of Wang Yangming (**Wang Shouren**). Born in Seoul, he was until the age of twenty a pupil of Pak Se-chae 朴世采 (1631–1695, zi Hwa Suk 和叔, hao Hyŏn Sŏk 玄石). Early on he was taught **Zhu Xi**'s thought but he quickly became fascinated by that of the Yangming School. At that point he abandoned his preparations for the state civil service examination and instead concentrated his efforts on his scholarly research. At the age of thirty-one he was recommended for a government post and continuously rose in government ranks into his later years, though the bulk of his time he devoted to his scholarship. By sixty, Chǒng moved to Kanghwado to deepen his understanding of the Yangming learning and live out the rest of his days.

It was during this period that Chǒng criticised the slavish, self-righteous authoritarianism of the Zhu Xi school, which rejected the Yangming School as not

conforming to Confucianism. He wrote detailed letters debating the fundamental theories of Yangming's thought with his teacher Pak Se-chae and others. He also developed his own representative theories on this subject in his works entitled *Hakpyŏn* 學辨 and *Chonun* 存言.

In his writing entitled the *Wangyangmyŏng Hakpyŏn* 王陽明學辨 (*A Critical Examination of the Learning of Wang Yangming*) Pak Se-chae criticised the learning of Wang Shouren and gave a copy to Chŏng, suggesting in vain that Chŏng abandon the learning of Wang Yangming. It was particularly through correspondence with Min Yi-sung (?-?) that Chŏng meticulously detailed the differences between the two schools of thought. He particularly advocated the theory that the mind is equated with principle (*xin ji li shuo*, Kr. *simjŭk yisŏl* 心即理說) propagated by the school of Wang Yangming. Chŏng rejected the dualistic understanding about principle and material force (Kr. *igi iwŏnhwa* 理氣二元化), presumably suggested by the school of Zhuxi, and insisted that principle and material force be unified. He also asserted that intuitive knowledge (*liang zhi* see **Liang zhi liangneng**, Kr. *yangji*) was not perception or knowledge, but rather intrinsic nature (*xing*, Kr. *sŏng*). Due to worldly desires, knowledge and perception are divided; Chŏng thus came to assert his own theory of the unity of knowledge and action, based heavily on the teachings of Wang Shouren. He brought to this school a normalised order and domain of practical application, while widening an explanation of natural phenomena, unique in the history of Korean Confucianism. Despite numerous social restrictions during Chŏng's time, he was able to form in his later years the so-called *Kanghwa Hakpa* 江華學派, which later had an important influence on the Practical Learning (*Sirhak*) in the areas of phonology, history, bibliographic studies of the Classics, etc.

JANG-TAE KEUM

## Chŏng Mong-ju 鄭夢周

1337–1392

(*zi* Talga 達可, *hao* P'oŭn 圃隱)

Chŏng was a representative Confucian of the late Koryŏ dynasty (918–1392), who played a leading role in the implementation of the *Chu Hŭi Karye* 朱熹家禮, and whose loyalty to the outgoing Koryŏ dynasty resulted in his execution as a traitor to the newly established Chosŏn dynasty (1392–1860). He was the junior of scholar Yi Saek 李穡 (1328–1396) but he had no fixed teacher, creating instead his own school of thought which revived scholarly interest in **Neo-Confucianism** at that time, and thus he came to be known as the founder of Neo-Confucianism in Korea. At the age of thirty-nine he took up a teaching post at **Sŏnggyun'gwan** (the main Confucian education institution of the day). There he demonstrated profound Neo-Confucian scholarship in teaching and educating his students, developing his own understanding of Confucianism. Unfortunately there is very little surviving material of his philosophical work. His school of thought was not just associated with the *Sarim* 士林 faction (lit. the class of scholars or Neo-Confucian literati, the newly emerging group of scholar-officials who rose through government ranks by merits rather than inherited privileges), which was the leading social force in the early Chosŏn era, but also had links to the *Hungu* 勳舊 faction (the social elite group who gained bureaucratic power by helping the throne). However, it is now generally agreed that in the Chosŏn period the Learning of the Way (Kr. *Tohak*) took the *Sarim* over the *Hungu* as its social foundation and political force.

