CHAPTER 14

State Power and the Confucian Classics

Observations on the *Mengzi jiewen* and Truth Management under the First Ming Emperor

Bernhard FUEHRER

DISCUSSIONS OF THE RELATION between state power and the Confucian classics tend to revolve around distinct events such as the infamous burning of the books, the central government's attempts to re-take possession of the classics in the late medieval periods after the reunification of the empire that led to the "correct meanings" (*zhengyi* 正義), regulations for prohibiting foreigners access to the classics, or the stocktaking-cum-censoring enterprise that produced the *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書.

Notwithstanding academic trends, China's intellectual history as well as the distinctly political nature of discussions of this topic in the contemporary context attest to the mere truism that the state's exercise of control over the Confucian classics was—and still is—an ongoing project, not limited to discrete events. As ultimate authority governing intellectual discourse, the Confucian classics constituted not only a comprehensive and definitive intellectual framework but also an instrument of state power to ensure continuation of existing hierarchies of social status and political power, embedded in which was the authority to define, disseminate, and enforce orthodoxy. Where the interests of the supreme earthly powers required new interpretative norms and directions, these changes tended to be set out by leading scholars under imperial directives, on some occasions even through emperors directly engaging with the classics as commentators.[1]

The canon and its exegetical directives were enforced via education. From

the Han onward the curriculum, with its focus on the classics and associated works—such as the *Analects* (*Lunyu* 論語) or, in later periods, the *Xiaojing* 孝經 and the *Mencius* (*Mengzi* 孟子)—functioned as the primary mechanism not only to shape the minds of the educated classes but also to control their intellectual pursuits. Despite the textually heterogeneous nature of the classics, they were traditionally perceived as an embodiment of the *dao* 道—which we read here as "the ultimate truth." At first glance, this textual embodiment of "the ultimate truth" seems to provide learners with basic ethics in a given environment, a method to better oneself, a procedure that ideally leads to the attainment of the highest level of self-cultivation, that is, to become an "accomplished person" (*junzi* 君子). But then, the classics and their state-sanctioned readings had another and—in our context here—far more significant function. They offered clear guidelines on how established hierarchies were to be maintained, and imperatives that—once internalized through educational indoctrination—demanded subordination by means of a philosophy of "knowing one's station" in society.

Of course, the primary corpus of the classics (*jing* 經) is not an eternally fixed textual body but has gone through various stages of complex canonization processes. But it seems perhaps more important that the real prowess of the classical canon lies in its interpretations and the way in which earthly authorities invested authority in their readings. Different periods showed different levels of tolerance toward divergent interpretations, some institutionalized interpretative diversity even in the highest educational bodies, and at other times some allowable co-existence of conflicting and sometimes even mutually contradictory readings. The degree to which the canonical texts are perceived as open texts often tends to coincide with periods of governance characterized by the ineffectiveness of the political mandate. In times when we observe strong central power, the authority's urge to take possession of the intellectual foundations of state power, namely the Confucian classics, tends to become preeminent. At the direction of emperors, scholar-officials set out to narrow the range of allowable readings. This standardization of readings of the canon aims at bringing out a particular version of "the ultimate truth," a process that renders the canonical texts serviceable in a specific historical and political context.

In this chapter I shall concentrate on Zhu Yuanzhang 朱元璋 (1328–1398; r. 1368–1398), the founding emperor of the Ming (1368–1644), his management of truth, and his attempts to ensure the serviceability of canonical writings. In pursuit of these aims, he applied various strategies.[2]

As he felt discontent with interpretations of the *Shujing* 書經 by Cai Chen 蔡沈 (1167–1230), Zhu Yuanzhang ordered his trusted advisor Liu Sanwu 劉三吾 (1312–1399) to revise the parts of Cai Chen's commentary that the emperor considered deficient or unsuitable.[3] Liu Sanwu, an erudite scholar who

found favor in the eyes of the emperor at a very late stage in his life, revised over sixty passages in Cai Chen's *Shu jizhuan* 書集傳 (1210), parts of which carry glosses made by his former teacher Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) shortly before his death.[4] After its completion in 1394, the *Shu zhuan huixuan* 書傳會選 by Liu Sanwu and his team of Hanlin scholars was promulgated to the empire until it underwent further revisions during the Yongle 永樂 period (1403–1425).[5] What we witness in this case is an emperor who challenges received norms and orders a revision of crucial explanatory material. In the *Shu zhuan huixuan* the transmitted *jingwen* 經文 ("main text") remains untouched. Nonetheless, the readings extracted from the *jingwen* as well as their implications undergo significant changes pontificated by the emperor. The new exposition of the canon is a redefinition of a classic by exegetical means, constructed through rectifications according to a new interpretative standard.[6] The newly established readings are promoted throughout the empire as standard for examinations. Non-adherence to this new standard simply means that the doors to any career as a scholar-official remain closed.

Zhu Yuanzhang also applied the classics to regulate and remedy hierarchies. His continuous revisions of various ritual prescriptions were aimed at keeping potentially treacherous members of the imperial family in check, and at making visible the envisaged hierarchies through the symbolic language of ritual performances. The revised ritual prescriptions and their points of reference stemmed from the venerated exegetical traditions in exactly the same way as the pre-reform prescriptions. While remaining within the multifaceted repertoire of exegetical traditions for ritual affairs, revisions of ritual prescriptions allowed the emperor to react to changing political situations. These revisions were confirmed in tandem with points of reference in the tradition, which consented—or could be explained as consenting—to changes implemented to address perceived new operative needs. The classics and their exegetical corpora served as a repository of glosses at the disposal of erudite literati, who, in accordance with the imperial directive, formulated codified credenda of governance.[7]

In *biji* 筆記 notebooks—which I perceive as highly valuable accounts that not only offer information otherwise not transmitted in official historical source material but provide us with an alternative historiography—Zhu Yuanzhang tends to appear primarily in an unfavorable light.[8] However, these sources contain interesting accounts of the first Ming emperor's elaborations on the readings of the classics. They tell us of his aversion to the contemplative interaction with canonical texts that was so fashionable during the Song (960–1279), and of the issues Zhu Yuanzhang had with Zhu Xi's readings.[9] Although *biji* authors may well aim at caricaturizing the first Ming emperor, the important point here is that some of the readings put forward by Zhu Yuanzhang do actually coincide

with interpretations suggested by earlier scholars.[10] This is to say that the man who is widely perceived as the embodiment of an emperor with an educational deficit, and whose views on the classics are often in open disagreement with Zhu Xi's line of scholarship, which was elevated to the national standard during the Mongol period, arrived at readings shared with earlier scholarship.[11]

