

Reprinted with permission.

H
1/5

1

CH'ING DYNASTY "SCHOOLS" OF SCHOLARSHIP*

Benjamin Elman
Colby College

In a pioneering essay written in 1924, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao attempted to delineate the geographical distribution of the major schools of scholarship that existed during the Ch'ing dynasty. These schools had long been embedded as discrete entities in the literature of and about the period. School divisions were taken for granted as evidence of the filiation of scholars, who through personal or geographical association, philosophic or literary agreement, or master-disciple relations could be linked together into specific groups.¹

Liang added needed precision to earlier descriptions of the generally accepted schools of learning that had flourished in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. The usefulness of these school divisions lies in two areas of concern. First, they provide us with a preliminary framework from which to sort out the complicated intellectual developments that appeared during the Ch'ing dynasty. Second, an understanding of these traditional schools allows us to evaluate the organizational principles that underlay the divisions themselves.

* The author wishes to express his gratitude to the editors of Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i for their thoughtful criticism of an earlier draft of this article. Their suggestions for improvement have been incorporated into the present version.

Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i is published twice a year in June and December. Annual subscriptions are US\$7.50. All correspondence relating to subscriptions should be sent to Mary Rankin at the above address.

Mary Rankin
1614 44th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Susan Maguin
History Department CO
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104

Editors:
James Cole
6 Strong Street
New Haven, Conn. 06515

Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i publishes articles on all aspects of Chinese history, society, economics, politics, literature, philosophy, religion, art, and bibliography from the seventeenth through the early twentieth century. It also will publish news of conferences, exhibitions, publications, and dissertations on the Ch'ing period.

Manuscripts may be submitted to any editor. They should be typed on 8 1/2 x 11 bond, double-spaced. Notes should appear at the end, and characters should be inserted in the text. Both Wade-Giles and pinyin romanizations are acceptable. Full-length articles are approximately 25-35 pages. Shorter notes are also published. Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i is abstracted in Historical Abstracts and American History and Life.

Back issues: Complete sets are no longer available. Remaining issues may be purchased individually at the following prices. Inquire as to the availability of specific issues. A complete listing of the contents of all back issues through Volume 3, No. 10 (December 1978) may be found in Volume 4, No. 1 (June 1979).

Volume 3 at \$2.50 each
Volume 4 at \$3.75 each

In the discussion below, we will summarize the traditionally acknowledged school divisions in Ch'ing scholarship. In addition to relying on Liang Chi-ch'ao's analysis, our account will be based on the schematic diagrams of schools of learning in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries drawn by Naitō Konan and Nakamura Kyūshirō earlier this century. These diagrams offer easy, if preliminary, access to the intellectual complexities of Ch'ing dynasty k'ao-cheng 考證 [evidential research] scholarship--the dominant trend in intellectual life in late imperial China.²

Taken together, Liang's, Naitō's, and Nakamura's accounts provide us with an antidote to the generally accepted but inaccurate twentieth-century view (particularly prominent among western historians) that k'ao-cheng scholars were simply members of a minor faction or a single school. We will not attempt to explicate in detail the organizational principles that underlie the school divisions. Here we will simply provide an introductory geographical framework, which others have found useful in their research, for those scholars who have been interested in but perplexed by the vibrant intellectual life in late imperial China. In final remarks, we will suggest ways in which the organizational strategies used by Ch'ing scholars to evaluate their intellectual pedigrees can be better placed within a framework of analysis that allows us to see the unified aspects of academic life, particularly in the Lower Yangtze provinces, which superseded local and regional differences.

We should begin, however, by voicing a few needed qualifications and caveats. It is important, for the reasons outlined above, to recognize that the diversity of ideas current during the Ch'ing dynasty usually was viewed through the traditional prism of "schools." Although the reality behind this approach is worth exploring, it has often been applied in a vague manner. In the history of Chinese painting, for instance, James Cahill has explained that the Che 浙 (Hangchow) and Wu 吳 (Soochow) schools served as the basis for historical and theoretical discussions during the Ming dynasty. He has questioned whether the distinction between the two schools in art history is "clear and useful." Confessing himself a "splitter," as opposed to a "lumper," however, Cahill concluded that, in painting, correlations between regional and stylistic criteria were observable and real.³

Similar problems arise in any effort to make sense out of the many so-called "schools of scholarship" in China during the Ch'ing dynasty. The traditional notions of p'ai 派 [faction], chia 家 [school], or chia-hauh 家學 [learning of a school] are less precise than traditional scholars tended to assume. Chang Hsueh-ch'eng 章學誠 (1738-1801), for example, is normally associated with the Che-tung 浙東 [Eastern Chekiang, lit., "East of the Che (Ch'ien-t'ang) River"] school of history and statecraft, and he himself claimed to be a member. Yet, as Yü Ying-shih has pointed out, as late as 1797, four years before his death, Chang still had no clear understanding of the Che-tung

school or of his relation to it. Until that time, Chang was still linking the patriarch of the Che-tung school, Huang Tsung-hai 黃宗羲 (1610-95), to Chu Hai's 朱熹 (1130-1200) school of thought. Chang made this connection despite the fact that the Che-tung school traced its genealogy back to Wang Yang-ming 王陽明 (1472-1529).⁴

What then constitutes an intellectual school in China? Nathan Sivin has defined a school as "the special theories or techniques of a master, passed down through generations of disciples by personal teaching. . . ." This definition stresses the transmission of a text through a school and what the master claimed as the orthodox interpretation. One obvious difficulty with this otherwise extremely useful definition arises from the mixing of master-disciple and geographical criteria. A member of a geographically defined school frequently travelled and acquired disciples outside his home area. Should geographical criteria be used, or master-disciple relations, to document the nature of the learning transmitted? Often these criteria were hopelessly mixed together.

In some cases, a school was little more than a vague logical category whose members shared a textual tradition, or geographical proximity, or personal association, or philosophic agreement, or stylistic similarities, or combinations of these. In many cases, the definition of a "school" merely legitimated the organizations that prepared its genealogy or provided rationalizations for the focus of scholarly activities peculiar

to a particular region. We are on somewhat firmer ground, however, when "schools" refer to specific geographical areas during particular periods of time. To speak, as Chinese and Japanese scholars do, of the "Soochow school" or the "Yangchow school" during the eighteenth century does not obviate the dangers outlined above; this perspective can be useful, nonetheless, for an overview of Ch'ing currents of scholarship.

In the discussion that follows, we will describe which organizational principles were used to define Ch'ing schools of learning. The mixing of criteria for the filiation of schools is a hazard that all intellectual, literary, and art historians must wade through as they attempt to arrive at the best angle from which to view a particular problem. Part of the justification for this article lies in providing some working guidelines for making sense out of Ch'ing intellectual history.

THE CENTRALITY OF KIANGNAN IN CH'ING ACADEMICS

Since the medieval economic revolution that began in China in the middle of the T'ang dynasty (618-906), intellectual life was dominated by "men from the South." North China, although still the setting for important political events, no longer took the lead in the cultural life of the country. During the Sung dynasty (960-1279), when the rich delta lands of the South became the chief suppliers of China's granaries, literati from the South initiated most of the great movements in art, letters, and scholarship that dominated succeeding dynasties.⁶

We now recognize that the Yangtze River basin was the hub of commerce and communication in late Imperial China. The growth and multiplication of cities and market towns there created a new social environment for new movements in cultural life reflecting the merging of mercantile and literati interests.⁷ Schools of art, literature, and philosophy that emerged in the Lower Yangtze region became models for the entire country to emulate. It was in this milieu that the schools of Chu Hsi and Wang Yang-ming grew into the Neo-Confucian, i.e., Tao-hsueh 道學 [studies of the Tao], patterns of discourse, which provoked the K'ao-cheng reaction in the seventeenth century. After the Manchu takeover in 1644, southern literati led the way in solving the the dilemmas posed by the collapse of Ming rule. Their turn away from moral cultivation to precise scholarship was a key element in the Chinese response to the Ming collapse.⁸

Punctuating as a "national elite," literati from the Lower Yangtze region were able to transmit much of the verve and flavor of Kiangnan 江陰 [lit., "South of the Yangtze," i.e., the most important parts of Kiangsu, Anhwei, and Chekiang provinces] academics to the capital in Peking. This transmission was accomplished through the official projects sponsored by the imperial government during the Ch'ing dynasty, as well as through the official examination system in which Lower Yangtze scholars traditionally excelled. Kiangnan trends in scholarship, art, and literature were also diffused throughout China because of these patronage networks.⁹

SCHOOLS OF LEARNING IN KIANGSU

Ku Yen-wu 顧炎武 (1613-82) and Yen Jo-ch'ü 閔若 堯 (1636-1704) are generally considered to be the founders of the k'ao-cheng movement in Kiangsu scholarship. Because they were primarily considered scholars of the Classics, their emphasis on classical studies was employed by Ch'ing literati to distinguish Ku and Yen from the more historically oriented Eastern Chekiang scholars. Kiangsu schools of learning were then usually broken down further by focusing on urban centers or subregions within the province. Table 1 gives an outline of members of these provincial schools.

