

## 宋遼金元

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

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

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

# 宋遼金元

The Bulletin of  
SUNG-YUAN  
Studies

21

## GLOSSARY

Chao I 趙奕	mou 畝
Chao Liang 趙亮	Pan Chao 班昭
Chao Lin 趙麟	Pan Ch'ao 班超
Chao Meng-fu 趙孟頫	Pan Ku 班固
Chao Yung 趙雍	Pan Piao 班彪
Cheng Ssu-hsiao 鄭思肖	shih-lu 實錄
ch'eng-chih 承旨	shih-tu hsueh-shih 侍讀學士
Ch'eng Chü-fu 程鉅夫	Su tung-po 蘇東坡
chi-hsien yuan 集賢院	Ta-tu 大都
Chi-nan 濟南	T'ai-chou 泰州
ch'i-yün 氣韻	T'ai-yüan 太原
Chiang Ch'ing 江青	T'ien-mu 天目
Ch'ien-ch'iu hsiang 錢秋鄉	tsung-kuan fu 總管府
Ch'ien-tzu wen 千字文	Tung-heng 東衡
Chih-ku 直沽	tz'u 詞
Chung-chi 仲姬	Wang Hsi-chih 王羲之
Chung-feng Ming-pen 中峰明本	Wang Hsien-chih 王獻之
Chung-feng tai-fu 中奉大夫	Wang Wei 王維
Fen-chou 汾州	Wei-kuo fu-jen 魏國夫人
Kuan Chi-fu 管直夫	Wu-hsing 吳興
Kuan Chung 管仲	Wu-hsing chün fu-ren 吳興郡夫人
Kuan Fu-jen 管夫人	
Kuan Tao-sheng 管道昇	
Kuo Hsi 郭熙	
lang-chung 郎中	
Li Ch'eng 李成	
Li Ch'ing-chao 李清照	
Li K'an 李衍	
Lin-ch'ing 臨清	
Miao-yen 妙岳	
Mo-chu p'u 墨竹譜	

## BOOK REVIEWS

State and Scholars in T'ang China. By David McMullen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. Pp. x, 423, bibliography, index and glossary.

During my tenure (now ending) as Book Review Editor, I have solicited reviews for all publisher-sent books, except a novel and two books on Japan that clearly did not fall within the scope of the Bulletin. Although State and Scholars in T'ang China deals with the era before the one covered by the Bulletin, it is of such relevance to major views becoming current in Sung and Yüan studies that an exception should be made. Hence, I will very briefly highlight some of the contributions of this noteworthy book.

Professor McMullen has written a well-balanced and detailed survey of Confucian scholarship during the T'ang. In discussing scholarship on the classics, histories, governance, ritual, and belles lettres, he demonstrates that common trends throughout these complex topics fit into three periods: the two founding reigns; the years from 650 to 755; and lastly the period after the An Lu-shan rebellion. Such factors as degree of state power, relative peace, and numbers of scholars are put forth as causes for the differences between periods. As such, he links intellectual history to social--and especially political--developments. In the process, he suggests that the social and economic backgrounds and experiences of T'ang scholars are too mixed for us to apply the simple term "elite." Although one might be skeptical about the degree of poverty claimed by some members of prominent lineages, McMullen's suggestion deserves consideration by those of us in the Sung period who have expended so much effort in defining the elite. We have tended to focus either upon centralization and autocratic power at the national level or upon local studies in which the power of the central government appears inconsequential. Moreover, we have used degree of involvement in polity and society at the national level to define a watershed change in the nature of the elite from the Northern to the Southern Sung. Perhaps, we should consider similar patterns in other dynasties. Comparative study might further accent such factors as the ones McMullen emphasizes. This is not a call for a return to a dynastic-cycle interpretation of history, but some of our studies might be enriched by paying closer attention to similar phenomenon in other periods.

McMullen's study is particularly helpful in setting forth the complexity of being Confucian during the T'ang. In contrast to some Sung scholars in recent years, he does not restrict "Confucian" to refer to pedants commenting upon the canon or to scholars committed to particular doctrines. McMullen understands that many T'ang scholars had commitments to Confucian values and scholarship; moreover, although not formalized or detailed, there were expectations about those who were associated with the values and learning of earlier Confucians. Although not as clearly delineated and articulated as our own polemics would require, McMullen's sense of the variety of T'ang Confucian views and priorities might serve as a corrective to our tendency to apply later definitions or standards for being Confucian. For instance, T'ang scholars surely had in mind

some meaningful sense of Confucian when calling someone, such as Liu Chih-chi, a 'pure Confucian' (ch'un ju). Even though Chu Hsi's more doctrinaire usage of that particular standard certainly would have excluded Liu, are we to follow Chu's standard and dismiss the ju label as inappropriate or meaningless when applied to such T'ang scholars? Should we rather strive to understand why scholars in various periods associated themselves with the Confucian tradition and to distinguish among different varieties of Confucians? The term Confucian does need to be specified and qualified more precisely by periods and priorities (or orientations). But, won't we miss a significant continuity in the history of Chinese thought if we heed the call of some Sung scholars to dispense with the term altogether?

The author also clarifies Confucian attitudes toward wen by showing the diversity of associations inherent in that term and concept. McMullen demonstrates the complex mixture of harmony and tension among historical, statecraft, literary and other approaches to wen. Furthermore, his awareness of historical setting illumines his discussions. For example, scholars championed wen to counter the dominance of military prestige and interest during the dynasty; moreover, political considerations were significant in enhancing the importance of belles lettres in the examinations. Such political and cultural contexts shed light upon statements about wen that might otherwise too easily be transposed into much larger philosophical and interpretive polemics.

In the Introduction and Conclusion, McMullen contrasts the pluralistic mentalité encouraged in the T'ang with the drive toward orthodoxy in the Sung. Although his comments on Sung Confucianism are brief and do not take into account recent studies and interpretations, Professor McMullen's balanced account of the T'ang provides us with an excellent baseline against which to measure not only diverse changes that occurred during the Sung but also our own characterizations of T'ang Confucianism.

Rather than concentrating upon a line of argument, McMullen has produced a detailed mosaic of T'ang Confucian scholarship in its political and intellectual contexts. Although some might prefer to have had a more polemical interpretation or rigorously argued thesis, McMullen's book is actually all the more valuable because of its comprehensive and balanced presentation.

Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, Arizona State University

\* \* \* \* \*

Dieter Kuhn, *Die Song-Dynastie (960 bis 1279): Eine neue Gesellschaft im Spiegel ihrer Kultur*. Weinheim: Acta humaniora, VCH, 1987. Pp. xxi + 528. 272 illustrations, maps, tables, diagrams, and charts. DM 162. [U.S. \$82]

The monograph under review claims to characterize the historical era of the Sung dynasty as a unified cultural entity. In the process, the author takes sides in the ongoing debates concerning various aspects of the period. He does so on the premise that the Sung dynasty represents an integral object of historical study. The beginning of the Sung marks, in his opinion, the end of the Middle Ages in China, and he is convinced

that the specific cultural configuration that evolved under the Sung set the tone of cultural life under later imperial dynasties of China.

The author takes a decisive stance in maintaining that the key to the character and development of Sung civilization lies in the growth of the elite of scholar-officials: "In the tragicomedy of the Sung, the causes for the florescence [of the Sung] as well as for the creeping decay in the 13th century are to be found: in the thought and actions of the scholar officials; and in the intricate complicity (in the intermediate range advantageous for the state, if deleterious in the long run) between governmental policy-making powers and administrative power, as well as between capital and landownership" (p. 5). In the failure of the policies of Wang An-shih, the Sung missed the opportunity to solidify the remarkable gains of the preceding era.

Given the encompassing prospects heralded in Professor Kuhn introduction and echoed in Herbert Franke's preface, it would seem tempting to take the measure of the work by such elevated expectations. Still, our impression of the intrinsic merits of Kuhn's book need not depend exclusively on how close the author comes to an integrated treatment of the cultural history of the Sung. The book under review may well take its place in a triad of outstanding recent German monographs in Sung history: it stands along with Klaus Flessel's study of hydro-engineering under the Sung, and Herbert Franke's study on warfare under the Southern Sung.

The fundamental characteristic of Kuhn's book is that he seeks out and finds the particular flavor and tone of Sung culture in aspects customarily not emphasized by traditional historians. Before the advent of the modern French school of historiography, cultural phenomena under the label "life-style" were relegated to the cultural background, or sealed off in separate chapters or monographs. Kuhn's introduction of aspects of daily life, craftsmanship, and the aesthetic, is not simply motivated by an attempt to fall in line with the French school. From his own practical aptitude and expertise, Kuhn interprets the contributions of art, commercial craft, and industry to the historical diversity of Sung civilization. Such directness of personal expertise informs the stronger sections of *Die Song-Dynastie*.

A book of this nature presents obvious problems of organization. Kuhn's work is essentially focussed on three major sections dealing with the material culture of the Sung: agriculture, urban life, and the characteristic Sung style of 'conspicuous consumption.'

The author adroitly lays the foundation for these sections in two introductory chapters (pp. 7-79, 81-125). It will always be an important task for historians of 'middle-period' China to explain and describe how

<sup>1</sup>Klaus Flessel, *Der Huang-ho und die historische Hydrotechnik in China: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der nördlichen Sung-zeit und mit einem Ausblick auf den veraleichbaren Wasserbau in Europa*. Leiden: Kommissionsverlag E. J. Brill, 1974. Herbert Franke, *Studien und Texte zur Kriegsgeschichte der südlichen Sungzeit*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987 (Asiatische Forschungen; Bd. 102).



the political system and cultural life of the Sung (as well as that of the Liao and Chin) evolved from a re-alignment and re-concrescence of the products of late T'ang decay. Kuhn tackles this daunting task by taking an 'exemplary' approach.

From an overview of political developments, he progresses to a discussion of very specific aspects of cultural life that serve to represent the evolutionary trends of the T'ang-Sung transition. The topics selected include: burial architecture (as archaeologically analyzed from regional regimes based in Ch'eng-tu and Nan-ching); objects of daily life archaeologically recovered from burials of that period; the development of printing during the Wu-tai and early Sung as the truly creative age of printing in China; and the discovery of nature in the evolving representational painting styles of the period.