The spiritual axis of the *Sarim* School was its unfailing loyalty and fulfillment of duty to the Koryŏ dynasty. On the basis of Chŏng's theory of self-cultivation, the *Sarim* Neo-Confucian tradition received its direction. In addition, the pro-Ming policy of Chŏng's thought reflected some of the key features of *Tohak*; one was the strong moralistic righteousness and moral founda-

tion for Chosŏn scholars, the ‘Sŏnbi’. The other was his criticism and rejection of Buddhism (Kr. *Paebullon* 排佛論) as the cause of the corruption of the age. This spirit of opposition was later seen in the late Chosŏn (c. 1600–1860) anti-western sentiments.

Chŏng spent three years mourning the loss of his parents and introduced, implemented and spread these rites from the *Chu Hŭi Karye*. He was instructive in ensuring the dynamic transmission of these rites to the social and family order of the Chosŏn, and in fact making them part of the consciousness of the people. Thus Chŏng is remembered for his development and cultivation of *Tohak* and his offer of the model for future developments on the character of Chosŏn Neo-Confucianism.

**Reference:** Keum Jang-t’ae, 1997.

JANG-TAE KEUM

## Chŏng To-jŏn 鄭道傳

1337–1398

(*zi* Chongchi 宗之, *hao* Sambong 三峰)

Chŏng was a Confucian scholar and politician at the time of the establishment of the Chosŏn dynasty. His role as an adviser to the new Chosŏn king is extremely important, since the previous Koryŏ dynasty had been based on Buddhism, and Chŏng, through his counsels and writings including the *Chosŏn Gyŏnggukchŏn* (朝鮮經國典) and *Kyŏngjemun-gam* (經濟文鑑), established Confucianism as the structural basis and state policy for the Chosŏn dynasty. From his perspective of the learning of **Zhu Xi** he made detailed criticisms of Buddhist cosmology and its dogmatic theories of retribution in his *Miscellany of Mr Buddha* (*Pulssi chappŏn*) and asserted the superiority of Zhu’s thought over Daoism and Buddhism in the minutely elaborated theory deliberated in his *Shimgi ipyŏn* (心氣理篇). Chŏng’s fundamental cosmological view was that principle (*li*) is the single source

(Kr. *iirwollon* 理一元論), by which he confirmed that everything and everyone originate from principle along with material force (*qi*), and that principle is the public way (Kr. *konggongjido* 公共之道) and is the foundation of material force and the mind (*xin*). That which is absolute and metaphysical (the Great Ultimate, *Tai ji*) is none other than principle, the source of everything and the revealer of physical laws of matter. Mind is metaphysically endowed with the ability to perceive the principle of things. It was from this assertion that he criticised the Buddhist doctrine of mind, as well as their view that human cognition of truth is only a kind of felt experience.

Chŏng also held that mind and the physical self have an intimate connection, with the process of perception beginning with mind, and our mental faculties being the product of material force, and that all our organs and our general physical constitution respond in mutuality. Thus Chŏng said, ‘If there were only mind and no principle, if we were swayed only by profit and loss and if there were only material force, we would only do as we please and be indistinguishable from beasts’ (*Sambongjip* 三峰集). Chŏng’s theory of self-cultivation thus presents the necessity for the attainment of the four original virtues of human nature (humaneness, righteousness, propriety and knowledge: *ren, yi, li, zhi*) from the point of view of ‘preserving the heart–mind and cultivating nature’ (*cunxin yangxing* Kr. *chonshim yangsŏng* 存心養性).

**References:** Chŏng To-jŏn, 1977; Han Yŏng-u, 1999.

NAM-JIN HUH

## Chŏng Yag-yong 丁若鏞

1762–1836

(*zi* Miyong 美鏞, *hao* Tasan 茶山, Yŏ Yu Dang 輿猶堂)

Chŏng was an active Neo-Confucian (*Sŏngnihak* 性理學) scholar during the late

eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, better known by his stylist name, Tasan. He was the synthesiser of the Practical Learning (*Sirhak*) in Korea, and based his thought on the reinterpretation of the **Confucian Classics**. It was on this basis that he presented a plan to reform the social system and threw light on a wide range of topics, including Korean history, geography, ceremony, education, culture, customs and craftsmanship.