TABLE 1. SCHOOLS OF LEARNING IN KIANGSU DURING THE CH'ING DYNASTY AND A FEW FAMOUS ADHERENTS OF EACH

K'UN-SHAN	SOOCHOW
Ku Yen-wu	Hui Chou-hsi
Hau Yuan-wen	Hui Shih-ch'ü
Hau Ch'ien-hsueh	Hui Tung
Ku Tsu-yü	Chiang Sheng
Chu Ho-ling	Ch'ien Ta-hsin
Yen Jo-ch'ü	Wang Ming-sheng
Hu Wei	Wang Ch'ang
	Pi Yuan
	Chiang Fan
YANGCHOW	CE'ANG-CHOU
Wang Mao-hung	Chuang Ts'ün-yü
Wang Chung	Chuang Shu-tau
Wang Nien-sun	Chuang Shou-chia
Liu T'ai-kung	Chuang Yu-k'ü
Chiao Hsun	Li Chao-lo
Juan Yuan	Liu Feng-lu
Chiang Fan	Chang Hui-yen
Wang Yin-chih	Yun Ch'ing
Ling Shu	Sung Hsiang-feng
Liu Wen-ch'ü	Kung Tzu-chen
Liu Shih-p'ei	Wei Yuan

K'ao-cheng Scholarship in K'un-shan

Hsu Yuan-wen 徐元文 (1634-91) and Hsu Ch'ien-hsueh 徐乾學 (1631-94), nephews of Ku Yen-wu, were best known as patrons who provided the official auspices for scholarly associations of literati in the seventeenth century. Hsu Yuan-wen was in charge of the Ming History project from 1679-84; Ch'ien-hsueh was director from 1684-90. As a result, the Hsu brothers had a great deal of influence on the tenor of scholarship during the 1680's.

That Hsu Ch'ien-hsueh held high regard for the emerging K'ao-cheng scholarship of his time is apparent in his choice of scholars to work on the Ta-Ch'ing I-t'ung-chih 大清一統志 [Comprehensive Geography of the Great Ch'ing Realm] project. For example, Hsu engaged Yen Jo-ch'nd as his personal secretary and then appointed Yen as an editor of topographical material for the geography project. The appointment to the project staff of K'un-shan native Ku Tau-yd 顧祖禹 (1631-92), perhaps the most qualified student of historical geography in his time, indicates the high degree of professionalism with which the project was carried out.

When Hsu Ch'ien-hsueh was forced to leave Peking in 1690, he was able to move the entire geographical compilation to his estate in K'un-shan, southwest of Soochow. Many Kiangsu scholars, who might never have participated if the project had remained in Peking, were able to add their efforts to the compilation. The exact scholarship used in the project required critical

collection and comparison of geographical materials and accounts. Methods used by scholars such as Yen Jo-ch'nd and Hu Wei 胡渭 (1633-1714), who worked on the compilation, became the hallmark of evidential research in the Ch'ing dynasty.¹⁰

As a school of learning, K'un-shan scholarship represented a mixture of teacher-disciple relations traceable back to Ku Yen-wu and patron-client connections revolving around the Hsu brothers in Peking and Kiangsu. Geographical criteria were less important, because Ku Yen-wu was often seen as the patriarch for Kiangsu scholarship in general and not just a representative of K'un-shan learning. K'un-shan, a county in Soochow Prefecture, was more often than not subsumed under Soochow, the capital of Kiangsu province.

Han Learning in Soochow

Known mainly for advancing the slogan of Han Learning (Han-hsueh 漢學) in the eighteenth century, Hui Tung 惠棟 (1697-1758) and his Soochow followers were regarded as opponents of the Neo-Confucian philosophies associated with the Sung and Ming dynasties. They turned instead to a study of Han dynasty (206 B.C.-A.D. 220) classical interpretations, because the latter were closer in time to the composition of the Classics and thereby more likely to reveal the authentic meaning they conveyed. This Han-Sung controversy was one of the most significant features of Ch'ing thought, and, as Yü Hsing-shih has pointed out, "became the conceptual starting point for various

modern interpretations of Ch'ing intellectual history."¹¹

In the eighteenth century, scholars routinely associated k'ao-cheng with the ascendancy of Han Learning. Seventeenth-century scholars such as Ku Yen-wu and Yen Jo-ch'ng were certainly precursors of Han Learning because they rejected Sung-Ming sources in favor of earlier Han materials. Strictly speaking, however, Han Learning denotes a school of scholarship that came into fashion in Soochow with Hui Tung in the mid-eighteenth century. Although this school played a significant role in the rise of evidential studies to prominence in Kiangnan, Han Learning did not monopolize the k'ao-cheng identity. As we shall see, New Text scholars in Ch'ang-chou were also part of the scholarly environment that favored precise scholarship.

The turn to a k'ao-cheng methodology was evident not only in Han Learning--as is well-known--but also in Sung Learning (Sung-hsueh 宋學) scholarship produced during the Ch'ing dynasty. Rumoto Yasutaka has described in considerable detail the achievements in Sung Learning that resulted from the application of evidential research techniques to Sung sources. Many Sung Learning scholars provided the impetus for a syncretic movement in Changsha and Canton in the nineteenth century (see below), which attempted to synthesize Han Learning empirical research with Sung Learning moral philosophy.¹²

A further problem concerning the meaning of Han Learning is the distinction between the scholarship of the Later Han (A.D. 25-220) and former Han (206 B.C.-A.D. 9) dynasties. This

distinction is the crux of the Old Text-New Text controversy. So-called "Han Learning" of the eighteenth century tended to emphasize the Later Han annotations of the Classics, especially those by Cheng Hsuan 鄭玄 (127-200). Hence, Han Learning was frequently referred to simply as Cheng-hsueh 鄭學 (Cheng Studies). Wang Ch'ang 王承 (1724-1806), for example, referred to his library as the Cheng-hsueh-chai 鄭學齋 [Cheng Learning Study]. "Han Learning" really means "Later Han Learning." New Text scholarship, on the other hand, was moving toward "former Han Learning."¹³

The organizational rationale for the Soochow school rested on the research techniques and stress on Han sources that were transmitted via the Hui family to scholars and students who resided in or studied in Soochow. We should add, however, that there were other currents of thought in Soochow in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, including interest in Sung Learning, but these were overshadowed by Han studies. Ch'ien Tshin 錢大昕 (1728-1804) and Wang Ming-sheng 王鳴盛 (1722-98), both native sons of Chia-ting, were caught up in the Han Learning wave while students in the 1750's in Soochow.

Primary criteria for membership in the Soochow school were master-disciple relations, which traced their genealogy back to Hui Tung. Han Learning became so popular, however, that as a school it soon transcended its initial geographical locale and its official filiation. Philosophic agreement became the sign of Han Learning unity.¹⁴

Evidential Research in Yangchow

K'ao-cheng studies became important in Yangchow through the efforts of Wang Mao-hung 王懋功 (fl. ca. 1725), who applied evidential research to the study of the Chu Hsi tradition. Later Yangchow scholars traced their genealogy back to Wang, but few actually received or continued his teachings. Kondo Mitsuo, in his discussion of Yangchow scholarship in the late eighteenth century, has noted that Yangchow scholars were strongly influenced by Hui Tung's Soochow school.

Chiang Pan 江藩 (1761-1831), for instance, studied for a time in Soochow under Hui Tung's followers and was frequently sponsored by Juan Yuan 阮元 (1764-1849), one of the great patrons of Han Learning in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Chiang, with Juan's support, later compiled a highly controversial but authoritative genealogy of Han Learning entitled Record of Han Learning Masters of the Ch'ing Dynasty. Chiang thus was a member of the Soochow school according to master-disciple criteria, but a member of the Yangchow school by geographical association.¹⁵

The more formative influence in Yangchow, however, was Tai Chen's 戴震 (1724-77) critical approach to scholarship. Although himself a member of the Southeast Anhwei school (see below), Tai lived and taught in Yangchow from 1756-62, initially at the home of Wang An-kuo 王安國 (1694-1757), father of Wang Nien-sun 王念孫 (1744-1832). The latter acquired his training in phonetics and etymology from Tai, which he then

transmitted to his son, Wang Yin-chih 王引之 (1766-1834). Nien-sun and Yin-chih became two of the most important and influential k'ao-cheng scholars during the Ch'ing dynasty. A distinguished textual scholar in his own right, Wang Chung

江中 (1745-94) noted:¹⁶

At this time [ca. 1765] ancient learning (ku-hsueh 古學) was popular [in Yangchow]. Hui Tung of Yuan-ho (in Soochow) and Tai Chen of Hsiu-ning (in Anhwei) were admired by everyone. In the area north of the Yangtze River [i.e., Yangchow], Wang Nien-sun promoted ancient learning and [Li Ch'ün 李 (1734-84)] did the same. Liu T'ai-kung 劉台拱 (1751-1805) and I came along and continued [their efforts]. We worked hard together to realize our talents, and each of us formed his own [specialty of] learning.

