

Intellectuals and Officials in Action: Academies and Granaries in Sung China

Since government officials assumed the prerogative to scrutinize all public activity, a persistent issue in Chinese life and thought has been how individuals might establish a meaningful arena for community action. Events in China during the last several years have in fact highlighted this with great clarity. In this paper I explore two of the most successful and famous institutions established through the community action of Sung (960–1279) intellectuals. Academies and granaries were “middle level” institutions that formed communities between the level of the family, on the one hand, and that of governmental structures, on the other. Recent studies have shown that there was a retrenchment in actual governmental control during the twelfth century that by default encouraged the elite to focus on local issues and alliances because the central government no longer played as large a role as it had during the eleventh century.¹ Such retrenchment also meant a government withdrawal from close supervision of monasteries and cloisters; therefore, there was more opportunity beyond the customary administrative scope of the state to develop lay Buddhist and Taoist associations.² These interpretations can enrich our understanding of the environment in which Sung intellectuals, especially Chu Hsi 朱熹 (1130–1200), gave a particularly Confucian imprint to local community institutions.

My own research suggests that current accounts of Chu Hsi as the “fountainhead” of such Confucian institutions during the Sung need to be qualified. I focus upon Chu Hsi’s first academy and first granary: the White

I thankfully acknowledge the support of the American Council of Learned Societies (from resources provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities) and by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Arizona State University. Comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this project were made by Professors James T. C. Liu and Wing-tsit Chan, as well as by my graduate students Ji Xiao-bin, Pang Huang, and Niu Pu. A pleasant evening debate with my teachers Monica and Ying-shih Yü was also very stimulating. This article is, in part, an answer to questions raised by Professors Yü and Chan; hence, it is dedicated to them. I also thank the Chinese University of Hong Kong for the invitation to present an earlier version at the conference on “Confucian Intellectuals: Ideals and Actions (with Emphasis on the Sung),” July 19–21, 1990.

¹ See especially Robert P. Hymes, *Statesmen and Gentlemen: The Elite of Fu-chou, Chiang-hsi, in Northern and Southern Sung* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1986).

² Chikusa Masaaki 竺沙雅童, *Chūgoku Bukkyō shakaishi kenkyū* 中國佛教社會史研究 (Kyoto: Dobunsha, 1982), pp. 262–65.

Deer Grotto Academy (Pai-lu-tung shu-yüan 白鹿洞書院) on Mount Lu 廬山 near Nan-k'ang, Kiangsi; and the community granary (*she-ts'ang* 社倉) in Ch'ung-an 崇安 county, Fukien. These two institutions have been the subject of excellent scholarly studies in recent years that provide a base for our further investigation and reflection.³ The White Deer Academy had flourished in the tenth and eleventh centuries, but had been abandoned for almost a century. Thus Chu had to reestablish it. In both projects, others perhaps played crucial roles that have not been fully appreciated by modern scholars. More might also need to be said about the role of official action in these projects.

A preliminary word should be said about terms. There is not necessarily complete congruence between the modern rubric "intellectuals" and the Sung category "literati" (*shih* 士, *shih-ta-fu* 士大夫, or *wen-jen* 文人). Nonetheless, it seems quite justifiable to discuss at least the leading thinkers among the literati in terms of an intelligentsia. James T. C. Liu has explicitly reserved the label "intellectuals" for the more profound thinkers among the literati, and I am following him on this point.⁴ Similarly, Benjamin Schwartz defends the appropriateness of using "intellectuals" to refer to many who emerged from the *shih* stratum in ancient China, for they had complex and problematic relationships to the sociopolitical order.⁵

In the case of academies, Chu Hsi was apparently influenced by Lü Tsu-ch'ien 呂祖謙 (1137-1181), probably Chu's closest friend. While I know of no place in Chu's writings where he explicitly admitted such a debt,

there is considerable circumstantial evidence. First, Lü established both studies (*ching-she* 精舍) and academies (*shu-yüan* 書院) before Chu did. This fact merely establishes the direction in which a possible influence might flow.

