

## INTRODUCTION

Hoyt Cleveland Tillman and Stephen H. West

**A**lthough never well integrated into the cultural history of China, the Chin (Golden) dynasty needs to be appreciated as part of an enduring process of interaction between the northern and southern cultures of that land. These two cultures have traditionally been thought of as quite distinct: northern culture is conventionally held to be more rational, martial, and political, southern culture more romantic, peace-loving, and philosophical.<sup>1</sup> From the Southern Sung era onward, there has been a tendency among scholars of China to focus on the formation of cultural orthodoxy, identified with Tao-hsüeh, that developed during and after the Southern Sung. Attention has been concentrated on that evolution to the neglect of cultural developments in the North during the Chin, which has more or less been seen as the twilight preceding the dark night ushered in by the Mongol conquest. This neglect has been strengthened by the ascension of Yangtze valley culture in the early Ming and the general shift away from the predominantly northern cultural values of T'ang and Northern Sung toward the literary and artistic aesthetic of the South and the southern philosophical traditions exemplified by Chu Hsi. Conventional wisdom explains the shift as the triumph of orthodox southern culture; we propose that the paradigm of interaction and fusion common to other eras of cultural history applies to the Chin as well. Chin culture, we suggest, contributed significantly to the cultural unification of China under the three dynasties, Yüan, Ming, and Ch'ing, that spanned the last seven centuries of the Chinese empire.

Chin was a polyethnic state that ruled more of China and became more sinicized than any earlier dynasty founded by a foreign conqueror. The

Jurchen rulers wedded native customs and practices that had evolved among Tungusic tribal units deep in the forests of Manchuria to the institutional features of the Chinese bureaucracy and imperial system. The resulting offspring greatly influenced later Chinese political culture. The Jurchen, for example, were the first rulers to inflict corporal punishment on high officials at the imperial court. They also simplified the upper levels of government, creating the tripartite system of bureaucracy, Censorate, and army. Inherited and refined by later dynasties, this structure is still operative in Peking, where the Party now functions in a fashion analogous to the Censorate. It was the Chin that first established Yenching (modern Peking) as a principal dynastic capital. Although the Jurchen retreated back into Manchuria when they were vanquished by the Mongols in 1234, their descendants, the Manchus, benefited from Jurchen experiences and institutions when they founded the Ch'ing to rule over the whole of China. New religious trends and movements that developed during the Chin, such as Ch'üan-chen Taoism, also dominated the later centuries of imperial China. New forms of oral and dramatic performance—the farce play (*yüan-pen*) and the ballad form known as “all-keys-and-modes” (*chu-kung-tiao*), both discussed in Professor Wilt Idema’s article—flourished in the major Chin cities. Clearly, the Chin dynasty represents a significant, if neglected, stage in the development of Chinese political, intellectual, and cultural history, and the scholarly community must now consider it as such.

The fact that the Chin state was established by foreign conquest has been the major factor in its neglect. The trauma of barbarian invasions and conquests that culminated in An Lu-shan’s (d. 757) rebellion in the mid-eighth century has given the Chinese (i.e., ethnic Han Chinese) an understandable bias against the cultures that developed under conquest dynasties—especially in the case of the Chin, which coexisted with a native Chinese dynasty, the Southern Sung. In the eyes of traditional historians, no dynasty established by a people ethnically distinct from the Chinese could claim cultural legitimacy unless it was sole master of all under Heaven—and unless it eventually became sinicized enough to take on the mantle of Chinese civilization.

Among the many problems inherent in bringing the contributions of Chin intellectual and cultural history into focus, the issue of sources stands at the fore. Primary source materials are scarce compared to those available for other, roughly contemporaneous dynasties, particularly the Sung and even the Yüan. Limits appear in two fundamental ways. First, only a fraction of the 1,351 works of drama, poetry and prose, history and philosophy mentioned in extant Chin works still exists. Second, the literary corpus that has survived derives principally from only three

localities other than the capital at Yen-ching: the south-central part of Shansi, Chen-ting (modern Ting-hsien near Shih-chia-chuang) in Hopei province, and Tung-p'ing in the western part of Shantung province. Such traditional cultural centers as Ch'ang-an (Sian), Loyang, or Kaifeng are hardly represented. This fact was not lost on Chin intellectuals. Liu Ch'i (1203–50), the chief chronicler of the period, for instance, joked with his friends, "Most eminent literati of the Chin came from the north. . . . When I was in southern precincts, I was talking once with some colleagues and I jested, 'From antiquity the renowned have come from the east, the west, and the south; but nowadays we should head for the north!'" (KCC 10.112). He might have been referring to Chen-ting, home to such scholars as Ts'ai Kuei (d. 1174), Chou Ang (d. 1211), and Wang Jo-hsü (1174–1243). Although Kaifeng became an important cultural center after the relocation of the capital there in 1214, Chen-ting and Tung-p'ing remained, along with Peking, the principal literary centers even until the early Yüan. Scholars from these areas were also treated as significant figures not only by the major literary critics of the period to survive the Chin—Yüan Hao-wen (1190–1257) and Liu Ch'i—but also by the compilers of standard histories during the Yüan, who drew on their writings for source material. Our confidence on this score should be somewhat tempered by the knowledge that they, like other critics and historians, often propagated their own schools of thought or lineages of affiliation to the exclusion of others. The tendency in traditional writing to give prominence to one tradition while ignoring or misrepresenting others should caution us not to construe the whole of Chin cultural development from such a limited number of sources, themselves bound by both geographical distribution and the predilections of collectors, editors, and publishers. Yet even though few in number and exclusive in nature, these works do not exist in a vacuum; relations in thought or style or theme are there to discover, if not as a whole picture, then as related fragments that have points of intersection and tangency.