The second chapter provides a basic orientation to the administrative geography, the demographics, and the major political developments of the Sung dynasty itself. Kuhn lists dynastic rulers in detailed charts, which is unusual for recent historical surveys, and offers an analysis of the local and central structures of administration. In keeping with his emphasis on the scholar-official class, Kuhn gives ample attention to the recruitment of officials. Kuhn prefers not to underestimate the extent of social mobility; hence, his perspective differs from that in recent studies by Robert M. Hartwell and Robert P. Hymes.<sup>2</sup> Partially prompted by Wolfram Eberhard's pioneering work, the focus of research in recent years has shifted from the selection mechanism (i.e., the examinations) to family background and local contexts as the main factors for social mobility; thus, recent studies have greatly reduced earlier estimations of upward mobility during the Sung. A middle course between the extremes of these estimations has been charted by Kuhn and also by John W. Chaffee.<sup>3</sup> Although only a small minority achieved success and only individuals with assistance from relatives or local institutions could hope to ascend to the upper ranks through examinations, we should not be blind to the advancement opportunities for individuals not enjoying the benefits of automatic entitlement or preference.

The section on developments in agriculture is divided into two chapters: land-ownership and social stratification in the agricultural sector; and descriptions of various aspects of agricultural production, trade, and technology. Kuhn's technical analyses of material culture includes these specific topics: the technology of irrigation; the cultivation and trade of rice, legumes, vegetables, citrus fruit, sugar cane, tea, and plant oils; the production and processing of silk; the

<sup>2</sup>Robert M. Hartwell, "Demographic, Political, and Social Transformations of China, 750-1500," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 42 (1982): 365-442. Robert P. Hymes, *Statesmen and Gentlemen: The Elite of Fu-chou, Chiang-hsi, in Northern and Southern Sung*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

<sup>3</sup>John W. Chaffee, *The Thorny Gates of Learning in Sung China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

(pp. 127-187).

Urban life is described in the examples of five major Sung cities. Kuhn's description of K'ai-feng supplements that given by E. A. Kracke and others.<sup>4</sup> Shorter notices on Ning-po, Nanching, and Su-chou also incorporate archaeological materials. Most lengthy is his survey of the Southern Sung capital at Hangchou. Among Kuhn's predecessors in this field, Jacques Gernet gave what was essentially a description of the life-styles of the various population segments of Hang-chou.<sup>5</sup> Kuhn, by contrast, presents the city very graphically as an urban environment, with its over-all lay-out, its guilds and stores, restaurants, wine and tea houses, entertainment quarters, excursion spots, and welfare institutions (pp. 241-285).

"Visible wealth" is the title of the third major section, which gives us descriptive and technical chapters on the luxury industries. These industries produced objects of conspicuous consumption: ceramics (analyzed in art-historical and technical detail in eight regionally differentiated groups), gold and silver crafts, lacquer, and bronze. Careful documentation and illustrations from recent archaeological finds support Kuhn's study of the couture of the privileged and also his detailed and highly technical analyses of the upscale silk fabrics of the period (pp. 287-392). The standard of living known from literary sources has become directly visible in its posthumous manifestations through newly discovered burials, which Kuhn describes with the special competence of an art historian and archaeologist. In his view, the finds reflect, among other things, a more dignified and respected status for women than was commonly assumed on the basis of ideologically biased written documents (pp. 392-430).

In acceding to the author's wish to be judged by what he chose to present rather than by what was excluded or omitted (p. 5), we might attempt to piece together the rationale for his choices. The author clearly shows a preference for technical aspects and craftsmanship involved in cultural expression; moreover, he favors archaeologically recovered and visual materials over data exclusively transmitted in literary sources. Such principles also seem to have inspired him painstakingly to assemble such a rich and instructive assortment of illustrations. Similarly, Kuhn prefers selective presentation of expressive detail, in the mode of Clifford Geertz's "thick description," over generalizing accounts and conventional narratives. Such characteristic choices inform the book's overall organization as well as to the individual sections, chapters, and paragraphs.

In addition to visual illustrations, Kuhn's 'exemplary' approach, makes ample use of diagrams, maps, and statistical tables. The book

<sup>4</sup>E. A. Kracke, "Sung K'ai-feng: Pragmatic Metropolis and Formalistic Capital," in John W. Haeger, ed., *Crisis and Prosperity in Sung China*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, pp. 49-77.

<sup>5</sup>Jacques Gernet, *La Vie quotidienne en Chine à la veille de l'invasion mongole, 1250-1276*. Paris: Hachette, 1959.

makes ample use of diagrams, maps, and statistical tables. The book might have been more coherent if the chronological, demographic, and sociological analyses of the scholar-official class and the agricultural sector had been brought together in the introductory section, where Kuhn gives his characterization of Sung society. While describing material culture, the author is perfectly justified in relying almost exclusively on his own research. In sections devoted to the political, social, and economic structure of the dynasty, more references to Chinese, Japanese and Western contributions would have been useful even to readers without professional specialization in middle-period China.

In summary, Kuhn has been able to maintain a fresh view of his materials, and nowhere do we find him entangled in the conventional verbalizations of China specialists. Besides the many remarks interspersed throughout his text, a particularly clear example of this freshness is the sure-handed "epilogue" (pp. 431-441), where Kuhn places his descriptions in the larger context of Chinese history. The characteristic independence and directness of his approach mark the special contribution of this book to the scholarly historiography of China.

Horst Huber, Harvard-Yenching Library

\* \* \* \* \*

Statesmen and Gentlemen: The Elite of Fu-chou, Chiang-hsi, in Northern and Southern Sung. By Robert P. Hymes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. Pp. xv, 379. Maps, tables, bibliography, index.

Social mobility in Sung China has been a topic of study by Western scholars for over four decades. Professor Hymes' work is a recent contribution to this topic.

Professor E. A. Kracke was the pioneer in quantitative studies of Sung social mobility. His earliest work on this topic was published in 1947.<sup>1</sup> His studies focused on the core elite--the officials and the holders of civil service examination degrees; moreover, he concentrated on the two complete and extant examination lists from the Sung dynasty. His statistical analysis of the family background of chin-shih degreeholders focused on three generations of paternal ancestors, and he concluded that well over half of the chin-shih were from non-bureaucratic families. These "new men" indicated freedom of opportunity in the examinations and a high level of social mobility between officials and non-officials.

Kracke's studies heavily influenced Japanese scholars, such as Sudō Yoshiyuki, and Chinese scholars, such as Sun Kuo-tung, Ch'en I-yen, and

<sup>1</sup>E. A. Kracke, "Family Versus Merit in Chinese Civil Service Examinations under the Empire," Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 10 (1947): 105-23.

Ho Ping-ti.<sup>2</sup> Sun and Ch'en used the biographical data in the History of Sung Dynasty (Sung shih) to analyze the family background of the officials and found far larger social mobility between bureaucratic and non-bureaucratic classes in Sung than in T'ang. Ho Ping-ti also found higher levels of mobility in the Sung than in later dynasties.

These studies have been challenged by Robert Hartwell and his former student Robert Hymes who have developed the concept of Sung elite and quantitative measurement in a more sophisticated way.

Arguing that the group of officials and degreeholders was too narrow for the concept of elite, Robert Hartwell put the Sung elite into three categories: founding elite, professional elite, and regional elite.<sup>3</sup> The "founding elite" were military families from Northwest and North China: military governors and their associates, the personal staff of the founders, and the bureaucrats who had served in the capitals of the previous Five Dynasties. According to Hartwell, they had high downward mobility. The "professional elite" or "national elite" had five main characteristics: they

- (1) established their main residence in the primary or subordinate Sung capitals,
- (2) claimed pre-Sung great clan ancestry,
- (3) preferred intermarriage with each other regardless of regional origin,
- (4) placed most of their sons in the higher offices of the bureaucracy generation after generation, and
- (5) periodically controlled the Sung government between 980 and 1100.

They lasted longer than the founding elite, but also declined. The "regional elite" or "local gentry" were the families that provided a significant proportion of the officials in the lower bureaucracy as well as individuals in nongovernmental occupations, especially estate management, teaching, or commerce. They increased rapidly during the Sung dynasty. Rapid population growth led to changes in political structure and power struggles, that caused the decline of founding and professional elites, as well as the growth of local elites. He also pointed out that in cases of high mortality rates, Kracke's methods of analyzing three direct ancestors would be meaningless.

<sup>2</sup>Sudō Yoshiyuki, "Sōdai Kanryōsei to Daitochishoyō," Shakai kōseiishi taikai, (1950): 48-77. Sun Kuo-tung, "T'ang-Sung chih she-hui men-ti chih hsiao-jung," Hsin Ya hsüeh-pao, (1959): 212-305. Ch'en I-yen, "Ts'ung pu-i ju-shih ch'ing-hsing fen-hsi Pei-Sung pu-i chieh-ts'eng te she-hui liu-tung," Ssu-yü-yen, 9.4 (November, 1971): 48-57. Ho Ping-ti, The Ladder of Success in Imperial China: Aspects of Social Mobility, 1368-1911, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962).

<sup>3</sup>Robert Hartwell, "Demographic, Political, and Social Transformation of China," Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 42.2 (December 1982): 405-25.



criteria: wealth, power, and prestige. This marked a significant advance over narrow investigations of bureaucratic groups. As presented (pp. 7-10), his non-exclusive working categories of elite were:

- (1) officeholders;
- (2) graduates of the prefectural examinations or the equivalent;
- (3) major contributors of funds or lands to Buddhist or Taoist temples;
- (4) organizers of and major contributors to the founding or building of schools, academies, libraries, bridges, waterworks, or gardens;
- (5) organizers or leaders of local defense activities or of famine relief;
- (6) men connected by friendship, master-student ties, or common membership in academic or poetic societies, to members of categories (1) through (5); and
- (7) affinal kin of members of categories (1) through (5).

Emphasizing the importance of local studies, Hymes developed a method which used data collected and systematically arranged from all available sources for one particular area instead of the one most useful source on a national level. This method brought more accuracy to his quantitative analysis because it avoided the weakness of some earlier studies that depended upon just one particular source, either the biographies in the official *History of Sung Dynasty*, which often lacked information on the family background of the individuals, or the examination lists which had no information on the individuals' collateral and affinal relatives.