Second, despite being several years junior to Chu Hsi and Chang Shih 張栻 (1133-1180), Lü Tsu-ch'ien had become the most renowned teacher within the Tao-hsüeh 道學 (Learning of the Confucian Way) fellowship, or community, by the 1170s.⁶ No one within the Tao-hsüeh fellowship during the 1170s appears to have been as widely respected as scholar, educator, and statesman. He was the leading member of his generation from the most prestigious literati family of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Besides being one of only thirty-four men during the Sung to pass the Erudite Literatus (*po-hsüeh hung-tz'u* 博學宏詞) examination, he became by the end of the 1160s a professor in the university system. Emperor Hsiao-tsung 孝宗 (r. 1162-1189) appointed him as one of two chief examiners for the 1172 *chin-shih* 進士 examinations. A greater number of notable Tao-hsüeh thinkers were awarded degrees in this examination than in any other during the Sung. Not counting the case of Lu Chiu-yüan 陸九淵 (1139-1193), seven Tao-hsüeh men who would be proscribed at the end of the century earned their degrees at this time. Only one person who would later be identified as an opponent of Tao-hsüeh earned his degree that year. Such results were no mere coincidence. Lü's literary acumen was exceptional. So good was his recognition and memory of style that even though he had never met Lu Chiu-yüan and had previously read only a couple of the young candidate's pieces, Lü recognized Lu Chiu-yüan's paper in spite of the government's safeguards to prevent the examiners from knowing whose paper they were grading. So secure was Lü's reputation that he even announced his discovery and was never penalized for favoritism in violation of the state's rules to ensure an impartial grading system. Having had such a spectacular impact, it is not surprising that students flocked to his door—even when he was in mourning for his father. While Lü had as many as 300 students at a time at his academy in the 1170s, Chu had scarcely more than a handful before 1179 when he took office in Nan-k'ang and established the White Deer Academy.

Given Chu's well-known appreciation for the importance of teaching, his attention must have been drawn to his close friend's success, and Lü's example must have been an inspiration. When Chu did set up his first major academy, he asked Lü to compose the record of the occasion; moreover, he

⁶ Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, *Confucian Discourse and Chu Hsi's Ascendancy* (Honolulu: U. of Hawaii P., 1992), chaps. 4, 5.

³ See particularly: Richard von Glahn, "Community and Welfare: Zhu Xi's Community Granary in Theory and Practice," in Robert P. Hymes and Conrad M. Schirokauer, eds., *Ordering the World* (Berkeley: U. of California P., forthcoming); Liang Keng-yao 梁庚堯, *Nan-Sung te nung-ts'ang ching-chi* 南宋的農村經濟 (Taipei: Lien-ching, 1984), pp. 279-93; idem, "Nan-Sung te she-ts'ang 南宋的社倉," in *Shih-hsüeh p'ing-tun* 史學評論 4 (July 1982), pp. 1-33; Thomas H. C. Lee, "Chu Hsi, Academies and the Tradition of Private *Chiang-hsüeh*," in *Chinese Studies* 2.1 (June 1984), pp. 301-29; John W. Chaffee, "Chu Hsi in Nan-k'ang: Tao-hsüeh and the Politics of Education," in Wm. Theodore de Bary and John W. Chaffee, eds., *Neo-Confucian Education: The Formative Stage* (Berkeley: U. of California P., 1989), pp. 414-31; John W. Chaffee, "Chu Hsi and the Revival of the White Deer Grotto Academy, 1179-81," in *TP* 71 (1985), pp. 40-62; Wing-tsit Chan, "Chu Hsi and the Academies," in de Bary and Chaffee, eds., *Neo-Confucian Education*, pp. 389-413. On schools and examinations generally, see esp. John W. Chaffee, *Thorny Gates of Learning in Sung China: A Social History of Examinations* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1985); Thomas H. C. Lee, *Government Education and Examination in Sung China* (Hong Kong: Chinese U. of Hong Kong P., 1985); and Liu Tzu-chien 劉子健, *Liang Sung shih yen-chiu hui-pien* 兩宋史研究彙編 (Taipei: Lien-ching, 1987), pp. 211-27.

⁴ James T. C. Liu, *China Turning Inward: Intellectual-Political Changes in the Early Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U., Council of E. Asian Studies, 1988).

⁵ Benjamin I. Schwartz, *The World of Thought in Ancient China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1985), pp. 57-59.

had Lü's composition inscribed on stone at this White Deer Grotto Academy.