The scarcity of source materials in part reflects what was surely a real cultural decline in the wake of both the Jurchen and Mongol conquests. Although the Jurchen captured the Sung capital at Kaifeng in 1127 and imprisoned the last two Northern Sung emperors, warfare between Jurchen forces and Sung loyalists did not cease until a peace was concluded in 1142. The remnant Sung court had set up a temporary capital at Hangchow (renamed Lin-an, "Temporary Resting Place") in the southeast. Cultural losses during this extended period of warfare were compounded by the exodus of most leading literati families to the South. While the Southern Sung court attempted to prevent printed texts from being exported to the Chin, the amount, number, and quality of Southern Sung

texts actually to reach the Chin remains a matter of uncertainty. Chao I (1727–1814), the great Ch'ing historian and critic, suggests that few, if any, Southern Sung texts made their way north (*OPSH* 12.12). Refuting this argument, the modern polymath Ch'ien Chung-shu (1984, 158) offers evidence of citations of near-contemporary Southern Sung poets in the work of Yüan Hao-wen. Although our own investigations on this point are only tentative, they suggest a limited circulation of important texts. But caution is again the key word. The wide range of material cited in Wang Jo-hsü's forty-three-chapter critique of the literary and historical tradition, for instance, seems at first blush to suggest access to an enormous collection of primary sources in the classics, histories, and belles lettres. Many entries in the work, however, may be read as responses or counterarguments to essays that can be traced to one of two major Southern Sung compendia: Hung Mai's (1123–1202) *Jung-chai sui-pi* and Hu Tzu's (1082–1143) *T'iao-hsi yü-yin ts'ung-hua*. Hung Mai's work originally appeared serially: the first portion was edited for presentation to the emperor between 1174 and 1189, and the final editing of the entire work took place between 1208 and 1224. Hu Tzu's work was originally published in two separate volumes, the first in 1148, and the second in 1169. So while Wang Jo-hsü, who cites most widely from other texts, may not have possessed the works of each individual author he discussed, he at least had access to these two compendia within a few decades of their publication. Those Southern Sung works that are known to have been available in the North and that provided a (now) hidden stimulus for writers like Wang Jo-hsü are of particular importance in reconstructing the world of thought the Chin literati moved in; they demonstrate that the textual and intellectual interests of Chin scholars evolved along a path completely different from that of their contemporaries in the South.

Even though Chin was not extinguished by the Mongols until 1234, military disruption of civil culture had begun soon after the turn of the century with the menacing assaults of the Sung from the south and the Mongols from the north and west. By 1214 the Jurchen had had to abandon the principal capital at Peking to the Mongols and flee to Kaifeng just south of the Yellow River. The empire's longest continuous period of peace and normalcy thus lasted only about forty years, from 1165 to 1206, a period that might be called "High Chin," and civil culture thus had little time to flourish in the North under the Chin. The official *Chin History* centers its discussions of Chin culture around the reign of Chin Shih-tsung (r. 1161–89) and states that it was during the reigns of Shih-tsung and Chang-tsung (r. 1190–1208) that learning flourished (*CS* 125. 2713; Chu Chung-yü 1984). This era of relative peace was shattered by the Mongol conquest of North China, a protracted border war of some twenty years' duration (1213–34). The devastation wrought by the Mongols was so overwhelming, the crises

of this era brought challenges that far exceeded any faced by the South during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Historically, a degree of turmoil and disorder has often provided a stimulus to cultural creativity, but rampant upheaval and violence can reach a point where mere survival leaves little energy for cultural pursuits. This period found its voice in Yüan Hao-wen, whose poems of death and disorder (*sang-luan shih*) are recognized as the greatest achievement of Chin poetry. Stephen West's article on Yüan's poems discusses the tragedy of the Mongol cataclysm and how it provoked these poems of lamentation even while it created in Yüan Hao-wen the resolve to chronicle the achievements of his fallen dynasty, a resolve that came to fruition in his *Collection of the Central Plain* (*Chung-chou chi*) and other works that provided much of the source material for the later *Chin History*.

The greatest literati of the Chin dynasty, those who were educated during High Chin, began to rise in prominence only in the 1190s and produced the body of their literary output during the crisis years of the early thirteenth century. This period of change from High Chin to Mongol conquest presents a curious mixture of political instability and bureaucratic reform. The focus of this reform was, as during the Northern Sung, the examination system. An enduring conflict noted in Liu Ch'i's writings is that between two classes of scholars, the literati (*wen-jen* or *shih*) and the examination candidates (*chü-tzu* or *chü-tzu pei*). He identifies the first class as comprising those who are broadly read in the classics, histories, and belles lettres, especially poetry, and the second as those who specialize only in the examination curriculum and the requirements of "regulated rhyme-prose" (*lü-fu*), an exercise in syntactic symmetry, tonal and metrical antithesis and parallelism, and the use of a highly refined diction. Between the decline of High Chin and the years before and after 1224, the examination system became particularly corrupt: the examiners effectively made regulated rhyme-prose the centerpiece of the exams, promoting or rejecting candidates on what was, in reality, only one of the several parts of the examinations. Liu Ch'i described the situation:

