

## Change and Continuity in Historical Geography: Chang Huang's (1527–1608) Reflections on the *Yü-kung*

The famous [*Ch'in-ting*] *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu* [欽定] 四庫全書總目 imperial bibliography of 1782 assigns works of geography to the history division — a revealing classification. Furthermore, its general introduction to the separate subdivisions explains that “the oldest geographical monographs only dealt with territories, mountains, streams, local customs, and products. Today, these books no longer can be seen, yet the [extant] *Yü-kung* 禹貢 (*The Tribute of Yü*) and the “Overseers of Feudatories” (“Chih-fang shih” 職方氏) [section of] the *Chou-li* 周禮 (*Chou Rituals*) are generally [of that type].”<sup>1</sup>

The bibliography goes on to discuss later monographs like Yüeh Shih's 樂史 (930–1007) *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi* 太平寰宇記 (*Geographical Records of the Empire [at the Time of] Great Peace*). This is the work, it is said, which first increased the genre's array of contents to include not just historical material (as done traditionally), but biographical and cultural (*i-wen* 藝文) items as well.

In fact, Li Tao-yüan 酈道元 (d. 527) had given information of this type in various places of his *Shui-ching chu* 水經注. But a new stage was being reached with the deliberate collecting and encyclopedic arranging of materials that was accomplished by Yüeh and others like him. The period of the Sung (960–1278) and onward was characterized by this stage, and geographical writing produced a set of recurring features,<sup>2</sup> one of which was

<sup>1</sup> [*Ch'in-ting*] *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1981), vol. 1, ch. 68, *shih-pu* 史部, sect. 24, p. 594c. Geographical works containing historical data may also appear in other categories, e.g., *ibid.*, vol. 2, ch. 147, *tzu-pu* 子部, sect. 57 (s.v. *tao-chia* 道家), p. 126b, for *Hua-shan chih* 華山志 (*Monograph on Mt. Hua*).

<sup>2</sup> The most frequent genre was that of the gazetteer (*ti-fang-chih* 地方志). These were written or revised for all levels of local administration (peaking during the Ch'ing) and resulted in a large store of useful data; see Chang Kuo-kan 張國淦, *Chung-kuo ku fang-chih k'ao* 中國古方志考 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1962). For the Ming and Ch'ing periods, see Benjamin Elman, “Geographical Research in the Ming-Ch'ing Period,” *MS* 35 (1981–83), pp. 1–18; and *idem*, *From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1984), pp. 204–7. Precedents for Ch'ing *k'ao-cheng* 考證學 (“evidential research”) can easily be seen in Sung and early Ming disputes about geography and bibliography.

the standard reference to the text of *Yü-kung*. It usually was placed at the beginning of geographic entries in larger collections, thus helping to define the basic geographic framework.

During the Sung, historical geography often combined field research and literary exegesis. For example, Chu Hsi 朱熹 (1130–1200) and Ch'eng Ta-ch'ang 程大昌 (1123–1195) attempted to pin down the locations of the "Nine Rivers" (*chiu-chiang* 九江) mentioned prominently in the *Yü-kung*. Their ideas were shaped by the loosely articulated conflicts between canonical authority and practical knowledge of geography.<sup>3</sup>

The Sung period also saw the renaissance of interest in such symbolic representations as the "Ho-t'u" 河圖 and "Lo-shu" 洛書, which seemed to have supplied normative concepts about the world order. Later, "an industrious scholar and devoted teacher," Chang Huang 章潢 (1527–1608), would use the key terms from those representations — *t'u* ("chart") and *shu* ("written record") — in the title of his grand work comprising exegeses to the Confucian canon, descriptions of the universe, and physical geography: the *T'u-shu pien* 圖書編.<sup>4</sup> In fact, the work opens with front matter entitled "General Foreword on the T'ai-chi 太極, Ho-t'u, Lo-shu, and Trigram Images of the *I* 易."<sup>5</sup>

Chang had access to new geographic information — ideas that went far beyond anything known by Sung-period scholars. He spent most of his life in Nan-ch'ang 南昌, near Lake P'o-yang 鄱陽 in northern Kiangsi, and met Matteo Ricci there in 1595. He eventually became the first to include a representation of the Jesuit's *mappa mundi* of 1584. In 1567 he helped establish a teaching institution called Purification Hall (Tz'u-hsi t'ang 此洗堂) and in 1592 became director of The White Deer Grotto Academy 白鹿洞書院. His scholarly production included numerous works that contained maps