Hymes argued that besides the three lineal ascendants, one must also consider collateral and maternal relatives. If one did so, the proportion of "new men" coming into the civil service would be reduced from over sixty percent to between six and twenty percent for the area of Fu-chou. Rather than simply calculating rates of movement in status, Hymes developed a method to study strategies used by elite families. From the Northern Sung to the Southern Sung, the elite changed their strategies; their attention switched from nation-wide affairs to local affairs, and from the single goal of a post in civil service to diverse career goals. These strategies enabled them to establish their elite status firmly for long periods throughout the dynasty. Social mobility, Hymes concluded, was not so great as Kracke and other scholars had assumed. For example, even though discussing political rather than social history, Professor Richard Davis presents the Sung bureaucratic elite as highly precarious.<sup>4</sup>

Although Hartwell and Hymes advanced the understanding of mobility, the concept of strata and methods of study still have not been fully resolved. Although Kracke's studies only dealt with the core group of governmental elite, Hartwell's three categories of elite still did not cover all elite. His first two categories were based on the bureaucratic group only. His founding elite were the exclusive families established at the beginning of the dynasty. No new families could be added to this

<sup>4</sup> *Court and Family in Sung China, 960-1279: Bureaucratic Success and Kinship Fortunes for the Shih of Ming-chou*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1986), especially p. 13.

cover all elite. His first two categories were based on the bureaucratic group only. His founding elite were the exclusive families established at the beginning of the dynasty. No new families could be added to this group. We might ask: was not the rapid downfall of the founding elite evidence of high social mobility?

Furthermore, Hartwell did not include the new military families in this category. They also had high mobility. For instance, a general said: "I heard that the families of generals for many generations had no prosperous descendants." However, their upward mobility could also be rapid. A famous general, Ti Ch'ing (1008-1057), rose from the rank of a common soldier to the minister of military affairs, from the bottom of the society to the top. He was proud of the tattooed letters on his face which evidenced that he had sold himself to the army, just like a slave sold himself to a master. Although fighting had lower prestige than education, the military elite still should be counted in studies of elites.

Why did the "professional elite" last longer than the "founding elite" but eventually give way to the "local elite"? Instead of merely citing changes due to population growth, we should probably include the rapid development of the educational system, the spread of knowledge through advanced printing techniques, and hence a largely expanded group of literati. One might notice that Hartwell did not include the Ch'ien family of the former state of Wu-yüeh in the founding elite because they were from the South and surrendered to the founders late. However, as a warlord family they had the same social position as the founding elite. In Hartwell's categories, they were in the professional elite and avoided downward mobility for a longer time. What distinguished the Ch'ien family from the founding elite would be that they had more prestige in family education. Similarly, the difference between the professional elite and the local elite would still be the degree of education.

In short, Hartwell's three categories might serve to address the questions he posed, but as a general framework, they were not sufficient. Hartwell's categories did not cover all of the elite and were not divided according to a systematic standard set before the division into categories but rather according to certain characteristics of the groups resulting from that division.

Hymes set three systematic standards before defining the Sung elite: wealth, power, and prestige. Including not only officials and degreeholders but also wealthy and powerful men with local prestige, his concept of the elite was more complete than that of any earlier researcher. Hymes' categories have some similarity to Sung criteria. Sung people used three criteria to classify people: political power, wealth, and religious prestige. According to the criterion of political power, people were divided into officials (*kuan*); clerks (*li*); runners (*yi*), the common people in the service of the government; and lastly soldiers. According to the criterion of wealth, people were divided into households with property (*chu-hu*)--which were subdivided into five grades

<sup>5</sup> Li Tao, *Hsü Tzu-chih t'ung-chien ch'ang-pien*, Chung-hua shu-chü ed., (Peking: Chung-hua, 1979 and 1985), 83.1896.

Taoist monks and non-licensed monks. Thus, Sung society was a multi-strata society.

Although Hymes' standards might be better for analyzing Sung society, his seven working categories were merely seven ways to identify the elite, rather than systematically defined categories of elite. Even for the purpose of identifying the elite, his categories could still be questioned. His seventh category--the affinal kin of members of categories (1) through (5)--was identified as the elite, but the direct kinsmen of members of categories (1) through (5) were not mentioned in these seven categories. We should probably assume that the categories (1) through (5) not only included the individuals but also their kinsmen, because Hymes, as well as Hartwell, used the extended family or lineage as the unit of analysis. This assumption is confirmed by his practice of identifying the elite. For example, in his refutation of Kracke's thesis about "new men", the following people were identified as elite: a nephew of a chin-shih degreeholder, an agnate of a chin-shih, a member of a "leading lineage" or a family with previous chin-shih (pp. 38-39).

Hymes' inferences here seem to be: a kinsman of an elite was an elite, such a person was a kinsman of an elite, so he was an elite. Regarding the major premise of this inference and Hymes' categories six and seven, we might ask the question: were all kinsmen, affinal kinsmen, and friends of an elite the elite? If it is true that all kinsmen, all affinal kinsmen and friends of an elite are the elite, then we should have to say all families of scholars (shih) would be elite families, every member of these families would be elite; and once a family became an elite family, it would never lose this status again. No evidence would really be needed to demonstrate this conclusion, it would already be included in the premises. Hymes' own work offered some evidence that a few elite families lost their status in Fu-chou, but he prefers to think that most of them simply migrated out of Fu-chou to other areas. Thus, Hymes' categories six and seven appear questionable.

The problem is that Hartwell and Hymes used, what I regard as, an inappropriate unit of analysis: the lineage or extended family.<sup>1</sup> Although Hymes said that he focused on families (chia) without distinguishing extended or lineage ones, his working category actually seems to have been the lineage. The assumption behind using this unit is that all the members of a lineage have similar social status. Actually, in the Sung dynasty as in later periods of Chinese history, the members of a lineage might belong to different strata. The Sung was not a period in which the family name would secure elite status. In a Sung instructional paper, it was said:

If one is rich, but his clan is poor, then the tasks of ploughing, farming, carrying sedan chairs and loads, will all be done by his clansmen, even his elders. His wealth is enough to support his

<sup>1</sup> Robert Hartwell, 380, 417. Hymes, xii.

clansmen, so he can make them perform his services.<sup>2</sup>

Even though they shared the same family name, those clansmen carrying the sedan chairs for this rich person were apparently not elite.

We need to use a unit which can be employed to analyze the divergence and changes of social status within a lineage family. Concluding that the lineage is indivisible or divergent in social status should come only after, not before, the analysis. Hartwell's and Hymes' use of lineage as the unit of analysis greatly reduces the possibility of mobility (i.e., change in status both down and up) in the society as well as in the elite.

The traditional unit of Sung historical statistics was the household. Compared to lineage, the household is a more objective unit in the study of Sung social mobility. A household was an independent economic unit. Households encompassed various kinds of families, such as nuclear families, stem families, and extended families. In one lineage, there might be many households in various economic and social conditions. In Sung times, most households were small, generally not larger than families in European medieval or early modern societies. The demographic statistics of Sung governmental records show that the average size of households ranged from three to five persons. According to some scholars, the lineage family system typified the period from the T'ang through the Ch'ing. But, Sung data suggests that most Chinese households were not large enough to become a lineage family. The average household size ranged from three to five, quite the same as, or even smaller than, that in medieval and early modern Europe.

Hymes' working category two--graduates of prefectural examinations--might also be questioned. Professor Ho Ping-ti's work on social mobility during the Ming and Ch'ing drew a line which divided elite and non-elite between Prestige Bachelor Degreeholders (kung-sheng) and the Bachelor Degreeholders (sheng-yüan).<sup>3</sup> This line has generally been accepted because the Prestige Bachelor Degreeholders and those above them had direct opportunities to reach bureaucratic positions, but Bachelor Degreeholders did not. Similarly, in the Sung dynasty, graduates of the prefectural examinations generally did not have direct opportunities to get bureaucratic positions. Did they have enough prestige to be counted as elite? I doubt it--especially if we compare them with those powerful clerks in local government who had direct opportunities to become officials. Hymes' categories failed to count such clerks, however.

To study the elite and their social mobility, one must examine society as a whole. One also needs to know about the non-elite before one can understand the elite. The lines between elite and non-elite are always arbitrary in a sense, but must be reasonable.

<sup>2</sup>Cheng Chih-tao, Ch'in-t'ang yü-su pien, cited by Ch'i Hsia Sung-tai ching-chi shih, (Shanghai: Jen-min), 350.

<sup>3</sup>Ho Ping-ti, 27-29.



The social mobility of individuals and their families should be studied. What change of social status or positions happened during one's life? What kind of change happened in one's family? These are new questions to students of Sung social mobility. Hartwell and Hymes focused on the lineage unit, and did not consider intrageneration mobility (the change of social positions of individuals), or even intergeneration mobility (the change of social positions between two generations).

From Hymes' definition of the elite system, the problem of intrageneration and intergenerational mobility is largely meaningless, because elite status was guaranteed by one's family and even passing the chin-shih examination only confirmed elite status. His categories effectively guaranteed this absence of mobility. However, Sung elites did not think their position in society was so secure and stable. Ch'en Liang (1143-1194) wrote many funeral inscriptions for his relatives and friends. His view on family lineages was expressed in his comment on a Fang family of P'u-chiang hsien who rose from being farmers:

The genealogies were dim for a long time. There were even few scholar-officials who could show their genealogies clearly from the beginning to the end. If a family rose from farming and could keep a genealogy from the beginning ancestor for one or two hundred years, it was a praiseworthy family.<sup>4</sup>

Ch'en Liang's own family was said to have had several high officials before the T'ang, but the family became commoners long before Ch'en Liang's generation. His great-grandfather was even a soldier.<sup>5</sup> When he wrote an inscription for the descendants of Sun Ch'üan, the ruler of Wu in the period of Three Kingdoms, Ch'en remarked that anything could happen between Sun Ch'üan's time and his own.<sup>6</sup> He meant that one's descendant might become any kind of commoner, even a slave.