The corruption of regulated rhyme-prose during the Chin is beyond description. The creations of writers of the Ta-ting reign period are full and substantial in both spirit and content; their scholarship is deep and broad and can still stand as a model. But after this period, Chang Hsing-chien [d. 1215] became chief examiner, and in grading [the examination candidates] he adhered strictly to the stipulated metrical and stylistic rules; he was tyrannical and assiduous in his fault-finding. Candidates who sat for the examinations during this period simply sketched out something that was loosely akin to the topic, vague, sometimes so much so that the language of the piece

was completely incomprehensible. Because of this, . . . the air [i.e., the accustomed style and quality] of [compositions of] the literati gradually declined. In the grove of scholars it was said, "Whenever you begin a smaller piece of regulated rhyme-prose, you must say, 'The state—one desires to plan for its ordering; the emperor should understand [this with clarity], as if he had been burned by it.'"<sup>2</sup> When a transitional phrase was called for between passages, they invariably used the four-character phrase *k'o te erh chih* ["it can be assumed," "one simply knows"], so when real scholars see an examination candidate, they point him out and say, "Here's another 'one simply knows.'" (KCC 9.97)

Liu Ch'i's point here is not only that by its nature regulated rhyme-prose pushed the writer in the direction of hyperbole, florid language, and set, even stale, diction, but that the process of writing in this form robbed the young student of the ability to think properly. In mentioning their use of the phrase "one simply knows," he is pointing to the corruption of logic in text. This transitional phrase, unlike others that might normally include particles of summation or causation, describes the relationships between two sets of ideas as "self-evident." The writer is thus relieved of the responsibility of establishing authority for his views through either logical argumentation or reference to classical precedent.

It is important, of course, to realize that what Liu wrote about literature and the examination system is analogous to the moral and social order in general: literature and writing exemplify moral character and—by extension of the moral self into the public sphere—government, administration, and bureaucracy. The net result is that, in Liu Ch'i's mind, this decline of literature and personal morality exemplified the wholesale degeneration of the cultural *Zeitgeist*. Liu lays the blame for this at the feet of the Jurchen rulers, particularly Hsüan-tsung. He points out that after the southern crossing of 1214, Hsüan-tsung surrounded himself with sycophants and eunuchs who wielded great power, gradually divesting his prime ministers of all authority and efficacy (KCC 7.69–72). Moreover, under the influence of the powerful Shu-hu Kao-ch'i, the emperor began to promote clerks, whom he relied on to run the bureaucracy; and the literati, who as a class gained political power through the examination system, were thereby disenfranchised (KCC 7.72). Liu wrote of the effect of these policies:

The spirit of the literatus must be fostered in an unbroken fashion. For instance, in the Ming-ch'ang and T'ai-ho reign periods [1190–1208] culture [*wen*] was venerated and scholars were fostered. Consequently, literati of the age respected each other on the basis of

boldness in speech and action. So when it came to the Ta-an reign period [1209–12], when northern troops penetrated our borders, many literati died in resistance, integrity intact. After the southern crossing, Emperor Hsüan-tsung used clerks [in the court bureaucracy] and suppressed the literati. Those bold in speech or action were expelled or punished. Those [who remained] in prominent positions were mostly weak-willed men who sought only either to avoid being charged with wrongdoing or to ingratiate themselves with others. During the T'ien-hsing [1232–34] usurpation [of Ts'ui Li], not one literatus died with integrity. But wasn't there something that had brought this about? (KCC 7.73)

In several places, Liu describes attempts at reform, primarily by Chao Ping-wen and Yang Yün-i, who supervised the examinations during the period after the southern crossing. These reforms did not, of course, go unchallenged:

Since the T'ai-ho and Ta-an reigns [1201–12], writings [produced] for the examinations had become corrupt. Now, those in charge of the examinations simply stuck to the rules of style and metrics, nurturing neither inner talent nor mind. Therefore, the texts that they selected were soft and weak, stale and rotten—[the candidates] simply did no more than what was necessary to pass. Those who possessed surpassing talent and expansive vigor or who delighted in what was new or extraordinary often met with expulsion or failure. So the air of culture declined more and more. When it came to Hsüan-tsung's southern crossing, at the beginning of Chen-yu [1213–17], a rescript was sent down abrogating the local first-level examination [*fu-shih*], and Chao "the Leisured" [i.e., Chao Ping-wen] became chief examiner for the Secretariat examinations [for the degree of *chin-shih*]. Those in charge received a piece of rhyme-prose from Li Ch'in-shu and were very fond of it. Now, although the style of his piece was a little loose in terms of metrical and grammatical rules, the rich vocabulary he employed was serious and solemn and lacked any touch of the vulgar or common. Consequently, he was chosen for the first position [in that category] and Ma Chih-chi was selected as top of the class in the category of discussion and policy. At this point the whole class of examination candidates began to raise a clamor. They [eventually] took their suit to the Censorate, submitting a complaint that the noble Chao had ruined the rules of writing; they also wrote poems satirizing him. Censor Hsü Tao-chen sent a memorial to the throne about it. The case was on the verge of undergoing a second investigation, but it died away after a long period of time.

At precisely this juncture, Ch'in-shu passed the palace examinations [*hung-tz'u k'o*] and was accepted into the Han-lin Academy. By that time, the multitude [of candidates] had been repressed, and they submitted.

During the Cheng-ta [1224–32] era, Ch'in-shu was again made chief examiner of the Secretariat examinations, and those in charge received the rhyme-prose of Shih Hsüeh-yu. They were greatly taken with it, and he was made top candidate. At this point the whole class of examination candidates again protested angrily. Now, Shih's rhyme-prose was even less bound by the rules than Li's, and it was solely on the basis of his learning and the force of his words that one could see that he was a great writer; moreover, the rhyme-prose used a number of animal names in parallel lines. The group of examination candidates said, "Do you know why the examiners took this rhyme-prose to be the best? Because it's so full of flavor!" They also said, "We should call Hsüeh-yu an animal trainer!" But Hsüeh-yu passed the palace examinations at precisely that time, and so the clamor died down.