<sup>3</sup> See Florian C. Reiter, "Über den Namen 'Neun Flüsse' (Chiu-chiang) und seine Behandlung in der historischen Geographie am Beispiel von Erörterungen Ch'eng Ta-ch'ang's (1123–1195)," *OE* 29 (1982), pp. 161–71. On "chiu-chiang" in the *Yü-kung*, see Sun Hsing-yen 孫星衍 (1753–1818), annot., *Shang-shu chin-ku-wen chu-shu* 尚書今古文注疏 (SPPY edn.) 3B, p. 42; 3C, p. 7b.

<sup>4</sup> For the remark about Chang and data on his life and writings, see L. Carrington Goodrich and C. N. Tay, "Chang Huang," in Goodrich and Chaoying Fang, eds., *Dictionary of Ming Biography* (New York: Columbia U.P., 1976) 1, pp. 83b–85a. This article also discusses the importance of Chang's major encyclopedic work; see n. 5 below.

<sup>5</sup> Chang Huang, *T'u-shu pien*, in vols. 244–67 of *Ssu-k'u ch'üan shu chen-pen* 珍本, 5th ser. (Taipei: Shang-wu yin-shu kuan, 1973; hereafter referred to as *TSP*) 1, p. 1a, introducing a large section on charts and graphs. (*TSP* is also contained in vols. 968–72 of the new photographic rpt. of the entire *Ssu-k'u* entitled *Wen-yüan ko* 文淵閣 *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* [Taipei: Shang-wu, 1983].)

and legends, sometimes dealing with territories outside the Chinese *oikoumene*.<sup>6</sup>

The following discussion describes Chang Huang's understanding of the text of *Yü-kung*, a part of the Confucian canon that purports to depict the Chinese world. Chang had to consider how to appraise the text in the light of new geographic insights and findings. What kind of textual "mistakes" would Chang reveal, as, for instance, Chu Hsi had done earlier?<sup>7</sup> In general, scholars working on historical geography at that time showed remarkable flexibility and willingness to probe thoroughly, combining philological and practical methods. They steadily strived for precision.<sup>8</sup>

I concentrate specifically on Chang's "Yü-kung i-i" 禹貢疑議 ("Doubts and Queries about the *Yü-kung*"), the translation of which follows.<sup>9</sup> The phrase "Doubts and Queries" signals a type of critical exposition, a common format that he used also for other exegeses of canonical texts.<sup>10</sup> Chang wrote extensively on the subject of the *Shang-shu* and historical geography, which essays are all included in his *T'u-shu pien*.<sup>11</sup> Taken together, Chang Huang's writings on historical geography try not only to list basic elements, but also to discuss subsequent developments — an attempt to sketch change

<sup>6</sup> Knowledge about sea routes and areas in the Pacific and Indian Oceans as far west as Africa had already been disseminated, e.g., in conjunction with the voyages of Cheng Ho 鄭和 early in the 15th century. Chang Huang seems also to have been interested in theological ideas of the world order; see *TSP* 30, pp. 58a–64b, which mentions the court Taoist Tu Kuang-t'ing 杜光庭 (850–933) as a primary source of Chang's geographical information, in this instance his *Tung-t'ien fu-ti yüeh-tu ming-shan chi* 洞天福地嶽瀆名山記 included in the *Tao-tsang* 道藏 (see Weng Tu-chien, comp., *Combined Indices to the Authors and Titles of Books in Two Collections of Taoist Literature*, Harvard-Yenching Sinological Index Ser. 25 [Pei-p'ing: Ha-fu Yen-ching hsüeh-she, 1935], no. 599). (On Tu and Taoist sacred geography, see Franciscus Verellen, "Liturgy and Sovereignty: The Role of Taoist Ritual in the Foundation of the Shu Kingdom [907–925]," *AM* 3d ser. 2:1 [1989], pp. 59–78, and the sources mentioned there.)

Chang published the *mappa mundi* in ch. 29 of his *TSP*, titling it "Yü-ti shan-hai ch'üan-t'u 輿地山海全圖." It is reproduced in Joseph Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1959) 3, sect. 22, Plate XC.