There were two greatest influences on the development of his thought. The first was from his fascination with western science and his conversion to Catholic Christianity. The second arose from his exile, which lasted for eighteen years. His family was affiliated with a group of Yi Ik's students who thought of western science in a positive light. Chŏng was also fascinated by western technology. As a student at the National Confucian Academy, Chŏng met Yi P'yok 李穡 (?-?) who was instrumental in converting him to Catholicism.

He took a government post at the age of twenty-seven under King Chŏng-jo (r. 1776–1800), and when he was thirty he used western technology to make pulleys for constructing a wall around the city of Suwon 水源. It was through things like these among others that Chŏng helped to open up a new world to the Koreans.

Under extreme pressure, he sent a memorial to the throne renouncing Catholicism. However, his study of western thought during his youth made an indelible stamp on his thinking, and his theory of human nature (*xing*) and his understanding of the Classics were very creative. Therefore, he rejected the Five Phases (*wu xing*) theory and shed new light on a naturalistic universe where the fundamental superintendent nature of Heaven (*Shang Di* 上帝) reinforced a person's self-control and belief. In assimilating western ideas into Confucian thought he did not discard the latter; rather he put forward a new reinterpretation of the world perceived in the Confucian Classics.

With the death of King Chŏng-jo, Chŏng lost a strong supporter at court and he was soon exiled to Kangjin 康津 (in modern Southwest Korea, South Cholla Province) in 1801. During the eighteen years of his exile he was prolific. He completed an enormous set of books analysing the Six Classics (*Liu jing*) and Four Books (*Si shu*), as well as his *On Ruling the Hearts of the People* (Kr. *Mongmin shimsŏ*), a political treatise. Though the former was for self-cultivation and the latter for ruling the country Chŏng saw them as two sides of the same coin. His works on the Classics established a solid independent philosophy, and he went beyond the then popular Evidential Learning (Kr. *Kojŭnghak*), which he thought was insufficient, and beyond the Neo-Confucianism of the Song, which he thought was careless with the evidence its ideas were based on. By combining self-cultivation and the ruling of the people, Chŏng opened up a new dimension in Korean classical studies.

Chŏng avoided Neo-Confucian intellectual debates and loathed factional strife. He promoted a theory of self-cultivation that urged one to serve a personified Heaven that looks down over us and to practice benevolence by understanding the heart/mind of others. Chŏng rejected the usual Neo-Confucian ideas of innate moral virtue. For him, virtue was gained and developed through practice. He recognised the force of emotions in human life, and while attaching positive values to emotion, he also stressed the need to constantly watch over the discord between the human heart/mind (*ren xin*), which follows emotion (*qing*), and the heart/mind of the Way (*dao xin*) that follows the intent of the Dao. He defined human nature (*xing*) as having a desire for the good and defined the heart/mind as containing both good and evil. In addition, he stressed the importance of individual responsibility in distinguishing between good and evil.

In human relations Chŏng emphasised humaneness (*ren*) in general, which he saw



in terms of empathy (*shu*) and filial piety (*xiao*) toward one's parents, politeness among one's siblings (*ti*), and being kind towards one's children (*ci*). On a social level this is seen as serving one's lord (Kr. *sa-gun* 事君), one's superiors (Kr. *sajang* 事長) and serving the people (Kr. *sa-chung* 事眾). In this sense 'governing the people' (*zhi ren* Kr. *Ch'ŭin*), for Chǒng Tasan, was understood in terms of developing responsibility and morality in people. Chǒng saw the existing social order as an obstacle to achieving this and desired to replace it with the one where everyone could be a scholar and all were seen as equal before Heaven. Chǒng also deliberated a concrete policy for reforming the social system and establishing a social order that protects the livelihood of commoners.