A particularly noteworthy case of manipulation of the classics by state power is Zhu Yuanzhang's short-lived suppression of substantial portions of the *Mencius.*[12] The Qing scholar Quan Zuwang 全祖望 (1705–1755) transmitted a short account of Zhu Yuanzhang faulting the *Mencius* for promoting insurrection and subversive teachings.[13] In 1372, so Quan Zuwang reports, the emperor set his mind on prohibiting the transmission of such outdated views.[14] But shortly after he had the tablet of Mencius removed from the Confucius temple, Zhu Yuanzhang saw himself forced to withdraw his order following the occurrence of an inauspicious omen.[15] In the same source we also learn of his rage over the warning given by Mencius to King Xuan of Qi (齊宣王) which Zhu Yuanzhang deemed entirely unacceptable.[16] The relevant passage in *Mencius* 4B3 reads:

> 君之視臣如手足，則臣視君如腹心；君之視臣如犬馬，則臣視君如國人； 君之視臣如土芥，則臣視君如寇讎。[17]
>
> If the ruler looks upon subjects as [his] hands and feet, then the subjects look upon the ruler as [their] belly and heart. If the ruler looks upon subjects as dogs and horses, then the subjects look upon the ruler as a passerby.[18] If the ruler looks upon [his] subjects as mud and weeds, then the subjects look upon the ruler as a robber and enemy.[19]

With the office of prime minister abolished and the government reorganized in 1380, Zhu Yuanzhang's ministers thus expurgated from the *Mencius* the passages faulted by the emperor and produced an abridged version of the *Mencius* that, it would appear, became part of the reading list for civil examinations after the restoration of the examinations in 1384–1385.[20]

One decade and several serious episodes of political turbulence later, Zhu Yuanzhang ordered Liu Sanwu to cleanse the *Mencius,* once again, of material that he found objectionable.[21] In 1394 the *Mengzi jiewen* 孟子節文 was established by the Imperial Academy as the standard version of the *Mencius* in civil examinations.[22] Two decades later, Zhu Di 朱棣 (1360–1424; r. 1403–1424) abolished the version censored according to his father's wish and reinstated the full transmitted version of the *Mencius,* which—in the compendium of commentaries on the *Five Classics* and the *Four Books,* the *Wujing Sishu daquan* 五經四書大全 (1415), compiled by the Hanlin academician Hu Guang 胡廣

(1370–1418) and his staff—became part of the newly established reading list for civil examination candidates.[23]

In the introduction to his excerpts from the *Mencius,* Liu Sanwu endeavors to provide a rationale for censoring this book.[24] He states that during the time of Mencius, titled lords (*zhuhou* 諸侯) behaved without restraint, "valued their own profit most highly, and no longer knew of the existence of humankindness (*ren*) and sense of duty (*yi*)."[25] And with reference to the first section of the *Mencius,* that is, Mencius' encounter with King Hui of Liang/Wei, Liu Sanwu notes the philosopher's failure to grasp the actual threat that the king and his country faced from their mighty neighbors:[26]

> 仁義正論也。所答非所問矣。是以所如不合，終莫能聽納其說。[27]
>
> Humankindness and sense of duty are the correct teachings. [But Mencius] did not answer [the king's] question(s). Hence their destinations were not in accord, and in the end his suggestions could not/cannot be accepted.[28]

Liu Sanwu clearly agrees with the *Mencius* that, as a matter of principle, *ren* 仁 and *yi* 義 are the right measures.[29] Nevertheless, he—as well as Zhu Yuanzhang and others before them—came to consider his approach starry-eyed and thus unable to deal with the actual political situation. In their judgment the *Mencius* is deemed incapable of providing counsel that Zhu Yuanzhang would deem fit for his purpose.[30] Section 1A1 of the *Mencius*, which according to Zhao Qi 趙岐 (d. 201) sets the main theme of the entire book, is subsequently taken out.[31] With *Mencius* 1A2 also deleted on similar grounds, the *Mengzi jiewen* begins with *Mencius* 1A3.

Where he spotted a need for censorial action, Liu Sanwu did not doctor sentences, words, or characters but deleted entire sections (*zhang* 章) and noted that these sections would no longer be included in examination questions and topics.[32] As a result, the *Mengzi jiewen* carries only about two-thirds of the sections transmitted in Zhu Xi's *Mengzi jizhu* 孟子集注 (1177).[33]

In the sections deleted by Liu Sanwu we observe a clear focus on the relationship between subjects and rulers, a crucial point in the Mencian political philosophy that Zhu Yuanzhang found particularly difficult to endorse. In his preface to the *Mengzi jiewen* the *realpolitiker* Liu Sanwu summarized his objections to the *Mencius* with reference to its historical environment. The current situation under the first Ming emperor, Liu argued, was fundamentally different from the Warring States (475–221 B.C.E.) environment in which the Mencian argument was situated. Strategies suitable then would thus not be applicable under the newly established regime. In his view, the Mencian strategies and postulates

> …在當時列國諸侯可也。 若夫天下一君，四海一國， 人人同一尊君親上之心，學者或不得其扶持名教之本意。[34]
>
> …were allowable in those days of various states and titled lords. Nowadays there is one ruler of the "all-under-heaven," one state within the four seas, and all men are united in their mind of honoring the ruler and having affection for the supreme [emperor], [but] some scholars do not grasp his genuine intention to support the venerated teachings [on Confucian morality and ethics].

In the reception history of the *Mencius,* Zhu Yuanzhang—and Liu Sanwu with him—stands in an illustrious line of scholars who vented their skepticism about or outright denial of the efficiency of core political concepts outlined in the *Mencius.*[35] Though Zhu Yuanzhang and Liu Sanwu clearly paid lip service to—or may even have agreed with—some of the more widely shared aspects of its general ethics, the book *Mencius* and its commentarial traditions provided no valuable perspectives for some of their more pressing lines of inquiry. From an exegetical standpoint, the crucial task of interpreters, namely to take older traditions and reinterpret them in light of their own situation, seemed impossible: the deficit of the *Mencius* could not be bridged; central portions of the book were deemed to be "beyond repair." Rather than attempting to have the message of the *Mencius* adjusted to Zhu Yuanzhang's needs through reinterpretation of the main text, he thus decided to repress the operative force of the Mencian tradition.[36] With interpretative projections of meaning being rooted in the situation of the interpreter, the sections expurgated by Liu Sanwu, which can be divided into the following groups, offer insights into Zhu Yuanzhang's political and social philosophy.[37] None of the following five topic areas was a natural paradigm for the first Ming emperor to employ.[38]

1. Sections in which the *Mencius* proposes the people as the ultimate locus of political sovereignty: the Mencian hierarchy (in descending order: people, state, ruler) clashed with the emperor wielding power oppressively and striving at ruling with absolute power. This includes Mencian views on the prerogatives and duties of rulers, namely to serve and look after their people.[39]
2. Sections in which the *Mencius* explores its vision of an idealized relationship between ruler and subject: from the Northern Song (960–1127) onward, this had become an increasingly popular stance among officials. In Zhu Yuanzhang's view, the teachings of the *Mencius* led to unrest and lack of respect for the ruler; and he took decisive action wherever he encountered any signs of these.