In the intergeneration mobility studies, if one calculates only significant persons, such as officials and degreeholders, while neglecting other unsuccessful persons in the family, what kind of conclusion might one expect? One would most likely have a false picture. Some primary source materials, such as Ying T'ing-yü's Chin-hua hsien-min chuan and Cheng Po's Chin-hua hsien-ta chuan have this bias. They mention only officials and those with chin-shih degrees. Hymes' work has the same problem, for only successful persons are included in his study. If an elite lineage family produced a chin-shih in three generations, that person would be recognized as a hero to rescue the family from downward mobility. In these three generations, there might well be several dozen persons whose social position declined, however.

If we discuss the question of the elite in terms of the Sung concept

<sup>4</sup> Lung-ch'uan wen-chi, 27.15ab.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 27.1ab.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 27.16b.

of strata, we will find that the Sung elite was complex. According to the criterion of religious prestige, licensed monks would be regarded as elite. In the case of the other two criteria, the line was not so clear cut. According to the criterion of political power, would clerks be in the elite? They had power; hence, by a modern standard they should be regarded as elite. In Sung society, however, the ideology of government and the prejudice of scholars excluded clerks from the elite. It is difficult to put clerks into either the elite or non-elite categories. Some runners were rich, but had no political power. Others became bankrupt while in the governmental services. It is also hard to decide whether runners should be included in the elite. According to the criterion of wealth, there were five grades of households with property in rural areas, but with which grade would the elite begin? It is hard to decide.

Scholars as a special stratum deserve more discussion. Historians generally believe that all scholars were elite. However, since the number of literati increased tremendously in Sung times, more people from lower strata came into this group, and so competition in the civil service examinations became keener. It became harder to enter and remain in the bureaucracy. Compared to governmental service, wealth became more and more important in society. Some far-sighted philosophers, especially Ch'en Liang, begin to challenge the supremacy of the civil service examinations. Some scholars did not have enough prestige to identify themselves as being part of the elite. Since scholars diverged so widely, should we include all of them in the elite? It is better to use the multiple-strata system to analyze scholars than to regard all of them as elite.

In conclusion, when the Western concept of "elite" is used to analyze Sung society, it would be better to identify which Sung strata one equates with the Western concept of the elite. There appears to have been no Sung concept or particular strata that translates readily into "the elite."

In closing, I would like to raise a minor question about Professor Hymes' understanding of a passage. He believes widow Huang was able to marry her daughter to a son of [a family with property or income of] two thousand shih (p. 86). He concluded that both the importance of wealth in a son-in-law and the importance of one's own wealth in getting one are clear. To the best of my knowledge, the son-in-law was most likely the son of a prefect, this title was often during the Sung called two thousand tan or shih.

Yu Zongxian, Apache Junction, Arizona

[Editor's note: Yu Zongxian has M.A. degrees in Chinese history from Shanghai Teacher's University and Arizona State University.]

\* \* \* \* \*



**Chu Hsi: Life and Thought**, by Wing-tsit Chan. Hong Kong and New York: The Chinese University Press and St. Martin's Press, 1987. xii + 212 pp. Index.

This book is not a biography of Chu Hsi (1130-1200), as the title might suggest, but it does contain a wealth of biographical detail that will delight anyone seriously interested in the Sung period or in the history of Neo-Confucianism. The first half of the book contains Professor Chan's 1984 Ch'ien Mu Lectures at the Chinese University of Hong Kong: "The New Fortune of Chu Hsi," "What is New in Chu Hsi?" and "Chu Hsi and World Philosophy." The last three chapters are important articles published elsewhere but not easily obtainable, including the often-cited "Chu Hsi's Completion of Neo-Confucianism" (1973) and two more recent ones, "Chu Hsi's Religious Life" (1983) and "Chu Hsi and the Academies" (1984). The public lectures are for the most part based on material found elsewhere in Professor Chan's writings, resulting in some duplication even within the present volume. For example, we read three times (pp. 12, 159, 166) about Hu Hung's (c.s. 1163) resentment at being offered brown rice, with no chicken and wine, when he visited Chu Hsi at Wu-i Mountain. But this example also suggests the kind of intimate detail with which the lectures are spiced. Professor Chan's ability to draw on an astonishingly vast body of reading adds a valuable new dimension even to something he has said before.

For the specialist, particularly one familiar with Professor Chan's writings, the strongest part of this book is the second half, containing the three pieces written as scholarly articles. The last two of these are especially useful, since they have not been easily available before. "Chu Hsi's Religious Life" fleshes out those aspects of Chu's life that fall under the rubric of religion in a rather narrow sense, e.g. prayer, ritual, and ancestor worship. No attempt is made to construct a broader definition of religion that would include the Confucian tradition *per se* by identifying its fundamental nature as inherently religious. This latter approach, of course, would be highly significant both for scholars of Confucianism and for scholars of religion in general. Nevertheless, Professor Chan's approach shows not only that Chu Hsi was a religious man by anyone's definition, but also that much of his religious practice was essentially Confucian. His devotion to ritual, for example, involved not only writing the manual of *Family Rites* (*Chia-li*) and advising the Court on ritual matters, but also regular worship of his own ancestors and frequent sacrifices to Confucius (the ancestor of the *literati*). In his written "reports" (*kao*) to Confucius he demonstrates a highly personal bond to the Sage as his moral teacher, and a commitment to the tradition as the embodiment of the Way. Chu's conduct of public prayer meetings for relief from droughts, etc., was apparently motivated by sincere belief in their efficacy. Such activities by the arch-"rationalist" of the Confucian tradition demonstrates the extent to which Confucianism, and Chinese thought in general, eludes simple categorization in Western terms.

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this discussion I am leaving aside the question (which one does not need to be Buddhist to raise) whether any tradition has such a thing as a fundamental nature.

In "Chu Hsi and the Academies" Professor Chan discusses Chu's considerable work establishing retreats (*ching-she*) and academies (*shu-yüan*).<sup>2</sup> He concludes that this work was a crucial precursor to the official institutionalization of Chu's version of *tao-hsüeh* (Learning of the Way) as the basis of the civil service examinations in 1313. Institutionalization at the grass roots, so to speak, had to precede governmental recognition. This is a very solid piece, enlivened further by Professor Chan's accounts of his own visits to some of the sites. Historical studies of Neo-Confucian education, such as this chapter and the articles in *Neo-Confucian Education*, edited by W.T. de Bary and John Chaffee (University of California Press, 1989), are beginning to fill a significant gap in Neo-Confucian studies, a field that has largely been dominated by philosophical approaches.

"Chu Hsi's Completion of Neo-Confucianism" is an influential article outlining three areas in which Chu Hsi's work established the basic direction of what was to become the orthodox *tao-hsüeh* tradition. In philosophy he focused attention on the concepts of *li* (principle), *ch'i* (material force), *t'ai-chi* (Great Ultimate), and *jen* (humanity). Secondly, he defined the "tradition of the Way" (*tao-t'ung*), i.e. the line of sages whose teachings contributed to Chu's own system based on *li*. This section is especially valuable, having become a seminal discussion of a topic still being studied by others. Finally, Chu's publication of the Four Books in 1190 established the core curriculum of higher education and the civil service examination system, which was to remain in effect until the twentieth century.

The choice of the word "completion" to describe what Chu Hsi did with the Neo-Confucian tradition has aroused controversy, to which Professor Chan responds in his Preface and in "What is New in Chu Hsi?".<sup>3</sup> He has used the word advisedly, he says, not meaning to imply that Chu's system was perfect. His intention has been to refute the notion that Chu merely combined or "synthesized" the ideas of his predecessors into a unified system without adding anything new. This notion, while not as widely-held as it once was (thanks in part to Professor Chan), still has adherents. But Professor Chan's objection to the word "synthesis" may

<sup>2</sup> Chan prefers to leave *ching-she* (literally "abode of refinement") untranslated, because by Chu Hsi's time the term had acquired considerable ambiguity. Its original meaning was "a Confucian place for lectures and discussions" (p.164), and Buddhists used the term "to translate *vihara*, a Buddhist retreat" (*ibid.*). Chu Hsi's first *ching-she* was a cottage beside his mother's grave, where he and Lü Tsu-ch'ien worked on the *Chin-ssu lu* (*ibid.*). Thus "retreat" accurately conveys the original Confucian meaning of the term. However, *ching-she* and *shu-yüan* were sometimes used interchangeably, and in some cases *shu-yüan* referred to a particular part of a *ching-she*, namely "the central hall where books were stored and formal lectures and discussions took place" (p.170). One telling distinction is that *ching-she* were always private, while *shu-yüan* could be either private or public.

<sup>3</sup> See also Wing-tsit Chan, ed., *Chu Hsi and Neo-Confucianism* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), p.1.

be misplaced, leading him to over-estimate the extent of the above notion. "To synthesize" can, to be sure, mean simply "to combine" (chi). But it also means to bring simpler elements together into a more complex whole, creating a higher-order system. This usage is common enough to justify our applying it to Chu Hsi in such a way as to be consistent with Professor Chan's theory of Chu's innovative qualities. For example, in chemistry, to synthesize a compound is to create an entirely new substance out of simpler ones. In philosophy, a synthetic proposition or judgment is one that adds something to the meaning of the subject. And of course there is the Hegelian sense of synthesis as the higher-order result of the contradiction of thesis and antithesis. Thus the use of the word "synthesis" does not necessarily imply absence of anything new.

In fact I think the word is quite apt in reference to Chu Hsi, with the qualification that the elements he worked with were carefully and deliberately selected from among the varieties of Sung thought. He "creatively" excluded nearly as much Confucian thought from the Sung as he did from the Han and T'ang. This and certain later developments (such as the category tao-hsüeh being limited to the Ch'eng/Chu school in the Sung Dynastic History) has resulted in considerable inconsistency among contemporary scholars in the usage of the terms tao-hsüeh and Neo-Confucianism. As Hoyt Tillman has shown, tao-hsüeh before the end of the twelfth century included more than the Ch'eng/Chu school.<sup>4</sup> In any case, it is important to avoid the implication that Chu Hsi's version of Neo-Confucianism is exhaustive and normative, despite its mantle of orthodoxy in China from 1313 to 1905.

Professor Chan's use of the term "completion" does suggest finality or perfection, at least to me. It implies that Chu brought Neo-Confucianism to its ultimate condition, beyond which nothing has been or could be added; he made it complete. But Chu Hsi's system was not, of course, the final stage of Neo-Confucian development (Wang Yang-ming, for one, certainly added something new), and this is not the meaning that Professor Chan intends. Nor, as he says, does he intend to imply perfection. But that impression is conveyed nonetheless.