<sup>7</sup> Chu Hsi, "Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien" 九江彭蠡辨, in *Chu-tzu ta-ch'üan* 朱子大全 (SPPY edn.) 72, pp. 5a–11a. Chang does not quote this title, but clearly refers to it; see my translation sect., below.

<sup>8</sup> As seen below, under "Chang Huang's Arguments for the Validity of the *Yü-kung*," Chang called into question the literal sense by which Chu's *Chiu-chiang* could act as a statement of name-identities.

<sup>9</sup> This essay is contained in *TSP* 10, pp. 50a–53b [Wen-yüan-ko photorpt. edn., pp. 387–88].

<sup>10</sup> E.g., see his "Ch'un-ch'iu i-i" 春秋疑議, in *TSP* 13, p. 65b.

<sup>11</sup> See "Hsüeh Shu ta-chih" 學書大旨 ["Extensive Instructions for the Study of the *Shu*"], *TSP* 10, pp. 15b–32a; "Yü-ti tsung-lun" 輿地總論 ["General Discussion of Geography"], in *TSP* 34, pp. 8a–12b; "K'un-lun chiu-chou" 崑崙九州 ["The K'un-lun Mountains and the Nine Provinces"], in *TSP* 31, pp. 35a–41b; and "Ku-chin tu-hui tsung-lun" 古今都會總論 ["General Discussion of Ancient and Modern Capitals"], in *TSP* 33, pp. 46b–51b.

and continuity in the subject matter. In the following I refer to two of these other essays (cited just above), namely, "Hsüeh Shu ta-chih" 學書大旨 and "K'un-lun chiu-chou" 崑崙九州.

#### A TRANSLATION OF CHANG HUANG'S "YÜ-KUNG I-I"

Chung-ni's 仲尼 editing of the *Shu* 書 preserved only one hundred sections. [But] all that is preserved can be relied upon and moreover should serve as a norm for later generations. The *Yü-kung*, recorded in the sage canon, has been transmitted down [to us] from old. One who relies upon the sage canon should refer to antiquity in order to examine the present and should not invoke today's similarities and differences in order to doubt antiquity. Why is this?

One [specific] place sometimes becomes different in name. One [specific] name sometimes changes in time. Thus antiquity and the present are not completely identical, and the changes<sup>12</sup> may be beyond a complete examination. When a complete examination is not possible, how could one for that reason doubt the *Yü-kung*?

The *Yü-kung* says:<sup>13</sup> "The lake of P'eng-li 彭蠡 was confined to its proper limits; and the sun birds had places to settle on. The three Chiang 江 were led to enter the sea; and it became possible to still the marsh of Chen 震."

It also says:<sup>14</sup> "From Po-chung 蟠冢 he surveyed the Yang 漾, which, flowing eastwards, became the Han. Farther east, it became the water of Ts'ang-lang 滄浪; and after passing the three great dykes, went to Ta-pieh 大別, southwards from which it entered the Chiang. Eastward still, and whirling on, it formed the marsh of P'eng-li; and from

<sup>12</sup> *Yen-ko* 沿革 is commonly used in gazetteers to introduce sections dealing with such things as changes in the location of government offices or boundaries.

<sup>13</sup> Here and elsewhere I cite Sun's *Shang-shu*; see ch. 3B, pp. 1a-1b. James Legge, trans. and annot., *The Shoo King or the Book of Historical Documents*, vol. 3 of *The Chinese Classics*, 2d edn. (Hong Kong: Hong Kong U.P., 1960), pt. 1, p. 108, explains the great many difficulties of the text and its interpretation, but his trans. still serves us well, and it is used here (with adjustments to Wade-Giles romanization). Cf. the trans. of Bernhard Karlgren, "The Book of Documents," *BMFEA* 22 (1950), pp. 1-81, where he has (p. 14, no. 10): "The P'eng-li (marsh) was drained into a lake, (that is) where the ("southing" birds =) birds that go south (for the winter) dwell. The three Kiang entered (into the sea). The marsh of Chen was settled."

