

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EVIDENTIAL RESEARCH MOVEMENT: KU YEN-WU AND THE SSU-K'U CH'ÜAN-SHU*

R. KENT GUY

A scholar's contentions, however precise and polished, are often less important in establishing his influence than the concerns, methodological and theoretical departures on which they rest. This is particularly true of the founder of a school or tradition, whose findings may be superseded by followers with more finely honed scholarly tools, but whose impact in shaping patterns of inquiry cannot be forgotten. To argue with such an intellectual innovator is to argue with an image often more compelling than the life or writing which produced it. This paper will examine the image of Ku Yen-wu 顧炎武 (1613-1683) in the massive Ch'ing government catalog of extant literature, the *Ssu-k'ü ch'üan-shu tsung-mu t'i-yao* 四庫全書總目提要 (Annotated catalog of the complete collection of the four treasuries), commissioned in 1772, and its relationship with seventeenth and eighteenth century scholarship. A founder of modern evidential scholarship, Ku's writings were enormously influential. He was regarded as one of the most brilliant and creative minds of the era by his seventeenth-century contemporaries,⁽¹⁾ and revered as the founder of modern scholarship by eighteenth-century thinkers like Ch'üan Tsu-wang 全祖望 (1705-1755) and Chang Hsueh-ch'eng 章學誠 (1738-1801).⁽²⁾ Clearly, he was too important to be ignored in the government catalog.

But was he also too seditious to be endorsed? Such, at least, is the impression one gets from nineteenth-century thinkers who held Ku up as a model of social and political commitment,⁽³⁾ and twentieth-century historians who honored him as an exemplar of revolutionary spirit.⁽⁴⁾ Indeed, in his "Lament for Lost Writings," Chang Ping-lin 章炳麟 (1869-1936) accused the chief editor of the *Ssu-k'ü* compilation and his "henchmen" of systematically emasculating Ku's work of its social

* Professors Alison H. Black, Jack L. Dull, Benjamin Elman, Judith Whitbeck, Ying-shih Yü, and Ms. Aileen Yang have generously contributed their time and expertise in the preparation of this article. I am very grateful for their help.

- (1) See, for instance, the preface to the 1695 edition of *Jih-chih-lu* by P'an Lei (1646-1708), and the preface to the 1670 edition by Ch'eng Kung-pu. The former preface is fairly widely available, the latter is reprinted in *NPTP*, p. 246. See also comments by Yen Jo-chü (1636-1704) in "Nan-tien Huang-shih ai-ts'u," *NPTP*, p. 274.
- (2) Ch'üan Tsu-wang, "Shen-tao-piao," *NPTP*, pp. 291-296; Chang Hsueh-ch'eng, "Che-tung hsueh-shu," in *Wen-shih t'ung-yi*, T'ai-p'ing shu-chü reprint (Hong Kong, 1973), p. 52.
- (3) See, for instance, Wu Ch'ung-yueh's 1844 colophon to Chang Mu's *Ku t'ing-lin hsien-sheng nien-p'u*, *NPTP*, p. 299.
- (4) Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, *Intellectual Trends during the Ch'ing Period*, translated by Immanuel C. Y. Hsu (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), p. 30.

and political content in the course of their editorial labors.⁽⁵⁾ Chang was accusing the *Ssu-k'u* editors of more than a simple case of editorial hatchet-work; for to the extent that the Ch'ing government could suppress Ku's legacy or change the way Chinese intellectuals thought of him it could influence, by political fiat, the course of intellectual development within its realm. A reassessment of the elements of Ku's legacy and the way they were treated in the government compilation will reflect not only on Ku's ideas of government, but on the capacity of Ch'ing to effect the government of ideas. More broadly, such a reassessment will afford an opportunity to weigh the relative importance of internal logic and external forces, intellectual evolution and political pressures, on the development of the evidential research movement in modern Chinese history.

KU'S LIFE AND LEGACY

Few facts of Ku's life were clearly recorded; some, perhaps, were deliberately obscured.⁽⁶⁾ As a result, the place which Ku occupied in the shadowy world of seventeenth-century elite politics has yet to be clearly established. It can be said that Ku was born to an old and distinguished lineage in K'un-shan 崑山, Kiangsu in 1613, that after a brief and somewhat uncertain flirtation with resistance to the new Manchu government in 1645 he retired to a life of teaching and scholarship, and that he left an enormous scholarly corpus which is surprisingly sparse in autobiographical references. From the point of view of eighteenth-century editors, however, where Ku actually stood on the political and social issues of his day was perhaps less important than where he was perceived as standing by his contemporaries and biographers. Establishing the eighteenth-century image of Ku is a necessary first step in evaluating the *Ssu-k'u* portrayal of him.

There have been, however, several images of Ku in modern Chinese history. Indeed, one might argue that the view of Ku which prevailed in any given era represented a litmus test of what intellectuals of that day considered the critical social and philosophical issues. No two biographies of Ku were exactly the same, but for purposes of argument, treatments of his life may be divided into three sorts. In the first view, Ku was primarily an institutional reformer. Indeed, he was often represented as advocating a particular type of reform, one which involved the transfer of authority away from the central government and toward local institutions—clans, districts and provinces—in a way that would have radically altered the traditional balance of state and society in China. A second group of biographers saw Ku as an anti-Manchu resister, and pointed to unmistakable expressions of loyalty to the fallen Ming house and ethnic anti-Manchuism

(5) Chang Ping-lin, "Ai-fen-shu," in *Chien-lun*, 4.17b. Reprinted in *Chang-shih ts'ung-shu* (Shanghai, n. d.).

(6) The best English language biography is Willard J. Peterson, "The Life of Ku Yen-wu," Parts I and II, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 28: 114-156 (1968) and 29: 201-247 (1969).

in his corpus. In a third view, Ku was most significant for his attack on the Sung neo-Confucianism enshrined in examination hall and government publications, and for his replacement of Sung metaphysical speculation with a scholarly method based on the careful evaluation of texts. Each of these images has a measure of truth, but often treatments of Ku reflect the concerns of his biographers as much as the events of his life.

Ku's commitment to reform of central government institutions may have begun with his experience in the state examinations. Although family friends who noted Yen-wu's promise encouraged him to take the tests, he never advanced beyond the first stage, and barely passed the annual examinations for renewal of his status as a *sheng-yuan* 生員.⁽⁷⁾ Ku's education may have ill-suited him to test-taking. His grandfather, who directed Ku's studies from the time he entered school in 1619, was himself a failed examination candidate and stressed command of historical fact over mastery of examination style.⁽⁸⁾ It is likely that Ku had a healthy skepticism of the examination process even before he entered the examination hall. Whether disillusionment led to failure or failure to disillusionment, Ku remained sour on the system throughout his life. He wrote that "the harm done by eight-legged essays is equal to that of the burning of the books by the first emperor of Ch'in and the destruction of human talent in the process is worse than that wrought outside Hsien-yang." While the first emperor of Ch'in had massacred only 460 scholars, Ku suggested that thousands had been massacred, metaphorically at least, in the examination halls.⁽⁹⁾

As the drama of late Ming and early Ch'ing history unfolded before him, Ku became convinced of the bankruptcy of many other institutions of Chinese central government. He argued, for instance, in his essay "Chun-hsien lun 郡縣論" (On the Prefectural system), and his book *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping shu* 天下郡國利病書 (On the advantages and disadvantages of the various commanderies and kingdoms of the empire) that the Chinese emperor had become a despot with little regard for the people's lives or livelihoods and that the system of central administration of prefectures and districts needed to be infused with the spirit of feudal localism. He cited the government's creation of the *sheng-yuan* class, its collection of taxes in silver rather than copper, and its reliance on clerks and functionaries rather than regularly appointed officials as instances of its unfair burdening of the people.⁽¹⁰⁾

(7) Chang Mu, "Ku T'ing-lin hsien-sheng nien-p'u," *NPTP*, pp. 192-194; Peterson, "Life," Part I, pp. 126, 129.