Although Chǒng endured many hardships in his youth, he left an extremely large corpus of creative works. After his exile, he returned home to finish writing. Although he had little opportunity to spread his ideas while he was alive, his ideas influenced the enlightenment thinkers at the end of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. Moreover, in 1936, the 100th anniversary of his death, his Practical Learning was reevaluated and his ideas on modern thought and the people were rediscovered.

**References:** Keum, 1998a.

JANG-TAE KEUM

## Chongren xuepai 崇仁學派

(The School of Wu Yubi)

The Chongren School was founded by **Wu Yubi** and his students and drew its name from the site of the Wu family estate in Chongren of Fuzhou 撫州 (in modern-day Jiangxi). Wu's leading students included **Chen Xianzhang**, Lou Liang 婁諒 (1422–1491) and Hu Juren 胡居仁 (1434–1484). Hu was inspired by Wu to give up attempts at government service, choosing instead

to spend his time serving his parents and teaching students. Chen Xianzhang, the founder of the Baisha School in Guangdong, also studied for a period with Wu. The Chongren School influenced the developments of subsequent schools, and Julia **Ching** notes that late Ming thinkers probably drew a connection between Wu Yubi and **Wang Shouren**, through Wu's student Lou Liang.

Wu Yubi was described by his students as a man, who chose the humble lifestyle of a simple farmer, working in the fields at day-break while his students still slept. He also sent clear signals that government service in difficult times should perhaps be avoided. When Wu was once called on by imperial authorities for official appointment, he declined with the statement 'Unless we get rid of the eunuchs and the Buddhists, it is too difficult to get good government. For what should I go?'

Wu was strongly influenced by the **Cheng-Zhu** School, and is considered by Huang Zongxi to have been its first great Ming proponent of *Dao xue*. Regarding the 'heart/mind' (*xin*), Wu saw within it consciousness (*zhi jue* 知覺) and principle (*li*) in separate parts. Wu's method of self-cultivation involved 'preserving [heart/mind] and nurturing [one's nature] in tranquillity and watching over oneself in activity'.

**References:** Song-Yuan *xuean*, 1966; Wu & Song, 1992: 1095–6.

JAMES A. ANDERSON

## Chǒngyuk 正易

(A Correct Theory of Changes)

This work by Kim Hang 金恒 (1826–1898, *hao* Ilbu 一夫) details his revolutionary new worldview based on his study and interpretation of the philosophy of the *Book of Changes* (*Yi jing*) and which figured in the thought of late Chosŏn history. The decline of the traditional Confucian system which Kim witnessed during the social



reform of the late Chosŏn led to his proposal of a new Confucian tradition and worldview, rather than a new social order based on western civilisation. This worldview was one of the philosophy of change. Kim took the diagram of the eight trigrams of mythological Chinese King Fu Xi (伏羲) and rearranged it into a new *a posteriori* order, a timely indicator of the need for, and direction of, the impending reformation. His proposal was based on a new ideal and character for the world, and subjugation of the old order. For example, Kim reformed the old *a priori* order of the changes where yin suppresses yang (he deemed this to be subjective), presenting instead a new, universal *a posteriori* principle and order based on the harmony of yin and yang (see **yin–yang**). For Kim, the former system is part of the discriminatory nature and society, whereas the *Chōngyuk* order indicates equality and harmony in social relations.

**Reference:** Yi Jōng-ho, 1976.

JANG-TAE KEUM

### ***Chu Hǔi Su Chōlyo*** 朱子書節要 (*Essentials of Zhu Xi's Works*)

This work is a compilation by **Yi Hwang** of the most important parts of **Zhu Xi's** letters and writings. Yi wrote the preface and Hwang Jun-liang 黃俊良 (1517–1563, *zi* Ch'ungŏ 仲舉, *hao* Kumkye 錦溪) and **Ki Tae-sūng** wrote the afterword. This book was ordered by royal decree to be published and distributed by the office of editorial review (Kr. *Kyosŏkwŏn* 校書館) in 1543. With Zhu Xi's letters, poetry and dissertations all included, the work amounted to a massive ninety-five-book set. Of those, forty-eight are the letters Zhu Xi exchanged with scholars, administrators and his students, on various topics like self-cultivation, etiquette, society, politics etc.