Alas. The literati have so long been at peace in a position of baseness and so long accustomed to the vulgar that their fright and surprise at the sudden appearance of someone of extraordinary talent far surpassing their own is most understandable. The [purpose of the] examinations is primarily to select those in the world who possess heroic talent; metrical and stylistic rules are just a general guide. Some [examiners] will take this one and reject that one [following different criteria], so there is always a possibility someone will lament being left out. And Chao and Li did not simply go along with the predilections of the majority; they selected candidates on the basis of what they alone thought was right—so how can the clamorings of those who debate this point be worth comparing, one with another? (KCC 10.109)<sup>3</sup>

Not surprisingly, Chao Ping-wen's, Yang Yün-i's, and Li Ch'in-shu's efforts at institutional reform did not bear fruit. There was simply too little time. Try as they might, the reformers were unable to overcome what Liu Ch'i saw as a lack of strong leadership in late Chin intellectual life. Hsüan-tsung's policies were partially to blame, but the literati must share accountability.

Liu presents us with two important facts about the years between 1224 and 1234: the first is that the literati were then disenfranchised by those in power; the second is that there was a reform movement headed by men of moral worth that was just then beginning to gather steam. These two



issues seem paradoxical until we look more closely at what Liu actually says. The reforms themselves are part of a basic instability at the nexus of late Chin culture. We find, for instance, that Liu mentions three major periods of reform within a space of ten years—this clearly indicates that for him there was no well-defined contemporary concept of the responsibilities and duties of the literati. We do not mean to imply here that Liu Ch’i argues for a rigid consensus; on the contrary, he seems to argue for a generally recognized field of values within which there is room for expression and implementation of literati ideals. For Liu Ch’i the constant change of examination curriculum, the bickering at court between scholars and students were symptomatic of a destabilization of the moral and cultural center of the state. His criticism of examination writing may be seen, we think, as indicative of his concern about the locus of responsibility for culture. In his essays it is clear that he sees that the disempowerment of the literati had debased their values. They were unable to muster authority, either by reasoning or by reference to classical sources, and thereby were unable to inspire their writing with any moral essence. The lack of allegiance to a central set of values also meant that the literati gravitated toward political power instead of moral authority, and, as Liu Ch’i points out, the consequent possession of power cut even deeper rifts between those in and those out of office:

After the southern crossing, the air of the literati [*shih-feng*] became exceptionally insubstantial. Once they got on the registry of official service, they viewed the various students who had not passed the examinations as following a different road, and they might even go so far as to part suddenly from those who had once been close friends and associates. Sometimes, when those who were still civilians had affairs of importance, they would try several times to see those who were in positions [of authority]. But those in positions [of authority] would rarely answer their requests. Some even removed themselves to lofty mansions where their old friends could not get access to them. Li Ch’ang-yüan therefore became very upset about this and said, “Can they become the most arrogant of all literati in the world on the basis of one trifling pass in the examinations?” Many who had already passed the examinations were extremely angry when they heard this, and they managed to drive Li Ch’ang-yüan out of the Bureau of History and actually lodged a formal complaint against him. Can the air of the literati be like this? (KCC 7.76)

Instead of using their official positions and moral authority to advance the cause of the *shih* as a class, these scholars accelerated the fragmentation of

those who should have been united in their quest to reinstate and uphold the cultural order that was their heritage

The Chinese literati would probably have found themselves in a better environment for cultural creativity if they hadn't had to contend with problems introduced by the southern crossing. Still, it would be unfair to overlook areas of creativity that existed during High Chin and even during the declining years of the dynasty—creativity in the realms of religious thought, literature, and institutional restructuring. The level of scholarship in Chin China, more uneven in quality than that of either the Northern or Southern Sung renaissance, still had its high points, especially if we position thinkers like Wang Jo-hsü and Chao Ping-wen in a tradition of scholarship not particularly allied to Tao-hsüeh—one like Hung Mai's, which was heavily textual. We should not deny the positive contributions the literati made to civilizing alien rule in North China and continuing alternative forms of Confucian learning, ethics, and service.

In addition to the destruction and losses incurred during the conquests of North China, the attitudes of Ming and Ch'ing scholars and the regimes that ruled them have not favored the survival of Chin historical materials. Much was no doubt lost during the Ming simply because it was considered to be of inadequate significance to mainstream Confucian culture to be preserved or reprinted. Although the reigning Manchus of the Ch'ing dynasty were related to the Jurchen, after their conquest of China they did not call attention to their ancestry, cultural or otherwise. The Manchus wanted to present themselves to the Chinese as the custodians of Chinese culture, and little was to be gained from close identification with the Jurchen. Moreover, the Chin had been not only a short-lived dynasty, but one that was also geographically restricted to the northern part of China.

Modern scholarship has only recently begun to transcend traditional biases against the Jurchen and Chin history. In recent decades Chinese scholars have explored a wide spectrum of topics, which is evident even in a partial listing of the major publications in this field. Sun Chin-chi's (1987) book, for example, traces the history of the Jurchen beginning with the end of the Eastern Han and continuing through the Ming period. Sung Te-chin (1988) and Wang K'o-pin (1989) discuss various aspects of Jurchen society and daily life, including food, clothing, recreation, festivals, wedding ceremonies, and religious beliefs. Yü Yu-yen and others (1989) document surviving Jurchen folk tales. Jin Guangping and Jin Qicong's (1980) volume on the Jurchen language and Jin Qicong's (1984) Jurchen dictionary enhance our understanding of the language. Chang Po-ch'üan, whose (1981) book on economic development and (1984) historical survey are both well known, is currently writing a three-part work (1986–) on Chin history, an overview of historical sources, personages, social change,