(8) Wu Ying-kuei, "Ku T'ing-lin hsien-sheng nien-p'u," *NPTP*, p. 44; Peterson, "Life," Part I, p. 124.

(9) Ku Yen-wu, *Yuan-ch'ao-pen jih-chih-lu*, T'ai-p'ing ch'u-pan-she reprint (Taipei 1958), p. 477.

(10) There is a useful summary of Ku's political thought in Hsieh Kuo-chen, *Ku T'ing-lin hsueh-p'u* (Peking, 1957), pp. 91-117. See also Peterson, "Life," Part I, p. 131.

Whether eighteenth-century editors would have found Ku's thought seditious is a complex question. Ku was not the first to propose the reintroduction of feudal, localist elements into Chinese government. Moreover, as Philip Kuhn has argued, Ku's proposals were not "conceived in support of local autonomy for its own sake, but rather as a guarantee of stability and prosperity of the monarchic structure."⁽¹¹⁾ Even in a government which respected precedent and stability as much as the Ch'ing did, one could propose reform without being regarded as dangerous. Those who have argued that Ku's institutional reformism posed a threat to the Ch'ing government have done so not so much on the basis of his specific proposals, but rather on the basis of his intellectual acuity, his comprehensive vision of change, and his all-consuming commitment to articulating a vision of the future. Not surprisingly, the image of Ku as an institutional reformer has most often appeared in times which seemed to call for men of commitment and vision.

Thus, one of the most vivid portrayals of Ku as an institutional reformer was found in the writings of his student and editor, P'an Lei 潘耒 (1646-1708), a man who had lived with Ku through the first years of Ch'ing rule and who knew at first hand the rigidity of central government institutions.⁽¹²⁾ P'an's argument was that the value of Ku's suggestions for reform lay in the breadth of his learning and his mastery of all aspects of political and social organization. This breadth, P'an argued, made Ku a "comprehensive Confucian" as opposed to the "ordinary Confucians" who wrote only scholarly treatises.⁽¹³⁾ A less academic assessment of Ku's ideas of change dominated biographies prepared by scholars and historians of the early nineteenth century, who saw in Ku's righteous reformism an antidote to the dynastic decline all too evident in their own day. So convinced were scholars like Chang Mu 張穆 (1805-1849) and Wu Ch'ung-yueh 伍崇曜 (also known as Howqua, compradore at Canton [1810-1863]) of Ku's symbolic significance that they erected a temple in his honor in Peking in 1843.⁽¹⁴⁾ It was probably also in tribute to this aspect of Ku's legacy that activist Ku Yen-wu societies developed in late nineteenth-century China.⁽¹⁵⁾

If Ku was opposed to the form of central government, he was certainly opposed to the Manchus who ran it after 1644. He served briefly as a member of the Board of War at the Ming restoration court in Nanking, although no records were kept of any actual participation in military resistance. However, perhaps because of his service to the last Ming prince or perhaps because of a

(11) Philip Kuhn, "Local Self-Government Under the Republic," in Wakeman and Grant, eds, *Conflict and Control in Late Imperial China* (Berkeley, 1975), p. 264.

(12) On P'an's life, see Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, Ch'eng-wen reprint (Taipei, 1975), pp. 606-607.

(13) See P'an's preface to the 1695 edition of *Jih-chih-lu* which was reprinted by Huang Ju-ch'eng in his 1834 edition, and in most subsequent editions of the work.

(14) See Hummel, *Eminent Chinese*, p. 425.

(15) I am grateful to John Fincher for pointing these out to me.

promise he gave to his stepmother on her death in 1644, Ku refused to serve the Ch'ing dynasty in any capacity, even rejecting a summons to participate in the *Po-hsueh hung-ju* 博學鴻儒 examination in 1679.⁽¹⁶⁾ Whatever his motives, Ku made his personal feelings toward the new rulers clear, as in the following passage:

Barbarians act like barbarians...therefore the sages emphasized the differences between the inner Chinese and the outer barbarians so vigorously. During Han Ho-ti's reign, the palace attendant Lu Kung memorialized: 'Barbarians carry the heterodoxical atmosphere from the four directions. They are stuffed with rudeness and recklessness, and are no different from birds and animals. If one lets them dwell dissolutely and oppressively in China, they will disturb the atmosphere and disgrace good people.'⁽¹⁷⁾

Some have suggested, based on this and other passages, that the restless travels of Ku's later years were military reconnaissance missions for the Ming restorationist movement, and many have interpreted Ku's *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping shu* as a manual for resistance.⁽¹⁸⁾ Recently, however, Wang Ch'un-yü 王春瑜 has argued that such writings did not necessarily represent a blueprint for an uprising, but were rather part of a pervasive concern with issues of defense and strategy among those who had seen the fall of a dynasty.⁽¹⁹⁾ Such a hypothesis receives some confirmation from the preface Ku wrote for the book *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping shu*:

Realizing the many grievous problems with which the state was faced, I was ashamed of the meagre resources which students of the classics had to deal with these problems. Therefore, I read through the 21 histories as well as the gazetteers from the whole empire. I read the collected works of famous literary men from each period as well as memorials and and documents. I noted down what I had gained from my reading.⁽²⁰⁾

This seemed more the language of an intellectual on the outside looking in than the reminiscences of a man of action.

Whether or not it was solidly based, the view of Ku as a leader of armed resistance was surprisingly persistent in Ch'ing and early Republican period

(16) On the *Po-hsueh hung-ju* examinations, see Hellmut Wilhelm, "The Po-hsueh hung-ju Examinations of 1679," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 71.1 (March, 1951) pp. 60-66.

(17) Ku Yen-wu, *Yuan-ch'ao pen jih-chih-lu*, pp. 186-187; translated in Mi Chü Wiens, "Anti-Manchu Thought During the Early Ch'ing," *Harvard University Papers on China*, 22A (May, 1969), p. 8.

(18) Peterson, "Life," Part II, p. 206.

(19) Wang Ch'un-yü, "Ku Yen-wu pei-shang k'ang-ch'ing shuo k'ao-pien," *Chung-kuo-shih yen-chiu*, 1979.4 (Dec., 1979), pp. 43-46.