The letters were quite fragmented, but contain Zhu Xi's keen insights on these topics. Yi Hwang especially stressed both

the theoretical and logical developments of Zhu Xi's works, as well as the various points of difference he had with his colleagues and on this basis organised the *Chu Hǔi Su Chōlyo*. Yi took great pains to consider the personalities and scholarly works of Zhu Xi's colleagues in his compilation. Yi was deeply influenced by these letters which he studied in great detail, and of which he selected the core contents. This project took a very long time to complete. Due to Yi's deep understanding, his integration of Zhu's thought in the *Chu Hǔi Su Chōlyo* is acknowledged to be of great value as an introduction to Zhu's thought. Moreover, it contributed to a deeper appreciation of Zhu's thought and furthered studies by Chosŏn scholars as well as having had great influences on Japanese Zhu Xi (Jn. *Shushigaku*) studies.

**References:** Yi Ga-won, 1989.

JANG-TAE KEUM

### ***Chu Hǔi Ullon Tongiko***

#### 朱子言論同異考

(*A Comparative Study on the Sayings of Zhu Xi*)

This work by late Chosŏn Confucian **Han Wŏn-jin** explains the differences, incompatibilities and inconsistencies in the various topics covered by **Zhu Xi** and the subsequent interpretations of his work by later scholars. It was completed in 1741, in three books, printed by woodblock. Originally this work was undertaken by **Song Si-yŏl** in 1689, but he was unable to complete it before the end of his life, and thus the work was taken over by Han.

The work ranges over a wide variety of topics, including principle (**li**, Kr. *i*) and material force (**qi**, Kr. *gi*), yin–yang, and Five Constant Virtues (**wu chang**, Kr. *osang*), etc. According to Han, due to the inability of later scholars to accurately grasp Zhu's views, they were thus unable to fully understand Confucius' theory of the sage (**sheng ren**, Kr. *sōngin*), and therefore could not

uncover the Way (*dao*, Kr. *do*). Han stressed the need for a reexamination of Zhu Xi's thought, in order to come to a better understanding of Confucius. The *Chu Hūi Ullon Tongiko* particularly establishes Zhu's later views and thus unravels the various core points of debates in Chosŏn Neo-Confucian metaphysics (*Sŏngnihak* 性理學). The various views of Zhu on the **Four-Seven Debate** are also presented in this work.

**Reference:** Han Won-jin, 1741.

JANG-TAE KEUM

## Chu Shaosun 褚少孫

104?–30? BCE

Chu Shaosun set out to supplement the *Shi ji* with text to replace some of the ten chapters that had been lost at a very early stage, and a number of passages in the received text are dutifully ascribed to his name. The most valuable parts of his additions are seen in the dossier of documents that concerned the nomination of three of **Han Wudi's** sons in 117 BCE, extra entries to some of the tables and information about Ren An 任安 (?–91 BCE) and **Dongfang Shuo**. He also appended parts of the *Guo Qin lun* 過秦論 of **Jia Yi**.

**Reference:** Pokora, 1981.

MICHAEL LOEWE

## Chuanxi lu 傳習錄

(Instructions for Practical Living)

*Chuanxi lu* refers to the title of a book by the Ming philosopher **Wang Shouren**, or better known by his stylist name, Wang Yangming. Translated into English as *Instructions for Practical Living*, this text has long been regarded as the best encapsulation of the great philosopher's main ideas. Wing-tsit **Chan** regards it as 'indisputably the most important Chinese philosophical

classic since the early thirteenth century' (Chan, 1963c: xi).