Third, Lü Tsu-ch'ien wrote a series of academy rules for students that prefigured Chu Hsi's. Chu's "Articles of Learning" for the White Deer Grotto Academy near Nan-k'ang are the ones whose fame endured through the ages to serve as a model for many future academies throughout China.⁷ As in the case of Chu's rules, Lü had emphasized personal cultivation of virtues that enriched personal spirituality and that promoted harmony within the family and clan. For example, Lü set down as the basic rule for students entering his academy in 1168: "All those who participate in this association must regard filial piety, fraternal affection, loyalty, and fidelity as the foundation."⁸ Although less attentive to, and less specific about, actual practice than Lü's, Chu's "Articles of Learning" echoed the ideals that Lü had articulated a dozen years earlier.

Even though the academy rules of both educators concentrated on training in ethical practice, it would surely be an overstatement to reduce their teachings to ethical training and spiritual cultivation. For example, Lü devoted so much time to historical, institutional, literary, and other practical knowledge of use to students taking the civil service examinations, that Chang Shih and Chu Hsi complained that Lü's students flocked to him due to their desire to advance their careers in government. Sharing their concerns for practical affairs and government service, Lü wrote a number of works designed to ease their entrance into, and understanding of, governmental affairs. Compared with Lü, Chu was even more focused upon ethical training and lowered much further the priority that Lü had given to teaching history and institutions and also to preparing students for government service. Nevertheless, how could anyone who had read widely in Chu's writings fail to be impressed with the breadth of his sense of what Confucian learning included? Priorities about areas of that learning differed, however.

Both men clearly also sought to develop a sense of community among their students. Here again, however, Lü gave more attention to the details of structure and practice that would promote group consciousness. Within the group, he designated such things as how students should behave toward one another and how discussion sections should further explore topics upon which students had taken notes from his lectures. Chu apparently considered such detailed rules on deportment and pedagogy to be more elemen-

tary than needed by the kind of disciples whom he sought for the academy.

So central was the concern for building the Tao-hsüeh fellowship that Lü Tsu-ch'ien forbade his students from getting involved with local officials or from association with people who were not of "our *Tao* 道." This element of exclusiveness complicated another of Lü's fundamental orientations. The Lü family had a tradition of not restricting itself to one teacher or point of view, but rather drawing upon a variety of teachings to the extent they proved true and useful. Because of his dedication to building a sense of community among those associated with "our *Tao*" and "our faction (*tang* 黨)," Lü himself undermined the somewhat pluralistic penchant that is notable elsewhere in his words and deeds. Still his contemporaries appear to have been far more receptive to his leading role within the Tao-hsüeh fellowship than they were to Chu Hsi's assumption of the leadership role in the 1180s and 1190s. The prestige of the Lü family and Lü's own erudition and personality account for much of this difference. Another reason for people's strong response to Lü was his flexibility and relative openness to diverse ideas.

Chu Hsi was, in part, striving to establish an academy as a community with guidelines quite independent of the government's. In letters to friends, Chu was straightforward about his aim to use the academy for instructing students. He was explicit about the need for pedagogy that emphasized ethical training. Furthermore, he revealed his frustrations with the three state schools in the prefecture that devoted themselves merely to preparing students for the government's civil service examinations. During his tours of state schools within his administrative area, Chu lectured students about Confucian ethical values and spiritual cultivation. To this end, he expounded upon the classics, especially the *Great Learning* and the *Analects*. Moreover, he instructed local teaching officials to repeat his lectures on the classics. Interjecting himself and his educational agenda into the state schools stirred a negative reaction among the teachers in charge there. At least one of the educational officers at a government school complained to Lü Tsu-ch'ien in an effort to counteract Chu's interference. Upon hearing of the tension, Lü wrote cautioning Chu Hsi about encroaching upon the prerogatives of the school preceptor. Responding to Lü's admonition, Chu defended his own actions as not excessive at all. As Chu himself saw his own actions, he had neither infringed upon the duties of the instructing official nor done anything else beyond what he should have been doing as a concerned local official.⁹

⁷ Chu Hsi 朱熹, *Hsi-an hsien-sheng Chu Wen-kung wen-chi* 晦庵先生朱文公文集 (SPFY edn.; rpt. Taipei: Chung-hua, 1970) 74, pp. 16b-17a; Wing-tsit Chan, "Chu Hsi and the Academies," pp. 397-99.