3. Sections in which the *Mencius* discusses the possibility of dethroning a ruler and the conditions under which such an act would be legitimate.
4. Sections in which the *Mencius* hints at a certain degree of (intellectual) autonomy of members of the educated class, which, in the eyes of Zhu Yuanzhang, led to insufficient subordination and disputatious officials.
5. Sections in which the *Mencius* makes pacifistic statements or argues against the wars between titled lords that lead to nothing but suffering and destruction.[40]

Though Zhu Yuanzhang's attempts to eradicate Mencius from the Confucian pantheon were short-lived, the case of the *Mengzi jiewen* remains rather unique—so unique, in fact, that some challenged the historical truthfulness of accounts of the first Ming emperor's anti-Mencian activities.[41] Some go so far as to urge us to disregard entirely the *Mengzi jiewen* in our considerations and discourses. Because of—what he perceived as—a lack of reliable records, the eminent Qing scholar Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊 (1629–1709), among others, refused to regard accounts of Zhu Yuanzhang's censorship of the *Mencius* as trustworthy.[42]

What may have seemed most inconceivable in the traditional environment is the candid nature of Zhu Yuanzhang's management of orthodoxy. Whereas other rulers adjusted the classics—or had them adjusted—to their needs via exegetical procedures without major amendments of the venerated main texts (*jingwen*), Zhu Yuanzhang stands out in assigning to himself such authority over the main text of a classic as to be permitted to make significant editorial changes.[43] And in contrast to others who engaged in censorship and who made possession or dissemination of uncensored material a criminal offense, Zhu Yuanzhang allowed the unabridged version of the *Mencius* to remain in circulation. If the examination system is seen as a means to implement a new state orthodoxy, the decision to keep the uncensored version in circulation may be understood as a confident manifestation of imperial power that is—inter alia—formulated through and symbolized in the bold contrast between the old and the new *Mencius.*

The founding father of the Ming dynasty attributed great importance to education; his efforts to establish schools throughout the empire are well documented.[44] And the Confucian classics, which are traditionally presumed to elevate their readers out of their own lives to another reality with overriding purposes and concerns, played a prominent role in this education campaign: they were held as an indispensable requisite in every household.[45] Within this context of education, the expurgated version, that is, the *Mengzi jiewen,* was established as the only valid version of the *Mencius* in the compulsory reading list for examination candidates. Its main purpose was to make a claim on its readership so as to rein in potential criticism rooted in the political philosophy

of the *Mencius.* As a function of the examination mechanism, education was the channel through which he promulgated and tried to enforce his "*Mencius* light," excerpts from one of the traditionally celebrated Confucian core readings cleansed of edges and potential points of reference for critical minds in an autocratic system.

Notes

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Ms. Liu Yangruxin and Ms. Eleanor Lipsey, both of the London School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), for their comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

The following abbreviations are used for collectanea:

CSJC	*Congshu jicheng* [*chubian*] 叢書集成 [初編]. 3,999 vols. Shanghai: Shangwu Yinshuguan, 1935–1937.
SBBY	*Sibu beiyao* 四部備要. 100 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1989.
SBCK	*Sibu congkan* [*zhengbian*] 四部叢刊 [正編]. 100 vols. Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu Yinshuguan, 1979.
SKJHSCK	*Siku jinhuishu congkan* 四庫禁燬書叢刊. 300 vols. Beijing: Beijing Chubanshe, 2000.
SKQS	*Siku quanshu* 四庫全書. 1,501 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1987.
SKQSCMCS	*Siku quanshu cunmu congshu* 四庫全書存目叢書. 1,298 vols. Jinan: Qi Lu Shushe, 1997.

1. Though highly authoritative at the time they were issued, only a fairly limited number of commentaries made by or attributed to emperors remained part of the canonized readings of the Confucian classics over more substantial periods of time. The preface (*xu* 序) and the commentary (*zhu* 注) on the *Xiaojing* 孝經 (722; revised 743) by Li Longji 李隆基 (685–762), i.e., Emperor Xuanzong of the Tang 唐玄宗 (r. 712–756), which—through the subcommentary of Yuan Xingchong 元行沖 (653–729)—fed into Xing Bing's 邢昺 (931–1010) subcommentary in the highly authoritative *Thirteen Classics* of 1815/1816, may serve as an example here for an imperial reading that exercised considerable influence on the subsequent reception of this elementary teaching material. Li Longji brought together the conflicting commentarial traditions deriving from the works of Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200) and Kong Anguo 孔安國 (d. ca. 100). For the imperial commentary and preface see Li Shuchang 黎庶昌 (1837–1897) and Yang Shoujing 楊守敬 (1839–1915), *Guyi congshu* 古逸叢書 (Tokyo: Published by the compiler, 1882–1884), 5:1a–5b (preface) and 5:5b–25b (commentary). Cf. also Ruan Yuan 阮元, *Shisan jing zhushu* [*fu jiaokanji*] 十三經注疏 [附校勘記] ([1815/1816], 8 vols. (Taipei: Yiwen Yinshuguan, 1985), vol. 8.

2. For further comments on Zhu Yuanzhang "rectifying the classics" see the notes by Zhu Yunming 祝允明 (1461–1527) under the heading "Zheng jing zhuan" 正經傳 in his

Qianwenji 前聞記, in Deng Shilong 鄧士龍, *Guochao diangu* 國朝典故, 3 vols. (Beijing: Beijing Daxue Chubanshe, 1993), vol. 2, pp. 1389–1390 (*juan* 62).

3. See the "Introduction" (*tiyao* 提要) to *Shu zhuan huixuan* 書傳會選, *SKQS* 61, 1a–4b, esp. 1b; cf. also Ming T'ai-tsu and Romeyn Taylor, "Ming Tai-tsu's 'Essay on the Revolutions of the Seven Luminaries and the Body of Heaven'," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102, no. 1 (1982): 93–97, esp. p. 93. The *Shu zhuan huixuan* is also known as *Shangshu huixuan* 尚書會選. On some of Liu Sanwu's amendments to Cai's readings see the comments by Zhu Yunming in his *Qianwenji,* in *Guochao diangu,* vol. 2, pp. 1389–1390 (*juan* 62); cf. also Zhu Yunming, *Yeji* 野集, 4 *juan,* in *Guochao diangu,* vol. 1, pp. 496–497 (*juan* 31). Prior to this attempt to rectify and improve Cai's readings of the *Shangshu* 尚書, we observe a number of efforts to correct Cai's version, including Zhang Baoshu 張葆舒 (Yuan dynasty) in his *Cai zhuan dingwu* 蔡傳定誤; Huang Jingchang 黃景昌 (early fourteenth cent.) in his *Cai shi zhuan zhengwu* 蔡氏傳正誤; and, among others, the two *Shujing* commentaries by Chen Li 陳櫟 (1252–1334), namely his *Shu zhuan zhezhong* 書傳折衷 and his *Shangshu jizhuan zuanshu* 尚書集傳纂疏. See Yves Hervouet, *A Sung Bibliography* (*Bibliographie des Sung*) (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1978), pp. 22–23. On Liu Sanwu and his works see L. Carrington Goodrich and Chaoying Fang, eds., *Dictionary of Ming Biography 1366–1644,* 2 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), vol. 1, pp. 956–958.