The text was compiled by **Qian Dehong** (1496–1574) after Wang's death. It is organised into three parts. The first part consists of a record of conversations between Wang and his students **Xu Ai** (1488–1518), Lu Cheng 陸澄 (obtained his *jinshi* degree in 1517) and Xue Kan 薛侃 (d. 1545). The conversations took place at different times in Wang's life, and often focus on different topics. The second part was compiled by Qian Dehong and consists of seven long letters treating various aspects of his thought, an essay by Wang that deals with his ethical philosophy, and an essay in which Wang critiques existing educational institutions and establishes basic principles for the community schools he established after pacifying a rebellion in Jiangxi province in 1518. The third part consists of conversations recorded by Chen Jiuquan 陳九州 (1495–1562), Huang Yifang 黃以方 (?–?), Huang Mianshu 黃勉叔 (?–?) and Huang Mianzhi 黃勉之 (?–?), the 'Doctrine in Four Dicta' (*Siju jiao* 四句教), the record of a conversation with Qian Dehong and **Wang Ji** (1498–1583), and the preface to *Zhu Xi's Final Conclusions Arrived at Late in Life*.

**Reference:** Chan, Wing-tsit, 1963c.

ALAN T. WOOD

## Chunqiu 春秋

(The Spring and Autumn Annals)

The *Chunqiu* is one of the traditional classical texts integrated at the beginning of the Han dynasty (206 BCE–220 CE) into the corpus of the Five Classics (*Wu jing*), although it is the only one (possibly with the *Book of Changes* (*Yi jing*) not to have been mentioned in Confucius' *Analects* (*Lunyu*). Its content is best described by Burton Watson (1958: 75–6): 'The *Chunqiu* or Spring and Autumn is a chronicle of the reigns of twelve dukes of the state of Lu 魯 covering the period from 722 to 481 BCE. It contains,

in barest outline, notations of the internal affairs of Lu, of diplomatic conferences, feudal wars, and Lu's other relations with neighbouring states, and occasional records of eclipses, floods, earthquakes and prodigies of nature. The account is entirely impersonal, with no trace, at least to the untutored eye, of the personality or attitude of the recorder or recorders.' The *Chunqiu* appears to be a bare record of facts, composed in an extremely terse style (the longest item does not count more than forty characters, and the shortest only one) and arranged in chronological order. The title is usually taken to stand as a synecdoche for the four seasons of the year, and therefore to be a generic term for annals; it gives its name to the period that it covers, starting from the beginning of the Eastern Zhou period during which the effective power of the dynasty kept declining until its final demise in 256 BCE.

According to **Mengzi**, this type of annals was being kept in all the principalities related to the royal house of Zhou, but the '*Chunqiu*' of Lu (the native state of Confucius) seems to be the only one extant: 'The traces of the (former) kings were extinguished when the *Poetry* (*Shi jing*) was lost. After the *Poetry* was lost, the *Chunqiu* was composed. The *Sheng* of Jin, the *Daowu* of Chu, and the *Chunqiu* of Lu were the same kind of work. Their accounts concern Duke Huan of Qi and Duke Wen of Jin, and their literary form is that of a history. Confucius said: "Their righteous principles I have appropriated"' (*Mengzi* 4B: 21).

Three or four generations after Confucius, *Mengzi* was the first to claim that the Master himself was the actual author of the *Chunqiu*. He was followed on this point by the whole of traditional scholarship, and the revered character of the *Chunqiu* as a classical text was not brought into question until early in the twentieth century. But, whoever the author may have been, the *Chunqiu* was most probably known to Confucius. In any case it constitutes a valuable source of historical information and it may

be considered as a major fountainhead for the historiographical tradition in China since **Sima Qian**, the first historian with a personal interpretive view of history, who claimed to be a disciple of **Dong Zhongshu**, a leading exegete of the *Chunqiu* tradition in the early Han period.

The work is currently known under the headings of its three main commentaries, the *Gongyang*, the *Guliang* and the *Zuo* or *Zuoshi* 左氏. In the bibliographical chapter of the *Hanshu* (ch. 30, p. 1713), two other commentaries, now lost, are listed, the *Zoushi* 鄒氏 and the *Jiashi* 夾氏; they are both entered as being in 11 *juan* (sections). The three extant commentaries must have stemmed originally from different schools of interpretation, and were the objects of passionate discussion during the Han dynasty, with each school claiming to be the bearer of Confucius' authentic teaching. Furthermore, the three commentaries were based on different versions of the *Chunqiu* whose textual variants have been studied chiefly by Qing scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The *Gongyang* and *Guliang* were taken to represent the New Text School, in that they were based on a version of the *Chunqiu* in 'new script' (*jinwen*), i.e., the script current in Han times; these were already officially acknowledged as the orthodox interpretations in the Former Han period. The *Zuo* commentary, on the other hand, is associated with the Old Text School, because, when it was brought to imperial attention at the end of the Former Han, it was claimed to be based on an older version of the *Chunqiu* in pre-Qin 'ancient' script (*guwen*).