⁸ Lü Tsu-ch'ien 呂祖謙, *Lü Tung-lai hsien-sheng wen-chi* 呂東萊先生文集 (Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edn.) 10, pp. 247-49, especially p. 247.

⁹ Chu, *Chu Wen-kung wen-chi* 34, p. 11b, 69th letter to Lü.

How seriously Chu took his mission was most clearly revealed in his seemingly modest statement that he simply hoped to be of assistance, much as a prefect had been during the Han dynasty. Wen Weng 文翁 (fl. 145 B.C.) had been a prefect in Szechwan, and his educational work there had been traditionally credited with acculturating the people to Confucian learning. For example, Tu Fu 杜甫 (712-770) had praised one of his own contemporaries: "And like the educator, prefect Wen Weng of Han, he too exerted a great cultural influence."¹⁰ Using this analogy, Chu was thus conveying to his friend the urgency of his educational work in Nan-k'ang. This analogy communicated readily to Lü Tsu-ch'ien and drew his focus back to their shared cultural agenda. For example, in his historical account of the academy and its rebuilding, Lü proclaimed that the academy was a response to three challenges: competition from Buddhists and Taoists; improving the educational system; and the promotion of Confucian learning.¹¹

The rebuilding of the academy still reveals how significant Chu Hsi's ties to state action actually were. Chu secured resources to rebuild the academy from the central government. Some modern scholars have focused upon Chu's complaints about the central government's allegedly lethargic responsiveness to his request.¹² In reality, the central government was so receptive to his petition that even the construction of the buildings was completed within less than a year after his initial request. Securing authorization and funding took just over six months, and the actual construction was completed in just under another six months. The academy opened in the third month of 1180. Given the normal pace in bureaucratic governments for considering, approving, funding, and completing new building projects, we could surmise that government action was quite prompt in this case. After all, there were already three government schools in the prefecture, including the main one in Nan-k'ang. The government schools were more convenient and accessible than the academy that Chu was proposing, for it was in the mountains and about five miles away from town. Shouldn't Chu Hsi have expected some scrutiny of his request to use precious government resources for another school in a less convenient location? Indeed, he was

enough of a strategist to downplay the educational function of the academy in his request for funding, thus he must have realized that there was little grounds for his petition on those terms. He projected the need to revive the academy for its historic and symbolic significance as a center of Confucian learning. Ostensibly and officially, historical restoration and preservation thus took precedence over educational needs.

With approval from the central government for the academy, Chu was successful in pooling additional governmental and private resources from the local area. Literati from the area made contributions to the construction and the academy's library. The imperial family also promised to bestow books on the academy. Overall, the restoration followed much of the pattern of the restoration in the 1160s of the Mountain Slope Academy (Yüeh-lu shu-yüan 嶽麓書院) in Ch'ang-sha, Hunan. Chu had the local government provide rice fields for perpetual financial support of the White Deer Grotto Academy. Just as authorization and funding from the central government was necessary for the construction, the local government gave what was most necessary for the continued functioning of the academy. Chu wisely built a solid base of governmental authorization and resources for the academy. Many academies were being either built or restored during Hsiao-tsung's reign. During the century and a half of the Southern Sung, over 250 private academies were established. Private resources alone were hardly enough to sustain an academy. Chu's effort centered upon institutionalization with government resources; hence, the White Deer Grotto Academy was much more secure than others of the time. So successful was Chu's model of combining community action and official action in the restoration of the White Deer Grotto Academy that it became a model for many later academies.

Chu was aided by the councilor Wang Huai 王淮 (1127-1189) in the capital and educational official Yang Ta-fa 楊大發 (c.s. 1175) in Nan-k'ang. Both of these men were Lü Tsu-ch'ien's friends, and Lü apparently facilitated cooperation with Yang and perhaps Wang as well. With Wang's rising influence at court, the central government responded quite promptly and favorably to Chu's request. Yang was one of two persons to whom Chu delegated supervision of the construction. Chu was particularly pleased with the shrine that Yang erected to commemorate Chou Tun-i 周敦頤 (1017-1073) and six local worthies. In his letters to Lü Tsu-ch'ien, Chu commended Yang's work on the academy project.¹³ The significance of such aid has

¹⁰ Tu Fu 杜甫, "Tseng tso-p'u-yeh Cheng-kuo-kung Yen-kung Wu" 贈左僕射鄭國公嚴公武, in Ch'ou Chao-ao 仇兆鰲, *Tu shih hsiang-chu 杜詩詳註* (Peking: Chung-hua, 1979) 16, pp. 1383-90; trans. William Hung, *Tu Fu, China's Greatest Poet* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P. 1952), pp. 232-33. On Wen Weng, see Pan Ku 班固, *Han shu 漢書* (Peking: Chung-hua, 1962) 89, pp. 3625-26. Chu's letter is in *Chu Wen-kung wen-chi* 34, p. 11b.