4. Cai's *Shu jizhuan* was established as the standard commentary for civil examinations under Emperor Renzong 仁宗 (r. 1312–1320) of the Yuan (1279–1368). It was in circulation under a number of alternate titles including *Shangshu jizhuan* 尚書集傳 and *Shujing jizhuan* 書經集傳. For Zhu Xi's corrections on the chapters "Yao dian" 堯典, "Shun dian" 舜典, and "Da Yu mo" 大禹謀 see the "Preface" (*xu*) to the *Shu jizhuan* 書集傳, *SKQS* 58, 1a–2b. Later, the *Shu jizhuan* served as the primary base when Hu Guang 胡廣 (1370–1418) and others, again under imperial direction, compiled their *Shu zhuan daquan* 書傳大全 as part of the *Wujing daquan* 五經大全 (1415) project. And it served again as a base for the [*Qinding*] *Shujing zhuanshuo huizuan* [欽定] 書經傳說會纂 (1730) by Wang Xuling 王頊齡 (1642–1725) and others.

5. See Zhang Tingyu 張廷玉 (1672–1755) et al., *Mingshi* 明史 (1739), 28 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, [1974] 1987), 96:2352, 137:3942, 137:3955, and the various prefaces to the *Shu zhuan huixuan.* Cf. Goodrich and Fang, *Dictionary of Ming Biography,* vol. 1, pp. 362–363.

6. On competing orthodoxies from the Song to the Ming see Thomas A. Wilson, "The Ritual Formation of Confucian Orthodoxy and the Descendants of the Sage," *Journal of Asian Studies* 55, no. 3 (1996): 559–584, esp. pp. 560–563.

7. For more detailed investigations see Ho Yun-i, "The Organization and Functions of the Ministry of Rites in the Early Ming Period (1368–1398)" (unpubl. Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1976), and Ho Yun-i [He Yunyi 賀 允宜], *The Ministry of Rites and Suburban Sacrifices in Early Ming* [*Ming chu de li bu ji jiao si* 明初的禮部及郊祀] (in English) (Taipei: Shuang-yeh Bookstore, 1980). I am also indebted to Dr. Zhan Beibei's research on changes in the official prescriptions for marriage rituals applicable to imperial princes under Zhu Yuanzhang; see Beibei Zhan, "Deciphering a Tool of Imperial Rule: A Case Study of the Marriage Rituals for Imperial Princes during the Hongwu Reign" (unpubl. Ph.D. diss., SOAS, 2015).

Cf. also Edward L. Farmer: "Social Regulations of the First Ming Emperor: Orthodoxy as a Function of Authority," in *Orthodoxy in Late Imperial China,* ed. Liu Kwang-ching (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), pp. 103–125, esp. pp. 107–111.

8. See the comments in Wolfgang Franke, *An Introduction to the Sources of Ming History* (Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1968), esp. pp. 98–118.

9. See, e.g., Li Xian's 李賢 (1408–1466) *Gurang zalu* 古穰雜錄 (1460s), *CSJC* 3962, p. 10.

10. For one such case see his reading of *Lunyu* 2.16, which coincides with explanations offered by Sun Yi 孫奕 (d. after 1205) in his *Lüzhai Shierbian* 履齋示兒編 (1205), *SBCK*, 5:15a (442); cf. Bernhard Fuehrer: "Did the Master Instruct His Followers to Attack Heretics? A Note on Readings of *Lunyu* 2.16," in *Reading East Asian Writing: The Limits of Literary Theory,* ed. Michel Hockx and Ivo Smits (London: RoutledgeCurzon Press, 2003), pp. 117–158.

11. Whereas it is well known that at the beginning of his enterprise Zhu Yuanzhang was rather undereducated, he later achieved a good command and knowledge of classical learning and literature; see Zhao Yi's 趙翼 (1727–1814) appraisal in his article "Mingzu wenyi" 明祖文義, in Zhao Yi, *Nian'er shi zhaji* 廿二史箚記 (1799), *SBBY* 51, pp. 387–388 (*juan* 32), and the references in Hok-lam Chan: "Xie Jin (1369–1415) as Imperial Propagandist: His Role in the Revisions of the *Ming Taizu Shilu,*" in *T'oung Pao* 91, nos. 1/3 (2005): 58–124, esp. p. 61.

12. With regard to the short period of its effectiveness, we note that the bibliographical chapter of the *Mingshi* as well as the magisterial *Siku quanshu zongmu* 四庫全書總目 (1782), 2 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, [1965] 1987) both fail to list the *Mengzi jiewen.* Though Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊 (1629–1709) records the *Mengzi jiewen* in his *Jingyikao* 經義考, *juan* 235, he notes that he had not seen it; see Zhu Yizun: *Jingyikao* 經義考 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1998), p. 1192. As it is absent from the important catalogs of private book collectors (for one of the rare exceptions see the reference to the *Dushu minqiu ji* in note 13 below) it would appear that copies were exceptionally rare during later Ming and Manchu times. This is also confirmed by a catalog entry on a Hongwu block print in Mo Boji's 莫伯驥 (1878–1958) *Wushiwanjuanlou cangshu mulu chubian* 五十萬卷樓藏書目錄初編 (Taipei: Guangwen Shuju, 1967), p. 355, where it is noted that no recent prints of the *Mengzi jiewen* were available. For the short entry on the *Mengzi jiewen* in the more recent continuation of the *Siku quanshu* catalog see *Xuxiu Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao: Jing bu* 續修四庫全書總目提要 • 經部, 2 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1993), vol. 2, p. 921.