<sup>14</sup> Sun, *Shang-shu* 3C, pp. 6a-7a; Legge, *Shoo King*, p. 136. Cf. Karlgren, "Documents," p. 17, no. 24: "(From) Po-chung he travelled along the Yang (river); it flows eastwards and becomes the Han; again flowing eastwards it becomes the Ts'ang-lang river; passing San-shih it comes to Ta-pie, and southwards enters into the Kiang; in the east, the Hwei marsh forms the (lake) P'eng-li; eastwards it forms the Pei Kiang ("Northern River") and enters into the sea."

that its eastern flow was the northern Chiang, as which it entered the sea."

It also says:<sup>15</sup> "From mount Min 岷 he surveyed the Chiang, which branching off to the east formed the T'o 沱; eastward again it reached the Li 禮; after this it passed the nine Chiang; and flowing eastward and winding to the north, it joined the Han in its eddying movements; from that its eastern flow was the middle Chiang, as which it entered the sea."

It also says:<sup>16</sup> "[He surveyed and described] . . . the south of mount Min, and went on to mount Heng 衡. From this he crossed the lake of Chiu-chiang, and went on to the plain of Fu-ch'ien 敷淺."

This [description of] the Ch'ang-chiang 長江 from beginning to end and the record of [Great] Yü's surveying the Chiang are very detailed. But if one examines the text of *Yü-kung* against today's geography, how could they be completely the same? Accordingly, where it speaks of Chiu-chiang one matches that to today's Chiu-chiang prefecture.<sup>17</sup> Presumably the rivers would divide into nine, but indeed there are no splittings off. The waters of the Chiang and Han 漢 flow together to form [Lake] P'eng-li, and also they do not enter from opposite directions at Hu-k'ou 湖口. These are arguments such as those put forth by Chu-tzu 朱子 and which stem from this very point,<sup>18</sup> leading to the statement that Great Yü had never traveled in person in the provinces of Liang 梁, Yung 雍, Ching 荆, and Yang 揚, but that he only had dispatched separate officials and subordinates who were to go to inspect [these areas].

Even more, [Chu-tzu says that] the area between Tung-t'ing 洞庭 and P'eng-li was one in which the San-miao 三苗 peoples lived. At that time rivers, marshes, mountains, and woods were deep and dark beyond reckoning. [Those officials] turned their backs on dangers and obstacles, traveled recalcitrantly, and did not work. The officials and

<sup>15</sup> Sun, *Shang-shu* 3C, pp. 7a-8a; trans. Legge, *Shoo-king*, p. 137. Cf. Karlgren, "Documents," p. 17, no. 25: "(From) Min-shan he travelled along the Kiang; eastwards branching off it forms the T'o; again eastwards it comes to the Li (river); it passes the Nine Kiang and comes to Tung-ling; eastwards it deflects and in the north unites with the Hwei; eastwards it forms the Chung Kiang (Central Kiang) and enters the sea."

<sup>16</sup> Sun, *Shang-shu* 3C, p. 2a; trans. Legge, *Shoo King*, p. 130. Cf. Karlgren, "Documents," p. 17, no. 21: ". . . and it comes to Heng-shan; it passes the Nine Kiang (rivers), and comes to the Fu-t'ien plain." This skips "Mount Min."

<sup>17</sup> See *Chung-hua jen-min kung-ho kuo fen-sheng ti-t'u chi* 中華人民共和國分省地圖集 (Peking: Ti-t'u ch'u-pan she, 1974), p. 57/B3; Kiangsi province.

<sup>18</sup> In Chang's opinion the opposite is true (see below). For Chu's argument, see Chu Hsi, *Chu-tzu ta-ch'üan* 72 ("Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien"), p. 7a.

subordinates who went, then, had not necessarily ventured to penetrate deeply into such environs. For this reason they only saw that P'eng-li was in fact a marsh, but did not know that its sources were very far away and numerous. They saw only that downstream from Tung-t'ing<sup>19</sup> it had become the Chiang, but did not know that throughout its middle flow it was mostly a marsh, and a vast one at that. On this basis they erred — certainly not surprising.<sup>20</sup>

That on the basis of modern place names [Chu-tzu] suspected the [presence of] mistakes in *Yü-kung* was [thus] a natural result, was it not? Also, [Chu-tzu] quoted Cheng Ch'iao 鄭樵 (1104–1162), who states that the thirteen characters “eastward still, and whirling on, it formed the marsh of P'eng-li; and from that its eastern flow was the Northern Chiang, as which it entered the sea”<sup>21</sup> constitute an “extraneous interpolation.” Here [Chu-tzu] once more follows the opinions of later men (that is, modern commentators) in raising suspicions to the effect that the *Yü-kung* needs editing.