(20) Ku Yen-wu, "Hsu," *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping shu*, translated in Peterson. "Life," Part I, p. 131.

historiography. Strikingly, Ch'ing biographies which emphasize this aspect of Ku's life all seem to derive from one source, an epitaph written for Ku some years after his death by Ch'üan Tsu-wang.⁽²¹⁾ Ch'üan, of course, had not lived through the Ch'ing conquest, and had no personal involvement in its drama. However, he belonged to a school of historians, known as the Eastern Chekiang school and deriving ultimately from Huang Tsung-hsi 黃宗羲 (1610-1695), which took as one of its primary tasks the preservation of stories of Ming loyalism and the details of resistance to the Ch'ing.⁽²²⁾ It was probably more out of loyalty to Huang, a contemporary of Ku's who had participated actively in the anti-Manchu resistance, than out of faithfulness to Ku's biography that Ch'üan stressed this dimension of his life.

As Wang Ch'un-yü has pointed out, the picture of Ku as a leader of anti-Manchu resistance was also prevalent among revolutionary historians of the early twentieth century, who were intent upon demonstrating that all the great scholars of the seventeenth century were, in varying degrees, opposed to the Ch'ing government.⁽²³⁾ Therefore, while there certainly was a basis for claims of Ku's anti-Manchuism, those who advanced them most forcefully had their own historiographical axes to grind.

In the realm of intellectual discipline, Ku condemned the metaphysical speculation which had predominated in late Ming intellectual life and in the official commentaries on the classics. He compared Ming metaphysicians to the practitioners of *ch'ing-t'an* 清談 (pure talk) at the end of the Han dynasty:

Everyone knows that the chaos into which China was plunged (after the fall of the Han) came about because of *ch'ing-t'an*. But how many know that modern *ch'ing-t'an* is even more dangerous? Formerly, those who engaged in *ch'ing-t'an* spoke of Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu. Now they speak of Confucius and Mencius. Not familiar with the six arts, not examining the system of ancient kings, not exploring the preoccupations of the times, they don't even consider Confucius' comments on government and learning, yet they speak of having the one thread (which united everything) or of transmission without words. They substitute 'clarifying the mind to perceive nature' for the practical tasks of preparing the self to rule society.⁽²⁴⁾

(21) Ch'üan Tsu-wang "(Ku Yen-wu) shen-tao-piao," *NPTP*, pp. 291-296.

(22) On the Eastern Chekiang school see Naito Konan, "Shina shigakushi," in *Naito Konan zenshu*, Vol. 11 (Tokyo, 1966), pp. 356-357; and Paul Demieville, "Chang Hsueh-ch'eng and his historiography," in Pulleyblank and Beasley, eds., *Historians of China and Japan* (London, 1961), p. 170.

(23) Wang Ch'un-yü, "Ku Yen-wu pei-shang k'ang-ch'ing shuo k'ao-pien," pp. 46-55. See also the biography of Ku by Teng Shih which was published serially in the *Kuo-tsui hsueh-pao* of 1906 (Wen-hai ch'u-pan-she reprint, Vol. III, pp. 1777-1788, 1905-1918, and 2031-2048).

(24) Ku Yen-wu, *Yuan-ch'ao-pen jih-chih-lu*, p. 196.

In place of metaphysical analysis, Ku offered a scholarly method based on meticulous historical study, careful observation of local conditions and the thorough explication of texts. For much of his adult life, Ku travelled around north and central China collecting stone inscriptions and writing notes on geography and local customs. He produced at least 12 studies of regions of China, two catalogs of stone inscriptions and an enormous compendium of source materials for the study of geography. Perhaps Ku's most explicit statement of the rationale for his work came in the preface to one of his collections of stone inscriptions. There he argued that the evidence he had gathered in 20 years of visiting famous mountains and historic temples could fill in the gaps and correct the corruptions which a thousand years of inaccurate scholarship had produced in the classical canon. He condemned contemporaries who were limited by what they heard and read distressed by the thought of a day's labor, and whose steps never brought them to the edges of deep waters or high mountains.⁽²⁵⁾

Another corrective for the errors of sloppy scholarship, in Ku's view, was phonology. Ku did not originate phonological studies in the seventeenth century; he drew, in fact, on a number of late Ming works. But Ku's *Yin-hsueh wu-shu* 音學五書 (Five treatises on phonology) was distinguished from earlier works in several respects.⁽²⁶⁾ As Ch'ien Mu 錢穆 has pointed out, Ku's concern for solid evidence and the careful dating of materials made his work much more reliable than that of his Ming predecessors. Moreover, where earlier phonologists had used the study of sounds along with other techniques of classical commentary to produce works discussing individual classics, Ku grouped all of his phonological studies together and prefaced them with an essay "Yin-lun 音論" (On sounds), thus moving phonology toward recognition as an independent field of study.⁽²⁷⁾

While all of Ku's biographers have noted his work in phonology, epigraphy and geography, they have assessed its purposes differently. Some, like P'an Lei, emphasized the link between Ku's scholarly work and his social and political philosophy, arguing that Ku's efforts to reconstruct ancient texts was part of his larger quest to determine how society should be ordered. Others praised Ku's efforts to restore the sounds and textual integrity of the classics without mentioning any larger social or political purposes. A particularly famous example of the latter sort of treatment was a biography by Li Kuang-ti (1642-1718) 李光地 written shortly after Ku's death. It is possible that Li chose to ignore the political dimensions of Ku's scholarship; as a grand councillor and close advisor of

(25) Ku Yen-wu, "Hsu," *Chin-shih wen-tzu chi*, reprinted in Hsieh Kuo-chen, *Hsueh-p'u*, pp. 150-151.

(26) I am grateful to Benjamin Elman for clarifying my views on the growth of phonology during the Ch'ing, and for letting me read his unpublished paper, "From Value to Fact: The Emergence of Phonology as a Precise Discipline in Late Imperial China."

(27) Ch'ien Mu, *Chung-kuo chin-san-pai-nien hsueh-shu ssu-hsiang shih*, Commercial Press reprint (Taipei, 1976), Vol. I, pp. 134-135.

the K'ang-hsi emperor, Li may well have thought it imprudent to dwell on Ku's commitment to change.⁽²⁸⁾ But an equally possible hypothesis was that Li, who knew Ku only in the last years of his life, was simply unaware of Ku's earlier activities. Most of Ku's scholarly work dated from the last years of his life and perhaps reflected a time when Ku's own interests and the interests of his readers were changing. Moreover, Li was speaking to a generation which had largely forgotten the pathos of the Ming-Ch'ing transition. Whatever his motives, Li's view of Ku prevailed at least for a time.⁽²⁹⁾

With Juan Yuan 阮元 (1764-1849), however, the emphasis changed. Juan, who lived in an era when the textual emphasis which Ku had pioneered was under severe challenge from defenders of the Sung learning, stressed particularly the stridency of Ku's antimetaphysical stance, in an apparent effort to make Ku the standard-bearer for the evidential research movement.⁽³⁰⁾ Liang Ch'i-ch'ao 梁啟超 (1873-1929) added a new twist to this interpretation with the observation that Ku's attack on Sung metaphysics was in fact a veiled attack on the government which sponsored them. "When Ku's doctrine appeared," Liang wrote in 1920, "the sanctity of the intellectual oligarchy was completely destroyed."⁽³¹⁾

Thus, not only were there varied images of Ku during the Ch'ing dynasty, the images were variously interpreted. In the first years after his death there were few biographies of Ku, the most notable early estimation being by his student P'an Lei who portrayed Ku as the ideal Confucian, a man whose reading and study informed his political life. In the eighteenth century Ku's apotheosis began, and two new images of Ku emerged. Ch'üan Tsu-wang, influenced perhaps by his own mentor Huang Tsung-hsi, pictured Ku as the ardent Ming loyalist, while Li Kuang-ti painted him as an equally ardent philologist. Although Ch'üan's biography was evidently read by a few, Li's view of Ku prevailed, at least until other concerns moved intellectuals to look for other themes in Ku's writings. In the nineteenth century, activists portrayed a reformist Ku, while in the early twentieth century, radicals found a revolutionary Ku. It was a testimony to the vibrancy and importance of Ku's work that he could speak with equal relevance and passion to almost every generation of Ch'ing intellectuals. Just which facets of Ku's legacy *Ssu'k'u* editors chose to portray will be the subject of the next section.