One cannot help noting, however, that there is a profoundly puzzling paradox in the very fact that the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, a dry account of purely factual events which is content with recording scattered historical events as succinctly and dispassionately as possible, became a book of wisdom for all ages. For few, if any, books in the Confucian canon would seem less likely to be singled out as comprehensive and

all-inclusive repositories of wisdom. At first sight no interpretive effort whatsoever is made. Some commentators even went as far as to raise the question of the lack of historical value of the *Chunqiu*: if, like the rest of the canon, the book is really comprehensive in scope, then why does it apparently neglect to present a detailed or even adequate account of the events of the era it covers? In spite of the fact that this bare chronicle of the state of Lu became the basis for the traditional historiography of ancient China, why does it, in some respects, even fail to measure up to the standards of a conventional history?

In spite of all this, in the corpus of canonical scriptures, at least as it was set up in the Han, the *Chunqiu* occupies a distinctive place, since it appears as the hermeneutical Classic *par excellence*. In fact, the text remained open to all types of interpretation up to modern times, including very critical views such as Wang Anshi's opinion that the *Chunqiu* was nothing more than 'a torn and rotten court chronicle' (*duanlan chaobao* 斷爛朝報). Paradoxically enough, a dry-as-dust court chronicle was thus transformed into one of the most significant sacred scriptures of the Confucian Canon. Probably the very terseness of the text made it open to interpretation. By virtue of its laconic and enigmatic nature, the text of the *Chunqiu* seemed to many commentators to have been written, not for the purpose of being understood but of being interpreted – in anticipation that it would have to be supplemented by a commentary.

**References:** Cheng, Anne, 1993; Couvreur, 1951; Legge, James, 1893–94a; Watson, 1958.

ANNE CHENG

### *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露

(*Luxuriant Gems [or Dew] of the Spring and Autumn Annals*)

Early references to the writings ascribed to Dong Zhongshu under titles such as *Chunqiu*

*fanlu* are by no means consistent, nor is the meaning or the overtones of the expression *fanlu* certain. The renderings that are sometimes adopted, as given above, suggest that the work comprised extended interpretations or elaborations of the *Spring and Autumn Annals* (*Chunqiu*). As received the text includes seventy-nine out of eighty-two chapters; the biographical account of Dong Zhongshu refers to 123 chapters of his writings, including one that is entitled 蕃 [sic] 露.

For a number of reasons the work should not be regarded as a unity. Internal references show that the chapters were compiled at different stages of Dong Zhongshu's career or in some cases subsequently. Some of the chapters do indeed set out to explain or interpret the events reported in the *Chunqiu*; some are in the form of responses to questions of doctrine or to the views of critics; one concerns a matter of ritual. Two chapters give Dong Zhongshu's replies to the kings whom he served; two were the work of his pupils; one is in the form of a eulogy.

The authenticity of all or parts of the work, whose text is in some places defective, has been subject to doubt by scholar critics such as Zhu Xi, Chen Zhensun 陳振孫 (c. 1190–1249) and the editors of the *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 四庫全書總目提要. Such doubts rest on internal inconsistencies; variations between early citations from the book and the received text; and the occurrence of references to the *Wu xing* as contrasted with their absence in Dong Zhongshu's other writings. As against such objections, some scholars retain a faith that, incomplete as it now is, the greater part of the received text derives from Dong Zhongshu's hand. There is certainly considerable overlap as between some of the themes of the *Chunqiu fanlu* and those of the three responses that Dong Zhongshu gave to decrees, as reported in the *Han shu*.

In general terms the *Chunqiu fanlu* may be said to expound the principles of the *Chunqiu* as these were interpreted in the Gongyang (*Chunqiu Gongyang xue*) tradition,