In literature, Yangchow's Han Learning scholars were best remembered for their revival of Han dynasty P'ien-wen 駢文 [parallel prose] styles of writing, in opposition to the T'ang-Sung ku-wen 古文 [ancient prose] styles favored by New Text and Sung Learning scholars in Ch'ang-chou and T'ung-ch'eng. In fact, the Han Learning versus Sung Learning debate was also carried on in literary fields. The predilection for Han dynasty parallel prose among evidential scholars meant that for them literary prose required genres of expression that stressed ancient forms of writing. Genres were as much a part of academic debate as Confucian doctrine.¹⁷

Criteria for inclusion in the Yangchow school were for the most part geographical. If master-disciple connections are used to evaluate them, Yangchow literati must be viewed as direct offshoots of the Soochow and Southeast Anhwei schools. Based on

doctrine and literary agreement, Yangchow scholars were nevertheless a discrete group within the larger academic milieu in Kiangsu.

New Text Studies in Ch'ang-chou

Ch'ang-chou's geographical location between Soochow and Yangchow, north of Lake T'ai, made scholars there geographically part of the same general area in Kiangsu. Unlike their counterparts in Soochow and Yangchow, however, Ch'ang-chou scholars were chiefly known for their New Text studies. Standing on the borderline between Sung Learning and Han Learning, the works stressing the Kung-yang Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals that were authored by this small group of scholars relied on careful textual scholarship employing k'ao-cheng methods. Because it was a Former Han dynasty source, the Kung-yang Commentary received new respect and attention in the eighteenth century.

The Chuang family was the mainstay of this school. Juan Yuan, from nearby Yangchow, had close ties with several scholars from Ch'ang-chou; moreover, he had studied in Yangchow under Li Tao-nan 李道南 (1712-87), an examination disciple of Chuang Ts'un-yü 莊存與 (1719-88), the patriarch of the Ch'ang-chou tradition. Juan saw to it that many New Text works were included alongside the writings of Han Learning scholars in the Huang-Ch'ing ching-chieh 皇清經解 (Ch'ing Exegesis of the Classics) published in Canton in 1829. Kung Tzu-chen

龔自珍 (1792-1841) from Hangchow and 魏源 (1794-1856) from Hunan were students of Liu Feng-lu 劉逢禄 (1776-1829), Chuang Ts'un-yü's grandson, when Liu was an official serving in Peking.¹⁸

Linked to the New Text school in Ch'ang-chou was the rise of what is referred to as the Yang-hu school of "ancient prose" writing, named after a county in Ch'ang-chou prefecture, and the Ch'ang-chou school of 詞 [lyric] poetry, promoted by Yun Ching 惲敬 (1757-1817) and Chang Hui-yen 張惠言 (1761-1802) respectively. Hellmut Wilhelm has connected Yun and Chang to the New Text scholars. In both classical scholarship and traditional Chinese prose and poetry, the Ch'ang-chou literati were more favorably oriented to Sung Learning than their peers in Soochow and Yangchow.¹⁹

The Ch'ang-chou school was originally organized according to master-disciple relations based on the Chuang family. Like the Soochow school, however, it soon transcended its geographical ties. The filiation of New Text Confucianism extended well beyond Ch'ang-chou in the nineteenth century, when philosophic agreement became the determining measure for membership.

SCHOOLS OF LEARNING IN ANHWEI

Anhui province was traditionally divided into two major geographical areas. The northeastern part, which bordered on southern Kiangsu, was called 皖北 (Northern Anhwei); the southeast, which shared borders with northern Chekiang, was

referred to as Wan-nan 皖南 [Southern Anhwei]. Table 2 outlines members of the chief schools of learning that were associated with these two geographical divisions in Anhwei. 20

Exact Scholarship in Wan-nan

The decidedly scientific cast to the Wan-nan school began in the seventeenth century with the astronomical and mathematical research of Mei Wen-ting 梅文鼎 (1633-1721). Mei's interest in the western precise sciences introduced by the Jesuits in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was transmitted directly to his son Mei Ku-ch'eng 梅穀成 (d. 1763) and indirectly to Chiang Yung 江永 (1681-1762). Tai Chen, who together with Ch'ien Ta-hsin was known as one of the outstanding K'ao-cheng scholars of the eighteenth century, seems to have gotten his interest in astronomy, mathematics, and calendrical science from Chiang Yung. 21

TABLE 2. SCHOOLS OF LEARNING IN ANHWEI DURING THE CH'ING DYNASTY

WAN-NAN (SE Anhwei)	WAN-PEI (T'ung-ch'eng)
Mei Wen-ting	Fang I-chih
Chiang Yung	P'ao Pao
Mei Ku-ch'eng	Liu Ta-k'uei
Tai Chen	Yao Nai
Tuan Yü-ts'ai	Fang T'ung-shu
Ch'eng Yao-t'ien	Tseng Kuo-fan
Chin Pang	
K'ung Kuang-sen	
Wang Nien-sun	
Pao Shih-ch'ên	

In addition to their scientific interests, members of the Wan-nan school stressed precise evidential studies in phonology.

textual criticism, and etymology. Scholars such as Tuan Yü-ts'ai 段玉裁 (1735-1815) and Wang Nien-sun (both from Kiangsu) were direct disciples of Tai Chen; they in turn transmitted Tai's scholarship to their own home areas. Going beyond the Han Learning scholars, who placed undue emphasis on Han sources as the basis for textual verification, Tai and his followers developed a more critical orientation toward Han materials and attempted to verify knowledge in a more formal manner. Tai Chen was also interested in Neo-Confucian philosophic themes, for which he was criticized by his Han Learning friends. 22

Membership in the Wan-nan school depended for the most part on the filiation of scholars directly connected to Tai Chen. Very often stress on Tai's actual disciples resulted in stretching geographical criteria beyond Southeast Anhwei to include scholars from Kiangsu, Peking, and elsewhere. In these cases, agreement in research techniques frequently became the criterion for membership.

Sung Learning in T'ung-ch'eng

The city of T'ung-ch'eng represented a distinctive school of scholarship in northern Anhwei. In contrast to their southern Anhwei contemporaries, members of the Wan-pei school, which centered on T'ung-ch'eng, were famous for their powerful influence in promoting T'ung and Sung genres of "ancient prose" writing and for their partisan support for Sung Neo-Confucian philosophy in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centu-

ries. 23

Members of the Fang family were the main figures in this school of learning. Fang Pao 方苞 (1668-1749), although not the actual founder of the T'ung-ch'eng tradition, was referred to by later followers as the progenitor of an orthodox defense of Chu Hsi's teachings, which this school was famous for promoting in the nineteenth century. Han Learning was attacked as heterodox and morally bankrupt. Although Yao Nai 姚鼐 (1732-1815), and especially Fang Tung-shu 方東樹 (1772-1851), vehemently attacked Han Learning for its lack of moral concern, both Yao and Fang recognized the importance of k'ao-cheng research methods.²⁴

Along with the Yang-hu school of "ancient prose," with which T'ung-ch'eng stylists developed a rivalry, the T'ung-ch'eng school was largely responsible for the Sung Learning and "ancient prose" revivals in the nineteenth century. To counter the compositional principles used in parallel-prose examination essays, which Han Learning scholars promoted, Yao Nai delineated eight elements that "ancient prose" should have. Adherence to T'ang and Sung dynasty styles remained Yao's chief consideration. In addition to the "models and rules" (l-fa 義法) that writers of "ancient prose" favored for literary composition.

Tseng Kuo-fan 曾國藩 (1811-72), although from Hunan, was an important T'ung-ch'eng partisan in the mid-nineteenth century. The Hunan (Changsha) and Kwangtung (Canton) schools of learning shared the T'ung-ch'eng stress on moral self-cultivation

and social activism, which returned to favor as the Ch'ing state declined. Members of the T'ung-ch'eng school were defined more according to philosophic and literary agreement than actual master-student relations. Although a geographically defined entity, the T'ung-ch'eng school could also be considered part of the country-wide orthodox Ch'eng-chu (Ch'eng I 程頤, 1033-1107 and Chu Hsi) tradition during the Ch'ing dynasty.

SCHOOLS OF LEARNING IN CHEKIANG

Traditional geographical divisions in Chekiang were drawn between Che-tung and Che-hai 浙西 [western Chekiang, i.e., "West of the Che (Ch'ien-t'ang) River] since the T'ang dynasty. Strictly speaking, the prefectures southeast of the Ch'ien-t'ang, i.e., Ningpo, Shaohsing, T'ai-chou, Wenchow, and Chin-hua, made up what can be considered with some geographical precision "Eastern Chekiang." Western Chekiang, using similar geographical criteria, i.e., west and north of the Ch'ien-t'ang, was composed principally of Hangchow, Huchow, and Kashing prefectures.