KU IN THE SSU-K'U CH'ÜAN-SHU

The Ch'ien-lung emperor (r. 1736-1796) was hardly the sort of monarch to

(28) Li Kuang-ti, "(Ku Yen-wu) hsiao-chuan," *NPTP*, p. 274.

(29) On Li Kuang-ti, see Hummel, *Eminent Chinese*, pp. 473-475.

(30) Juan Yuan's view of Ku was expressed in the biography Juan wrote for the draft history of the Ch'ing, see *NPTP*, pp. 287-289.

(31) Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, *Intellectual Trends during the Ch'ing Period*, p. 30.

whom Ku's work would have been likely to appeal. A ruler excruciatingly sensitive to any slights of his own or his dynasty's prestige, he embarked on a seemingly endless series of campaigns and projects designed to enhance the military, political and intellectual prestige of the central government vis-à-vis its vassals and subordinates.⁽³²⁾ In 1772, provincial officials were ordered to make copies of the rare or valuable manuscripts within their jurisdictions and send them to Peking for inclusion in the imperial library. At the suggestion of *Hanlin* Academician Chu Yun 朱筠 (1729-1781), the emperor ordered that a review be written assessing the moral worth and informational value of every work in his library. Brief notices were also to be prepared for books which, though of a certain value, were not important enough to be copied into the collection. All the reviews were collected and issued in 1782 under the title *Ssu-k'u ch'uan-shu tsung-mu t'i-yao*⁽³³⁾

The *Ssu-k'u* editors were not obliged to include every extant work in their catalog. They were, as one grand councillor expressed it, to exercise the same standards of praise and blame in deciding what should be included in the collection that Confucius had exercised in compiling the *Chun-ch'iu* 春秋 (Spring and autumn annals).⁽³⁴⁾ Surprisingly, in view of the political implications that some have found in his writings, considerable attention was devoted to Ku's work. Some 23 of his books were noted, 15 were copied into the imperial library and another 8 were given brief notice. Only 7 other authors, one of them Chu Hsi 朱熹, had as many books reviewed in the catalog.⁽³⁵⁾ Moreover, of the 23 works included in the catalog, only two had previously been a part of the imperial library, and only one was described as an edition in common circulation.⁽³⁶⁾ The remainder of the works were drawn from private collections, in particular those of the Lianghuai 兩淮 salt merchants and prosperous families of the lower Yangtze delta. One impact of the *Ssu-k'u* project was, therefore, to place the best editions of Ku Yen-wu's work, which had previously been in the hands of the wealthy few, into the public domain.⁽³⁷⁾

(32) On the Ch'ien-lung emperor's sensitivity, see Harold L. Kahn, *Monarchy in the Emperor's Eyes: Image and Reality in the Ch'ien-lung Reign* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971).

(33) See my Ph. D. thesis, "The Scholar and the State: The Politics of the *Ssu-k'u ch'uan-shu* Project" (Harvard, 1981) for a more complete description of this process.

(34) Yü Min-chung, *Yü min-chung shou-cha*. Ch'en Yuan, ed., Wen-hai publishing company reprint (Taipei, 1973), p. 73.

(35) Only seven individuals had more than 20 works listed in the annotated catalog: Chu Hsi (1130-1200), 28 works; Ch'en Chi-ju (1558-1639), 31 works; Lu Shen (1477-1544), 20 works; Wang Shih-ying (1634-1711), 32 works; Wei Sheng-chih (1616-1686), 24 works; Yang Shen (1488-1559), 35 works.

(36) The *Jih-chih-lu* and *Chiu-ching wu-tzu* were part of the imperial library, the *Tso-chuan tu-chieh pu-cheng* was described as a commonly circulating edition.

(37) Seven copies of the *Ssu-k'u* were made, which were located in Peking (2 copies), Mukden, Jehol, Hangchow, Yangchow and Chinkiang. Copying of texts was possible at some of these locations and texts included in the *Ssu-k'u* collection were usually disseminated fairly rapidly.

Certainly, then, the editors of the *Ssu-k'u* project respected Ku's work, but how did they choose to portray him? It was customary in the first review of an author's work that appeared in the catalog to provide a short biography and intellectual characterization of the author. Accordingly, in their review of Ku's *Tso-chuan tu-chieh pu-cheng* 左傳杜解補正 (Corrections and additions to Tu [Yu'] explanation of the *Tso* commentary) the editors described Ku as bringing "breadth in reading and precision in research" to his writing, a phrase that would recur in *Ssu-k'u* descriptions of Ku's writings. The phrase signaled the general tone of the *Ssu-k'u* portrayal of Ku, one in which Ku's methodology and precision were seen as bringing a new cutting edge to Chinese scholarship.⁽³⁸⁾

The matter of Ku's biography had to be approached a little more cautiously. In Confucian theory, an author's moral character and political views were an important consideration in assessing the quality of his writings; in fact, *Ssu-k'u* editors were often more concerned with the intellectual significance of a book than with its author's life. *Ssu-k'u* guidelines required only that an author's official ranks be listed in the first review of his work, and the editors often listed works by anti-Manchu resisters without mentioning any details of their lives.⁽³⁹⁾ In Ku's case, however, the author's persona was probably too large to be ignored. The editors first noted that "The scholars of the early years of our dynasty who held that scholarship must be based on evidence all considered Ku to be their leader." Then, as if to prove their point, they cited Li Kuang-ti's biography of Ku.

Li's biography was not quoted in the catalog, but it was carefully cited and probably accessible enough that the editors expected their readers to consult it. The principal theme of the piece, as noted above, was Ku's skill in phonology. Li attributed this skill to Ku's talent for collecting and evaluating evidence, and to the fact that there was no source, ancient or modern, classical or colloquial, written or inscribed, that Ku had not consulted. Li further remarked:

In addition, Ku has a work in ten (sic) *chüan* entitled *Jih-chih-lu* 日知錄 which examines the rights and wrongs of great and small, which may be of some use to scholarship. Wei Er-sheng also says that Ku's studies of geography are carefully done, but I have not seen them. The scholars of the south frequently censured Ku for his tendency to criticize men past and present.⁽⁴⁰⁾

The point of quoting Li's biography of Ku was probably not the accuracy of its information (indeed, elsewhere in the catalog, proper citations of Ku's other work were given) but the view it presented of Ku as a master of precise scholarship.

(38) *TMTY*, p. 547.