economy, government institutions, Jurchen military organization, wars with the Sung, and historical geography. Yü Chieh and Yü Kuang-tu (1989) explore the legacy of Peking as the Chin capital. Liu Su-yung (1987) provides a detailed biography of the dynasty's most outstanding emperor, Shih-tsung. Ts'ui Wen-yin gives us a modern edition of a major historical source for Chin history (*TCCC*). Li Shu-t'ien (1989) provides annotated transcriptions of Chin stele inscriptions. Chou Hui-ch'üan and Mi Chih-kuo (1986) have an annotated volume of literary selections from the Liao and Chin. Two important works on literature have recently appeared: the first, by Chao Chih-hui and others (1989), is a study of the literature of Manchu peoples and is devoted to Hsiao-shen, Po-hai, and Jurchen literature; the second, by Chan Hang-lun (1993), is a comprehensive history of Chin dynasty literature. Even though the late Ch'en Shu's major research centered on the Liao, he deserves special credit for developing Chin studies during his long tenure as president of the Chinese Association of Liao-Chin and Khitan-Jurchen History. Among other works, he edited five volumes of essays (1987-92) on Liao and Chin history. Although most research in the People's Republic of China has centered on ethnic culture, archaeology, socioeconomic history, and political institutions, more attention is currently being given to the subject of cultural development than in past decades. For example, at the 1991 Tatung conference convened by the Liao-Chin Association, there were even several papers on Confucianism.

Chin studies have also made progress outside the PRC. Besides several studies in Chinese by Tao Jing-shen (T'ao Chin-sheng) on Chin institutional, political, and military history, as well as a book by Yeh Ch'ien-chao (1972) on Chin legal history, other monographic studies include Yang Shu-fan's (1978) book on central government political systems. The volumes of essays compiled by Yao Ts'ung-wu (1971) and Wang Ming-sun (1981) are also noteworthy. Japanese scholars have made major contributions to the field, particularly to our understanding of the language, culture, and customs of the Jurchen people. Special notice should be taken of Toyama Gunji's (1975 and 1978) histories of the Chin, Mikami Tsugio's (1970, 1972, 1973, 1984) social and institutional studies of the Jurchen, Niida Noboru's (1944) work on Chin law, and Yoshikawa Kôjirô's (1974) pioneering work on Chin political culture. The history and teachings of Ch'an Buddhism are subjects of particular interest among Japanese academics because of the link between Ch'an and Zen. In the West, outstanding examples of scholarly contributions to the field of Chin studies would include Herbert Franke's social and political histories; Chan Hok-lam's studies of historiography; Morris Rossabi's (1982) monograph on the Jurchen during the Yüan and Ming; Gisaburo Kiyose's (1977) and Daniel Kane's (1989) studies

of Jurchen language and script; J. T. Wixted's (1982) work on Yüan Hao-wen and Chin literary theory; and Tao Jing-shen's and Chan Hok-lam's works on political history and interstate relations. Special note should be made of the volume of translations on Chin society that Herbert Franke and Chan Hok-lam have been editing at the University of Washington. Even this partial listing of major works reminds us that the present volume is indebted to a growing scholarship on the Chin period. Still, compared to the state of secondary scholarship on the Sung or Yüan dynasties, Chin studies are markedly underdeveloped.

This underdevelopment is particularly pronounced in regards to cultural history. Although the limits of extant sources and the nascent state of the field restrict our progress, the present volume will take steps to relate aspects of institutional, intellectual, religious, literary, artistic, and social developments to the cultural matrix. Discussing these various areas of historical development should promote a greater interest in the culture of the era and help set the foundation for the eventual integration of the Chin into Chinese cultural history. In taking up this task, the authors of these essays have in a sense been influenced by one of the primary missions of the Chin intellectuals upon whom they have focused. For instance, Chao Ping-wen (1159–1232), in a memorial to Chin Chang-tsung, praised that emperor's efforts to "enhance the tradition of the Central Plain" (*FSWC* 10.9a). He was anxious, in other words, that the Chin strengthen its connection to the cultural tradition of North China. As Sung Te-chin (1990) documents, dynastic legitimacy was a major issue throughout the Chin, of both political and cultural import. The concern displayed in Chao Ping-wen's memorial reflects the seriousness with which Chinese scholars and regimes have historically viewed the question of legitimate dynastic succession. It was profoundly important that a dynasty be judged, by contemporary and future generations of historians and critics alike, to be or to have been in the mainstream of Chinese history. Being viewed as mainstream was crucial to a dynasty's legitimacy and also to the individual Confucian scholars who hoped their lives and literary works would be appreciated as contributions to the legacy of Chinese culture. Although we are not attempting to redress the placement of the Chin in the succession of dynasties, we generally do share the concern that Chao Ping-wen articulated, to consider the cultural developments that unfolded under the Chin as a part of the cultural history of China.

Although Yüan scholars edited the three histories of the Liao, Chin, and Sung nominally without settling the controversial problem of legitimate succession, their official *Chin History* in fact affirmed the Chin as the legitimate state. Specifically, legendary births are cited only for Jurchen ancestors and not for successors of the Sung or Liao royal houses; empha-

sis is repeatedly placed upon the arrival of envoys from the Sung, Korea, and the Hsi-Hsia (990–1227), a state founded by Tanguts in northwestern China; and references to the fall of the Southern Sung consistently employ terms of unification and pacification that imply that the Mongol Yüan had already gained legitimacy from their conquest of the Chin (Chu Chung-yü 1984). Thus, the Mongol editors broke with the tradition of according legitimacy only to Han Chinese regimes; moreover, they presented a positive image of a polyethnic state that regarded all its people ultimately as one family (Chang Po-ch'üan 1984, 11–13). Besides noting that the official history retrospectively accorded political legitimacy to the Chin, James Liu (1977) also observes that the Chinese contributors to the dynastic histories project sponsored by the Yüan court countered by establishing collective biographies of Tao-hsüeh Confucians in the official *Sung History* only and thereby set their claim to ideological orthodoxy. Historiographically, there was a clever compromise between the Mongol preference for the Chin and the Chinese affinity for the Sung.