The public lecture format of the first half of the book probably accounts, in part, for a troublesome tendency toward overstatement, especially concerning the historical uniqueness of Chu Hsi. For example, in "What is New in Chu Hsi?" we read of Chu's "record breaking" achievements in volume of writing, number of pupils, establishment of and involvement in retreats and academies, length of written memorials, number of calligraphic remains, and number of surviving portraits (p. 40). Many of these are indeed impressive achievements, although the last two, it will be noticed, are partly due to accidents of history. But with the possible exception of Chu's involvement in retreats and academies, I cannot see how such facts support Professor Chan's claim that "this is sufficient to show the innovative character of the man"

<sup>4</sup> Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, Utilitarian Confucianism: Ch'en Liang's Challenge to Chu Hsi (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982). See also his This Tao of Ours: Tao-hsüeh Confucians during the Southern Sung, forthcoming.

(*ibid.*). Chu's creativity can be demonstrated in more substantial ways, as Professor Chan in fact does elsewhere. Another example of overstatement is found in "The New Fortune of Chu Hsi," where we read that the biography (hsing-chuang) of Chu written by his pupil and son-in-law, Huang Kan (1152-1221), "represents the final opinion of history" and "is the final post-mortem opinion of the Chinese people on Chu Hsi" (pp. 18, 19). Would it not be preferable to say that Huang Kan's biography, written in consultation with a number of Chu's former students and published twenty-one years after Chu's death, merely reflects a consensus of Chu's surviving pupils? Here what may have been a certain amount of dramatic flourish in the public lecture does not translate well into the book format.

In "The New Fortune of Chu Hsi" Professor Chan also reviews the history of Chu's relations with other scholars and the treatment of his legacy by later generations, from the Sung to the present day. Like the other lectures, the purpose of this is not to break new ground but to present some familiar material in a new way. There is a great deal of historical detail here that fleshes out some fairly well-known episodes in Chu Hsi's life, such as the meeting with Lu Hsiang-shan (1139-1193) at Goose Lake Temple. We are also treated to many fascinating personal glimpses of Chu, such as the fact that he "loved to burst into songs after some cups of wine," and that Chang Shih (1133-1180) criticized him for it (p. 3). Professor Chan also reviews the debate over Chu's alleged remark on the death of Lu Hsiang-shan: "It is regrettable that Kao Tzu [the rival of Mencius] has passed away." Later scholars have had difficulty with the remark, assuming that its intention was to denigrate Lu, who was Chu's philosophical rival but respected nonetheless. Some have argued that the remark was not actually uttered by Chu, while others, including Professor Chan, have tried to explain it by comparing Lu's ideas with Kao Tzu's (pp. 9-10, 157-158). But is it not possible that Chu might have seen Kao Tzu not as a bitter opponent of Mencius, but rather as a valued interlocutor, a colleague in philosophical dialogue, just as Lu was to Chu?

"Chu Hsi and World Philosophy" includes some duplication of a 1976 article, "The Study of Chu Hsi in the West," but also contains some useful speculation on the value of Chinese thought in today's world. After critically reviewing several contributors to the debate over the absence of Western-style science in traditional China (primarily Joseph Needham), Chan concludes that Confucianism's most significant role might be found in the model it provides and the questions it raises for the integration of natural philosophy (or science in the West) with moral philosophy and cultivation.

In terms of book production, the only flaw in Chu Hsi: Life and Thought is a rather large number of minor syntactical errors that should have been caught by an editor. The paper and printing are of excellent quality, footnotes are at the bottom of the page, and Chinese characters are found throughout the text and notes. The index, as usual in Professor Chan's books, is excellent. Despite the difficulties partly attributable to the juxtaposition of public lectures and scholarly articles in one volume, this book has a great deal to offer anyone interested in Chu Hsi or Sung intellectual history.

Joseph A. Adler, Kenyon College



\* \* \* \* \*

**Mongol Imperialism: The Policies of the Grand Qan Möngke in China, Russia and the Islamic Lands, 1251-1259.** By Thomas T. Allsen. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986. Pp. xvii + 225. Abbreviations, glossary, bibliography, index.

Professor Thomas T. Allsen's book is an ambitious panoramic study of the early Mongol imperial administration. It offers a refreshing and plausible explanation for the Mongols' success in creating the largest continuous land empire in human history. Because of the well-known complexities of the languages and cultures involved in the study of Mongol history, historians have tended to focus their studies on a particular regional qanate of the empire. Setting against this "compartmentalization," the author proposes a "holistic approach" by studying the empire in its entirety, which, in his view, would enable the historian to "look at the events from the perspective of the empire as a whole and from the standpoint of the Mongol leadership" (p. 10).

The main thesis of the book is that the Mongols' success in empire-building, apart from the conventional military explanations, can be attributed to their ability in creating an effective administrative system. This system, "an amalgam of Chinese, Muslim, Turkic and native elements" (p. 7), enabled them to "mobilize effectively the human and material resources of the areas under their control" (p. 7) and to adopt methods of warfare that were "akin to the modern concept of total war" (p. 224). Instead of focusing on the whole span of the Mongol imperial history, the author opts for an in-depth study on the eight-year reign of Möngke (1251-59), Chinggis Qan's grandson and the fourth grand qan on the Mongol throne. The reason for making this choice is that Möngke was "the last qaghan to rule over a unified and rapidly expanding empire" (p. 218) and that his reign was a time of expansion and conquest during which Mongol techniques of resource mobilization were fully deployed and thoroughly tested" (p. 9).

The book is systematic and well-balanced in organization. It is at once an institutional study and a political history of Möngke's reign. After the introductory chapter, which outlines the thesis and methodology and the sources used in the book, Chapters II and III describe Möngke's rise to power and the consolidation of his rule. The grabbing of the throne by Möngke, Tolui's (d. 1233) son, from the hitherto predominant house of Ögödei is analyzed in the familiar context of the rivalry between the Toluids and Jochids on the one hand, and the Ögödeids and the Chaghadaids on the other. But, the author argues against the conventional view that Batu (1208-55)--Jochi's (d. 1277?) son and the ruler of the Golden Horde--was Möngke's king-maker and consequently the predominant power in the empire early in Möngke's reign. Chapter IV, entitled "The Tools of Centralization," discusses the policies Möngke formulated and the administrative structure he erected to carry them out. The reforms are said to have enabled the grand qan to "concentrate a great deal of political and administrative power in the office of the qaghan" (pp. 113-14) and "to obtain the maximum amount of resources without depriving the people of their minimum needs" (p. 92).

Chapters V through VII concretely deal with three specific aspects of

Möngke's resource mobilization in order to prove that "the center's demands for resources were met on the regional and local levels" (p. 114). Chapter V shows that an empire-wide census, started in 1252, was successfully completed by the end of the reign. Chapter VI discusses the taxation reform carried out during the reign. The author follows closely John Mason Smith's revised version of Franz Herbert Schurmann's scheme in classifying all taxes imposed by the Mongols in various parts of the empire into two categories: alban/galan (pre-Mongol traditional taxes and levies) and gubchiri (Mongol imposed tribute). A relatively uniform gubchiri, a tax on all male adults collected in cash, is said to have been superimposed on the indigenous taxation systems in various parts of the empire. The author attributes the introduction of the poll tax system to Mahmüd Yalavach (d. 1254?), a Central Asian Muslim who was the head of the Regional Secretariat of North China early in Möngke's reign. Apart from making uniform, centralizing and rationalizing tax collection, Möngke is also credited with the monetization of revenues. In Chapter VII, the author shows that a large proportion of the populace in China, Iran, Central Asia and Russia were conscripted as auxiliaries. To facilitate the conscription, the general populace in these regions are said to have been organized into numerical units in the fashion of the Mongol army. The chapter also contains a brief discussion of recruiting common laborers and skilled craftsmen for war and other purposes.

In the concluding chapter the grand qan is given a highly favorable overall assessment. By offering an attractive program that combined internal reforms with external expansion, he is said to have revitalized the fragmented empire, which he had inherited, and to have won wide support among the Mongols. The administrative system that he constructed, we are told, was effective and responsive to the commands of central authorities, enabling the grand qan to mobilize perhaps more resources than any previous rulers in history.

The book as a whole is lucidly written and based on exhaustive research into nearly all relevant primary sources still available. The core sources used are: the Chinese official history, Yüan shih; the History of the World Conquerors (Ta'rikh-i-jahān-gushā) and the Collection of Chronicles (Jāmi' al-tavārikh) by the Persian historians 'Atā-Malikh Juvainī and Rashīd al-Dīn, respectively; and the travelogue of William of Rubruck, a Franciscan missionary who visited Möngke's court in 1254-55. In addition, there are a rich array of other sources of diverse nature in many different languages: Chinese literary works; Persian local histories; Russian, Armenian, and Georgian chronicles; and numismatic and archaeological materials. The author is equally well-informed of the secondary works in many major modern languages and has made good use of them. But, he does not take the advantage of the large amount of Chinese secondary works that have been produced on both sides of the Taiwan Straits since 1980. Japanese scholarship on the Mongols is noticeable by its absence. His language competence and skill in culling and systematizing materials from diverse sources is still admirable.

One of the most important achievements of the book is the systematization of the diverse institutions and policies imposed by the Mongols on different sedentary societies. But the author may have gone too far in some cases in stressing the degree of institutional uniformity



achieved under Möngke. Not only did the Mongol Empire consist of many societies of vastly different backgrounds, the styles of rule imposed on these regions and the relationship of these regions with the grand qan's court also varied greatly. Moreover, the sources available for the period are indeed rich in variety but quite small in quantity. The sources for some regions, for example, Golden Horde and Central Asia, are very few and far from sufficient to sustain the author's purpose. An institution which can be established beyond doubt to have existed in one region may not be proven to have existed in another either because of the insufficiency of sources or because the institution never existed there. Both the disparity of the institutions and policies adopted by the Mongols in different regions and the paucity of sources tend to thwart the author's effort to establish the existence of a relatively uniform pattern of Mongol rule in different regional qanates. I shall concentrate my comments on taxation and military recruitment, the two most important aspects of Möngke's resource mobilization, to show the problems encountered by the author in this regard.