¹¹ Lü Tsu-ch'ien, *Lü Tung-lai wen-chi* 6, pp. 138-39; *Chu Wen-kung wen-chi* 34, pp. 21a-23a.

¹² See especially Chaffee, "Chu Hsi in Nan-k'ang," pp. 414-31.

¹³ Chu, *Chu Wen-kung wen-chi* 34, pp. 9ab, 13b, 14b, 24b, 32a. See also *ch. 7*, pp. 4b-6b; 26, pp. 3a-4b; 50, pp. 1a-b, and his *pieh-chi*, *ch. 7*, p. 10a.

been passed over with little comment by traditional and modern scholars perhaps because of Wang's and Yang's opposition to Chu a few years later. Both men became critical of Chu's Tao-hsüeh agenda and were listed among those who sought to ban Tao-hsüeh as false learning in the late-twelfth century. Furthermore, details of others' contributions might have complicated the effort in later times to enhance Chu's accomplishments and leadership of the Tao-hsüeh fellowship.

Wang Huai also played a crucial role in another community-action project for which Chu Hsi is famous: community granaries. It was Wang Huai as prefectural head who had given official approval for the plan for Chu's first community granary in Ch'ung-an county in Fukien. Moreover, Wang suggested that Chu retain repayments of loans rather than return the proceeds to the prefectural government. Wang thus provided the capital to establish the granary. Such capital investment through official action was essential because Chu began his granary as part of a response to a local famine.

If one had started collecting grain before such a crisis, one could have funded a granary without dependence upon such official action. This alternative had already been explored by villagers in Wu-chou (in the central area of modern Chekiang), who organized their own charitable service systems and foundations. Such resources could become the base for establishing a granary, and this did actually happen in a few local areas during the Sung.¹⁴

More similar to Chu Hsi's case in the late 1160s, Wei Shan-chih 魏揆之 (1116-1173) had in the mid-1150s established a model granary that had a direct impact upon the way Chu Hsi's granary came into being.¹⁵ In addition to being a noted scholar-official and also Chu's friend, Wei Shan-chih had set up his granary in Chien-yang 建陽, the county adjacent to the one where Chu was to begin his granary efforts about a dozen years later. When disaster struck, the magistrate of Chu's county implored Chu and Liu Ju-yü 劉如愚 (c.s. 1142) to assist in famine relief. Given Liu's considerable seniority, he was no doubt the primary one to whom the magistrate looked for leadership. At the time, Chu had served only once — ten years earlier — as a local official elsewhere in Fukien. Moreover, he was only thirty-eight — still years from his emergence as a major national figure. Furthermore, sitting in

the prefectural offices in Chien-yang, Wang Huai certainly knew of Wei's experiment and was encouraged by that example when he approved of the new granary in Ch'ung-an county. Upon final completion in 1171, the granary was administered by Liu Ju-yü's relatives. This is further evidence that Liu probably exercised more leadership at the time than he has been given credit for in later accounts. The magistrate in Ch'ung-an certainly also knew of Wei Shan-chih's model granary when he called upon Chu and Liu Ju-yü to serve, but he also had another paradigm available.

The state had a system of granaries. Charitable granaries (*i-ts'ang* 義倉) of that day provided direct handouts to needy people during hard times, especially floods or famines. Moreover, the state's ever-normal granaries (*ch'ang-p'ing ts'ang* 常平倉) attempted to stabilize extremes of price fluctuations in the marketplace. At times, reserves in the two systems were used interchangeably. Although we may assume that the magistrate had access to the reserves in a state granary, the response time of granaries was sometimes slow because of bureaucratic regulations and procedures. Ever-normal granaries also tended to be concentrated near cities and towns. Complementing official action, Chu and Liu were active in the village of Wu-fu 五夫. Without their activity in the local community, this village would probably have been relieved less adequately by official action, which concentrated on larger population clusters. Chu's awareness of such limitations of state action no doubt enhanced his dedication to participate in local famine relief efforts and to cooperate in the establishment of a community granary.