(39) See, for instance, the first reference to Huang Tsung-hsi's work, *TMTY*, p. 354.

(40) Li Kuang-ti, "(Ku Yen-wu) hsiao-chuan," *NPTP*, p. 274.

A similar view of Ku as master of a method emerged in the reviews of Ku's studies of phonology. In their review of Ku's essay on phonology, the editors credited him with originating the modern study of sounds:

When Ch'en Ti wrote the *Mao-shih ku-yin-k'ao* and *Chü-sung ku-yin-yi*, the doorway to phonological studies was opened. But in the beginning, phonology was nothing more than chaff and weeds; there were no careful studies. With Ku Yen-wu, phonology found its origins.

In evaluating Ku's specific findings, however, the editors were more guarded, noting in particular that his attempts to reconstruct ancient pronunciations using the *I-ching* 易經 were misguided and that some of his reconstructions from the *Shih-ching* 詩經 were inaccurate. Their point was that although Ku had been enormously influential in founding phonology, his work had been superseded.

Although in the past hundred years as scholars have progressed their work has become more detailed, and they have sometimes come to conclusions different from Ku's, in the matter of discovering the ancients' intentions, after Ch'en Ti, Ku must be regarded as in the orthodox tradition.

Comparing Ku's work on the *Shih-ching* to that of the eighteenth-century phonologist Chiang Yung 江永 (1681-1762), the *Ssu-k'u* wrote in the same vein:

Chiang Yung wrote the *Ku-yin piao-chun* 古音標準, correcting Ku's work in a fair number of instances. But the two were in agreement ninety per cent of the time.... Therefore, although we may supplement Ku's work with Chiang's we need not, on account of Chiang's work, dispose of Ku's.⁽⁴³⁾

The reviews of Ku's work in epigraphy followed the same pattern. First, Ku's foresight and care in developing epigraphy as a discipline were praised. Then, subsequent corrections of Ku's work, in this case errors pointed out by Ch'ien Ta-hsin 錢大昕 (1728-1804), were noted. Finally, Ku's influence as an example and guide for modern scholars of stone inscriptions was asserted.⁽⁴⁴⁾

Ku's work in geography was not evaluated as fully as his research in other areas, in part because not so much of it was included in the imperial collection. Although notice was given to seven of Ku's geographical studies, only two were copied into the imperial library, and one of those was a fragment. Nonetheless,

(41) *TMTY*, p. 902.

(42) *Idem.*

(43) *TMTY*, p. 903.

(44) *TMTY*, p. 1805.

the reviewers commented on the mastery that Ku brought to his studies, "Carefully examining by historical eras the course and development [of each city], precisely quoting and thoroughly explicating his texts, Ku's scholarship was most discriminating. Geography was indeed his forte."⁽⁴⁵⁾

Perhaps the most interesting review of Ku's work was, however, the review of his masterpiece, the *Jih-chih-lu*, for it was in this review that the editors addressed most directly the political commitments which, at least in the view of some, informed his scholarship. The review began with a quotation from Ku's own preface to the work, in which he described it as a distillation of over 30 years' worth of note-taking and observation. The editors omitted, however, Ku's final phrase in which he declared the purpose of the work to be "correcting the ways of future *chün-tzu* 君子," and in fact throughout the review there was little mention of the political aspects of the book. Where earlier biographers had noted Ku's wide range of concerns as evidence of his commitment to comprehensive change, the *Ssu-k'u* editors merely listed the topics addressed in the book as neutral bibliographers. As usual, they had nothing but praise for Ku's scholarship, and in fact declared that Ku's accuracy and conclusiveness distinguished him from late Ming scholars like Chiao Hung 焦竑 and Yang Shen 楊慎 who merely "waded shallowly and hunted indiscriminately" in books. When it came to assessing Ku's political theory, however, the editors were far more careful:

Ku Yen-wu was born in the late Ming and delighted in talking about practical statesmanship. Agitated by contemporary events, he sought to restore the customs of antiquity. His theories were either vague and impossible to put into practice, or perverse and insignificant.... P'an Lei wrote a preface to the *Jih-chih-lu* in which he argued that Ku's commitment to social service took as its first task precise evidential research. This was, however, not a statement based on fact.⁽⁴⁶⁾

The editors apparently recognized that at least part of the impulse behind Ku's studies of the past had been a desire to criticize the present, but they did not necessarily share the conclusions that he had reached. The close connection between scholarship and politics which much of Ku's work seemed to reflect was not an improper one, but it was exaggerated by the "agitated" time in which Ku lived.

The work which most reflected Ku's "agitation," the *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping shu* was most puzzling to the *Ssu-k'u* editors. Their review of this work was the shortest, and least favorable, of any of Ku's major works. Still, it reflected at least one dimension of the *Ssu-k'u* view of Ku Yen-wu, and so may be quoted in full:

(45) *TMTY*, p. 1488.

(46) *TMTY*, p. 2503.

This work draws randomly from the local histories of the various prefectures and districts, the collected writings of officials of previous dynasties, and compares these texts with the *Shih-lu* 實錄 of the Ming. Ku has organized his findings in one volume. In selecting his materials, however, Ku has included works with varying arguments, and so there are contradictions in the work. Furthermore, the organization of the book is disorderly. It should probably be regarded as an unfinished draft.⁽⁴⁷⁾

A consideration of the factual accuracies and distortions of this review will have to wait for the next section, in which the various influences on the image of Ku in the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* will be considered. For the present, it suffices to note that if, as Wong Ch'un-yü argued, the *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping shu* reflected a concern with matters of military strategy and defense pervasive among intellectuals alive at the time of the Ming-Ch'ing transition, this was a concern not shared by *Ssu-k'u* editors.

Such, then, was the image of Ku Yen-wu in the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu*. On the whole, it was a very favorable one, particularly in view of the very high standards often adopted by *Ssu-k'u* editors in their reviews. On the other hand, it was not uncritical. Where Ku's work had been superseded, the fact was carefully noted. It was in this respect that the *Ssu-k'u* treatment of Ku most differed from the biography by Li Kuang-ti with which it commenced. Where it differed from other earlier biographies of Ku, most notably those by P'an Lei and Ch'üan Tsu-wang, was in its handling of Ku's political commitments. Indeed, it was the *Ssu-k'u* editors' alleged attempts to push Ku's political concerns into the background that led historians like Chang Ping-lin to accuse the *Ch'ien-lung* government of deliberately tampering with Ku's writings and reputation. As Part I has shown, however, there were many images of Ku, and often these images changed more in response to the changing concerns of intellectuals than to government pressures. To what extent was the image of Ku in the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* a faithful reflection of the views of late eighteenth-century intellectuals? To what extent was it a reflection of government pressures?

IMAGE-MAKING IN THE *SSU-K'U*

Thus far, we have referred to government editors and Ch'ing rulers synonymously, as if the imperial image-making apparatus were a monolith which acted independently of the concerns of those who composed it. It is now necessary to make distinctions in order to evaluate the *Ssu-k'u* image of Ku. Chinese government compilations like the *Ssu-k'u* were often complex tapestries woven of many strands of interest and opinion. In particular, three strata of personnel were involved in the *Ssu-k'u* compilation. The bulk of the work was probably done by

(47) *TMTY*, p. 1556.

a group of scholarly consultants, known as revisers, who were drawn from the ranks of *Hanlin* academicians and intellectuals inside and outside the capital. These revisers were overseen by the editors, of whom the most famous was Chi Hsiao-lan 紀曉嵐 (1724–1805), a man with wide contacts both at court and among scholars. Overall supervision was the responsibility of a number of senior courtiers and military men, and ultimately the emperor himself.