On the question of Mongol taxation, David Morgan, a Persian historian of the Mongol period, has recently warned us not to be over-schematized. Morgan even wonders whether we should dignify Mongol taxation with the term "systems."<sup>1</sup> John Mason Smith's revised version of Schurmann's scheme of Mongol taxation, to which chapter VI of this book closely adheres, is a highly simplified construct into which a great number of taxes and levies imposed by the Mongols on different regions cannot always be fitted. Persian specialists cannot agree even on the meaning of the key term galan--which is used by Smith and the author as a catch-all term for all pre-Mongol traditional taxation. A.K.S. Lambton points out that the term, as used in the Il-Khanid,<sup>2</sup> might mean "occasional levies" or "some sorts of corvée and service."<sup>3</sup> David Morgan asserts that "it was a general term for occasional exactions of a specifically Mongol character, imposed on the sedentary population and including some kind of corvée."<sup>3</sup> Therefore, it remains uncertain whether it is appropriate to put all the agricultural and commercial taxes of non-Mongol origins under the umbrella of galan/alban. It remains equally uncertain whether or not we should equate the ssu-liao and pao-yin collected in North China with the gubchiri, which first arose from Yalavach's experiments in Central Asia and later supposedly adopted by Möngke as an Imperial tax. Can we really attribute the pao-yin entirely to Yalavach's authorship? While gubchiri was a poll tax collected in coins, the ssu-liao and pao-yin were household taxes collected in silk and silver, respectively. Chinese sources indeed indicated that the adoption of pao-yin as an Imperial tax was the result of Yalavach's recommendation. But the existence of pao-yin as a local tax predated Yalavach's recommendation by two decades. It was early in Ögödei's reign

<sup>1</sup>Morgan, The Mongols (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986).

<sup>2</sup> E. van Donzel, et. al. eds., Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed. vol. 4 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), pp. 1050-1051.

<sup>3</sup> Morgan, p. 101.

that the local official of Chen-ting, who may be identified with the Chinese military lord Shih T'ien-tse (1204-74), reportedly first collected pao-yin as local levy to meet public expenses.<sup>4</sup> This was later emulated elsewhere in North China.<sup>5</sup> And during Töregene's regency (r. 1242-46) Abd ar-Rahmān (d. 1246?), who was in charge of taxation in North China and a rival to Yalavach, proposed to the Court to elevate the pao-yin to be a national tax. This recommendation was discarded because of strong opposition from the Chinese military lords.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, what was enacted by Möngke upon Yalavach's recommendation was not an extension to North China of what Yalavach had done in Central Asia, but the nationalization of a long-established local levy. In his detailed study on the pao-yin system, the Japanese scholar, Abe Takeo, recognizes the similarity between the pao-yin and Yalavach's gubchiri, but concludes that they were the results of parallel developments. He traces the precedents of the pao-yin in Chinese history to the service exemption tax (mien-i-ch'ien) and service-assistance tax (chu-i-ch'ien) of the Sung dynasty and to the property tax (wu-li ch'ien) of the Ch'in.

The author's thesis that Möngke's reign formed a "period of transition in which taxes in kind were replaced partially by taxes collected in cash" (p. 172) is not supported by sufficient evidence either. His thesis is based on two arguments: first, the grand qan made much efforts to place sufficient currency in circulation; and second, the newly introduced tribute, gubchiri, was collected either in coin or in ready negotiable commodities. While agreeing with the second, I find the first argument rather specious. His idea that issuance of paper currency in North China at the 'national' level was resumed by Möngke's court is based on two passages in the Yüan shih. The passage that a superintendency was established in 1253 is found in the basic annals of Qubilai, Möngke's brother and successor, who held several appanages in North China at that time. The passage is set in the context of the measures adopted by Qubilai to govern his newly awarded appanage, Ching-chao.<sup>6</sup> It is certain that the superintendency was established by Qubilai for Ching-chao, but not by Möngke for North China as a whole. That paper currency was printed in Ching-chao is also confirmed elsewhere in the Yüan shih.<sup>9</sup> The second passage only states that Bujir was

<sup>4</sup> Su T'ien-ch'ueh, Yüan-ch'ao ming-ch'ien shih-lüeh (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1961) 4:10b; for the origins and development of the pao-yin see Abe Takeo, "Genjidai no hōginsei no kokyū," in Abe Takeo, Gendai-shi no kenkyū (Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1972), pp. 75-232.

<sup>5</sup> Yüan-ch'ao ming-ch'ien shih-lüeh 10:1b.

<sup>6</sup> K'o Shao-min, Hsin Yüan shih (T'ui-keng-t'ang ed.) 140.2a; see also Abe Takeo, pp. 122-123, for the dating of this event.

<sup>7</sup> Abe Takeo, pp. 222-228.

<sup>8</sup> Sung Lien, Yüan shih (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1976) 4.59.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 159.3338.

appointed the Chief Judge (Yeke Jarghuchi) to print "precious notes" (pao-ch'ao) and does not indicate the amount of issuance nor the area of circulation of the precious notes in question.<sup>10</sup> The evidence for the issuance of paper currency by local officials in Ching-chao, Chen-ting, Hsing-chou, and Ho-nan during this period strongly suggests that what was issued under Bujir was limited in circulation.<sup>11</sup> The author, however, does not consider such evidence definitive on the grounds that some of the references are made to the period before 1253 while others are not clearly dated. But, the issuance of paper currency in the above-named places actually all took place in Mōngke's reign and mostly under Qubilai's auspices. (The year 1253 cannot be accepted as a divide, for, as we have shown, the superintendency established in that year was only a local organ.) The lack of a 'national' paper currency in North China can also be inferred from the fact that as soon as Qubilai issued the paper currencies at the national level after his enthronement, some taxes were collected in paper currency. This, however, was not the case in Mōngke's reign. Therefore, it is highly likely that despite Mōngke's effort, there was no paper currency that circulated widely in North China during his reign. As for the western qanates, the invaluable numismatic evidence collected by the author indeed clearly indicates that a great number of coins were minted in Central Asia, Iran, and Golden Horde during this period. Unfortunately, even though some of these coins bore Mōngke's name, neither they nor any existing literary evidence gives any indication that the coins were issued at the initiative of Mōngke. As in the case of North China, the coins were probably issued by local officials.

The author overstretches his sources also in his effort to reconstruct a uniform pattern of the recruitment of military manpower in different regional qanates. Following a general statement of Juvaini that the census "classified everyone into tens, hundreds, and thousands," the author makes an attempt to show that the general populace in the sedentary societies of China, Russia, Central Asia, and Iran were all grouped into numerical units, the highest being the tūmen (i.e., Mongolian for 10,000). As in the case of the Mongols, this unit supposedly functioned as "both a military formation and a territorial/administrative unit" (p. 194). There is no evidence, however, to show that the system described by the author did exist in any of the above-mentioned regions. Russian sources do mention the existence of the numerical divisions; however, as noted by the author himself, Michael Roublev doubted that they were military in nature. Even though the author recognizes the fact that "the Rus chronicles never explicitly state that troops were raised from such units," he argues nevertheless that "there is little doubt, in my opinion, that t'my [Russian equivalent to tūmen] contributed troops to the Mongols. This was one of their principal functions in China, Iran and Caucasus" (p. 209 n. 73). In the case of Central Asia, the author states: "[E]ven the existence of the

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 123.3021.

<sup>11</sup> See Yüan-ch'ao ming-ch'en shih-lüeh, 7.6b, 10.2a, and Wang Yün, Ch'iu-chien hsien-sheng ta-ch'üan chi (Reprint of Ming ed., Taipei: Hsin-wen-feng, 1985), 54.8b.

tūmen system in Turkestan cannot be demonstrated for Mōngke's reign" (p. 210). Yet, he resorts to the same logic that he uses for the case of Russia: "it appears to me likely that tūmen were formed there during Mōngke's reign if not before .... [I]t seems strange that the Mongols should have failed to introduce this system there when they had done so in China, Russia, and Iran, all of which fell to the Mongols after Central Asia had been conquered" (p. 210). In the case of Iran, the tūmens are mentioned by the author as military formations and not demonstrated as territorial/administrative units from which soldiers were conscripted.

As for the system of military conscription and administration in North China, the author's impression that the general populace were classified into numerical units is based on a misunderstanding of a text. The original text reads: "the pulse of life of the tens and hundreds of the chous (prefectures) of the Central Plain (i.e., North China) depended upon it (the office of tuan-shih-kuan)."<sup>12</sup> It is, however, mistranslated by the author as follows: "[t]he administration of the units of ten, units of hundred, and the chous of the Central Plain (that is China) were vested in it (the office of tuan-shih-kuan)" (pp. 105-106). On the basis of this mistranslation, the author makes the following statement:

[O]ne Chinese source speaks of administrative units of ten, of one hundred, and of chous (districts). If, as seems likely from the contexts, the author is listing these units sequentially, in an ascending order, then units of one thousand, ch'ien-hu, are equivalent to chous. In such a system, the next higher administrative division, the circuits (lu), could be equated with a unit of ten thousand, a wan-hu (p. 201).

In other words, the author gives the impression that North China was entirely organized in a military fashion and the military formations were identical with the territorial/administrative units of the corresponding levels. But, as far as I know, with the exception of those who had been registered as military households (chün-hu), the general populace were not grouped into military numerical units and were still governed under the traditional Chinese administrative/territorial divisions. Indeed, the Northern Chinese Army commanders in most cases acted as de facto feudal lords, having both their troops and territorial/administrative divisions under their control at the same time. But in governing the civilian population they were often given a civilian office on top of their military titles.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, since there were far more numerous circuits than wan-hu, the Chinese equivalent of tūmen, a wan-hu could control as many as five circuits.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, contrary to the

<sup>12</sup> Ma Tsu-ch'ang, Shih-t'ien wen-chi (Yüan ssu ta-chia chi ed., Shanghai, 1922), 14.12b.

<sup>13</sup> For examples, see Yüan shih, 148.3506 and 250.3548; Hsiao Ch'i-ch'ing, "Yen Shih (1182-1240)," Papers on Far Eastern History 33 (1986), p. 118.