13. The book collector Qian Zeng 錢曾 (1629–1701) has a somewhat different take on this and states that Liu Sanwu cleansed the *Mencius* text of "impurities" (*wei chun* 未醇), which Qian Zeng—with direct reference to Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824)—sees as a result of the *Mencius* text being put together posthumously by disciples of Mencius; see Qian Zeng, *Dushu minqiu ji* 讀書敏求記 (1726), *CSJC* 49, 1:13, and Han Yu, "Da Zhang Ji shu" 答張籍書, in Ma Qichang 馬其昶, *Han Changli wenji jiaozhu* 韓昌黎文集校注 (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1986), pp. 30–133, esp. p. 132. Similar arguments about the transmitted text as a twisted representation of Mencius' statements, and about these distortions being caused by the way in which the text of the *Mencius* came into being, have also been made by scholars such as Feng Xiu 馮休 in his *Shan Meng* 刪孟, 2 *juan,* and Sima

Guang 司馬光 (1019–1086) in his *Yi Meng* 疑孟, 1 *juan.* Though Sima Guang found the *Mencius* objectionable and considered it a fabrication of the Later Han (25–220) period, his own son (nephew?) Sima Kang 司马康 (1050–1090) adhered to the orthodox reception and dominant evaluation of this book and its philosophy; see *Qingxi xiabi* 清溪暇筆, 2 *juan,* in *Guochao diangu,* vol. 2, p. 1451 (*juan* 63). On Sima Kang's father see the debate in Song Yanshen 宋衍申, "Sima Kang wei Sima Guang zhi qin suo sheng" 司马康为司马光之亲所生, *Guji zhengli yanjiu xuekan* 古籍整理研究学刊 1 (1986): 30–31; Zheng Bijun 郑必俊, "Dui 'Sima Kang wei Sima Guang zhi qin suo sheng' yi wen shangque" 对司马康为司马光之亲所生一文商榷, *Guji zhengli yanjiu xuekan* 1 (1987): 30–34; and Yan Zhongqi 颜中其, "Sima Kang wei Sima Guang xiong qinzi" 司马康为司马光兄亲子, *Guji zhengli yanjiu xuekan* 3 (1988): 53–57.

14. See also Liang Yi 梁億 (*jinshi* 1511), *Zunwenlu* 尊聞錄, in *Guochao diangu,* vol. 2, p. 1426 (*juan* 62), who records Zhu Yuanzhang reproaching Mencius for his irreverence (*bu xun* 不遜). The exact dating of this event provided in the sources differs but they agree insofar as that it reportedly took place during the first few years of the Hongwu period, namely between 1368 and 1372/1373. For the removal of Mencius from the temple and for his reinstallation a year after this event see also *Mingshi* 50:1296.

15. See Quan Zuwang 全祖望, *Jieqiting ji* 鮚埼亭集 (1804), *SBCK* 85, 35:3a–4b (370). Zhu Yuanzhang also considered removing the *Mencius* from the curriculum for civil examinations. On this and his attempts to remove the tablet of Mencius from the Confucius temple see also Tu Shan 涂山, *Mingzheng tongzong* 明政統宗 (1615 block print), *SKJHSCK, Shi* 2, 5:11a (215), and *Mingzheng tongzong* (1615 block print), 7 vols. (Taipei: Chengwen Chubanshe, 1969), vol. 2, 5:11a (497). Cf. also Ho Yun-i, *The Ministry of Rites and Suburban Sacrifices in Early Ming,* p. 80; Benjamin A. Elman, " 'Where is King Ch'eng?' Civil Examinations and Confucian Ideology during the Early Ming (1368–1415)," *T'oung Pao* 79, nos. 1/3 (1993): 23–68, esp. p. 44; and Goodrich and Fang, *Dictionary of Ming Biography,* vol. 1, p. 389. Though Zhu Yuanzhang later managed to remove the tablet of Mencius from the Confucius temple, the status of Mencius and his place in the Confucian pantheon were restored by Zhu's son Zhu Di 朱棣 (1360–1424) during the Yongle reign period. Cf. Zhu Honglin 朱鴻林, "Ming Taizu de Kongzi chongbai" 明太祖的孔子崇拜, *Lishi Yuyan Yanjiusuo jikan* 歷史語言研究所集刊 70, no. 2 (1999): 483–530. For other changes to the Confucian pantheon under Zhu Yuanzhang such as the removal of Yang Xiong 揚雄 (53 B.C.–A.D. 18) and the integration of Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (179–104 B.C.) in 1396 see Gu Yingtai 谷應泰 (*jinshi* 1647), *Mingshi jishi benmo* 明史紀事本末 (1658), *CSJC* (reprint of a 1879 block print) 3918–3927, vol. 2, p. 84 (*juan* 14).

16. See Quan Zuwang, *Jieqiting ji,* 35:3a–4b (370). This anecdote appears, with some modifications, in a number of sources. *Mingshi* 139:3982 records it in the biography of Qian Tang 錢唐 (1314–1394) and states that Zhu Yuanzhang considered the speech transmitted in *Mencius* 4B3 utterly inappropriate for any subject, and that he would regard those who argued in support of such thought (like Qian Tang) guilty of *lèse majesté* (*da bu jing* 大不敬). On this incident see also the discussion in Huang Yunmei 黃雲眉, *Mingshi kaozheng* 明史考證, 8 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1979), vol. 4, pp. 1189–1191. Qian Zeng relates that Zhu Yuanzhang's reaction to reading this passage in *Mencius* 4B3 was to order Liu Sanwu to censor the *Mencius.* The modern compilers of the *Xuxiu Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao: Jing bu,*

vol. 2, p. 921, also copied this anecdote into their entry on the *Mengzi jiewen* and describe it as the event that led to Liu Sanwu producing the *Mengzi jiewen.* Others see the narrative about Zhu Yuanzhang reading *Mencius* 4B3 as an earlier event that triggered an entirely separate attempt at dealing with perceived inadequacies in the *Mencius.* In his *Shuanghuai suichao* 雙槐歲抄, 10 *juan* (1495), Huang Yu 黃瑜 (1425–1497) also reports on this event but does not relate it to the compilation of the *Mengzi jiewen;* see Huang Yu, 黃瑜 *Shuanghuai suichao* 雙槐歲抄 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, [1999] 2012), *Lidai shiliao biji congkan: Yuan Ming shiliao biji congkan* 歷代史料筆記叢刊 : 元明史料筆記叢刊, pp. 12–13.

17. *Sishu jizhu* 四書集注 [Song block print] (Taipei: Xuehai Chubanshe, 1984), pp. 307–308 (*Mencius* 4B3).

18. The reading of the term *guoren* 國人 as "passerby" follows Zhu Xi's gloss; see *Sishu jizhu,* pp. 307–308.

19. For other translations see D. C. Lau, *Mencius* (London: Penguin, 1970), p. 128, and Bryan W. Van Norden, *Mengzi: With Selections from Traditional Commentaries* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2008), p. 104.