In essence, we might say that this compromise by Yüan scholars left the status of Chin's legitimacy split by affording it a greater degree of political legitimacy but denying it cultural legitimacy. Especially given the fact that the political legitimacy accorded the Chin was not very explicit and could easily be viewed differently by Chinese historians and scholars, this recognition of the Sung as the inheritors of cultural orthodoxy relegated the Chin—and all cultural developments occurring within the boundaries of their empire and during their regime—to the fringes of Chinese civilization.

Part I of the volume consists of three essays on history and institutions. Hoyt Cleveland Tillman provides an overview of political and institutional developments that traces the evolution away from Jurchen tribal practices and toward Chinese imperial institutions. The Jurchen adapted a practical mixture of native and T'ang institutions inherited through Liao and Northern Sung institutional innovations. The Chin had some significant institutional differences from the Sung that arose largely from their Jurchen tribal heritage and the task confronting the ethnic minority determined to maintain its grasp on the reins of power. That consciousness of being a ruling minority notwithstanding, the Jurchen emperors deliberately expanded the civil service examination system to allow greater numbers of Han Chinese to enter the government. This expansion, especially from the last two decades of the twelfth century, played a major role in creating a critical mass of literati, some of whom excelled in the examinations and assumed cultural leadership during the Chin.

James T. C. Liu suggests major revisions in the way the Chin dynasty should be viewed in the larger historical context of conquest dynasties.

Although the Jurchen were the first people from the steppe region to cross the Yangtze River into South China, this fact has been ignored by historians, perhaps to enhance the historical significance of the later conquest by the Mongols, under whose supervision the official histories of the Sung, Liao, and Chin were compiled. The Jurchen did not attempt to conquer the South; they had more limited objectives, seeking at the time to rule through the Ch'i dynasty (1130–37) headed by Liu Yü (1073–1143). Although dismissed by later Chinese historians as a petty puppet regime, Liu Yü's government "secured the land and calmed the people" so successfully that his collaboration with the Jurchen paved the way for a bloodless transfer of power. The Jurchen might have achieved a complete conquest of China if they had realized the truth implemented so well by their descendants the Manchus in the seventeenth century: "No effective turncoats, no conquest." The ease with which the Jurchen unseated Liu Yü in their peaceful grasp of direct rule in North China meant that the Chinese government in Hangchow had little prospect for liberating the North. Nevertheless, the Jurchen were suspicious of turncoats and sometimes inflicted the cruelest punishments upon them. Such measures discouraged other Chinese from accepting similar roles in aiding the expansion of Jurchen power southward.

Tao Jing-shen explores how Chin patronage of local schools contributed to the revival of Confucian learning and the promotion of education. Based on a detailed scrutiny of essays written to commemorate the construction or repair of school buildings, Tao traces the development of local schools during the Chin, analyzes the nature of these schools, and assesses their influence on the culture of the period. The schools in question were "temple schools" (*miao-hsiieh*), which served as both schools and Confucian temples where statues or portraits of Confucius and his principal disciples were venerated. Professor Tao finds that the number of local schools either built or repaired during the Chin is actually greater than conventionally accepted estimates. Local schools were widespread enough both to continue the Northern Sung ideal of broadening educational opportunity and to promote Chinese literary and cultural values. The local officials' enthusiasm for these projects echoes through their essays. Moreover, the writers of these essays were convinced that Chin support for local education arose from the Jurchen emperors' aspirations to identify themselves with Chinese rulers of the past who were esteemed by Confucian literati.

Part II consists of three essays on religion and Confucian thought during the Chin. Two of the essays point to deep relationships between Chin, Sung, and Yüan Confucianism. Whereas Yoshikawa Kôjirô (1974) built his case for Su Shih's (1036–1101) near-total dominance of Chin literati culture largely on the culture of the civil service examinations,

Peter K. Bol has focused on the personal writings of leading intellectuals to demonstrate that they were indeed primarily committed to Su Shih's vision of literary culture (*wen*). That Northern Sung vision of culture rested on a philosophy of an integrated approach to various artistic and academic pursuits (like calligraphy, painting, poetry, prose composition, and historical writing) that would provide a broad base for the cultured literatus. Such major Chin literati as Chao Ping-wen engaged in these pursuits in accord with Su Shih's vision. Furthermore, having inherited Su Shih's criticism of Ch'eng I (1033–1107) as being too dogmatic and philosophically abstract, they were only cautiously receptive to the moral philosophy developed by various Tao-hsüeh Confucians. Although Ch'eng's focus on the *tao* and Su's on *wen* were in opposition during the Sung, Chin literati sought to ease the tension. Seeking to preserve Chinese culture in an era of militarism and foreign conquest, their efforts at harmonization set the tone for intellectual life until advocates of Confucian orthodoxy, grounded in Ch'eng I and Chu Hsi (1130–1200), gained such prominence in Peking by the 1350s that they could accentuate the tensions inherent in the approaches to *wen* and the *tao*. Professor Bol's thesis concentrates here on Chao Ping-wen.

