

宋遼金元

The Society of Song, Yuan, and
Conquest Dynasty Studies
appreciates the persistent efforts of
Beverly Bossler in the scanning of

volumes 18 through 30. Through her work, the Society has been able to
make electronic copy of the these volumes of the *Bulletin of Sung-Yuan
Studies Newsletter* available in the public domain.

Please Note: Because this bulletin was scanned as a series of graphics
images of the pages, it is not searchable.

宋
遼
金
元

The Bulletin of
SUNG-YUAN
Studies

21

周少雄 (男, 32, 讲师, 浙江师范大学中文系), “论苏轼与毛滂交谊始末”
 蔡涉 (男, 56, 副编审, 主席, 监安县文联), “苏轼在监安的行踪和诗作考析”
 周如汉 (男, 57, 副编审, 余杭县委为公室), “苏轼与蓝平”
 肖瑞峰 (男, 32, 副教授, 杭州大学中文系), “时空: 观照苏轼艺术特征的聚光点”
 黄征 (男, 30, 助教, 杭州大学中文系), “苏轼诗文俗语词考释”
 周建国 (男, 24, 研究生, 杭州大学中文系), “苏轼与苏辙”
 李越深 (女, 33, 讲师, 浙江大学中文系), “苏轼与杭僧参寥交游述略”
 朱则杰 (男, 32, 讲师, 浙江大学中文系), “略论苏轼在清代诗人中的影响”
 扁浙平 (男, 讲师, 浙江教育学院), “苏轼杭州纪游词初论”
 莫离 (男, 浙江省民间文艺家协会), “苏轼守杭史迹与杭州旅游文化的开始”
 韩建明 (男, 杭州苏轼纪念馆), “谈谈苏轼西湖诗的艺术特色”
 章楚藩 (男, 杭州师范学院中文系), “论苏轼诗歌的意境”
 樊维纲 (男, 教授, 杭州师范学院中文系), “释《牛衣》”
 林正秋 (男, 副教授, 杭师院历史系), “苏东坡与饮食研究”
 项冰如 (男, 主任记者, 杭州日报副刊部) and 黄云生 (男, 48, 浙江师范大学中文系), “苏东坡在杭州的方处之交”
 沈松劲 (杭州大学中文系), “苏门风概——论苏轼和苏门诸子”
 费君清 (杭州大学), “谈谈苏轼艺术精神中的《反常合道》”
 林冠群, “《苏东坡在海南岛》一文辨误”

There were also oral presentations by Wang Shui-chao 王水照 of Fudan University, Uchiyama Seiya 内山静也, and Professor Kathleen Tomlonovich, for which no printed versions were circulated.

A NOTE ON CLASSIFYING SUNG CONFUCIANS

James T. C. Liu
 Princeton University

An explanation: This note is a rough version in English, without much revision, of a paper originally in Chinese. It is presented here to inform the readers of the Bulletin of my efforts to stimulate the thinking of some interested scholars overseas. The original was first given in Hong Kong, December 1984 (an International Sung Conference at the Chinese University where scholars from both sides of the straight met for the first time, but no conference volume) and again at the Academia Sinica, Taipei, December 1985 (The Second Sinological Conference, volume forthcoming).

As it stands, many shortcomings are obvious. It stresses the political aspects, to the neglect of the well known intellectual and especially philosophical dimensions. Neither does it do justice to the great Sung intellectually, nor does it examine the differences between such clusters as li-hsüeh, tao-hsüeh, Ch'eng-Chu orthodoxy, etc. so ably discussed by my friends Robert Hymes, Conrad Schirokauer, Hoyt Tillman and several other scholars, Thomas Wilson, for example.

Allowing the shortcomings, this Note, it is hoped, may serve besides communication a few useful pointers. One, shifting the viewpoints may help produce several different ways of classification -- a pluralistic approach -- in addition to the one traditional and conventional way of grouping the Sung intellectuals. Second, intellectual history which is broader than history of ideas would become more lively and meaningful when placed alongside with political context: the main stage of intellectual developments in old China. Third, it is hoped that the comparison between Wang An-shih and Chu Hsi in this Note might encourage some further discussion and perhaps lead to comparisons of other Sung intellectuals. And this raises the whole question: whether the Sung might be described as neo-traditional or merely a new phase in post-traditional growth? Not altogether confident myself, I shall be gratefully guided by the readers' response.

* * * *

Most histories of philosophy limited by their discipline do not present us with a systematic picture of the Sung Confucian thinkers as a whole. This short essay suggests a vital criterion: how did each thinker react intellectually as well as politically toward the Confucian establishment at the time? The thinkers may thus fall into three major groups: (a) advocates of energizing ideals; (b) selective renovators; and (c) reconstructing fundamentalists. From this standpoint, Chu Hsi Neo-Confucianism may seem to be as radical as Wang An-shih's New School in demanding a radical transformation of the status quo.