20. The official account in the *Mingshi* does not seem to be particularly forthcoming on this: in the biography of Qian Tang it states: "but in the end [the emperor] ordered (a) Confucian minister(s) to prepare the *Mengzi jiewen*" (然卒命儒臣修孟子節文); see *Mingshi* 139:3982; cf. also Chen Jian 陳建 (1497–1567) (with additions by Jiang Xuqi 江旭奇), *Huang Ming tongji jiyao* 皇明通紀集要 [late Ming block print], *SKJHSCK*, *Shi* 34, 9:5b (120). With reference to this account Benjamin Elman seems to suggest that Qian Tang agreed to excise passages deemed insulting to the imperial authority (*bu jing* 不敬) from the *Mencius;* see Elman, "Where is King Ch'eng?" p. 44. However, no such early version of the *Mencius* cleansed (by Qian Tang?) of passages that Zhu Yuanzhang judged as an offense to his sovereign power has yet been identified or located. In the *Mingshi* as well as elsewhere, Qian Tang is portrayed as a dedicated defender of Confucius, Mencius, and the Cheng-Zhu orthodoxy who managed to change the emperor's mind on a number of occasions. In an earlier episode when the emperor restricted sacrifices to Confucius to celebrations at the master's old hometown (1369), Zhu Yuanzhang did not, at first, listen to Qian Tang's objections but only "followed his advice" (*yong qi yan* 用其言) after "a long time" (*jiu zhi* 久之) in 1382 when the nationwide sacrifices were reinstated; see *Mingshi* 139:3982. As the narrative of this incident (as well as accounts of other events) in the *Mingshi* jumps forward in time by a considerable number of years, we understand *zu* 卒 (in the end) in the reference to the compilation of the *Mengzi jiewen* as pointing to a much later event, namely the censoring of the *Mencius* under Liu Sanwu (1394). On the restoration of the civil examinations in 1384/1385 see Zhang Chaorui 張朝瑞 (1536–1603), *Huang Ming gongju kao* 皇明貢舉考 (1589), *XXSKQS* 828, 1:4a–4b (149).

21. Following the abolition of the post of prime minister in 1380, the status of the Hanlin Academy, an eminent locus in the interaction between imperial power and scholarship, was readjusted and transformed to formulate and implement imperially sanctioned doctrines and orthodoxies more efficiently. On the Hanlin Academy during the Hongwu period see Zheng Liju 郑礼炬, "Mingdai Hongwu zhi Zhengde nianjian de Hanlinyuan yu wenxue" 明代洪武至正德年间的翰林院与文学 (unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Nanjing Shifan Daxue, 2006), esp. pp. 49–78.

22. The *Mengzi jiewen* was the standard *Mencius* version for civil examinations between 1394 and 1411. With the *Mengzi jiewen* being submitted to the throne just a few months after completion of his *Shu zhuan huixuan* in 1394, it appears that although Liu Sanwu worked simultaneously on these two works for some time, he applied rather different strategies to ensure adherence to imperial directives; cf. the notes by Song Duanyi 宋端儀 (1447–1501) in his *Lizhai xianlu* 立齋閒錄, 4 *juan,* in *Guochao diangu,* vol. 2, pp. 913–914 (*juan* 39). The imperial order to compile the *Mengzi jiewen* was issued in 1390; see, e.g., Peng Sunyi 彭孫貽 (1615–1673), *Mingshi jishi benmo bubian* 明史紀事本末補編, 5 *juan* (*juan* 1), in *Lidai jishi benmo* 歷代紀事本末, 2 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1997), vol. 2, p. 1516. Cf. Liu Sanwu, "*Mengzi jiewen* tici" 孟子節文題辭, 3a–3b, in *Mengzi jiewen* 孟子節文 (1394), 1a–4b, in *Beijing Tushuguan guji zhenben congkan* 北京圖書館古籍珍本叢刊 (Beijing: Shumu Wenxian Chubanshe, 1988–) 1:955–1016, esp. p. 956, on Liu Sanwu working on the two projects at the same time. For a rounded discussion of the *Mengzi jiewen* and related issues see Zhang Jiajia 张佳佳, "Mengzi jiewen yanjiu" 孟子节文研究 (unpubl. M.A. diss., Qinghua Daxue, 2007), and Wolfgang Ommerborn, "Der Ming-Kaiser Taizu und das *Mengzi jiewen,*" in Wolfgang Ommerborn, Gregor Paul, and Heiner Roetz, *Das Buch Mengzi im Kontext der Menschrechtsfrage,* 2 vols. (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2011), vol. 1, pp. 419–439.

23. See the imperial preface to the *Sishu jizhu daquan* 四書集注大全, *SKQSCMCS, Jing* 170, 1a–11a (641–646), and Elman, "Where is King Ch'eng?" pp. 50–58. See also Pan Chengzhang 潘檉章 (1626–1663), *Guoshi kaoyi* 國史考異, 6 *juan,* in Chen Shoushi 陳守實 et al., *Mingshi kaozheng juewei* 明史考證抉微 (Taipei: Xuesheng Shuju, 1968), p. 113 (*Guoshi kaoyi, juan* 3, chap. 17), where Pan Chengzhang elaborates on the negative effects of the *Mengzi jiewen* on the orthodox transmission of the "wisdom of the ancient sages"; cf. *Guoshi kaoyi, XXSKQS* 452, 3:27b–29b (58–59). For the commentary versions of the *Five Classics* and the *Four Books* used in examinations during the reign of Zhu Yuanzhang see Zhang Chaorui, *Huang Ming gongju kao,* 1:4b–5b (149).

24. See Liu Sanwu, "*Mengzi jiewen* tici," 1a–4b (955–956).

25. Liu Sanwu, "*Mengzi jiewen* tici," 1a (955):…以功利為尚, 不復知有仁義.

26. For *Mencius* 1A1 see *Sishu jizhu,* pp. 197–198; Lau, *Mencius,* p. 49; and Van Norden, *Mengzi,* pp. 1–2.

27. As indicated in the translation above, the last phrase of this passage carries some ambiguity. If read in relation to the encounter(s) between Mencius and King Hui of Liang, a reading such as "…and in the end [the king] could not accept his suggestions" seems appropriate. Where this is contextualized as part of Liu Sanwu's concluding statement regarding the preceding examples of expurgated passages, it may be perceived as part of his argument for censoring the *Mencius.* In this case, we observe a switch of focus that leads to a more general perspective: "…and in the end his suggestions cannot be accepted" by the emperor (Zhu Yuanzhang), Liu Sanwu (who carried out the imperial will), and indeed, by extension, anyone.

28. Liu Sanwu, "*Mengzi jiewen* tici," 1b (955).

29. *Mingshi* 135:3923, for example, records Zhu Yuanzhang's approval of humankindness (*ren*) and sense of duty (*yi*) as guiding principles, his verdict that it was the lack of these two virtues that led to Xiang Yu's 項羽 (232–202 B.C.) defeat, and his intention to not

make the same mistake as Xiang Yu. For Zhu Yuanzhang's views on humankindness (*ren*) as a strategic requisite in warfare see also *Ming Taizu shilu* 16:1b (vol. 1, p. 214).