Three sets of draft reviews, collected and published in the nineteenth century, suggested the nature of the interaction between these strata. A comparison of these drafts with the final versions which appeared in the imperial catalog suggests that they did form a foundation for the final reviews. There were, of course, editorial interventions, and most sources point to Chi Hsiao-lan as the person primarily responsible at least for editing the reviews for stylistic and intellectual consistency. Of course, the final versions were also read by the emperor and his councillors. The degree of political interference at this stage cannot be certainly determined, but it seems clear that at least the broadest structures of argumentation were determined by the scholars who wrote the drafts.⁽⁴⁸⁾

Unfortunately, first drafts of the reviews of Ku's work are not extant, and so it is impossible to trace their evolution from draft to publication. It is possible, however, to compare the image of Ku Yen-wu in the *Ssu-k'u* with assessments of the significance of his work in the writings of a group of individuals who, by the testimony of those both sympathetic and hostile to their point of view, dominated intellectual life in the last quarter of the eighteenth century.⁽⁴⁹⁾ This group included Chief Editor of the *Ssu-k'u*, Chi Hsiao-lan, and Assistant Editor Chu Yun. But it also included the historian Ch'ien Ta-hsin, who held no position on the *Ssu-k'u* Commission as well as the younger classicists Wang Chung 汪中 (1745–1794) and Sun Hsing-yen 孫星衍 (1753–1818), the brilliant philosopher Tai Chen 戴震 (1724–1777) and the iconoclastic historian Chang Hsueh-ch'eng. Random references in their writings, writings not meant for government editing, conveyed a fairly clear picture of Ku Yen-wu. This image may be compared with the *Ssu-k'u* image in three areas, phonology, epigraphy, and geography and the study of local institutions.

Among the elite intellectuals of the eighteenth century, Ku's phonological studies were viewed as heralding the beginning of a new era. Tai Chen and his teacher Chiang Yung, as well as Ch'ien Ta-hsin himself, all published studies of

(48) These were Shao Chin-han, "*Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu t'i-yao fen-tsu'an kao*," in Ma Yung-hsi, comp., *Shao-hsing hsien-cheng yi-shu*, fourth series (K'uei-chi, 1883); and Yao Nai, "*Hsi-pao-hsuan shu-lu*," in Mao Yü-sheng, ed., *Hsi-pao-hsuan yi-shu san-chung* (T'ung-ch'eng, 1879). For more extended analyses of these drafts, see Guy, "The Scholar and the State," Chapters 7 and 8.

(49) On this elite, see Yü Ying-shih, *Lun Tai Chen yü Chang Hsueh-ch'eng* (HongKong, 1975), p. 170.

phonology, studies which were based on Ku Yen-wu's method even when they quibbled with his findings. Chiang, in the introduction to his *Ku-yun piao-chun*, quoted Ku's famous remark that "in fifty years, people will understand my work." Modestly protesting that he didn't begin to have enough erudition to fully understand Ku's work, Chiang nonetheless set out to correct many errors which Ku's overly rigid conception of phonology had produced in his work.⁽⁵⁰⁾ A similar tone of respectful remonstrance characterized Tai Chen's comments on Ku in a colophon he wrote for the *Ku-yin-lun* 古音論.⁽⁵¹⁾ While Tai Chen, Ch'ien Ta-hsin and their contemporaries all recognized that Ku had made mistakes, they all felt Ku's works had contributed to the recognition that the way to understand the classics was to read their texts. Of course, by the eighteenth century this study had not only become more sophisticated, but had come to include the studies of ancient script and grammar, areas on which Ku had not touched.

The imperial catalog's praise of Ku's role as a founder of phonology, and the relatively detailed and careful assessments of phonological works all reflected closely the thinking of many prominent eighteenth-century intellectuals. Moreover, these intellectuals' fervent belief in the importance of textual studies was apparent in the tone and style of many *Ssu-k'u* reviews, and particularly those of Ku's more scholarly work. Ironically, it was probably the very sincerity of their faith in Ku's method which led the *Ssu-k'u* editors and their friends to criticize his findings. Precisely because they believed in the importance of textual studies, *Ssu-k'u* editors took a special pride in pointing to the respects in which members of their own generation had superseded seventeenth-century pioneers.

A similarly close parallel existed between the writings of many prominent thinkers of the late *Ch'ien-lung* era and the *Ssu-k'u* evaluations of Ku's epigraphy. Interest in this area was especially strong among the students and friends of Chu Yun. In late October of 1771, Chu and some students had paid a visit to the Liu-li-ch'ang, the major book selling district of Peking, where they had unearthed a series of stone inscriptions which had enabled them to piece together a map of Liao dynasty Peking. The episode was a famous one and evidently served to inspire many who heard of it.⁽⁵²⁾ In the next quarter-century, many of Chu's students and friends published their own catalogs of stone inscriptions. In 1787, a volume of comments on inscriptions by Ch'ien Ta-hsin entitled *Chin-shih-wen pa-wei* 金石文跋尾 (Comments and colophons on stone inscriptions) was printed. Wang Ch'ang's 王昶 (1725-1806) massive work, *Chin-shih ts'ui-pien* 金石粹編 (A compendium of stone inscriptions) was published in 1805. Weng Fang-kang

(50) Chiang Yung, "Hsu," *Ku-yun piao-chun*, Kuang-wen shu-chu reprint (Taipei, 1966), 3b-4a.

(51) Tai Chen, "Ku-shih yin-lun-pa," *Tai Chen wen-chi*, Ho-lo Publishing Company reprint (Taipei, 1975), p. 86.

(52) Yao Ming-ta, *Chu Yun nien-p'u* (Shanghai, 1937), p. 38.

翁方綱 (1733-1818) produced in 1786 a study of Han dynasty stone inscriptions, *Liang-han chin-shih-chi* 兩漢金石記. Sun Hsing-yen's catalog, titled the *Huan-yu fang-pei-lu* 寰宇訪碑錄 (Stone inscriptions of the empire) was evidently a collective effort produced by the collaboration of many of Chu's students and friends in 1802.

The compilers of these catalogs saw themselves as part of a long, if occasionally broken, tradition. The oldest stone inscriptions in China dated from the Han dynasty, but the first extant catalogs were the *Chi-ku-lu* 集古錄 (Catalog of antiquities) of Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽修 (1007-1070) and the *Chin-shih-lu* 金石錄 of Chao Ming-ch'eng 趙明誠 (1080-1139) both of whom had assembled inscriptions made as early as the reign of Liang Wu-ti (502-550).⁽⁵³⁾ These two pioneers had a few followers during the Sung dynasty, but during the Ming dynasty, the practice of compiling catalogs of stone inscriptions had languished. From the standpoint of the eighteenth century, Ku Yen-wu had "rediscovered" the importance of stone inscriptions in the early Ch'ing, and it was to Ku that eighteenth century scholars looked for inspiration. Hence the *Ssu-k'u* remark that Ku's *Chih-shih wen-tzu-chi* 金石文字記 should serve as the shining example for modern scholars of stone inscriptions.