This is not a research paper, nor are there footnotes. Perhaps it might be called a "think piece" to stimulate discussion.

The Sung may be said to enter a late imperial period to some scholars. It may also be said, as Ch'ien Mu 錢穆 has, to be the beginning of the

scholar-official era. Many Western scholars accept the hypothesis of Naitô Torajiro 内藤虎次郎 that a great divide marks the Chinese history from the late T'ang on. Some textbook writers even describe the Sung as the "early modern period," some kind of a "renaissance." It is a laudable effort of showing that China was ahead of Europe from then on till about the 17th century.

However, neither did the "early modern" Sung period generate something more modern than itself, nor did any "late modern" age ever appear. And to call it a "renaissance" hardly explains how the Sung established itself as an orthodox model in many ways for almost a thousand years.

The present writer has proposed some twenty years ago to call the long stretch from the Sung to the 19th century the "neo-traditional period" (*Journal of Asian Studies*, 24 (1964), 105-107). Neo-traditional is no contradiction in semantic terms; as for example, "the new classics," a commonly used designation. As a concept the "neo-traditional period" means the following:

1. A selective continuity of the old heritage, together with the integration of new growths, in forming a new tradition.
2. The new tradition became more stable, tenacious, and continuous than the old heritage through permeation among the commoners and through upward social mobility that absorbed new blood into the established value system.
3. Changes to be acceptable must follow the same mode of adjustment in gradually weaving the threads of new departures into the net of conformity or orthodoxy.
4. By the same token, the neo-traditional period strenuously resisted attempted changes that were sudden, drastic, or basic, let alone revolutionary.

The concept of neo-traditional period automatically explains why China remained so long in the ambivalent stage of both stability and stagnation. It also explains why China's modernization in the 20th century has been so torturous, as compared with other large agricultural societies.

While few scholars have explicitly labelled some Sung Confucians as "early modern" or "renaissance" intellectuals, it has become quite popular to link them up with Neo-Confucianism. Originally coined by the Jesuit fathers who saw the distinctions between the ancient classics and the leading Sung-Ming philosophy, it refers exclusively to the Ch'eng-chu school, the school of reason or principle (li-hsüeh 理學) or the school of the true Confucian way (tao-hsüeh 道學). The difficulty arises with extending the term to refer to other Sung intellectuals who did not belong to this school. The present writer now confesses to such errors and wishes to rectify.

Two examples may suffice on what to call the other Sung intellectuals who were not Neo-Confucians? The Neo-Confucian school who came into being during the Southern Sung honored in retrospect the five masters of the Northern Sung (*Pei-Sung wu-tzu* 北宋五子). What about some of their contemporaries such as Ssu-ma Kuang 司馬光 who usually commanded due respect from Chu Hsi but were not exactly Neo-Confucians? What about Su Shih (Tung-p'o) 蘇軾 (東坡)? The Chu Hsi school resented him, for he

had ridiculed Ch'eng I 程頤 nor did they approve of his lifestyle. However, does not this multifaceted genius deserve some meaningful place in a more differentiating classification?

The second example is simple, but perplexing. Lu Chiu-yuan (Hsiang-shan) 陸九淵 (象山), the founder of the school of mind (hsin-hsüeh 心學) and a worthy adversary of Chu Hsi, should he be classified as a Neo-Confucian? Some histories of philosophy say no, for Lu did not belong to the Ch'eng-Chu school, yet other books credit him with complementing the evolution of Neo-Confucianism, though nominally not a part of it.

What is our choice? We can make a clear distinction: Neo-Confucian to be the specific exclusive term referring to one particular school only and "neo-traditional" Confucians as the general all-inclusive term for all.

Also missing in many standard histories of philosophy is the broad historical or mainly political context. The classic accounts deal chiefly with the five masters of the Northern Sung, Chu Hsi, his companions, plus Lu Chiu-yuan. The modern works expand this list into a mix bag by adding the following:

1. Reform thinker: Wang An-shih;
2. Opposing conservatives such as Ssu-ma Kuang;
3. Other conservatives of great fame such as Su Shih;
4. Famous patriots with military-related theories such as Ch'ien Liang 陳亮;
5. Utilitarian thinkers prominent in the Southern Sung such as Ch'ien Fu-liang 陳傅良 and Yeh Shih 葉適.

The roll-call seems acceptable. But how does the whole picture look? Suppose some one should ask: what did the Sung intellectuals have in common, and how did they differ? Are we going to say that in addition to the Neo-Confucian philosophers there were an assortment of reform and conservative thinkers, patriotic and utilitarian intellectuals?

Perhaps highly specialized schools might dismiss such general questions as elementary and beneath their concern. But classroom teachers would find it hard to ignore the understandable curiosity of their students. A mixed bag is no answer. It has neither a theme nor a scheme.

