

宋  
遼  
金  
元

The Bulletin of  
SUNG YUAN  
Studies

Number 19  
1987

China Under Mongol Rule. Edited by J. D. Langlois, Jr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981. XVI + 491 pages, appendices, index.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This review was solicited by the previous editor, but its publication was delayed by the interruption in the schedule of the Bulletin. Given the length of time that the book has been in print and widely read, we decided to omit Professor Kuczera's summary discussion of the contents of the volume and to focus instead upon his evaluation. We are delighted to have this contribution from our Russian colleague and regret that his review was postponed and had to be shortened. Professor Kuczera has published on the problem of continuity of Chinese cultural traditions under the Yuan dynasty.]

There are some common features in the essays which should arouse scholarly concern. The essayists tend to overstate the effect of Mongol rule in China. Because of limitations of time and space here, I will consciously oversimplify to present the crux of the problem, a pro-Mongol bias. J. D. Langlois remarked, "In some ways Mongol rule may even have been rather benign" (p. 16). In other words, emphasis is laid on the favorable aspects of Mongol rule in China, and this emphasis has influenced particular revisions of conventional views. In addition to D. M. Farquhar's thesis that the Yuan was not actually highly centralized, there is a general tendency to gloss over conflicts in the relations between (Han) Chinese and the Mongols or to see these relations as less "conflictible" than others have. Conflict is submerged not only by the particular problems and questions addressed in the essays which emphasize points of shared interests but also by rhetoric. For instance, Langlois proclaimed, "the notion that the Yuan and early Ming Chinese were anti-Mongol racists seems extremely dubious" (p. 17).

Although these interpretative points seem reasonable in principle and grow out of detailed analysis of selected issues, not all of the resulting conclusions can be accepted; moreover, their emotional impact on readers sometimes might run counter to actual facts. First, the reader should be cautioned against the larger

impression created by the book's portrayal of selected topics. According to the pars pro toto principle, inductive generalization are not always possible from the study of a rather narrow range of problems. Often the study of selected problems yields limited results. In this case, a somewhat lop-sided picture results from the lack of coverage of such topics as the country's economic life, the legal status of different sections of the population, the presence of Mongol troops in the country. Second, the situation in China under Khubilai differed from, say, that under Ren-zong (1312-1320) or that under Shun-di (1333-1268); hence, such differences of circumstances between periods should have been taken into consideration, especially in the general outline offered by Langlois. Third, when analyzing relations between the (Han) Chinese and the Mongols, it is impossible to confine oneself to considering only the views and attitudes of the Chinese literati and upper social strata in general—especially those who eventually collaborated with the Mongol authorities in one way or another. Peasants and others, including rebels—whose attitudes were to a considerable extent anti-Mongol—should be taken into account even though their moods changed and were expressed differently depending on the concrete situation, time and place. A more balanced scholarly view should not ignore patently negative elements of Mongol rule. For instance, Chancellor Bayan proposed in 1337 to exterminate all Chinese bearing the five most common family names (Zhang, Wang, Liu, Li and Zhao), i.e. the bigger part of the nation. Although not approved by the emperor, the proposal can hardly be viewed only in terms of one isolated official. It surely reflected the anti-Chinese sentiments among at least a portion of the Mongol nobles as well as the corresponding feelings among many Chinese people who were mounting growing resistance to Mongol rule.

There are a few specific criticisms that I would like to make. First, reference to Yuan emperors is by their Mongol names with their Chinese titles sometimes added in brackets. This method is acceptable when problems are considered from the point of view of the history of the Mongol people. Otherwise, with the exception of Khubilai who was still the khaghan for all the Mongols, it is preferable to refer to them by their Chinese titles. Second, Hok-lam Chan's thesis is that the need to assert legitimacy increased with the passage of time, as the Yuan Mongols increasingly abandoned their nomadic traditions and became separated from the rest of the vast empire of the Mongols (p. 57). As Herbert Franke in From Tribal Chieftain to Universal Emperor and God: The Legitimation of the Yuan Dynasty (München, 1978), pp. 42-51, has demonstrated, the problem of the legitimacy of any dynasty was especially acute only under its first ruler, whereas his successors rightfully came to power as heirs. Third, primary sources are sometimes treated uncritically. For example, Yan-shuan Lao cites the Yuan shi to claim that there were 24,400 "public schools" in 1288 (p. 114). Taken out of context of the source and the historical situation, this figure might seem plausible. We should bear in mind that there were 20,166 schools in 1286; hence, the number of schools had to have grown by 4,234 in a mere two years during a time when the entire educational system was going through a painful rebirth. Such data should be cited with reservations. Fourth, while D. M. Farquhar's essay on Yuan administration undoubtedly adds to our knowledge, his analysis of only the supreme

state authority without an equally deep study of at least provincial institutions yields an overly one-sided view and detracts from the cogency of his conclusion. Some of his arguments that "the provinces . . . were only loosely bound to the imperial province" (p. 53) seem to me to be ill-judged, unconvincing, and even contradictory to his own claims about ethnic solidarity, the role play by the censorate, the emperor's supreme authority, etc. (pp. 53-54).

China Under Mongol Rule is overall made up of fine scholarly writings, substantiated by a thorough analysis of primary sources and secondary works, especially in Chinese and English, and provides some new stimulating conclusions. Including a section on thought is particularly noteworthy because philosophy has been relatively neglected subject in Yuan studies.

C. Kuczera, U.S.S.R.