30. On the wider perspective of Zhu Yuanzhang's limited commitment to a Confucian worldview and his selective approach to its teachings see Farmer, "Social Regulations of the First Ming Emperor," p. 108. For another interpretation of Zhu Yuanzhang's esteem for Confucius and the teachings attributed to him see Zhu Honglin, "Ming Taizu de Kongzi chongbai," pp. 483–530, whose arguments appear to be embedded in the contemporary discourse on a so-called renaissance of Confucianism. John D. Langlois, Jr. and Sun K'o-k'uan 孫克寬, "'Three Teachings Eclecticism' and the Thought of Ming T'ai-tsu," in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 43, no. 1 (1983): 97–139, describe Zhu Yuanzhang as "a syncretist at heart" (quote, p. 97).

31. See Zhao Qi's 趙岐 note in his *Mengzi shisi juan* 孟子十四卷, *SBCK* 2, 1:1a (4). On this earliest extant commentary on the *Mencius* see Bernhard Fuehrer, "*Mencius* for Han Readers: Commentarial Features and Hermeneutical Strategies in Zhao Qi's Work on the *Mencius*," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 164, no. 2 (2014): 501–526.

32. See Liu Sanwu, "*Mengzi jiewen* tici," 3b (956). A close textual comparison of the *jingwen* in *Mengzi jiewen* and in Zhu Xi's version of the *Mencius* reveals a few minor textual discrepancies, none of which, however, has a major impact on the message. Liu Sanwu's approach to the text also means that in the context of Zhu Yuanzhang's literary persecution (*wenziyu* 文字獄), otherwise tabooed characters (such as *zei* 賊) remained unchanged in the *Mengzi jiewen.* On the literary persecution during the Hongwu reign see also the sources listed in Bernhard Fuehrer, "An Inauspicious Quotation or a Case of Impiety? Mr. Zhang and Literary Persecution under the First Ming Emperor," in *China and her Biographical Dimensions: Commemorative Essays for Helmut Martin,* ed. Christina Neder et al. (Bern: Peter Lang, 2001), pp. 75–82. Cf. also Hok-lam Chan, "Ming T'ai-tsu's Manipulation of Letters: Myth and Reality of Literary Persecution" [reprint from *Journal of Asian History* 29 [1995]: 1–60), in Hok-lam Chan, *Ming Taizu (r. 1368–98) and the Foundation of the Ming Dynasty in China* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2011)]. For a discussion of the *Mencius* in civil examinations during the Ming see Benjamin A. Elman, *A Cultural History of Civil Examinations in Late Imperial China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), pp. 78–88. It seems noteworthy that although Liu Sanwu clearly confirmed that the expurgated sections of the *Mencius* would no longer be included in the exams, Huang Yu reports that, in fact, from 1384/1385 (Hongwu *jiazi* 洪武甲子) onward there was no fixed rule for selection of the three examination topics on the *Four Books,* and that some exams did not include the *Mencius;* see Huang Yu, *Shuanghuai suichao,* p. 91 (*juan* 5), and the quote of this passage in Zhang Chaorui, *Huang Ming gongju kao,* 1:5b (149). The omission of topics on the *Mencius* seems to indicate a certain disinclination of top scholars to fully implement the imperial directives via the examination system.

33. See Zhu Ronggui 朱榮貴, "Cong Liu Sanwu *Mengzi jiewen* lun junquan de xianzhi yu zhishi fenzi zhi zizhuxing" 從劉三吾孟子節文論君權的限制與知識份子之自主性, *Zhongguo Wenzhe jikan* 中國文哲研究季刊 6 (1995): 173–198, esp. p. 179. As the *Mengzi jiewen* carries 172 out of the 260 sections in the *Mengzi jizhu,* Liu Sanwu deleted a total of 88 sections from the *Mencius.* Cf. also Huang Jingfang 黃景昉 (1596–1662), *Guoshi*

weiyi 國史唯疑 (Taipei: Zhengzhong Shuju, 1969), pp. 32–33. (*juan* 1), who, like many others, follows Liu Sanwu's count of 85 omitted sections; see Liu Sanwu, "*Mengzi jiewen* tici," 3b (956).

34. Liu Sanwu, "*Mengzi jiewen* tici," 2b–3a (955–956).

35. These include early figures such as Xunzi 荀子 and Wang Chong 王充 (27–ca. 97), and a considerable number of Song scholars such as He She 何涉 (fl. 1041), Sima Guang, Li Gou 李覯 (1009–1059), Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037–1101), and so forth. For concise summaries on the anti-Mencian points of view in the wider political and philosophical context of the Song see Huang Chun-chieh (黃俊傑), *Mencian Hermeneutics: A History of Interpretations in China* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001), pp. 155–171, and Huang Junjie 黃俊傑, *Mengzi sixiangshi lun* 孟子思想史論 (Taipei: Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan, 1997), vol. 2, pp. 127–190.

36. In his *Mingshi jishi benmo bubian, juan* 1, Peng Sunyi notes that "all [passages] which do not focus on [the proper] respect for the ruler such as '[if the ruler] is remonstrated but does not listen, then [he] is to be removed from [his] position' [諫而不聽則易位] [*Mencius* 5B9] or '[the] ruler is the least important' [君為輕] [*Mencius* 7B14] and the like were all to be expurgated"; see *Mingshi jishi benmo bubian, juan* 1, in *Lidai jishi benmo,* vol. 2, p. 1516. The quote from *Mencius* 5B9 exhibits significant omissions; compare *Sishu jizhu,* p. 350; Lau, *Mencius,* p. 159; and Van Norden, *Mengzi,* p. 142. On *Mencius* 7B14 see *Sishu jizhu,* pp. 403–404; Lau, *Mencius,* pp. 195–196; and Van Norden, *Mengzi,* p. 187. On the passages quoted by Peng Sunyi see also Chen Jian, *Huang Ming tongji jiyao,* 9:6a (120). Cf. Huang Yunmei, *Mingshi kaozheng,* vol. 4, p. 1191, who emphasizes that the *Mengzi jiewen* contains only a small fraction of the "real spirit" of the *Mencius.* The excision of *Mencius* 5B9 and 7B14 is also mentioned in Liu Sanwu, "*Mengzi jiewen* tici," 2b (955). As Huang Jingfang, *Guoshi weiyi,* p. 32 (*juan* 1), draws our attention to the omission of *Mencius* section 2A2, we note that *Mencius* 2A ("Gongsun Chou: Shang") begins with section 5. The first four sections of this chapter are omitted.