Because of the proximity of the northern prefectures in Chekiang to southern prefectures in Kiangsu, the term "Che-hai" frequently lost its geographical precision and was applied indiscriminately to southern prefectures of Kiangsu as well. Hence, all areas in Kiangnan north of the Ch'ien-t'ang and south of the Yangtze could be loosely called "Western Chekiang." For this reason, Chang Hsueh-ch'eng named Huang Tsung-hsi from Shaohsing prefecture as the chief representative of Che-tung and

Ku Yen-wu from Soochow prefecture as the main figure in Che-hsi. Che-hsi and Che-tung eventually stood as the most representative school division between Kiangsu and Chekiang provinces. 26

There is much to be said for this blending of southern Kiangsu and northern Chekiang prefectures. Certainly the scholarship transmitted in this area was very similar. Northern Chekiang accordingly had more in common with southern Kiangsu than with Che-tung. This mixing of southern Kiangsu with Che-hsi forces us to acknowledge that provincial boundaries often were not very useful as guidelines for school divisions. We will return to this point in our concluding remarks.

TABLE 3. CHE-HSI AND CHE-TUNG SCHOOLS
DURING THE CH'ING DYNASTY

CHE-HSI (W. Chekiang)	CHE-TUNG (E. Chekiang)
Chu I-tsun	Liu Tsung-chou
Hu Wei	Huang Tsung-hsi
Yao Chi-heng	Mao Ch'i-ling
Feng Ching	Wan Sau-ta
Lu Wen-ch'ao	Wan Sau-t'ung
Hang Shih-chdn	Wan Ching
Sun Chih-tau	Wan Yen
Kung Tzu-chen	Ch'fan Tsu-wang
Liang Yd-sheng	Shao Chin-han
Yd Yueh	Chang Hsueh-ch'eng
Chang Ping-lin	
Wang Kuo-wei	

For the sake of geographical precision and consistency--since that is, for better or worse, the underlying premise of our presentation--we will adhere to the strict provincial definition of Che-hsi and Che-tung within Chekiang. Table 3 gives the schools of learning in Chekiang that we shall discuss.

Classical Studies in Che-hsi

Hangchow was the major seat of the Che-hsi school. Scholars there tended to stress classical research over other concerns. In general, they were more sympathetic with the Chu Hsi tradition than with the Wang Yang-ming school. Che-tung scholars, on the other hand, traced their intellectual genealogy to the latter. When evidential scholarship became popular in the seventeenth century, scholars in Hangchow and elsewhere in Che-hsi were influenced by this new trend.²⁷

Hu Wei, Chu I-tsun 朱彝尊 (1629-1709), and Yao Chi-heng 姚際恆 (1647-1715?) were the chief Che-hsi promoters of K'ao-cheng scholarship in the late seventeenth century. Hu Wei and Yen Jo-chn began a lifelong friendship as a result of their collaboration on Hsu Ch'ien-hsueh's Ta-Ch'ing I-t'ung-chin geography project. Both went on to apply their geographical expertise to dismantling geographical concepts that permeated Sung and Ming cosmological speculation.²⁸

Chu I-tsun and Yao Chi-heng were avid bibliophiles and remarkable textual scholars in their own right. Each made important contributions to classical research. Their native city of Hangchow continued to be a mecca for classical learning and book collecting in the eighteenth century. Library associations developed in Hangchow in the mid-eighteenth century, and in this setting scholar-bibliophiles such as Hang Shih-chdn 杭世駿 (1696-1773) and Lu Wen-ch'ao 盧文弨 (1717-96) carried out their research and searched for rare books and archaeological

relics. 29

Che-hsi intellectual currents came to fruition when Juan Yuan, acting governor of Chekiang in 1799, established the Ku-ching ching-she 詁經精舍 [Refined Study for the Explication of the Classical] academy in Hangchow. In an effort to link a classical education with a commitment to "concrete studies" (shih-hsueh 實學), Juan saw to it that students at the Ku-ching ching-she were examined in astronomy, mathematics, and geography, in addition to their literary and textual studies. Juan's position as an amateur patron of science was no doubt due to the impact of Tai Chen's scientific expertise earlier in Yangchow. Juan invited two outstanding k'ao-cheng scholars from Kiangsu, Sun Hsing-yen 孫星衍 (1753-1818) from Yang-hu and Wang Ch'ang from Chia-ting, to share the directorship. Both were leaders of the late eighteenth-century Han Learning movement and transmitted Kiangsu scholarly currents to Hangchow. Later Yu Yueh 俞樾 (1821-1907), who for three decades taught at the Ku-ching ching-she, continued the Che-hsi school of learning into the late nineteenth century. 30

Although Hangchow was a center of k'ao-cheng scholarship, Che-hsi as a school of learning was not based on master-disciple relations. For the most part, geographical proximity and agreement in general on the usefulness of evidential research united Che-hsi scholars into what loosely can be considered a school.

History and Statecraft in Che-tung

As we have already noted, Eastern Chekiang scholars were known for their emphasis on historical research and statecraft. Members of this school saw in history the verification of political principles enunciated in the Classics. Chang Hsueh-ch'eng, belatedly to be sure, contended that the Che-tung school could be traced back to the Southern Sung (1127-1279), but Yu Ying-shih has questioned the reliability of Chang's genealogy. 31

John Langlois, Jr. has pointed to the continuity of scholarly writings during the Sung-Yuan period that "were well within the developing tradition of statecraft (ching-shih 經世), of which Eastern Chekiang was the center." Langlois has argued that Chin-hua (a prefecture in central Chekiang) literati continued the Southern Sung Che-tung tradition of practical learning through the Yuan and into the early Ming dynasties. Presumably their historical focus was then passed on to Huang Taung-hsi and his seventeenth-century followers. 32

Despite the somewhat tenuous nature of the Che-tung genealogy during the Sung-Ming period, this school does deserve to be included among Ch'ing dynasty schools of scholarship. In the late seventeenth century, Che-tung clearly referred to a tradition of learning associated with the Ning-Shao area, which was revived by Huang Taung-hsi in the name of his revered teacher Liu Taung-chou 劉宗周 (1578-1645). Huang set the guidelines for Eastern Chekiang scholarship with his broad conception of the nature and scope of historical writing, which included philosophy

and literature. These guidelines were firmly set in place among those Che-tung scholars, notably members of the Wan family, who studied with Huang under the auspices of the Chiang-ching hui 之會 [Society for the Discussion of the Classics], which began meeting in 1658 and lasted until 1679.³³

Although the criteria used to define the Che-tung school depended on master-disciple relations emanating from Huang Tsung-hai, members of this tradition could not help but be influenced by k'ao-cheng currents developing just to the north. Yen Jo-chu's definitive demonstration that the Old Text chapters of the Documents Classic were a later forgery provoked heated responses among Che-tung literati. Mao Ch'i-ling 毛奇齡 (1623-1716), members of the Wan family, and Huang Tsung-hsi himself were forced to take up sides and evaluate the empirically based proofs Yen employed in his research. In the process, Che-tung scholars recognized the efficacy of evidential research in classical studies. This has led Ho Yu-sen to argue persuasively that Che-tung scholars, including Huang Tsung-hsi, devoted considerable research to the Classics, in addition to their better known historical writings.³⁴

Che-tung learning continued in the eighteenth century, principally through the efforts of Ch'uan Tsu-wang 全祖望 (1705-55). The latter traced his filiation directly back to Huang Tsung-hsi. We have included Shao Chin-han 邵晉涵 (1743-96) and Chang Bauh-ch'eng as late eighteenth-century members of the Che-tung school, despite the fact that their connection to this

school is questionable.³⁵

NORTHERN SCHOOLS OF LEARNING

Chihli province, because it contained the metropolitan capital of Peking, was the center of intellectual life in North China. Initially in the seventeenth century, scholars from Chihli were followers of the Chu Hsi or Wang Yang-ming schools of Neo-Confucianism. Sun Ch'i-feng 孫奇逢 (1585-1675) and Pao Pao 包 (1603-69) were representative of these early currents during the Ming-Ch'ing transition period. The decisive impact of the fall of the Ming dynasty in 1644 was for many literati who lived through this tragic period confirmation of the sterility and uselessness of the forms of Confucian discourse that preceded the Ming debacle, however. Members of both the Yen-Li school and the northern school of evidential research accordingly attacked what they considered the heterodox ideals and doctrines of their Neo-Confucian predecessors.³⁶

Yen-Li School

The Yen Yuan 顏元 (1635-1704)-Li Kung 李榕 (1659-1733) school emphasized concrete human experience and action based on Confucian ritual and opposed bookish learning and scholarship. Yen and Li adamantly rejected Sung Learning, but their ideas were relatively unimportant by the middle of the eighteenth century.