How does one see neo-traditional Confucians on the whole? Are there not some major threads running through them? Of course one must not impose a pattern on seemingly confusing historical complexity. One must not be more schematic than objective. However it is possible to find meaningful patterns. While the patterns may be our interpretation and to that extent not entirely objective, they do rest on objective facts. Moreover, there should be more angles to look at the past, just as one turns a diamond around to see different reflections.

Classification is a scheme by which we see some pattern. It is nothing new. The *lieh-chuan* 列傳 in the dynastic histories are not just a series of biographies. *Lieh* means to arrange them in ranking order or in distinct groups. Following this time-honored method as well

as modern social sciences, one may classify the Sung Confucian intellectuals in any or several of the following ways:

1. To classify them by geographic distribution, as the Sung people already divided themselves into Lo 洛, Shuo 朔, and Shu 蜀 or during the Southern Sung into Fukien 福建, Yung-chia (Wen-chou) 永嘉(温州), Chin-hua 金華, and Kiangsi 江西.

2. To classify them by their family background: whether their grandfather or father had already become a minor official, a degree-holder, or a high official.

3. To classify them by the length of time they served at court versus the length of time they served in local government.

4. To classify them by their foremost field: classical studies? history? prose? or poetry?

What we choose to do here is an intellectual-political combination, the combination of scholar and official. But we exclude the ordinary Confucians or scholar-officials who conformed to the on-going Confucian establishment or conventional ways. They were not true intellectuals. Only the true intellectuals -- thinkers or philosophers -- raised questions about the prevailing conditions. Critical and often creative, they were the ones who proposed new ideas and changes. The vital question in classifying them is: how did each of them react both intellectually and politically toward the Confucian establishment at the time?

As if by common sense, their varying reactions fall into three groups, clusters, or trends: either something new in one focal area, or something new in several selective areas, or something new in a large number of areas.

If we insert the concept of tradition into this simple framework, then the three groups, clusters, or trends become:

- uplifting the tradition;
- improving upon the tradition;
- starting a new tradition or branch of the neo-tradition.

By looking at their mode of reaction to the prevailing Confucian establishment, we can put them in yet another form:

- advocates of re-energizing ideals;
- selective renovators but otherwise conservatives;
- reconstructing fundamentalists whose ideas and sometimes actions are radically different from that of the establishment, but not to be called radicals for they were never against the tradition or heritage of Confuciansim.

Such typology offers of course mere configurations rather than watertight compartments. The thinkers may have various thoughts over the years, under different circumstances, or in separate categories that appear to be uneven, divergent, or inconsistent. Also there are naturally many exceptions. Nevertheless the essential or general characterizations would stand. To save words, we beg to present a bird's eye view in the format of a table:

A SIMPLIFIED TABLE OF SUNG CONFUCIANS
SHOWING VARYING NEO-TRADITIONAL PERSUASIONS

Group or cluster of trend (as classified here)	Some leading intellectuals in the Northern Sung	Some leading intellectuals in the Southern Sung
ADVOCATES OF RE-ENERGIZING IDEALS (to raise morality and morale)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sun Fu (to make Confucianism supreme) - Ssu-ma Kuang (extending into history) - Su Shih (extending into literature and arts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yang Shih and other moralistic conservatives (to restore moral principles)
SELECTIVE RENOVATORS (to improve the system in selective areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fan Chung-yen (to lead the 1043-44 minor reform) - Ou-yang Hsiu (to uplift essay style and examination standards) - Ch'eng I and other philosophers (to develop new dimensions of Confucianism) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ch'en Liang, the hawk (to use new measures for military recovery) - Ch'en Fu-liang, Yeh Shih, and other utilitarians (to stress statecraft and improve selective institutions) - moderate philosophers, Neo-Confucian or otherwise; e.g., Lu Chiu-yuan (school of mind; on educational improvements)
RECONSTRUCTING FUNDAMENTALISTS a) reformers (to change the system by new institutions b) philosophers (to transform the people and thereby the system by reorientation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wang An-shih and neo-learning school in major reform and restored reform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transcendental moralists - Neo-Confucians led by Chu Hsi (Ch'eng-Chu school; school of principles; school of the true Confucian way; state orthodoxy from late Sung on)

A table has the advantage of seeing at a glance the entire landscape of the Sung Confucian intellectuals, all their neo-traditional variety, including the Neo-Confucian school. The contents of their thinking and philosophies need not detain us here, for information on these are readily available in standard works. On the other hand, some brief explanations on where we differ from the standard works are in order.