Another characteristic of the state's charitable granaries certainly also spurred Chu Hsi to assume community leadership. Buddhist monks customarily joined with village officers to handle distribution from charitable granaries. This must have been the norm even more often in Fukien where Buddhist institutions were particularly pervasive and active. Furthermore, Buddhist monasteries had for centuries been engaged in charity work, and their deeds contributed to the popularity of Buddhism. Although Chu himself had as a youth been infatuated with Ch'an Buddhism, he had turned hostile by the early 1160s. In his attempts to develop what he considered to be true Confucian teachings, he began in the 1160s to lambast Buddhism for having seduced literati into adulterating Confucian learning with Buddhist notions. Buddhist influence on Confucianism appears to have been a more pressing concern to Tao-hsüeh leaders from Fukien than from other areas during the Southern Sung. Mobilizing Confucian literati to participate in such charitable institutions as community granaries, Chu was providing an alternative to Buddhist dominance of charity activities. Surely, the practi-

¹⁴ Liang, *Nan-Sung nung-t's'un te ching-chi*, pp. 267-74; Brian E. McKnight, *Village and Bureaucracy in Southern Sung China* (Chicago: U. of Chicago P., 1971), pp. 158-63; see also Wang Teh-yi (Te-i) 王德毅, *Sung-tai tsai-huang te chiu-chi cheng-t's'e* 宋代災荒的救濟政策 (Taipei: Shang-wu, 1970).

¹⁵ Chu, *Chu Wen-kung wen-chi* 24, pp. 18ab; 79, pp. 18b-19a; 91, pp. 2a-5a; and 93, p. 22a; and discussion in Richard von Glahn's essay.

cal implications of such endeavors was not lost upon someone as sensitive as Chu to the influence of Buddhism on the literati and masses around him.

Having literati engage in charity functions associated with a granary also had other benefits for Tao-hsüeh. Participating in such activities would enhance a sense of common purpose and bonding among Tao-hsüeh Confucians. A community granary also opened the door of opportunity to constructive contacts with large numbers of poor peasants. Such interaction provided opportunities for Confucian intellectuals through words and deeds to transmit Confucian values and models to the masses. Having intellectuals involved with community granaries would also provide a medium for training in humaneness.

During the late 1160s and early 1170s while Chu worked to establish the granary in Ch'ung-an county, he was also engaged in discussions with Chang Shih on two intellectual issues that seem to have had some relevance to the founding of the granary. One issue debated between the two friends was: how should humaneness (*jen* 仁) be conceived and discussed? Chang emphasized the aspect of being one with all things; whereas Chu sought to draw attention back to compassion or love for others. Logically, one might speculate that Chu's participation in the charitable granary project enhanced his association of *jen* with love and deeds done out of love. Observing the impact of such charitable deeds upon the literati who participated might well have given Chu a heightened appreciation for centering Confucian ethical practice around the virtue of humaneness.

Another issue centered on the locus of self-cultivation. Was cultivation related to the state of mind before the feelings were aroused and one took action, or was it just applicable to the state of mind after the feelings were aroused and one became involved in action? Chang Shih followed the Hunan tradition developed by Hu Hung 胡宏 (1106-1161), which emphasized being engaged in action and service. Chu had been associated through his teachers with a Fukien tradition that focused on the need for meditation and reflection. The importance of Confucian teachings about being of service to government and society provided Chang's Hunan position with a major advantage over the Fukien penchant. Given Sung Confucians' awareness of the need for civic consciousness and service, the spiritual cultivation advocated by Hunan leaders surely appeared more responsive to the practical teachings of Confucianism and to the problems of the day. With its emphasis upon nurturing the mind in its state of tranquility, the Fukien position had at least some apparent resemblance to the meditation practiced by Ch'an Buddhists. Here is not the place to discuss the complex-

ities of this debate or Chu's resolution of it. Still one might suggest that the debate and the troubling implications it raised about the Fukien tradition of self-cultivation perhaps heightened Chu's commitment to get involved in famine relief and a charitable granary.