37. On the *Mengzi jiewen* as a means of indoctrination and a document transmitting insights into despotism in action see Rong Zhaozu 容肇祖, "Ming Taizu de *Mengzi jiewen*" 明太祖的孟子節文, *Dushu yu chuban* 讀書與出版 2, no. 4 (1947): 16–21, esp. p. 18.

38. For the first four groups of topic areas see Zhu Ronggui, "Liu Sanwu *Mengzi jiewen,*" pp. 184–191. The last group follows a suggestion in Jiang Guozhu 姜国柱, "Wenhua zhuanzhi de yi li: Zhu Yuanzhang de *Mengzi jiewen*" 文化专制的一例：朱元璋的孟子节文, *Liaoning Daxue xuebao* 辽宁大学学报 3 (1981): 17–19, esp. p. 18. Rong Zhaozu, "Ming Taizu de *Mengzi jiewen,*" pp. 18–21, identified a total of eleven doctrines eradicated from the Mencius.

39. Under the ninth moon of the fifth year of the Hongwu period, the *Ming Taizu shilu* 明太祖實錄, in *Ming shilu* 明實錄 (Taipei: Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan, 1962–1968), 76:4b (vol. 4, p. 1402), records that in his earlier years Zhu Yuanzhang followed the concept of the "people as the root/basis of the country" (*guo yi min wei ben* 國以民為本). And under the fourth moon of the third year of his reign, *Ming Taizu shilu* 51:8a (vol. 3, p. 1005) records his use of the analogy of the people as the water and the ruler as a boat. Further to this, Zhu Yuanzhang presented "himself in temples of Confucius in 1356 and 1360…, bestowed honors on the heirs of the sage…," and "granted special privileges to the descen-

dents of the disciple Yen Hui 顏回 and of Mencius 孟子" (quotes from Romeyn Taylor, *Basic Annals of Ming Tai-tsu* [San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1975], p. 19). For a discussion of the source material regarding his attitude toward descendents of Confucius see Zhu Honglin, "Ming Taizu de Kongzi chongbai," pp. 504–513. Notwithstanding a few (possibly rhetorical) references to these political concepts during his later years, the sources seem to suggest a personal development that made it increasingly difficult for the emperor to subscribe to the political concepts outlined in the *Mencius.*

40. For Zhu Yuanzhang commenting on the negative consequences of prolonged fighting on agricultural production at the end of the Mongol period see *Ming Taizu shilu,* 22:1a (vol. 1, p. 313), and Taylor, *Basic Annals of Ming Tai-tsu,* p. 52.

41. See, e.g., Jia Naiqian 贾乃谦, "Cong *Mengzi jiewen* dao *Qianshu*" 从孟子节文到潜书, *Dongbei Shida xuebao* 东北师大学报 2 (1987): 43–50, esp. pp. 43–44. The *Ming Taizu shilu* deals with the *Mengzi jiewen* only cursorily, and Zhu Yuanzhang's other anti-Mencian activities such as the removal of Mencius from the Confucius temple do not seem to attract much of the compilers' interest.

42. See Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊, *Pushuting ji* 曝書亭集, *SBCK* 81, 69:8b–9b, esp. 69:9a (526). Zhu Yizun understands Zhu Yuanzhang as showing great respect for Confucius and therefore finds it inconceivable that such a man would censor the *Mencius.* Others who rejected the historical truthfulness of the so-called "Qian Tang incident" and of Zhu Yuanzhang's censoring of the *Mencius* include Tan Qian 談遷, *Guoque* 國榷, 6 vols. (Beijing: Guji Chubanshe, 1958), vol. 1, p. 478 ("Taizu Hongwu wu nian"); cf. Zhu Honglin, "Ming Taizu de Kongzi chongbai," pp. 483–530. For discussions of relevant material see Huang Yunmei, *Mingshi kaozheng,* vol. 4, pp. 1189–1191, and Zhang Jiajia 张佳佳, "*Mengzi jiewen* shijian benmo kaobian" 孟子节文事件本末考辨, *Zhongguo wenhua yanjiu* 中国文化研究, 2006, pp. 84–93.

43. As far as we can see from the extant copies, it appears that the *Mengzi jiewen* circulated in two versions: one that carries only the main text with no glosses or commentary and one that includes Zhu Xi's glosses, which seem to remain unaltered. With regard to amending the main text of the classics, and without going into the thorny question of what happened to the classics during the Han period, scholars throughout the imperial periods (especially during the Song) adjusted the main text of the Confucian classics (and associated works), but they aimed at rectifying the text so as to arrive at good readings. For examples of emendations of the classics made by Song scholars see Ye Guoliang 葉國良, *Songren yijing gaijing kao* 宋人疑經改經考, *Wenshi congkan* 文史叢刊, 55 (Taipei: Guoli Taiwan Daxue, 1980). Needless to say, these activities are fundamentally different from the way in which Zhu Yuanzhang carried out his censoring exercise.

44. On the status of Confucian learning in the educational policies of Zhu Yuanzhang see Chen Hanming 陈寒鸣, "Hongwu Ruxue jiaoyu yu keju bagu de xingcheng" 洪武儒学教育与科举八股的形成, *Zhongzhou xuekan* 中州学刊 5 (1993): 105–111, and Chen Hanming 陈寒鸣, "Zai lun Hongwu Ruxue jiaoyu" 再论洪武儒学教育, *Hebei xuekan* 河北学刊 5 (1997): 60–63. On Zhu Yuanzhang's efforts to reshape the educational infrastructure see Wu Han 吳晗, "Mingchu de xuexiao" 明初的學校, *Qinghua xuebao* 清華學報 15, no. 1 (1948): 33–61. Sarah Schneewind, *Community Schools and the State in Ming China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), pp. 6–32, emphasizes the function of schools

as a means to uphold and enforce new state doctrines, and questions reports that suggest an efficient implementation of Zhu Yuanzhang's educational policies.

45. See Huang Pu 黃溥, *Xianzhong jingu lu* 閒中今古錄, 2b, in *Wuchao xiaoshu daguan* 五朝小說大觀 (1926), 6 vols. (Taipei: Guangwen Shuju, 1979), vol. 6, p. 2648. On the republication and dissemination of the *Five Classics* and the *Four Books* to schools at an earlier stage of Zhu Yuanzhang's career (1380–1381) see *Ming Taizu shilu,* 136:3b (vol. 5, p. 2154), and Taylor, *Basic Annals of Ming Tai-tsu,* p. 89. For the *Mengzi jiewen* and the *Shangshu huixuan* being distributed to schools throughout the empire see Liu Sanwu, "*Mengzi jiewen* tici," 3b (956), and the remark by Song Duanyi in his *Lizhai xianlu,* in *Guochao diangu,* vol. 2, p. 913 (*juan* 39).