On the advocates of re-energizing ideals, Sun Fu 孫復 was the earliest one to issue what might call a "Confucian manifesto," declaring it to be a shame on Confucians to tolerate Buddhism and Taoism. Ssu-ma Kuang, though invariably labelled as a conservative, actually held the ideal of improving administration through selecting morally sound as well as qualified officials. Su Shih put his faith in refined culture (wen 文) without indoctrination as the way to an enlightened society. Yang Shih 楊時 the key transmitter of the Ch'eng school to the Southern Sung, stressed moral awakening through philosophical cultivation. Hardly any of these advocates who raised re-energizing ideals developed elaborate theories or concrete programs.

The second group, cluster, or trend consisted of selective renovators who tried to make the established system work better. Fan Chung-yen 范仲淹 expressed the famous "scholar's declaration of dedication" and led a short-lived minor reform. Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽修, though not very effective in changing the government affairs, changed the prose style, the principal means of communication, as well as various interpretations in classical studies. Surprising as it may seem, the Ch'eng brothers and kindred philosophers did not in their own time advocate any thorough-going transformation. But they changed the very foundation of the existing Confucianism by introducing metaphysics and cosmology. This was the key turning point that led to the rise of Neo-Confucianism.

All selective renovators looked for a key that would unlock the door to a better state and society, without necessarily changing much else. In the Southern Sung, Ch'en Liang 陳亮 found his key in military-related affairs. Ch'en Fu-liang 陳傅良 looked into institutions for improvement. Yeh Shih 葉適 excelled in concrete theories if statecraft. Even though he had original ideas, he would renovate rather than innovate and in that sense stay in large part on the conservative side.

Lu Chiu-yuan, though an able adversary of Chu Hsi, did not command a broad range of knowledge as Chu had. Formulating a new idealistic philosophy, remarkable in psychological depth, he beamed on a wave length close to that of the Ch'eng brothers. He found a new key but did not wish to do much else.

Our brief explanation of the table finally comes to its surprising and possibly disputable part: putting Wang An-shih 王安石, the reformer, in the same boat as Chu Hsi and his school who were highly critical of Wang and his New Policies. As well known, polarized adversaries often share paradoxically some common characteristics. Wang wanted drastic institutional changes; this was what the Chu Hsi school considered to be the wrong way. But the Chu Hsi school advocated a thorough re-orientation of the society from the mentality of the emperor down through the molding of young scholars to every aspect of daily life. It was as sweeping as it could be. No other Sung intellectuals ever went that far. In any event, Wang An-shih and the Neo-Confucian school agreed completely

on the basic point of departure: the on-going Confucianism won't do; a fundamental reconstruction was in order.

The two sides also locked horns on the issue of orthodoxy, with interesting historical and geographical background factors. Wang An-shih believed that the government should uphold one integral set of virtues (*i-tao-te* 一道德), in other words, one uniform value system. This was close to declaring a new orthodoxy. The conservative opponents followed the northern tradition in the Yellow River valley in allowing various interpretations to co-exist (*chien-ts'un* 兼存), rather than settling on one (*ting yü i* 定於一). But the Chu Hsi Neo-Confucians, in spite of their respect for the earlier conservatives, escalated their position to a self-righteous stand. Paradoxically they went in the same direction as Wang An-shih had gone in wanting their exclusive interpretation to be the orthodoxy. Both Wang and the Neo-Confucians were from the south, at the time intellectually a new frontier where the leading exponents were characteristically aggressive, at least very different from the northern style.

Wang's reform system became discredited, largely owing to the mounting abuses, especially during the restored reform phase under the indulgent emperor Hui-tsung 徽宗. On the other hand, the Chu Hsi Neo-Confucians survived political persecution and went on to clinch the Confucian orthodoxy or state ideology (article originally in English, in *Philosophy East and West*, 23 (1973), 463-505; and the version in Chinese in *Wenshi* 文史 (1980), 7:129-148). However, it was a Pyrrhic victory; neither the court nor the bureaucracy was sincere about it. The emperor who proclaimed the orthodoxy was post-humously honored as *Li-tsung* 理宗; in fact, he cared little about *Li* or the principle. His abusive surrogate and many other officials likewise. Against the threat of the northern regimes who would well claim by virtue of the central geographic location the political orthodoxy of legitimate succession, the Southern Sung merely wanted to re-assure herself in defensive psychology that it had the ideological orthodoxy and hence the cultural superiority. Nonetheless, the Neo-Confucian orthodoxy did win socially and become neo-tradition in the society.

In concluding, let us comment once more on the neo-traditional period that stretched from the Sung to the 19th century. The double failures of Wang An-shih and the Neo-Confucians in politics meant that Sung Confucian intellectuals had no way of changing or transforming the autocracy and the bureaucracy. Later Confucian intellectuals fared worse; they did not even have a chance to try as hard. While the neo-traditional society remained stable along with internal refinements, the political system unchecked by anything else became decadent. The intellectuals were boxed in between the high ideals of the bygone centuries and the harsh realities of an oppressive environment.