Followers of the Yen-Li school, although loosely centered on

North China, were defined more by similarities in ideas and approach based on the transmission of Yen Yuan's philosophy by Li Kung than actual geographical or historical coherence. It is interesting, however, that Li Kung travelled to Che-tung and worked under Mao Ch'i-ling in the 1690's. There he studied music and evidential research. On his way home in 1699, Li stopped in Hui-an, Kiangsu, and met and talked with Yen Jo-ch'nd about textual problems in the Old Text Documents debate. 37

TABLE 4. SCHOOLS OF LEARNING
IN NORTH CHINA DURING THE CH'ING

YEN-LI	HAN LEARNING
Yen Yuan	Chu Yun
Li Kung	Chi Yun
Ch'eng T'ing-tso	Chu Kuei
	Weng Fang-kang
NORTHERN (Chihli)	Ts'ui Shu
Sun Ch'i-feng	Ts'ui Mai
Tiao Pao	
Liu Hsien-t'ing	

Han Learning in Peking

Closely connected to the Lower Yangtze scholars who came to Peking in the eighteenth century, many members of the northern school were usually thought of as part of the k'ao-cheng movement. The Han Learning scholar Chi Yun 紀昀 (1724-1805) was a patron of Tai Chen and employed him, along with other Lower Yangtze scholars, on the Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu 四庫全書 [Complete Collection of the Four Treasuries (in the Imperial Library)] project initiated when Chi was appointed one of the two chief editors. Chu Yun 朱筠 (1729-81) was also a patron of

Han Learning. While provincial director of education in Anhwei from 1771-73, Chu employed on his secretarial staff many of the most prominent Kiangnan scholars associated with the k'ao-cheng movement. 38

Peking had been the focus of the Ch'eng-Chu orthodoxy, which the imperial court had sponsored in the examination system since the Yuan dynasty. Many eighteenth-century Peking scholars, including those who leaned toward Han Learning, were thus unwilling to oppose openly the official orthodoxy. Weng Fang-kang 翁方綱 (1733-1818), for example, felt uncomfortable with the Han Learning threat to demolish the Chu Hsi orthodoxy without satisfying the need for some moral order and certainty. Nevertheless, Weng recognized the importance of Han dynasty source materials. In his own research, he made a name for himself in the field of bronze and stone epigraphy (Chin-shih-hsueh 金石學). Epigraphy was one of the key areas of focus for k'ao-cheng scholars. They used relics and other archaeological pieces to understand better the Chinese past. 39

Filiation of scholars in Chihli seems to have been defined chiefly according to geographical proximity. Only the Yen-Li school was defined according to master-disciple relations. Han Learning scholars shared the same interests, but these were general and often reflected the influence of Kiangnan scholars such as Tai Chen and Ch'ien Ta-hsin, who were in Peking for important periods in their careers. Ts'ui Shu 崔述 (1740-1816), for instance, absorbed the Han Learning currents then in

vogue in Chihli, but he cannot be connected to any particular group in or near Peking. One of the most innovative textual scholars that the eighteenth century produced, Ts'ui remained largely unrecognized in his own time and carried out his research in relative isolation.

THE CH'ENG-CHU SCHOOL IN THE CH'ING

The most important feature of the Ch'eng-Chu school was its imperial sponsorship as an orthodoxy, which determined the official character of its activity. In addition, the Ch'eng-Chu school during the Ch'ing dynasty included men who devoted a major portion of their writings to practical studies that included scientific and statecraft research. Li Kuang-ti 李光地 (1642-1718) was from Fukien and Chang Po-hsing 張伯行 (1652-1725) from Honan. The others came from Kiangnan.

TABLE 5. THE CH'ENG-CHU SCHOOL IN THE CH'ING

Chang Li-hsiang
Lu Shih-l
Lu Lung-ch'i
Li Kuang-ti
Chang Po-hsing

Wing-tsit Chan has defended the intellectual vitality of this school during the Ch'ing dynasty, but has admitted that in the seventeenth century members of the Ch'eng-Chu school had already put practical matters ahead of the concerns with self-cultivation and moral philosophy around which this tradition had been formed. Chan has noted: "It is too much to claim that the

seventeenth-century Ch'eng-Chu school created the empirical atmosphere, but certainly it shared in and contributed to it."⁴⁰ Of all Ch'ing schools of learning, the Ch'eng-Chu tradition was most clearly defined on the basis of philosophic agreement. Geographical factors mattered only when a specific area developed a filiation based on Chu Hsi's writings. For this reason, the T'ung-ch'eng school, although a part of the Ch'eng-Chu tradition in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, was defined as a geographical entity.

TABLE 6. OTHER GEOGRAPHICAL SCHOOLS OF LEARNING

MIN FU (Fukien)	HUNAN (Changsha)
Huang Tao-chou	Wang Fu-chih
Li Kuang-ti	Yen Ju-i
Ch'en Shou-ch'i	Wei Yuan
Ch'en Ch'iao-ts'ung	Ho Ch'ang-ling
	T'ao Chu
YUEN SHI (Kwangtung)	Lo Tse-nan
Lin Po-t'ung	Tseng Kuo-fan
Chu Tz'u-ch'i	Li Yuan-ti
Ch'en Li	Wang K'ai-yun
Kuei Wen-ts'an	Wang Hsien-ch'ien
K'ang Yu-wei	P'i Hsi-ju
Liang Ch'i-ch'ao	T'an Ssu-t'ung

OTHER GEOGRAPHICAL SCHOOLS DURING THE CH'ING

The centrality of Kiangnan in eighteenth-century intellectual currents is also evident from the schools of learning that emerged in Fukien, Kwangtung, and Hunan during the nineteenth century. Although not simply tributaries of dominant trends in Soochow, Yangchow, and Ch'ang-chou, these other regional schools were in various ways stimulated by Kiangnan scholarship.

New Text Philology in Fukien

Fukien had long been famous as Chu Hai's home area, but its scholarly importance had declined steadily in the Ming. In the seventeenth century, the Tung-jin partisan and Ming loyalist Huang Tao-chou 黃道周 (1585-1646) remained loyal to the Sung-Ming Neo-Confucian tradition. Li Kuang-ti, an important political figure in Peking, supported the Ch'eng-Chu orthodoxy, but he also had contact with many k'ao-cheng scholars. In particular, Li patronized the Anhwei mathematician Mei Wen-t'ing at the imperial court. 41

In the nineteenth century, Ch'ien Shou-ch'i 陳壽祺 (1771-1834) and his son Ch'iao-ta'ung 喬樞 (1809-69) were known as New Text philologists. They attempted to reconstruct Western Han literary sources in order to correct errors in Eastern Han scholarship. Ch'ien Shou-ch'i was heavily influenced by research carried out by Lower Yangtze scholars in Soochow and Chang-chou. He was intimate with Chang Hui-yen and Wang Yin-chih while in Peking. Later, before returning to Fukien to teach for the final two decades of his life, Ch'ien taught at academies in Hangchow, including the Ku-ching ching-she. 42

As a school of learning, Fukien was a loosely defined geographical entity. Except for Ch'ien Shou-ch'i's disciples, there was little in the way of a provincial consensus that would justify its designation as a school. Ch'ien was acting as little more than a loyal son of Fukien when he receded for publication in the nineteenth century a collection of Huang Tao-chou's

writings.

Syncretism in Canton

Kwangtung in general and Canton in particular became famous as centers for the nineteenth-century movement to synthesize Han learning research methods with Sung Learning political and moral concerns. This movement was chiefly the result of the impact on Kwangtung intellectual life of the Hsueh-hai T'ang 學海堂 [Sea of Learning Hall], founded in Canton in 1820 by then Governor-general Juan Yuan. 43

The Hsueh-hai T'ang was established on the model of the Ku-ching ching-she in Hangchow. In addition to founding the academy and using students and scholars there to compile the Huang-Ch'ing Canton to supervise the compilation of the Kwangtung provincial gazetteer. At the same time, Juan sponsored the T'ung-ch'eng partisan Fang Tung-shu, who became embroiled in a vitriolic debate in Canton over the merits of Sung Learning, which he defended, in the 1820's and 1830's. Hence, the rapid rise to prominence of Kwangtung in nineteenth-century intellectual life can be traced to the Kiangnan currents introduced to Canton via the Hsueh-hai T'ang. 44

Cantonese scholars such as Lin Po-t'ung 林伯炯 (1775-1845) and his student Ch'ien Li 陳澧 (1810-82), both directors at the Hsueh-hai T'ang, called for a more comprehensive vision of Confucianism, one that would go beyond the limited textual

studies in typical evidential scholarship. In their hands, K'iao-cheng research was informed by theoretical and ethical issues and was not an end in itself. This syncretic movement was in some ways a derivative of the Ch'ang-chou New Text and T'ung-ch'eng Sung Learning schools. 45

Such eclectic tendencies remained a strong undercurrent through much of the nineteenth century. By 1830, Confucian literature could no longer remain immune to the political and social tremors that were felt in the society at large. The return to favor of Kung-yang studies and Sung Learning was paralleled and in part provoked by an intense moral concern for the state of the country and involvement with administrative problems growing out of the social and political pressures of the nineteenth century. These concerns, particularly in Canton and Changsha, led to an overt attack on Han Learning.