<sup>14</sup> See Yüan-shih, 147.3477 and 150.3533 for examples.



author's interpretation, the administrative/territorial divisions did not always constitute the exact basis for the army's foundation. When the New Army (Hsin chün) was formed in 1254-55, it usually took the conscripts from several circuits to form a new wan-hu.<sup>15</sup>

To sum up this point, there is not sufficient evidence for the author's theory that a uniform system of military conscription/administration existed in all regional qanates of the empire. In China and Iran wan-hu/tümen were military units. In Russia, whether t'my were military in nature is still not clear. And in Central Asia, the existence of tümen during Möngke's reign remains questionable.

Though generally objective, fair and careful in his assessment of Möngke and his administration, the author occasionally leans too far toward leniency. He overlooks, though infrequently, evidence unfavorable to the grand qan. He cites from Möngke's basic annals in the Yüan shih various attributes of virtue of the Mongol sovereign, but does not mention that the grand qan was an extremely superstitious man who indulged in witchcraft and divination.<sup>16</sup> The grand qan's abilities to judge men remains uncertain; for even Qubilai criticized him for not acquiring worthy and competent men for his government.<sup>17</sup> The author also attributes to Möngke innovations made by his predecessors or his subordinates. The centralization of tax collection in the princely appanages, for instance, was initiated not by Möngke, but by Ögödei Qaghan (r. 1229-41).<sup>18</sup> The restoration of order and prosperity in North China should be attributed mainly to Qubilai and not to Möngke.<sup>19</sup> Even the recall of badges of authority, seals and jarlighs issued

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 147.3484 and 148.3507.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 3.54.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 4.64.

<sup>18</sup> The source cited by the author, Yüan wen-lei (Taipei: Shih-chieh shu-chü, 1967), 40.23ab, does not specify when the centralization of taxation in princely appanages was introduced. But Yüan shih, 2.35, clearly indicates that the centralization of tax collection was a built-in device at the suggestion of Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai for the appanage system when it was first created in 1236. This is confirmed in various modern studies on Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai and on the appanage system, see Chou Liang-hsiao, "Yüan-tai t'ou-hsia feng-feng chih-tu ch'u-t'an," Yüan-shih lun-ts'ung 1 (1938), p. 63; Hung Chin-fu, "Ts'ung 't'ou-hsia' feng-feng chih-tu k'an Yüan ch'ao cheng-ch'üan te hsin-chih," Chung-yang yen-chiu yüan li-shih yü-yen yen-chiu-so chi-k'an 58.4 (1987) 843-907; Igor de Rachewiltz, "Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai (1189-1243), Buddhist Idealist and Confucian Statesman," in Arthur Wright and Denis Twitchett, eds. Confucian Personalities (Stanford: Stanford University Press), p. 205.

<sup>19</sup> See, among other things, Morris Rossabi, Khubilai Khan: His Life and Times (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 28-36.

illegally by imperial princes and court officials, which is described in the book as a measure by Möngke to assert imperial authority, was actually nothing new. As pointed out by David Ayalon, both Ögödei and Güyüg had done this before to prevent the recurrent appearance of centrifugal forces in the Mongol polity.<sup>20</sup>

The statement, "Möngke was not by nature an innovator; whenever feasible, he preferred to stay within the bounds of convention and to exert his authority by traditional means through traditional institutions" (p. 233), is a keen and fair observation of Möngke's political style. Looking closely at Möngke's record as presented in this book, I am surprised to find how little institutional innovations were made during the reign. The administrative structure, census-taking, taxation, and system of manpower recruitment remained more or less the same as under Ögödei. The imposition of pao-yin in North China and the qubchiri in the western qanates were the only significant exceptions. Möngke's achievement lay mainly in his consolidation of the power of the Toluids, his tightening of discipline over the imperial princes and the bureaucracy, and his application on the imperial level of some measures which had been implemented only locally. Especially in terms of the development of the system of rule over sedentary societies, what was the true position of Möngke in the history of the Mongol Empire? To borrow Professor James T.C. Liu's typology of reformers in Chinese history,<sup>21</sup> I think Möngke was a system-repairing reformer, while Ögödei and Qubilai were the system founder and the system-reorienting reformer, respectively.

The cavils raised above reflect the complexities of the topic and the difficulties involved in the approach chosen by the author; thus, they should in no way be construed as incompetence on his part. Indeed, among living Mongolists very few have the competence, and perhaps the will, to write such a book. The book is testimony to the author's conviction that "[t]he study of Mongol history in its broadest context" is still possible "with a knowledge of several critical languages (in this case, Chinese, Persian, and Russian) and by relying on the available translations of sources one cannot read in the original" (p. 11). This exceptional book, together with several fine articles already published, will undoubtedly establish the author's credential as a leading researcher in the field of Mongol imperial history.

Hsiao Ch'i-ch'ing, National University of Singapore

\* \* \* \* \*

<sup>20</sup> Ayalon, "The Great Yäsa of Chingiz Khan: A Re-Examination (B)," Studia Islamica 34 (1971), pp. 164-165.

<sup>21</sup> Liu, "The variety of Political Reforms in Chinese History: A Simplified Typology," in Paul A. Cohen and John E. Schrecker, eds., Reforms in Nineteenth-Century China (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1976), pp. 9-13.



**Khubilai Khan: His Life and Times.** By Morris Rossabi. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press 1988. Pp. xvii, 322. Index, bibliography, glossary. \$25.00.

Although many studies have been done on Chinggis Khan, there is very little research, particularly in Western languages, concerning Khubilai Khan, founder of the Yüan Dynasty in China. As Rossabi has said, "Despite Khubilai's role in Asian, if not world, history, he has not been accorded a serious biography" (p. xii). Rossabi's work, *Khubilai Khan: His Life and Times*, is one of the outstanding works in the field of Mongolian history. According to the bibliography, there are 564 sources in Western languages and 119 sources in Oriental languages; among the latter, 23 are primary sources. These numbers show the extent of the author's research.

The book is divided into eight chapters: The Early Mongols; Khubilai Emerges; The Great Khan; The Conqueror; The Emperor of China; The Cultural Patron; Mismanagement and the Chinese Response; and Decline of an Emperor. This work presents most of the important events of the Mongol Empire in East Asia and the history of the founding of the Yüan Dynasty in China. Rossabi has condensed his historical account and analysis into 231 pages, which is not an easy task. According to Rossabi (p. xv) the original book manuscript was over twice the present size. If readers feel something is discussed insufficiently, they may follow the author's suggestion and contact the East Asian Library of Columbia University to read his original manuscript.

At the beginning of his work, Rossabi points out the position of Mongol history in the sphere of world history. He says (on pp. 1-2) that the Mongols:

inextricably linked Europe to Asia, ushering in an era of frequent and extended contact between East and West.... They expedited and encouraged travel in the sizable section of Asia that was under Mongol rule, permitting European merchants, craftsmen, and envoys for the first time to journey as far as China.... With the indispensable help of Chinese, Persian, and Turkic advisors and administrators, ... they set up governments and bureaucracies, devised systems of taxation, and promoted the interests of farmers, herdsmen, and merchants.... Most of the Khans were either tolerant of or indifferent to foreign religions.... Some of the Mongol leaders encouraged the various native cultures, patronizing artists, writers, and historians. Chinese drama, Persian historical writing and Tibetan Buddhist art and architecture all flourished during the Mongol occupation.... Yet the dark side of Mongol rule ought not to be ignored.

Rossabi also says, "Khubilai was able to institute Mongol rule... over the land China with the largest population in the world" (p. 95). These are probably the major points of his analysis and are principal in his narration of historical facts. According to his analysis he used many "chronicles of the peoples they [the Mongols] subjugated" (p. 2). Nevertheless, he points out that many of them are biased and should be "discounted" (p. . He also frankly confesses that in spite of these materials he has his own "revised opinions." This is another reason his

work is valuable to read.

Rossabi acknowledges the influence particularly of the Khan's mother Sorghaghtani-Beki and wife Chabi-Khatun on the Mongolian ruler. He also points out that Khubilai's position as the Son of Heaven was not challenged by the Chinese, except those from the Southern Sung before they were conquered by the Mongols. Nevertheless, Khubilai's claim to be the Great Khan of the Mongol Empire was disputed among the Mongol leader's. Rossabi analyzes the legitimacy of Khubilai's khanship and the factors responsible for the disintegration of the Mongol Empire. He provides a clear explanation concerning the aforementioned problems of China, but his account of China's influence on other parts of the Mongol Empire seem a little insufficient. Perhaps this is caused by the scarcity of materials, or was deleted when the work was condensed. Concerning Khubilai's policy toward China and China's culture, Rossabi states that Khubilai and his advisors "established a government based on Chinese models but not dominated by Chinese ideals and forms" (p. 177). He goes on to say that as Khubilai's economic and political prosperity grew, he became ever more concerned with China and developing his Chinese territories. "Even so, he was still and would always remain a Mongol, despite the need to accommodate some Chinese views and practices in order to rule successfully" (p. 23). Hence, Rossabi highlights the formation of a dual system under the Yüan Dynasty. Most of the institutions that were established according to Chinese tradition were recorded in detail in Chinese materials; those established according to Mongolian tradition were largely neglected by Chinese historians, so it is a very difficult task to recreate the dual system of the Yüan period. Rossabi's views are worthwhile for people to think about.

Rossabi writes that "Khubilai's inability to read Chinese further reduced his exposure to Confucian writings" and "gave him an incomplete view of what his Chinese advisors said or wrote" (pp. 16 and 162). Such were the cultural gulfs between the nomadic Mongols and the sedentary Chinese; hence, the Mongols accepted less Sinicization than other non-Han rules of the Middle Kingdom. Even near the end of the Yüan Dynasty, the Crowned Prince Ayurshiridara expressed his feeling toward Chinese teachings: "Mister Li Hao-wen has taught me the Confucian scriptures for many years, but their meaning is still not too clear to me" (*Yüan-shih*, Po-na edition, 46:8b). Such limitations in exposure to Chinese culture helped protect the Mongols from complete Sinicization and made it possible for them to exist as a national entity separate from the Han Chinese until the present day.