[Chu-tzu] has attempted to evaluate all the facts that can be culled concerning Chiu-chiang commandery and P'eng-tse 彭澤 district. [For example,] the *Shan-hai ching* 山海經 says:<sup>22</sup> “The Lu-chiang 廬江 arises from San-t'ien-tzu tu 三天子都 and flows into the Chiang to the west of P'eng-tse.” And the *Shui-ching* says:<sup>23</sup> “The Lu-chiang arises in the north of San-t'ien-tzu tu and passes P'eng-tse district in the west. In the north it flows into the Chiang,” which [facts Chu supposes] are not in accord with the *Yü-kung*.<sup>24</sup>

[But,] Lu-chiang commandery of the Han is the area of present day An-ch'ing 安慶 in Lu-chou 廬州.<sup>25</sup> Therefore it was not in Chiang-chou 江州. Hsün-yang 潯陽 originally got its name from the Hsün River in Ch'i 蘄; it did not belong [administratively] to Ch'ai-sang 柴桑 district. Chiu-chiang commandery of the Han originally was

north of the Chiang, and Chiang-chou was in reality Ch'ai-sang district [belonging to] Wu-ch'ang 武昌 commandery (that is, south of the Chiang). Later a commandery was created by combining Hsün-yang north of the Chiang and Ch'ai-sang [to the south of the Chiang]. Furthermore, the seat of the administration was moved from north of to south of the Chiang. In the eighth year of the I-hsi 義熙 reign (421 A.D.) of Chin An-ti 晉安帝 for the first time Hsün-yang was eliminated by being incorporated into Ch'ai-sang district. After that, the T'ang changed Ch'ai-sang district to Hsün-yang district. So this being the case, today's Chiu-chiang commandery is not at all the Chiu-chiang of Han and Chin times,<sup>26</sup> and even less so for the *Yü-kung*'s Chiu-chiang.

How is it possible, referring to present day Chiu-chiang, to use the separations between isles and banks in the middle of the Hsün River as a reason for doubting the text of the canon?<sup>27</sup> The [*Yü-kung*]'s claiming “the three Chiang were led to enter the sea; and it became possible to still the marsh of Chen”<sup>28</sup> might signify that P'eng-li constituted the Southern Chiang just to complete the canon's [tri-part] designations of a Middle Chiang and a Northern Chiang,<sup>29</sup> and therefore has nothing in common with Chen Marsh. Or it might be saying that the three Chiang ought to be found in the upper reaches [of the Chiang], as does Kuo P'u's 郭璞 (276–324 A.D.) commentary to the *Shan-hai ching*, which says that Mount Min is [the place] from where the Great Chiang emerges; and thus accordingly would the Southern Chiang emerge from Mount Lai 嶽 and the Northern Chiang from Mount Chü 嶽.<sup>30</sup> All three Chiang originate in Shu 蜀 and flow into Chen Marsh.

Therefore [from all the above arguments] the *Yü-kung* has in fact recorded [the Chiang] from [its] beginning to [its] end. If one uses place names alone to find out [actual historical sites] and [finds that] the *Chou-li*, [section] “Chih-fang shih,” says:<sup>31</sup> “Yang-chou 揚州 Marsh is called Chü-ch'ü 具區 and the streams [of Yang-chou] are called the Three Chiang” then [he must also realize that] the *Chou-li* is separated

<sup>19</sup> *Fen-sheng ti-t'u chi*, p. 77/B5-C5; Hunan province.

<sup>20</sup> This paragraph quotes almost verbatim Chu's “Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien,” pp. 8a–b, without citation. Chu thought that the Great Yü did not need to channel the rivers in the areas of Liang, Yung, Ching, and Yang as much as those in other areas. This would have been the reason for his dispatching lower officials there.

<sup>21</sup> Chu, “Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien,” p. 8a; see Sun, *Shang-shu* 3C, p. 7a.