Like Ku, eighteenth-century epigraphers regarded the collection of stone inscriptions as a natural complement to textual studies, since both projects were seen as establishing with certainty the words and deeds of the past. "Without stone inscription," Wang Ch'ang asked in his preface, "how can one check the language of the classics?"⁽⁵⁴⁾ One could, of course, find records of stone inscriptions in such sources as local gazetteers, but relying on such secondary records would, Sun Hsing-yen argued, defeat the epigrapher's primary purpose. Unless one had made a rubbing or transcription with one's own hand, how could one be certain that a careless scholar had not erred in recording a name or a date, thereby introducing just the sort of error that stone inscriptions were meant to be proof against.⁽⁵⁵⁾

The *Ssu-k'u* evaluation of Ku's writings on geography and local institutions also reflected eighteenth-century thought in these areas, but a combination of changing historical circumstances, accidents of textual provenance, and above all, the changing concerns of intellectuals created a climate which was not wholly sympathetic to all of Ku's geographical works. A strong interest in studies of localities and local institutions has characterized much of the last three centuries of Chinese intellectual history, but the preoccupations which fueled that interest

(53) For a convenient summary of the history of epigraphy in China from the eighteenth-century point of view, see Ch'ien Ta-hsin, "Hsu," *Chin-shih wen-tzu-chi*, Lung family reprint (Ch'ang-sha, 1884).

(54) Wang Ch'ang, *Chin-shih ts'ui-pien*. Chung-hsun-t'ang ts'ang-pan (n. p., 1805), *hsu*, 2a.

(55) Sun Hsing-yen, *Huan-yü fang-pei-lu*, Commercial Press reprint (Shanghai, 1935), p. 1.

have changed radically. No doubt, Ku Yen-wu's interest in studies of regions was sparked in part by a natural traveller's curiosity in the areas he visited and the sights he saw. But also, as the preface to the *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping-shu* suggested, Ku's interest was stimulated by a belief that local institutions could offer a counterweight to an increasingly burdensome and chaotic central government.

To the extent that an interest in local politics implied the rejection of central authority, it was viewed with suspicion by the Ch'ing government. Perhaps reflecting this suspicion, the preface of the imperial catalog specifically excluded works which "merely boasted of the personages" or accomplishments of their regions. Also barred were volumes which unrealistically advocated a return to the feudal institutions of an earlier era.⁽⁵⁶⁾ Within the catalog itself, the editors characterized the local history as a degenerate form of geography book, and remarked that they had excised from the collection local histories guilty of excessive boasting.⁽⁵⁷⁾

This government suspicion may have accounted in part for the fact that only two of Ku's geography books were included in the imperial collection, but an accident of textual provenance also contributed to the *Ssu-k'u* editors' limited understanding of Ku's geographical work. When Ku died, most of his work was turned over to his student P'an Lei, who proceeded to edit and publish it. His geographical manuscripts, however, became part of the library of Ku's cousin Hsu Ch'ien-hsueh 徐乾學, and remained unpublished through the eighteenth century. Among these works were the *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping-shu* which so puzzled the *Ssu-k'u* editors. A colophon by Ch'ien Ta-hsin written in the last years of the eighteenth century suggested that the *Ssu-k'u* characterization of the work as "disorderly, confused and nothing more than an unfinished draft" was indeed a fair one:

The breadth of Ku's learning encompassed all Confucianism and those of his writings in common circulation all concern the ways of the world and the customs of man. It is not only in this work that he emphasized penetrating understanding. The problem is, however, that the *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping-shu* does not exist in a printed edition. The versions which circulate are organized according to the ideas in the book, which is to say they have lost their original order. Thus [Ku's idea] is like a pearl hidden in a pillow.

Recently Huang Jao-p'u has purchased the *Ch'uan-shih-lu* edition of this work in 34 *ce*, which he knows to be from Ku's own hand. The characters

(56) *TMTY*, *sheng-yü*, pp. 1-2.

(57) *TMTY*, p. 1454.

are as small as a fly's head, but between the cramped lines one can see the message [Ku] was trying to convey, and unwilling to trust to a copyist. It is a work which brilliantly expresses his views.⁽⁵⁸⁾

Of course, for such intrepid bibliographers as the scholars of the late eighteenth century were, the fact that a work remained need not have been a barrier to its "rediscovery" and explanation. That eighteenth-century scholars didn't pursue the *T'ien-hsia chün-kuo li-ping-shu* probably meant only that they had little incentive to. The reasons for this were complex. The eighteenth century was the great age of local history writing in China, and most prominent thinkers of the century earned their livelihoods at it at one time or another, but the social and political assumptions behind such histories were quite different from what they had been earlier. Where Ku had been asking, at least in part, whether the local community could serve as the foundation for a new sort of political order, the eighteenth-century histories were celebrating the prosperity of their regions, and the success of its native sons. Living in a prosperous and secure age when there were few overt challenges to central authority, eighteenth century thinkers saw little need to contemplate institutional reform.⁽⁵⁹⁾ While they admired Ku's skill as a geographer, they saw little need to explore his notions of political reform, which they regarded as quaint remnants of an earlier era.

One need not, therefore, adduce government censorship as the only or even primary reason for the somewhat distant treatment of Ku Yen-wu's more political works in the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu*. Ku Yen-wu had left his followers a complex legacy which had both political and intellectual components. His own perception of the proper relation between these components may have changed during his own lifetime, and the accepted view of their relation certainly changed in the 300 years following his death. The *Ssu-k'u* editors' view of Ku as principally concerned with setting forth an intellectual agenda for precise research may not have been the only correct one, but it was certainly valid. More important for present purposes, it was much the same view that eighteenth-century intellectuals, working without government supervision, had put together for themselves.

CONCLUSION

Thus Chang Ping-lin was probably wrong. The *Ssu-k'u* editors did not tamper

- (58) Quoted in Hsieh Kuo-chen, *Ku T'ing-lin hsueh-p'u*, p. 159. Huang Jao-p'u lived at the end of the eighteenth century.
- (59) Eighteenth-century intellectuals' views of Ku were illustrated in the essay "Tu *Jih-chih-lu*" by Ch'eng Chin-fang 程晉芳 (1718-1784). Recording his admiration for Ku's scholarship, Ch'eng regrets Confucian scholars' tendency to involve themselves in political affairs. Of the reforms recommended by Ku, Ch'eng wrote, few could be put into practice; and of those few which could be put into practice, fewer still were without disadvantage. Ch'eng's essay can be found in ch. 3 of the *Huang-ch'ao ching-shih wen-pien* 皇朝經世文編 (Wen-hai ch'u-pan-she reprint, (Taipei, 1967) Vol. I, pp. 143-4).

with Ku Yen-wu's reputation and writings, they merely wrote of him as they saw him. Indeed, Chang Ping-lin may have recognized this toward the end of his life for one of his strongest arguments was that the version of the *Jih chih-lu* in the imperial compilation appeared to have been edited, and it was plausible that this editing was done by *Ssu-k'u* personnel. But earlier this century, a handwritten text was discovered which predated all extant versions of the work. The text indicated that Chang's suspicions were justified: However, the *Jih-chih-lu* had been edited not by government personnel in the eighteenth century, but rather by Ku's own students shortly after his death in the late seventeenth.⁽⁶⁰⁾ In 1932, Chang published a short note acknowledging his error, and thus corrected, Chang's earlier pronouncements should perhaps be forgotten. Indeed, Chang's mistake would be almost insignificant if it were not typical of the misperceptions of a whole generation of modern Chinese intellectuals, misperceptions which have profoundly influenced our reading of modern Chinese history. For interpretations like Chang's contributed to the fairly widely held belief that *k'ao-cheng* 考證 scholarship in modern China represented a quietistic response of Chinese intellectuals to the despotic exactions of the Manchu government. The *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* was seen by many as epitomizing this response.