In fact, a straight historical line of transmission has been assumed, linking the eighteenth-century Ch'ang-chou school to K'ang Yu-wei 康有為 (1858-1927) and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao 梁啟超 (1873-1929) in Canton via Wei Yuan, Kung Tzu-chen, and the nineteenth-century statecraft movement. New Text Confucianism aided and abetted the reaction against what were considered sterile textual studies. K'ang Yu-wei, it is argued, then used New Text doctrines for his own purposes in an effort to justify the 1898 Reform Movement. 46

Although geographical association was the key element in the Canton school, its pedigree depended a great deal on master-dis-

ciple relations that were formed at the Hsueh-hai T'ang. Cantonese scholars thus looked to Juan Yuan as their ultimate sponsor, indicating their debt to Kiangnan schools of learning. Reformist Sung Learning in Changsha

Statecraft issues dominated currents of thought in Hunan and Kwangtung in the nineteenth century. Nascent statecraft schools emerged from academies in Changsha and Canton, where the administrative problems facing the Ch'ing state were more clearly visible. The role of Hunanese scholar-officials such as Ho Ch'ang-ling 何長齡 (1785-1848) and T'ao Chu 陶澍 (1779-1839) in promoting reformist Sung Learning in the early nineteenth century suggests that the anti-Han Learning movement was led by literati whose native origins were outside the Lower Yangtze region.

Phillip Kuhn has noted that in Hunan Han Learning never gained as secure a foothold as in Kiangnan. Hunanese thus were inclined to favor Sung moral philosophy, especially as it was applied to reformist politics. The patriarch of the Hunan school was the Ming loyalist Wang Fu-chih 王夫之 (1619-92). Writing in almost total isolation in Hunan after the Manchu triumph in 1644, Wang had remained relatively untouched by the precise scholarship and philological techniques that were popular in Kiangnan and elsewhere. Instead, Wang continued to stress Neo-Confucian philosophic themes and Sung Learning political issues. When his writings were recovered from obscurity in the nineteenth

century, Wang Fu-chih symbolized to his admirers the more practical moral philosophy that the latter thought typified Hunan. 47

Wei Yuan, influenced by New Text scholars, was dissatisfied with what he considered petty K'ao--cheng philology. Because he served at one time or another on the administrative staffs of several important provincial officials (including Ho Ch'ang-ling and T'ao Chu), Wei was able to translate his theoretical views into concrete statecraft proposals. The revival of social activism in Hunan influenced a long line of scholars. This movement culminated in the self-strengthening program for modernization promoted by Tseng Kuo-fan and his Hunanese circle. As we have seen, Tseng was influenced by the T'ung-ch'eng school of Sung Learning. Seen in this context, Tseng's contention that institutional and political reform would be successful only if it were based on a moral fervor that reintroduced self-cultivation and a concern for statecraft to Confucian discourse is representative of the nineteenth-century backlash against Han Learning. 48

As far as filiation, geographical criteria underlay the master-disciple connections and philosophic agreement that characterized the orthodox-minded members of the Hunan school. Tseng Kuo-fan of course reflected the impact that Kiangnan academics, via T'ung-ch'eng, still had in nineteenth-century Hunan. Within a larger perspective, however, Changsha along with Canton represented during this period a widely supported

statecraft movement, which influenced and was influenced by bureaucratic and political relationships that were formed at the national and provincial levels. 49

* * *

This brief and in many ways cursory survey of Ch'ing schools of scholarship demonstrates the centrality of Lower Yangtze scholarly movements in the development of schools of thought in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century China. The schools that emerged in Peking, Fukien, Kwangtung, and Hunan in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were in many ways tributaries of or reactions against the dominant K'ao--cheng trends that developed in Lower Yangtze urban centers.

The persistence of these scholarly divisions into the nineteenth century raises the question of their usefulness in understanding twentieth-century intellectual developments. The latter, for the most part, have not been looked at through the prism of traditional Chinese schools of learning. Many modern Chinese intellectuals, however, seem to have been conscious of their connections to scholarly traditions that preceded them. Here we can only provide a few disjointed suggestions, which may deserve more careful study. To discuss them at greater length would require coming to grips with the question of in what ways these schools still served as intellectual markers in a changing intellectual and political milieu.

Liu Shih-p'ei 劉師培 (1884-1919) and Chang Ping-lin 章炳麟 (1868-1936) often acknowledged their debt to their Ch'ing predecessors. Before his interest in anarchism began in 1907, Liu admired Tai Chen for his critique of the oppressive aspects of the Ch'eng-Chu orthodoxy. After returning to China from Japan in the early part of this century, Liu decided to immerse himself in the evidential research tradition handed down through his family, which included generations of distinguished scholars in Yangchow. Liu's family traced its genealogy back to his great grandfather Liu Wen-ch'i 劉文祺 (1789-1856), who initiated the family's specialization in studies of the Tso Chuan 左傳 [Tso's Commentary (to the Spring and Autumn Annals)]. 50

Chang Ping-lin, better known for his opposition to Manchu rule, received a classical education according to the Che-hsi tradition while a student at the Ku-ching ching-she in Hangchow. When he fled to Japan in 1902 seeking political asylum, Chang impressed overseas Chinese students there with his combination of radical politics and classical erudition. Among those who followed him was Lu Hsun 魯迅 (1881-1936), then a student in Tokyo. Lu Hsun's own interests in ancient relics, woodblocks, and traditional Chinese literature may in some ways be linked to his geographical origins in Shaohsing, the heartland of Che-tung. 51

Reformers in both Kwangtung and Hunan were still indirectly tied to regional schools of learning. In Canton, K'ang Yu-wei studied for a time under Chu Tz'u-ch'i 朱次琦 (1807-81), who, although offered a fellowship to the Hsueh-hai T'ang in 1834

and invited to become a director there in 1859, rejected both because of his opposition to what he considered the prevailing Han Learning attitude on the part of scholars and teachers at the academy. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, K'ang's protégé, studied for a time at the Hsueh-hai T'ang in the 1880's. Much of the basis of his later classical erudition may have been learned there, in addition to his studies under K'ang Yu-wei's direction. P'i Hsi-jui 皮錫瑞 (1850-1908) and T'an Sau-t'ung 譚嗣同 (1865-1898), in addition to their involvement in the reform movement in Changsha, were also classical scholars of note. A follower of the New Text tradition, P'i Hsi-jui in particular made substantial contributions to our understanding of the Confucian classical tradition. 52

For final examples, we might mention Wang Kuo-wei 王國維 (1877-1927) and Ch'en Tu-hsiu 陳獨秀 (1880-1942). A native of Hsi-ning, Chekiang, Wang Kuo-wei, after early flirtations with first philosophy and then literature, eventually became a distinguished textual scholar and oracle bone specialist. Wang's stress on precise scholarship seems directly tied to the Che-hsi tradition. In fact, when Wang Kuo-wei was about to return to China in 1915, after spending a number of years collaborating with Lo Chen-yü 羅振玉 (1866-1940) in Japan on bronze, stone, and oracle bone inscriptions, Lo wished Wang well and said that he hoped Wang would become the next Ku Yen-wu of China. 53

Ch'en Tu-hsiu, a founding member of the Chinese Communist Party, seems to have evaluated many of his own scholarly interests according to his native Wan-pei (T'ung-ch'eng) school of learning. Ch'en's work in ancient Chinese etymology and phonetics, which he carried out after his expulsion from the Communist Party, may represent efforts late in his life to continue the classical scholarship of his predecessors. 54

Let us suggest in closing that the prism of Ch'ing schools of scholarship, while useful at a preliminary level of investigation, seriously refracts the geographical overlaps, complex master-disciple relations that crossed provincial boundaries, and shared elements of research that unified--despite local and regional differences--the disparate schools. Especially in Kiangnan, the cross-fertilization of ideas and K'ao-cheng research techniques forces us to acknowledge that there were definite unifying features, which transcended individually defined schools of learning. Despite obvious differences in focus and interest, which we have described above, all these schools defined themselves according to shared criteria. These shared criteria in turn allowed each school to emphasize their unique characteristics. Too often historians have been misled by the latter and thereby missed the unified aspects of scholarly life in late imperial China.