Although Hoyt Cleveland Tillman agrees that Su Shih was an intellectual figurehead for Chin Confucians, he seeks to demonstrate that the degree of Su Shih's dominance needs to be qualified because Tao-hsüeh Confucianism became increasingly popular among Chin literati from around 1190 onward. Tillman thus dates the introduction and spread of Tao-hsüeh Confucianism in North China about forty-five years earlier than scholars conventionally have. The rising popularity of Tao-hsüeh Confucianism did not eclipse the allegiance of major Chin Confucians to Su Shih, but even they were attracted to it enough to praise those who dedicated themselves to propagating its writings and doctrines. Furthermore, the writings of these major literary figures, particularly Chao Ping-wen and Wang Jo-hsü, reveal some influence from Tao-hsüeh Confucian ideas and concerns. The overall direction of various intellectual developments appears to indicate that Tao-hsüeh Confucianism was beginning to gain ground at the expense of Su Shih's philosophy of culture—particularly in regard to understanding the *tao*, ethical cultivation, and the Confucian classics. These areas are particularly significant, because they were seen by Chu Hsi as crucial issues of contention with followers of Su Shih. In large part, the apparent differences between Bol's and Tillman's essays regarding the relative predominance of Su Shih's philosophy and the relative weight of Tao-hsüeh Confucian influences arise from the different issues or questions they are addressing.

Yao Tao-chung reminds the reader that Taoism and Buddhism under the Chin were far more pervasive than Confucianism, even among literati.

Professor Yao surveys the institutional relationship of Buddhism and Taoism to government and society under the Chin to relate the complexities of the ties of patronage and conflict. Much like other dynasties in China, the Chin exercised control over religious groups. And its impartial patronage of both Buddhism and Taoism provided an environment in which the two religions could flourish more harmoniously than during the succeeding Yüan period. A major development during the Chin was the movement toward unifying these two religions, along with Confucianism, into the "Three Teachings." Wang Che (1113–70) was the first person to use the term "Three Doctrines" (*san-chiao*) to name religious congregations. Hence, he sought to be impartial in his borrowing from the three religious traditions; given his emphasis on cultivation of the "inner elixir" of immortality, however, Wang Che's Ch'üan-chen ("Complete Perfection" or "Perfect Truth") movement was considered a Taoist sect—and is now known to have been the most popular of any religious group during the Chin and one of two Taoist sects to have survived to this day. Ch'üan-chen was one of the new Taoist sects that arose at least in part as a religious reaction to the cultural aftermath of the Jurchen conquest. It was, after all, the Taoists in Chin China, rather than those in the Southern Sung, who continued the tradition of compiling the Taoist canon.

In addition to contributing to the Tripitaka, Chin Buddhists also served as a vital link between Buddhism of earlier and later periods. Although long thought to have been lost, the Chin compilation of the Tripitaka was discovered in 1958 in the Yün-chü Temple near Peking and is now being reprinted. The very survival of the Ts'ao-tung sect of Ch'an Buddhism hinged on the master Hsing-hsiu (1166–1246), through whom all important later masters of this predominately northern school traced their lines of transmission. Although Hsing-hsiu lived most of his life under the Chin, it is revealing of the perspectives of later writers that he is usually presented as a figure of the Yüan era.

Part III includes four essays that relate aspects of literature and art to sociopolitical and cultural developments. Susan Bush addresses the nature of Chin literati from the vantage point of an art historian. In her survey of five paintings that have not heretofore been studied as a group or related to the cultural context of the Chin, Dr. Bush provides additional evidence to support the view that by the end of the twelfth century culture was flourishing under the Chin. Including a major reattribution of one of the five paintings, her study explores the ties of the artists to bureaucratic organizations in order to address the questions whether an Academy of Painting existed and what the status of "professional" painters was under the Chin. Compared to their Northern and Southern Sung counterparts, Chin painters did not have the benefit of as much institutionally structured



government support, but there also appears to have been less of a status differential between painters and scholars than was true during the Sung. The early Yüan inherited these characteristics from the Chin; moreover, the only models for the early Yüan court artists were Northern Sung styles preserved by Chin painters and collectors. As during the Yüan, the relatively small status differential between painters and scholars actually reflected a decline in the status of the literati during the Chin as compared to the Sung, but the Chin devaluation in status was accompanied by a proliferation of examination degrees.

The essay by Jin Qicong, former head of the Shenyang Center for Research on Jurchen and Manchu Languages and Cultures, provides the first major study in English of the literature of the Jurchen people. A direct descendant of the Ch'ien-lung emperor (r. 1736–95), Professor Jin writes with the double advantage of academic background and personal familiarity with the culture of this northeastern minority people. Having studied in Japan several decades ago, Professor Jin draws heavily from Japanese scholarship on Jurchen people and culture in his work. In his contribution to this volume Professor Jin analyzes the evolution of Jurchen literature from its oral beginnings to its written forms. Because of the sinicization policies of mid-twelfth-century Chin rulers and the greater utility of literary Chinese, Jurchen literature lived in increasing danger of extinction until it was revived in the 1160s by the Chin emperor Shih-tsung. Yet even his heir apparent did not know Jurchen well, for the prince's studies concentrated on literary Chinese. Shih-tsung's successors forsook his re-Jurchenization program in favor of the sinicization policies of his two predecessors. Still, Shih-tsung's work bore some fruit in later years. By the first decade of the thirteenth century, there were enough schools and examination degrees in Jurchen that a significant number of scholars wrote in Jurchen, but their compositions were virtually translations from Chinese. Professor Jin argues that even Jurchen writings in Chinese should nonetheless be considered Jurchen literature because they express Jurchen thoughts and emotions.