<sup>22</sup> See *Shan-hai ching chien-shu* 山海經箋疏 (SPPY edn.) 13, p. 3a; cf. Chu, “Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien,” pp. 8b–9b. Probably Chang quoted the *Shan-hai ching* directly from Chu's text.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Shui-ching chu* (Shanghai: Shanghai jen-min, 1984) 39, p. 1236. The *Shui-ching* is not quoted in Chu, “Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien,” p. 9a, but instead a passage of *Han chih* 漢志, which text refers to the Lu River.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Chu, “Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien,” p. 9b.

<sup>25</sup> See *Fen-sheng ti-t'u chi*, p. 30/4F; Anhwei province.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Chu, “Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien,” p. 7b, who discusses some of the same facts as Chang does, but does not mention Chin An-ti and mentions Fu-ch'ien yüan 敷淺原 (the plain of Fu-ch'ien), which is not mentioned by Chang here.

<sup>27</sup> Chu Hsi also doubts deductions based on mere geographic names; but his conclusions are different (see “Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien,” pp. 7b–8a). See also my conclusion, below.

<sup>28</sup> See n. 13.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Chu, “Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien,” p. 10b, who rejects this interpretation.

<sup>30</sup> See *Shan-hai ching chien-shu* 5, pp. 28a–29a.

<sup>31</sup> Huang K'an 黃侃, comp., *Pai-wen shih-san ching Chou-li Hsia kuan ssu-ma* 白文十三經周禮夏官司馬 (Shanghai: Ku-chi, 1983), p. 91.

by more than one thousand years in particular from the *Yü-kung*, and "Chü-ch'ü" has by then become quite different from the name "Chen Marsh." So how much more is the present day "T'ai-hu" 太湖<sup>32</sup> also different from the names "Chen Marsh" and "Chü-ch'ü?" There is another [example], moreover, that refers to Pa-ling 巴陵 as Tung-ling 東陵, and Tung-t'ing as P'eng-li. To summarize, these [cases] all stem from speculation, taking [names of a period] several thousand years after and attempting to match them with those of a thousand years before. Hills and valleys change and shift. How could it be that each and every one should remain as before?

The text of the canon, as quoted above, says: "The lake of P'eng-li was confined to its proper limits."<sup>33</sup> So, its very confinement as a marsh is clear enough. Later [the canon] has: "still eastwards, and whirling on."<sup>34</sup> Today, each year in spring and summer the waters of the Chiang and Han swell, and then at Hu-k'ou, from opposite directions, they enter into Lake P'eng-li, reaching all the way up to Yü-chang 豫章 commandery. Who would say that the text of the canon is thereby in fact wrong?

Alas! The *Yü-kung* has been transmitted down [to us] from old. It depicts the mountains, rivers, fields, and tribute of the whole world (*t'ien-hsia* 天下). It is an unaltered historical record for the benefit of ten thousand generations. [In it] each mountain and stream of the Nine Provinces is separately delimited.

Let us consider [the phrase]: "the three Chiang were led to enter the sea."<sup>35</sup> This is attested as at Yang-chou, and thus we know that any attempt to find [the three Chiang] in the upper flow is incorrect. Let us consider: "the nine Chiang were brought to complete order."<sup>36</sup> This is attested as at Ching-chou, and thus we know that the commandery name was Chiang-chou, so any attempt to find [Chiu-chiang's] traces in Hu-k'ou is incorrect. Let us consider: "the country about San-wei was made habitable, and the affairs of the San-miao were greatly arranged."<sup>37</sup> This has been attested as at Yung-chou, and thus we know

that the area between Tung-t'ing and P'eng-li was blocked by the San-miao. Thus, not to know that at the time the *Yü-kung* was composed all the San-miao had become submissive makes the error of the explanation about merely dispatching officials [to the San-miao] even more serious.<sup>38</sup> When we consider [the explanation] that says "the Han is the Northern Chiang, the Chiang is the Middle Chiang, and Lake P'o is the Southern Chiang,"<sup>39</sup> the [error] is so great that we need not explain it.

This is the reason why I said, "The person who relies upon the sage canon should refer to antiquity in order to examine the present and should not invoke today's similarities and differences in order to cast doubts on antiquity." And I could not possibly dare [to accept Chu Hsi's] statements that "the *Yü-kung* contains mistakes" and "the thirteen characters of extraneously interpolated text ought to be deleted."