Rossabi points out that "Modern writers have often been harsh in assessing the Mongols" (p. 2). He, on the other hand, lists many historical facts to illustrate Khubilai's contribution to Chinese cultural development: his respect for Chinese scholars; his elevation of social position for merchants, craftsmen, medical doctors, and actors which contributed to the development of cities; his encouragement of contemporary Chinese painting, calligraphy, novels, and drama; and his concern for the life of peasants and the formation of *she* (peasant communities) (pp. 120 and 186). Rossabi's views, however, could be supported even by the authors of the *Yüan-shi*, which was written soon after the collapse of Mongol rule and was authorized by the court of Ming. Although this official history lacks some information, it is not

biased. For instance, the "Monograph of Law" of the Yüan-shih (102:2ab) says:

The Yüan continued to follow [the old Chinese laws] but tried to moderate them, showing their leniency. Emperor Shih-tsu said to the Prime Ministers, "If we are angry against the guilty ones and order you to execute, you shouldn't kill them immediately. You must delay it for one or two days. Then ask for my permission again." How could such words, even for the ancient merciful kings, surpass this compassion. . . . The advantage of the law of the Yüan was its mercy and leniency. But it was, in addition, slow-acting, with many loopholes and [they] did not know how to improve it."

Although these words do not appear in Rossabi's book, they are a positive witness for his observation. Some scholars have maintained that censorship increased during the Yüan, and Rossabi could have elaborated a little more on their views. Space limitations in this review will not permit me to go into this here.

As for the problem of the split of the Mongol Empire, Rossabi explains that Khubilai's struggle against his younger brother Arighbukha and Princes Khaidu and Nayan, as well as the later power struggle between the brothers Khoshila and Iughtemur, were all caused by the confrontation between two factions: the radical pro-Chinese group and the conservatives that desired the maintenance of Mongol traditions. He says that although Khubilai was able to absorb the territory of the Southern Sung, he was not successful in winning the hearts of the people, especially the intellectuals. North China was often dominated by the non-Han people. But those south of the Yangtze River had always been ruled by Han Chinese, and it was difficult for the people to accept being ruled by foreigners. According to Mongol tradition, Khubilai was over-Sinicized, but in the eyes of the Chinese, especially the Southern Chinese, he was a foreign monarch and had no true understanding of Confucianism.

Rossabi draws attention to the contrast between the Mongols' use of Chinese models for governmental institutions and their refusal to depend upon the examination system to fill posts in the bureaucracy. He correctly suggests that Khubilai liked to maintain his liberty to appoint people he thought were qualified for the job and was unwilling to allow the examination system to force him to appoint officials whom he did not know well. The Chinese elites that helped Khubilai in his enterprise were mostly old followers from his appanage or men he summoned without going through an examination system. This appears to have been a continuation of the Mongolian tradition to select the capable person from one's own retinue, kesigten; this practice allowed the monarch to become acquainted with appointees before giving them a post. As Rossabi points out, because the imperial examination system no longer served as a route to a governmental career, many talented intellectuals had to forsake that ambition and develop their talents in literature, drama, and other fields.

From the beginning of the establishment of the Mongol Empire Mongolian rulers customarily utilized people from the Western Region as administrators. The Sinicized Khitan scholar Yel-lü Ch'u-ts'ai was able

to convince ögödei Khan to use traditional Chinese institutions to rule over China. This decision marked the beginnings not only of the institutional development toward the later founding of the Yüan Dynasty but also of the confrontation between Chinese elites and officials from the Western Region. Using Chinese institutions to rule China was a major factor in the success of the great enterprise of Khubilai. Nevertheless, in order to accumulate the finances necessary to fulfill his plan, Khubilai had no choice but to follow his predecessors in having the officials from the Western Region gather financial resources within China. Rossabi provides a series of systematic analyses on this gathering of resources and on the activities of the notorious figures involved.

The following are some personal views which I would like to present to the author and his readers.

First, at the beginning of the book, Rossabi says: "Their Empire lasted less than a century." It is difficult to understand whether the word "empire" here indicates the entire Mongol Empire or only the Yüan Dynasty. On page 95 he says, "Mongol rule over China lasted for less than a century." This appears to indicate the Yüan Dynasty. Although Rossabi tried to avoid being influenced by traditional Chinese views, in these statements he was not successful. In historical chronology, Chinese historians usually place the beginning of the Mongolian Yüan Dynasty either in 1279, the end of the Southern Sung, or in 1280, the year after the Sung tragedy. The Mongolian Yüan Dynasty was ousted from Ta-tu (present Peking) in 1368, the same year in which Chu Yüan-chang established the Ming. But Chinese historians generally neglect the existence of the Northern Yüan on the other side of the Great Wall and do not delay the official beginning of the Ming Dynasty. In fact, Chinggis Khan occupied Chung-tu (present Peking) in 1215, and Ögödei Khan occupied all of North China and ended the Jurchen Chin Dynasty in 1234. China's southwestern regions fell to Mongolian domination during the days of Möngke Khan. Khubilai ascended the throne as the Khan of the Mongols and the Emperor of the Chinese in 1260. He adopted the title Yüan for his kingdom in China in 1271. Perhaps these facts should qualify Rossabi's statements.

Second, the story (on p. 105) of Khutulun, the daughter of Khaidu, is very dramatic and interesting, but it has little relationship to the life of Khubilai. It would be better to use that space for other important details about the hero of the book.

Third, on page 20, Rossabi says, "Shiremün was turned over to Khubilai for punishment, and accompanied him on several journeys until Khubilai, suspicious of Shiremün's intentions, had him executed." He, thus, claims that Khubilai executed Shiremün, but this incident is not recorded in either the Yüan-shih or the works of Juvaini and Rashid al-Din. In fact, Tu Chi's Meng-we-erh shih-chi and K'io Shao-min's Hsin Yüan-shih mention that Shiremün was drowned in the river on orders from Möngke Khan during his campaign in Southwest China; hence, he was not executed by Khubilai or at his command. The Chinese edition of d'Ohsson's The History of the Mongols records the same details. Therefore, Rossabi's account should have a footnote to clarify its source.

Fourth, on page 46 the death of Wang Te-ch'en is mentioned. This is



the first time his name appears in the text, and it is unclear why his death is important. At the end of the sentence is a footnote, but it is not related to Wang. Perhaps Wang's biography in Yüan-shih 153 should be mentioned in the footnote.

Fifth, Khubilai's attitude toward religions and the conflict between Buddhism and Taoism are discussed and analyzed; however, Rossabi should have mentioned conflicts between these two religions in China before and after the Mongol occupation. This traditional religious conflict was difficult for the Mongol Khans to deal with because of their ignorance of Chinese history. It would also have been helpful if Rossabi had pointed out that at the great debate of the Buddhists and Taoists, the Taoists were defeated because they were attacked not only by Chinese Buddhists but also by the Chinese Confucian Yao Shu, the Tibetan Buddhist Phags-pa Lama, and others. The fact that Khubilai first contacted Chinese Buddhists but eventually turned to Tibetan Buddhism, is evidence that the cultural distance between Tibetans and Mongols is not as far as that between the Mongols and Chinese.

Sixth, this work is devoted to the life of Khubilai. It would have been better to have included more of the personality, valuable words, and interesting behavior of Khubilai. Perhaps the manuscript was written before recent publication of many compilations and collections by the Chinese elites from around Khubilai's time. These valuable materials, in addition to Rossabi's primary sources, would have further enhanced his excellent work.

In short, Rossabi's book should be valued as a great contribution to the study of Mongolian history, especially during the period of Khubilai.

Sechin Jagchid, Brigham Young University

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF EUROPEAN NON-ENGLISH WORKS  
ON SUNG, LIAO, CHIN, HSI-HSIA AND YUAN

Francoise Aubin, CNRS & CERI, France  
Thomas H. Hahn, Philipps-Universität, Marburg, Germany

If a bibliography is, by necessity, always an incomplete and unfinished work, it is more than ever true for the present one. It was initially supposed to include German and French articles and books published since 1979 covering Chinese history from the beginning of the Sung until the end of the Yuan. Thomas Hahn (Th.H.), a specialist of Taoism, began the work and collected the greater part of the German titles published in Germany. The remaining work was left to Francoise Aubin (F.A.). But what were limits to be? What about German or French sinologists writing in English in a European publication poorly known in the U.S.? And what about foreigners publishing in German or in French outside of Germany or France (Hungary, for example)? There is also an acute problem of methodology, which concerns the scope of all the bibliographies in the Bulletin of Sung-Yuan Studies: where, geographically and chronologically, does the Yuan field begin and end?

Finally, is has been for F.A. a work of love. Living far from the Parisian libraries (which, anyway, are tragically poor, scattered, and not easily accessible to a physically handicapped person), she gives here mainly the content of her private library and bibliographical cards. (Many thanks are due to Professor Herbert Franke and Dr. Isabelle Robinet for the kind help they gave to F.A. concerning their own publications.) So this bibliography stresses the Chingiskhanid and Yuan periods and has been as inclusive as possible: all of the works for those periods are listed, including those published in English since 1970/71 that are missing in the previous bibliographies of the Bulletin (No. 15, 1979, pp. 54-78; No. 19, 1987, pp. 98-126). Some extra-European titles have also been included: for example, publications of the Australian scholar, Professor Igor de Rachewiltz, that were not contained in the previous lists; a title issued in Turkey; and some in Italian).

Important titles are surely missing. May the concerned authors (and their readers) forgive us! The Italian, Nordic, Hungarian and East European publications were known to F.A. only at random and by chance, so they are very inadequately registered. But if the users of the Bulletin may find here some new, interesting references, the present bibliography will receive its justification.

The index is a subjective enterprise too. It covers the content of the works which F.A. has personally seen, but only the titles for the others. Where some information is missing (such as publisher's name or number of pages), this means that F.A. and Th.H. have been unable to obtain it.

Finally we would note that the Liao period is, in Europe, a quite neglected one; that the Sung dynasty, while frequently treated in Germany, is seldom dealt with in France, except in the field of Taoism and popular cults; and that in French scholarship, Catholic missions and travellers through Central Asia remain the favorite topics.

Editorial Conventions:

- S. = Sung, Song
- L. = Liao
- C. = Chin, Jin
- H. = Hsi-Hsia, XiXia
- Y. = Yuan, Yuan