The argument here has been that the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* should be read, not as a pale reflection of government censorship, but as a statement of the views of the dominant group of late eighteenth-century Chinese intellectuals. Those who fault the *Ssu-k'u* editors for giving in to government pressures and ignoring Ku's political activity commit the anachronism of looking for nineteenth-century concerns in eighteenth-century writings. Ku Yen-wu had an uncanny ability to speak to all generations of Ch'ing intellectuals, but he spoke with differing voices. The source of his continuing popularity may have lain more in the vigor of his style and the compelling character of the tasks he set out for himself than in the specific content of what he proposed. As the issues, opportunities and institutional bases of intellectual life changed, different facets of Ku's legacy emerged. For eighteenth-century thinkers at any rate, Ku's methodological innovations were as important and exciting as his political reformism was for nineteenth century authors.

The fact that censorship did not seriously affect the portrayal of Ku in the *Ssu-k'u* should not be taken as a sign of the weakness of the Ch'ing government so much as an indication of the strength of the Chinese elite. Manchu attacks on scholars and their families could be quite brutal and arbitrary, but as the findings of recent research on Ch'ing treatment of intellectuals has shown, the targets of such attacks could be quite narrowly limited.⁽⁶¹⁾ The Ch'ing government, or for

(60) Chang Ping-lin, "*Jih-chih-lu* chiao-chi hsu," *Yuan-ch'ao-pen jih-chih-lu*, p. 957.

(61) See Thomas F. Fisher, "Lü Liu-liang (1628-1683) and the Tseng Ching Case (1728-1733)," Ph. D. dissertation (Princeton, 1974); and Chapter 9 of Guy, "The Scholar and the State."

that matter any Chinese government, could hardly buck the major tide of opinion flowing among the elite upon whom its power rested. And, as research on the eighteenth century is increasingly demonstrating, *k'ao-cheng* research was such a tide.

In a sense, this finding poses as many problems for intellectual historians as it resolves. At least, the treatment of Ku Yen-wu in the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* as here described cautions against attributing too much weight to governmental influence in tracing the evolution of *k'ao-cheng* claims and concerns. Tracing other sources of these claims is, of course, a difficult matter, for *k'ao-cheng* scholars wrote with tremendous erudition on a wide range of topics. Yet the task is an important one if we are to understand the evolution of modern Chinese history. Instead of decrying the despotism of Chinese government, the task before us is to assess the achievements of Ch'ing scholars.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE NOTES

NPTP: Ku T'ing-lin *nien-p'u ts'ui-pien*, Ts'un-tsui hsueh-she (Hong Kong, 1975).

TMTY: Chi Hsiao-lan, ed., *Ch'in-ting ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu t'i-yao* Commercial Press reprint (Taipei, 1971).

Table 1. Criteria for Evaluation in the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu*
(Based on 137 Articles in the *Documents* Section)

Criteria	Citations
1. Proper use of sources & verification or not	21
2. Critical of arbitrary judgment	13
3. Worthy of consideration as <i>k'ao-cheng</i> or not	11
4. Use of <i>Sung i-li</i> methods or not	9
5. Link to concrete studies or not	7
6. Use of proper <i>hsun-ku</i> 訓詁 methods or not	6
7. Discovery & originality	4

清代考據學的發展——顧炎武和四庫全書

蓋 博 堅

明末清初的大學者顧炎武，不僅被時人視為當代最傑出最富創造力的思想家之一，並且被十八世紀的學者如全祖望和章學誠尊為學術的宗師。然而，有清一代，顧炎武的形象隨着時間與學術之轉移，不但有許多變化，即對這些形象，也有不同的解釋。簡言之，對顧氏之看法，主要有三：一、以顧氏之弟子潘耒為代表，潘氏認為其師為倡導權力由中央移轉至地方的制度改革者。二、以全祖望為主。他受黃宗羲之影響，視顧氏為反清復明之民族運動者。三、以李光地為代表，認為顧氏為反對宋新儒學之玄想，力倡考據實證方法的大師，並以顧氏在音韻學的成就為證。盛行於十八世紀的看法，即是最後一說。乾隆時代編纂的四庫全書總目提要亦同樣熱烈地讚揚及肯定顧氏在音韻學、金石學和地理學上的成就與貢獻；相對地，於顧氏之制度改革論則僅稍稍提及。因此，將顧氏捧為關注社會、政治典範的十九世紀思想家及奉顧氏為革命精神榜樣的廿世紀史家，認為顧氏的形象在提要中遭到毀損。章炳麟在其哀焚書中譴責提要的編者在編纂過程中，有系統地閹割顧氏著作中有關社會與政治的內容。藉此，清廷可以壓制顧氏之學統，改變中國知識分子對他的認識，而影響全國學術發展的路程。

然而，顧炎武是否具有政治煽動性，而遭到清廷之貶抑呢？本文的中心論題，即在重估顧氏之傳承及其在提要編纂中被處理的方式。藉此，不僅能反映出顧氏之政府主張，更可反映出清廷統治思想的能力。更廣義地，這將為我們提供一個機會來衡量內在理路和外任勢力、學術演進與政治壓力，在中國近代史上對考證學發展之相對重要性。

據本文之研究，就提要的編纂過程而言，整個的立論架構乃決定於撰稿的學者。是故政治干預是有限的。再者，提要編者對顧氏學術遺產之評價和處理，與當時未參與編纂的名學者，如錢大昕、戴震、汪中、孫星衍和章學誠等對顧之評價相同。他們都稱頌顧氏在音韻學、金石學和地理學上的成就，但對顧氏之制度改革論則不太感興趣。

綜言之，在顧炎武之遺著中，有學術、亦有政治之元素。隨時間之推移，社會政治環境與學術興趣之變化，後人對二者取捨之比重，自有所不同。顧氏在方法學

上的創新，對十八世紀的思想家而言，就像顧氏的政治改革論，對十九世紀的學者同樣重要，同樣令人興奮。由此觀之，章炳麟可能是錯了。值得重視的是，這不僅是章氏一人之誤，更是整個近代中國知識分子的誤解；他們都錯認清代考證學之興起，乃是滿清專制統治引起的反應。這些責難提要編者對滿清壓力讓步的人其實是犯了時代錯誤：即將十九世紀的關心寄託在十八世紀的著作裏。對於這個誤解的澄清，將有助於我們對近代中國政治與學術關係的了解。