Wilt Idema's essay considers a literary genre addressed to upscale urban audiences including, but not limited to, literati. A musical medium designed for entertainment, the all-keys-and-modes (*chu-kung-tiao*) was a prosimetric form of storytelling that smilingly satirized exemplars of social mobility, especially students preparing for the civil service examinations. The genre arose in Kaifeng in the late eleventh century, along with the markedly increased visibility of students and growing importance of civil service examinations. Although popular in Hangchow and performed through most of the Yüan period, the zenith of the genre was reached under the Chin. Students continued to bear the principal brunt of

its humor because the gap between their initial expectations and actual success left them open to ridicule. The authors of *chu-kung-tiao* were generally sympathetic toward students struggling for upward mobility; however, they characterized students as victims of circumstance and slaves to passion rather than as strong masters of their own fates and fortunes. Even when presenting the tale of a historic figure before his rise to eminence, authors satirized the upwardly mobile figure as totally controlled by circumstance. Another characteristic of the genre under the Chin is the pervasiveness of sexual themes and imagery, reflecting a relative freedom in this period from more orthodox Confucian mores. But Professor Idema finds that the lessons inherent in stories involving sex generally mirror conventional Confucian morality. A new element in Chinese literature that appears in this genre is contempt for rural life. In contrast to the bucolic idealizations of earlier writers, *chu-kung-tiao* authors focused on the unpleasantness of village life and the ignorance of country yokels—and the fun they poked at them is devoid of the sympathy that characterizes their satiric portrayal of students. In such ways, Professor Idema's detailed discussion of the genre enriches our understanding of literati society of the era.

Stephen West's study of a series of poems by Yüan Hao-wen on the death and disorder wrought by the Mongol conquest is also a study of a Confucian literatus' reaction to what he perceives as the death of culture. In his poems, Yüan wrote of the new cataclysm of the Central Plain, the inundation of the seat of traditional culture by an (in his eyes) uncivilized horde of barbarians. Lamentation was soon replaced, however, by a new sense of mission to chronicle and preserve the textual and cultural heritage of the Chin. Yüan's sense of urgency was certainly inspired by a belief that it was Chinese, not just Chin, culture that was in danger. His identification with Confucius himself as the inheritor and perpetuator of culture demonstrates not only the deep sense of commitment such literati felt as participants in an unbroken cultural process, but also the value that commitment held in the formation of self-identity.

Running through these essays, there is an assumption that synchronic and diachronic dimensions point together toward the Chin's place in Chinese cultural history. Chin Buddhism, for instance, may be viewed from either the ecumenism of the Northern Sung or the syncretism of the Ming. A similar dual perspective applies to Tao-hsüeh Confucianism under the Chin. On the one hand, focusing on the importance of a Tao-hsüeh anthology, the *Chu Ju ming-tao chi* (Writings for propagating the *tao*), brings to the fore the continuation of broader Southern Sung Tao-hsüeh orientations into the Chin and Yüan. In this case, the prominence of early Southern Sung Tao-hsüeh philosophers, especially Chang Chiu-ch'eng (1092–1159), whom Chu Hsi excised from the tradition, suggests a certain

tension between Chu Hsi's delineation of Confucianism and their own. On the other hand, focusing retrospectively on the degree to which Chu Hsi did delimit Tao-hsüeh for later generations, we may reflect upon Tao-hsüeh under the Chin as a preparatory stage preceding the triumph of Chu Hsi's Confucianism under the Yüan. Each perspective has validity and helps to place the culture of the Chin era in Chinese cultural history. Both are crucial to understanding the contribution of the Chin literati in providing bridges between the T'ang-Sung past and the Yüan-Ming future.

We would concede that there is a strong historical bias to accept the conventional wisdom that the most important and impressive causeway of culture passed through Southern Sung. But we must ask ourselves how much this bias is a product of the predilections of later historians who could trace their own roots to that stream of thought. We must ask ourselves if it is historical perspective, created out of the desire of later historians, and ethnic and cultural prejudice that have viewed the shorter and more direct spans between the Chin and the Yüan with such disapprobation.

In spite of the emphasis here on intellectual, religious, artistic, and literary trends in the rise of southern cultural dominance over northern culture, we are not trying to be reductionistic. Other factors, such as material culture and population distribution, were of major significance. For instance, James T. C. Liu (1985) has demonstrated that the impact of the progression toward increased urbanization and intensive agriculture during the Sung, especially in the South, militated against continuing the northern legacy of the physically rigorous and martially minded exercise of polo. Polo played riding horseback across large fields as a form of military training gave way to kicking balls in alleys and courtyards. Although numerous Confucians articulated the dangers of polo playing and preferred riding in sedan chairs to riding on horses, they reflected the realities of the urban settings of their offices and the intensively cultivated fields that dominated their landscapes.

There are other important cultural topics that we would have liked to have included in this volume. We had planned to have additional essays on literary theory, classical studies, Buddhist ecumenism, and retrospective views of the Chin from the standpoint of later scholarship. Essays on some of these topics are now to be found elsewhere (for instance, Wixted 1990 on literary theory, originally one of the papers presented at the ACLS conference), or have proved too difficult to write because of the present state of Chin studies, but some discussion of these topics is included in the present essays.

Especially given the underdeveloped state of Chin cultural studies, the present collection of essays should prove to be adequate for a pioneering work and certainly for encouraging further research. With such diversity

of coverage and so much that needs to be explored, the various contributors have addressed very different questions that might at times appear to be more exclusive, even unrelated, than is actually the case. Indeed, to acquire an overview of the Chin, each paper should be seen in the context of the whole project. Because of the state of the field, we do not pretend to have achieved an adequate integration of the Chin into Chinese cultural history, but these essays do mark a milestone in the development of Chin cultural studies. And enrichment of our understanding of culture under Chin rule is important to the more complete appreciation of Chinese cultural history—one major component of our global cultural heritage.

*Notes*

1. This view has a pronounced effect on literary and cultural history even today. See, for instance, Liu Shih-p'ei's (1937) essay on the dissimilarity between northern and southern literature.
2. His point is, this opening couplet must always be cited to please the examiners.
3. That is, someone is always left out, anyway.