Some of Chu Hsi's contemporaries criticized his granary program for being too similar to a state program that had been implemented in the late eleventh century. Critics accused Chu of imitating the "Green Sprouts" (*ch'ing-miao fa* 青苗法) loan program of Wang An-shih 王安石 (1021-1086).¹⁶ As Wang had done, Chu capitalized with state funds and charged interest on loan repayments. Although Wei Shan-chih had capitalized with state funds, he had not charged any interest on loans. Furthermore, even Chu's close friend Chang Shih suspected that Chu's work had been influenced by Wang's failed experiment with social and economic manipulation.

To divert attention away from parallels with Wang's reform, Chu called upon the testimony of Lü Tsu-ch'ien, who had personally inspected the granary in 1175. According to Chu's account, Lü had praised the granary as having followed the ideals of the ancients. Thus he utilized Lü's prestige and credibility to provide Confucian sanction for his granary. He also answered his critics more directly. Contrasting his and Wang's programs, Chu pointed out: he lent grain rather than cash as Wang had done; based administration upon the local village rather than the county; put more of the management in the hands of local literati; and sought to raise peasants' economic security rather than state funds.¹⁷ Still even some of Chu's disciples apparently had some misgiving about similarities between his and Wang's programs. For example, when establishing a charitable granary following Chu's model, Chen Te-hsiu 眞德秀 (1178-1235) eliminated the role of local officials in its administration.¹⁸ Nonetheless, Chen followed the precedent of capitalizing the granary with state resources.

Lü Tsu-ch'ien had, according to Chu Hsi's account, expressed a commitment to establish a similar granary in Chin-hua. This was the city in Wu-chou where Lü's academy was also located. In the approximately six years after his inspection of Chu's granary, Lü was either too busy with official

¹⁶ See especially discussion in Ts'ai Shang-hsiang 蔡上翔, *Wang Ching-kung nien-p'u k'ao-liieh* 王荆公年譜考略 (Shanghai: Jen-min, 1959), appendix 1, pp. 392-94; Liang, "Nan-Sung te she-ts'ang," pp. 5-10; Chang Shih 張栻, *Nan-hsien chi* 南軒集 (Mien-i hsi-mo ch'ih edn.; rpt. Taipei: Kuang-hsüeh she, 1975) 12, p. 8b.

¹⁷ Chu, *Chu Wen-kung wen-chi* 79, pp. 15b-17a.

¹⁸ Chen Te-hsiu, *Cheng ching* 政經 (SKCS edn.), pp. 53b-55b; discussed and translated in Ron-Guey Chu, "Chen Te-hsiu and the 'Classic on Governance': The Coming of Age of Neo-Confucian Statecraft" (Ph.D., Columbia U., 1988), pp. 194-98, 350-55.

duties at the capital or too ill to take action on the commitment. Without having established a granary, he died prematurely in 1181. Soon thereafter, one of his students, P'an Ching-hsien 潘景憲 (1137-1193), built the granary, and Chu wrote an account of the occasion.¹⁹

Official response to Chu Hsi's granary program was limited. Hsiao-tung formally praised and promoted Chu Hsi's petition to implement the granary program throughout the empire. Opponents within the government blocked state subsidies, however. Consequently, very few were ever established. Thus this granary program had little prospects for success without official action and funding.

There were, of course, exceptions. In 1188, Lu Chiu-yüan's family established the first community granary in their area of Fu-chou, Kiangsi. That granary, however, apparently functioned for the interest of the Lu family itself. Judging from what is known about other community granaries in Fu-chou during the early-thirteenth century, families like the Lus could use the resources of a granary to enhance bonding within the lineage and to cement the loyalty of families with whom they were linked through local militia arrangements. Making loans at a lower-than-customary interest rate was probably sufficient to be perceived locally as a charitable granary operation.²⁰ The granary in Chin-hua was also an exception because it was established through an endowment from the P'an family. Even in this case, it is quite likely that the official prestige of the Lü family and its political connections facilitated the establishment of the granary. Local officials and families with official connections could donate some resources and exert an influence on local literati to contribute to such an endeavor.