Elsewhere I have explored beneath the surface of geographical diversities in time and place in order to discover what

social and institutional patterns were responsible for the emergence and subsequent triumph of evidential research in the Lower Yangtze schools of learning. My conclusion has been that the schools outlined above operated within what should be called the "Lower Yangtze academic community." Local schools of scholarship actually represented distinct subcommunities within specific urban areas. The larger academic community embraced these distinct subcommunities of scholars, which we have usually categorized as schools. It was from this academic community of K'ao-cheng scholars that Lower Yangtze currents of thought later spread to Peking, Canton, and elsewhere. 55

1. Liang Chi-chiao 梁啟超, "Chin-tai hseuh-feng chin-tai li te fen-pu" 近代學風之地理的分布 [Geographical Distribution of Scholarly Currents in Modern Taiwan], in Yin-ping-shih chuan-chi 飲冰室集 (Collected Works from the Ice-Drinker's Studio) (Taipei: Chung-hua shu-ch'u, 1969, Vol. 9), pp. 1-35.
2. Naito Konan. (Recent State of Chinese Scholarship), in 支那學研究 近狀 (Complete State of Chinese Scholarship), in Malto Konan zenshu (Complete Works of Naito Konan) (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1969-74, 13 vols), VI/51-52, and Nakamura Kyūshirō 中村久博士, "Shincho gakujutsu shiso shi (I)" 清代學術思想史(一), [History of Thought and Scholarship in the Ch'ing Dynasty (I)], To A kenkyū 東亞研究, II, 11 (Nov. 1912): 51-52.
3. Cahill, Parting At the Shore (N.Y.: Weatherhill, 1978), pp. 135, 163. For different views, see Harrie Vanderstappen, "The Style of Some Seventeenth-Century Chinese Paintings," in Artists and Traditions. Uses of the Past in Chinese Culture, edited by Christian Murck (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1976), pp. 149-66, and Richard Edwards, "The Orthodoxy of the Unorthodox," in Artists and Traditions, pp. 183-99.
4. Yü Ying-shih 余英時, Lun Tai Chen Yü Chang Hsueh-ch'eng 的 教 育 學 說 (On Tai Chen and Chang Hsueh-ch'eng) (Hong Kong: Lung-men shu-t'ien, 1976), p. 57. See also David Nivison, The Life and Thought of Chang Hsueh-ch'eng (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1966), pp. 277-79.
5. Stvin, "Copernicus in China," Colloquia Copernica II. Etudes sur l'audience de la théorie heliocentrique (Warsaw: Union Internationale d'Histoire et Philosophie des Sciences, 1973), p. 96n. See also Nivison, Change, p. 74.
6. Sillas Wu, Passage To Power. Kang-hsi and his Heir Apparent, 1661-1722 (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1979), pp. 39-52, 83-105, and G. William Skinner, "Regional Urbanization in Nineteenth-Century China," in The City in Late Imperial China, edited by Skinner (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1977), pp. 211-49.
7. With their headquarters in Yangchow, Kiangnan salt merchants, for example, were famous as great patrons of scholarship, theater, and the arts since the Ming dynasty. In addition, merchants all over the region supported the growth of schools and academies; this support carried over into and increased in the Ch'ing period. See Ping-ti Ho, "The Salt Merchants of Yangchow: A Study of Commercial Capitalism in Eighteenth-Century China," Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 17 (1954): 155-57.
8. Yamanoi Yū 山井湧, "Min-shin no tetsugaku to shuyō" 明清の哲學と修身學 (Ming-Ch'ing no tetsugaku to shuyō [Cultivation], Rakishi kyōku 史教書, II, 11 (Nov. 1954): 82-88.

9. Philip Kuhn, Rebellion and Its Enemies in Late Imperial China (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1970), pp. 180-88. See also my "The Unravelling of Neo-Confucianism: The Lower Yangtze Academic Community in Late Imperial China" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1980), chapter 3. We will use "Kiangnan" and the "Lower Yangtze region" as equivalent terms.
10. Lynn Struve, "Ambivalence and Action. Some Frustrated Scholars of the Kang-hsi Period," in Prom Ming To Ch'ing, edited by Jonathan Spence and John Wills (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1979), pp. 351-53.
11. Yü Ying-shih, "Some Preliminary Observations on the Rise of Ch'ing Confucian Intellectualism," Tsing-hua Journal of Chinese Studies, 11 (1975), 111.
12. Chiang Pan 汪滄 (1761-1831), for example, gave Yen Jo-ch'nd first place in his genealogy of Han Learning entitled Kuo-chiao Han-hsueh shih-ch'eng chi 國朝經學始末記 (Record of Han Learning Masters in the Ch'ing Dynasty) (Taipei: Chung-hua shu-ch'u, 1969), 1/3b. See also Fumoto Yasutaka 藤本孝, Sō Gen Min Shin Kinsei Jugaku henshū shiron 皇代明道史 皇朝經學史 (Historical Essays on Changes in Sung, Yuan, Ming, Ch'ing Early Modern Confucianism) (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1976), pp. 133-67.
13. See my "The Hsueh-hai T'ang and the Rise of New Text Scholarship in Canton," Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i, IV, 2 (Dec. 1979): 51-82.
14. Arthur Hummel and others, Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period (hereafter ECCP) (Taipei: Ch'eng Wen reprint, 1972), pp. 152-55, 828. For other scholarly currents in Soochow, see Liang Chi-ch'ao, "Chin-tai hseuh-feng," pp. 15-17. Soochow was also famous for its bibliophiles and printers, who added to the academic life of the city.
15. Liang 梁, "Chin-tai hseuh-feng," pp. 20-21. See also Kondo Mitsuo 近藤 光, "O Chu to Kokusho Jurinden Kō" 朱子と國朝 (Draft Biographies of Confucians in Ch'ing History and Wang Chung), Jimbun Kagaku ronshū 人文科學論叢, 3 (1964): 64-69. See also my "The Hsueh-hai T'ang," pp. 51-82, for discussion of Juan Yuan's importance in Ch'ing academics.
16. Wang Chung, Shu-hsueh 述學 (Discourses on Learning) (Taipei: Kuang-wen Reprint, 1970), wai-p'ien 外篇 (outer chapters), 1/9b.
17. E.D. Edwards, "A Classified Guide to Thirteen Classes of Chinese Prose," Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, 12 (1948): 770-88. See also Naito Konan, "Shina shinkai no kinjō," pp. 63-64, and Aoki Masaru 青木正光, Shindai bungaku hyōronen 清代文學評論史 (History of Ch'ing Literary Criticism), in Aoki Masaru zenshu 青木正光全集 (Complete Works of Aoki Masaru) (Tokyo: Kyōritsusha, 1969), pp. 526-33.
18. See Leung Man-kam, "Juan Yuan (1764-1849)." The Life, Works, and Career of a Chinese Scholar-Bureaucrat (Unpublished

- Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Hawaii, 1977), pp. 4-5, 42-44.
19. Aoki Masaru, Shindai bungaku hyoronshi, pp. 526-30. See also Wilhelm, "Chinese Confucianism on the Eve of the Great Encounter," in Changing Japanese Attitudes Toward Modernization, edited by Marius Jansen (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1965), pp. 309-10, and Chia-yang Yen Chao, "The Ch'ang-chou School of Tzu Criticism," in Chinese Approaches to Literature from Confucius to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, edited by Adele Rickett (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1978), pp. 151-88.
20. Liang, "Chin-tai haueh-feng," pp. 21-24.
21. Nathan Stavin, "Copernicus in China," pp. 63-75. Yü Ying-shih in his Lun Tai Chen, pp. 164-78, has questioned whether Tai actually ever studied under Chiang Yung. See also Hou Wai-lu (侯外庐), Chin-tai chung-kuo sai-hsiang haueh-shuo shih (近代中国思想史论) (Shanghai: Sheng-huo shu-tien, 1947, 2 vols.), II/365-79.
22. Yü Ying-shih, Lun Tai Chen, pp. 83-97.
23. Liang, "Chin-tai haueh-feng," p. 22.
24. ECCP, pp. 235-37, 238-40, 900-01.
25. Aoki Masaru, pp. 518-26. See also Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Intellectual Trends in the Ch'ing Period, translated by Immanuel Hsu (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959), pp. 75-79, and Edwards, "A Classified Guide to the Thirteen Classes of Chinese Prose," pp. 770-88.
26. See Chang Haueh-ch'eng's essay on Eastern Chekiang scholarship in his Wen-shih t'ung-i (文史通考) [Comprehensive Meaning of Culture and History] (Taipei: Han-chang ch'u-pan-shih, 1973), pp. 51-53. Naito and Nakamura follow Chang's loose usage of Che-hai in their outline of Ch'ing schools. See footnote 2 above.
27. Liang, "Chin-tai haueh-feng," pp. 24-25.
28. John Henderson, "The Ordering of the Heavens and Earth in Early Ch'ing Thought" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, 1977), pp. 110-21.
29. Nancy Lee Swann, "Seven Intimate Library Owners," Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 1 (1936): 363-90.
30. Chang Yin (張蔭), "ku-ching ching-shih ch'u-kuo" (科技革命物産) [Preliminary Draft of a Gazetteer for the Ku-ching ching-shih], Wen-lan haueh-pao 文蘭學報, II, 1 (March 1936): 1-47.
31. Yü, Lun Tai Chen, pp. 59-60.
32. John Langlois, "Political Thought in Chin-hua Under Mongol Rule," in China Under Mongol Rule, edited by Langlois (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1981), pp. 137-85.
33. Ono Kazuko (小野孜子), "Shinsho no Kōkōkai ni tsuite" (新書の権威について) [Concerning the Society for the Discussion of the Classics in the Early Ch'ing], Tohōgaku ho 東洋学報, 36 (1964): 633-61.
34. See my "The Unravelling of Neo-Confucianism," pp. 222-25, 319-25. See also Ho Yu-sen (何裕森), "Juan Yuan te ching-

- haueh chi ch'i chih-haueh fang-fa" 阮元的经学及其方法 of Research], Ku-kung wen-hsien 故宫文献, II, 1 (Dec. 1970): 22-23.
35. The fullest statement of the Che-tung school to date has been made by Lynn Struve in her "The 'Eastern Chekiang School,' Rethers the Eighteenth Century" (Paper presented for the Conference on Early Ch'ing Thought, Asilomar, Calif., 1977), pp. 1-102. I would like to thank Professor Struve for permission to cite this unpublished version.
36. Liang, "Chin-tai haueh-feng," pp. 6-7.
37. Ono Kazuko (小野孜子), "Gan Gen no gakumon ron" 顏元の學問論 [Yen Yuan's View of Learning], Tohōgaku ho (March 1970): 467-90. See also Yen-li ts'ung-shu (顏元集) (Collected works of Yen Yuan and Li Kung) (Taipei: Kuang-wen shu-ch'ü reprint, 1965, 4 vols), II/376.
38. ECCP, pp. 122-23, 637, and Kawata Teichichi (河田 一徳), "Shindai gakujiutsu no ichi sokumen" 清代学术の一面 (A Sidelight on Scholarship in the Ch'ing Period), Tohōgaku ho (Jan. 1979): 84-105.
39. ECCP, pp. 856-58.
40. Ming-tai Chan, "The Hsing-li ching-i and the Ch'eng-Chu School of the Seventeenth Century," in The Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism, by Wm. Theodore de Bary and others (N.Y.: Columbia Univ. Press, 1975), pp. 543-72. See also Henderson, "The Ordering of the Heavens and Earth," p. 43.
41. Liang, "Chin-tai haueh-feng," pp. 31-32. See also Yabuuchi Kiyoshi (矢野清), Chūgoku no kagaku to Nihon shindunaha (1978), p. 248. [Chinese Science and Japan] (Tokyo: Asahi shoin, 1978).
42. Liang, pp. 31-32.
43. See my "The Haueh-hai T'ang," pp. 51-82.
44. Liang, pp. 4-5. See also Hamaguchi Fujio (濱口富士雄), "Hō tojū no Kangaku hihan ni tsuite" 方東樹の漢学批判 (Research on the Criticism of Fang Tung-shu's Criticism of Han Learning), Nihon Chugoku gakkai ho 日本中国学会報, 30 (1978): 165-78.
45. Fumoto Yasuetsuka, Sō Gen Min Shin kinsai Jugaku henssen shiron, pp. 205-23.
46. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, in his Intellectual Trends, pp. 88-95, established this influential but controversial point of view.
47. Philipp Kuhn, Rebellion and Its Enemies, p. 186.
48. See my "The Unravelling of Neo-Confucianism," chapter 6. Cantonese reformers later made their way to Changsha in the 1890's to initiate political and social changes at the local level. See Onogawa Hiemi (小野川 秀美), Shimatsu seiji shiso kenkyū 清末政治思想研究 [Research on Late Ch'ing Political Thought] (Tokyo: Misuzu shobō, 1975), pp. 181-223.
49. See James Polachek, "Literati Groups and Group Politics in Nineteenth-Century China" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,

Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, 1977).

50. CCP, pp. 534-35, and Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, edited by Howard Boorman and Richard Howard (N.Y.: Columbia Univ. Press, 1967-71, 4 vols.), II/412-13.

51. See my "Lu Hsun and Wang Kuo-wei: The Early Years," Monumenta Serica, 34 (1979), forthcoming.

52. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Intellectual Trends, p. 69, and Ting Wen-chiang 丁文江, Liang Jen-kung hsien-sheng nien-p'u ch'ang-pien ch'u-ko 梁啟超先生年譜初編 (First Draft of a Chronological Biography of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao) (Taipei: Shih-chieh shu-ch'ü, 1972, 2 vols.), I/11-13. See also P'i Hsi-jui, Ching-hsueh li-shih 經學歷史 (History of Classical Studies), annotated by Chou Yü-t'ung 周予同 (Hong Kong: Chung-hua shu-ch'ü, 1961).

53. Tu Ching-i, "Conservatism in a Conservative Form: The Case of Wang Kuo-wei (1877-1927)," Monumenta Serica, 28 (1969): 202. When the looser definition of Che-hsi, which included southern Kiangsu, was used, Ku Yen-wu was often regarded as the patriarch of the Che-hsi tradition.

54. Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, I/248.

55. See my "The Unraveling of Neo-Confucianism," chapters 2, 3, and 5.

Assassination in the Republican Revolutionary Movement

Edward S. Krebs

Most textbook discussions of the Republican revolution-ary movement mention two or three dramatic assassination episodes directed against the Manchu government. Hu Yeh's 吳越 death by his own bomb in 1905 as he attempted to kill five officials at the Peking railroad station and Wang Ching-wei's 汪精衛 plan to rekindle the flame of revolution by bombing the Manchu regent Tsai-feng 載灃 in 1910 are among the standard stories of revolutionary bravery. However, these are usually presented as isolated examples of individual heroes in the anti-Manchu movement.

Studies on various aspects of the revolutionary movement have called attention to other assassination activity and suggested some reasons why this tactic appealed to Chinese revolutionaries.¹ My own work on the Fung-meng and activist and later anarchist, Liu Sau-fu 劉思復 has led me to conclude that assassination was used more often and with more significant effect than has been generally acknowledged. Not only did assassination attempts inspire radicals and elicit sympathy from wider circles before 1911, but successful assassinations in 1911-1912 appear to have affected the timing of transfers of power in Peking and in at least one province, Kwangtung.

Tables 1 and 2, which follow the introduction, present basic information on planned assassinations. As the tables show, assassination activity was concentrated in two phases,

THE UNRAVELLING OF NEO-CONFUCIANISM:
FROM PHILOSOPHY TO PHILOLOGY
IN LATE IMPERIAL CHINA.

BENJAMIN A. ELMAN

Historians gradually have recognized that an important shift in intellectual and philosophical orientation began in seventeenth-century China. The decisive part of the fall of the Ming dynasty (1368-1644) in 1644 was for many Chinese a tragedy who lived through this tragic period confirmation rightly or wrongly of sterility and uselessness of the forms of Confucian discourse that had preceded Ming collapse. They vigorously attacked what they considered the heterodox ideas and doctrines of their predecessors.⁽¹⁾

In Sung (960-1279) and Ming dynasty Confucianism, emphasis was usually accorded on introspection and the cultivation of moral perfection. In western scholarship, this mode of philosophy is called "Neo-Confucianism." Only if every literatus was an exemplar of virtue could Confucian society survive and prosper. Knowledge and action were equated. Political and cultural stability depended on the moral rigor of each individual.

To buttress their moral claims, Sung and Ming Confucians developed an elaborate and often systematic account of the interaction between heaven and earth, the role of cosmological patterns of differentiation and organization in the creation of all things in the world, and the place of man and his mental capacities as a universe of orderly and determinable change. Sagehood was their ideal. To

An earlier version of this article was presented at the Association for Asian Studies annual meeting in Toronto, Canada, on March 31, 1981. I want to thank all members on the panel "The Search for Evidence: Changes in Scholarly Discourse During the Ch'ing" for their comments and criticisms of my earlier presentation. The present version has benefited in particular from the careful scrutiny of Kent Guy and John Henderson. I would also like to thank Hazama Naoki 坂本直樹 of the Institute for Humanistic Research, Kyoto University, and Lu K'ai 呂凱 and Liu Chi-hua 劉己華 of National Political University in Taiwan for their help in the final stages of this manuscript.

(1) Jonathan Spence and John Wills (eds.), *From Ming To Ch'ing, Conquest, Religion, and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century China* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1979), *passim*, and Willard Peterson, *Bitter Court, Fung I-chih and the Impetus For Intellectual Change* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1979), pp. 1-17. For negative appraisals of Ch'ing scholarship, see, for example, Wm. Theodore de Bary, et al., *Sources of Chinese Tradition* (N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press, 1964, 2 vols.), 1/559ff., Hou Wai-in 侯外廔, *Ch'in-tai Chung-kuo ssu-hsiang hsueh-shuo shih* 近代中國思想學說史 [History of Modern Chinese Thought and Theories] (Shanghai: Sheng-huo shu-tien, 1947, 2 vols.), 1/355-79, and Hsu Fu-kuan 赫爾, "Ch'ing-tai Han-hsueh heng-jun 清代漢學研究 [Reassessment of Han Learning in the Ch'ing Period], *Ta-t'u tsa-chih* 大陸雜誌, LIV, 4 (April 1977): 1-22.

1547-1548
New Series 15
(Dec. 1953)