Chu's granary ideal had difficulty enduring in China. (Later, Chu's model attracted considerably more attention among Confucians in Korea and Japan, but that is another story.) The historic importance of the one in Ch'ung-an and Chu's legacy ensured that this granary would continue as a symbol, but there were probably points of discontinuity in its actual functioning. Putting aside Chu Hsi's granary, which endured in great measure because of its historical association with Chu, one gets the impression that others did not last long. The Chin-hua granary did last for a relatively long time because of its connections to the local elite, especially the P'an and Lü families. The prestige of the Lü family and the fact that Chu Hsi had written the historical record of the Chin-hua founding no doubt enhanced its chances for survival. Still its purpose and function remained intact for not

much over a half century. As Richard von Glahn has recently shown, the Chin-hua granary had fallen into the hands of government clerks by the middle of the thirteenth century. Operating the community granary as if it were a state granary, the clerks loaned grain only in the wake of a bad harvest and demanded repayment in cash. Chu's model called for Confucian intellectuals who would supervise a source of perennial credit to peasants. The clerks transformed the model in Chin-hua into simply another tool in the hands of the local bureaucracy for famine relief.²¹ Even though this community granary functioned only for a few decades as Chu Hsi had intended, the institution demonstrated his ideals in action.

In conclusion, judging from Chu Hsi's own example, his ideal of building a community on a "middle level" between the family and the local government did not require divorce from officials. In terms of two famous examples of the Ch'ung-an granary and the Nan-k'ang academy, it is clear that Chu was not hostile to central government involvement in the program of community action by local intellectuals. Literati from within, as well as from outside, the government were crucial to the conception and actualization of these Confucian institutions. In these two very famous and successful cases of community action, intellectuals did not operate in a political vacuum. Chu Hsi sought and received official sanction and resources. Without official action, these two community projects would have lacked major funding. Moreover, soliciting contributions locally from families of the elite would have been more difficult without the endorsement of state officials. Indeed, Chu's program anticipated and assumed some degree of official action.

Official action could also be a negative factor. Ties to officials to secure initial resources at least potentially strengthened the state's fetters on community organizations. As in the case of the Chin-hua community granary, the state or local bureaucracy could take over an institution that had been nurtured by the community action of intellectuals. The transformation of the Chin-hua community granary into a tool of the local bureaucracy for famine relief is a case in point. Clerks alone probably could not have taken charge of the granary and altered Chu Hsi's purpose. Central government officials on the local level surely sanctioned the action of these clerks. Was the government nervous about the degree of independent organization represented by the community granary? The government needed such activity by intellectuals during times of crisis, such as a famine or a peasant

¹⁹ Chu, *Chu Wen-kung wen-chi* 79, pp. 15b-17a.

²⁰ See discussion in Hymes, *Statesmen*, pp. 152-64.

²¹ See Richard von Glahn's account of this granary, as cited above, n. 3.

uprising. But an enduring organization linking intellectuals to the masses was potentially dangerous from the perspective of the state. In any event, the government was a player, for better or worse, in the establishment of these "independent" or community institutions.

Modern studies of major Confucian intellectuals, particularly Chu Hsi, have tended to highlight his role to such a degree that the contributions of other literati and his dependence upon official action have tended to be overshadowed. This penchant has been reinforced by the trend in recent studies to emphasize the limits of central government control on the local level. Yet, if we scrutinize the establishment of Chu's first granary and first academy — at times perceived as two stellar cases of community action by *the* leading Sung intellectual, the role of official action appears to have been historically and decisively significant. As we have seen, Chu Hsi did not act alone in setting up his granary and academy. Others provided critical concepts, resources, and cooperation. His followers highlighted his role at the expense of his contemporaries in part to strengthen his group and tradition during a time of crisis in relations between intellectuals and the Southern Sung state.

The history of "Chu Hsi's" academy and granary suggests that we might rather be looking for a more cooperative effort from a larger number of intellectuals. Although their scope definitely had limits, Chu and his friends took some steps to reach out to a large number of people. If they had an even larger organizational base and had been better able to cooperate with other literati and also the common people, they might have been more successful in realizing their ideals. Such organizational efforts, however, would likely have provoked suspicion and reaction from the Sung government. Yet, even in a Sung government dominated by court favorites who were despised by Tao-hsüeh intellectuals, there were still officials with whom Chu Hsi, Lü Tsu-ch'ien, and others could work to accomplish specific measures to improve Chinese society. Working with officials provided opportunities for both resources and restraints that affected the independent or community action of intellectuals.