#### EVALUATION OF THE TEXT

The basic message of Chang Huang's "Yü-kung i-i" is that the *Yü-kung* is beyond any doubt because of its inclusion in the Confucian canon. Aside from that, and perhaps more interesting historically, is how he reconciles antiquity with the present in matters of practical geography. In criticizing Kuo P'u's commentary to the *Shan-hai ching*, Chang points out that it is wrong to rely on historic geographical names when referring to today's geography, and in doing so to try to verify the data in the ancient *Yü-kung*. Such an attempt will always fail, because to Chang "change and shift" characterize not just administrative geography (as in the frequent policy of establishing and then removing the same administrative seat over and over through several dynasties), but also some natural features as well. Even "hills and valleys" may change and shift naturally.

Clearly Chang believes in change, but the idea of continuity is applicable to him also. First, he maintains that the *Yü-kung* is a totally reliable part of a sage canon — one that has not been altered since some point in antiquity. The key notion in Chang's opinion here is the word *hsin* 信, understood as reliability. It is not just truth that is meant, but also a proper approach to the text, one that knows how to use the text to understand the present and not the reverse. Thus for Chang the nine provinces of the

<sup>32</sup> See *Fen-sheng ti-t'u chi*, p. 42/E6, Kiangsu province. <sup>33</sup> Sun, *Shang-shu* 3B, p. 1A.

<sup>34</sup> Sun, *Shang-shu* 3C, p. 7A; these are the words that Cheng Ch'iao wanted to delete from the canon (see above).

<sup>35</sup> Sun, *Shang-shu* 3B, p. 1A; see n. 13.

<sup>36</sup> Sun, *Shang-shu* 3B, p. 4A; cf. Karlgren, "Documents," p. 15, "... the Nine Kiang (rivers) were greatly regulated."

<sup>37</sup> Sun, *Shang-shu* 3B, p. 11B; cf. Karlgren, "Documents," p. 15. "The (country of) San-wei was (measured out =) regulated, the (people of) San Miao were made grandly orderly."

<sup>38</sup> This interpretation probably is based on the wording of Chu, "Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien," p. 8b.

<sup>39</sup> Chu, "Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien," pp. 10b-11A.

*Yü-kung* are set apart from each other by the specific deeds of Great Yü, deeds that are recorded province by province. This would exclude any interpretation that would shift a topographical area between provinces. Chang Huang takes for granted the historicity of the person of Great Yü, whom he believes actually performed the deeds of ordering, surveying, and describing the *Yü-hsia*. This position is made clear forcefully when he refutes Chu Hsi's interpretation that claimed Great Yü had sent his assistants to visit the area of the San-miao.

*Chang Huang's Arguments for the Validity of the Yü-kung*

Chang Huang has given us in another section of his *T'u-shu pien* — the essay "K'un-lun chiu-chou" — further arguments against Chu Hsi's interpretation. At one point he says that Yü "determined the high mountains and the great rivers,"<sup>40</sup> and that for all ages these high mountains, large rivers, and nine provinces did not change. With rhetorical questioning, he claims that the qualities of different types of earth do not change; and that the *Yü-kung's* nine-part gradation of agricultural areas and their taxes does not change because it is based simply on the three major types of fertile soil. Moreover, when Great Yü surveyed and described the mountains and waterways he was really giving mankind the means for a livelihood using the resources of each area. Chang says,

All that the areas of the nine provinces contain has been set out in the *Yü-kung*. The present day is like antiquity. But how, given this, could each later scholar have had his own opinions about the mountains and streams that are recorded in the canon? How [could] they have known that although [later] countries and commanderies have different names from those of the nine provinces, the [actual] territories, nevertheless, do not get altered, and that that is why [the text's] "the nine rivers had been completely ordered"<sup>41</sup> is attested as at Ching [-chou]? Thus we can know that any view identifying this as Yang-chou is wrong.

Chang gives other examples and then makes this point:

The *Yü-kung* was completed after the San-miao were settled.<sup>42</sup> So we know that those who say that Yü never went in person to Ching [-chou] and Yang [-chou], or that because he sent officials who were afraid of

the San-miao and did not dare to enter [that area] [their reports on] Ching and Yang contained passages that were misplaced (literally, the strips of text having got out of sequence),<sup>43</sup> are quite in error. Alas! Later people, one by one, talked about the canon on the basis of mere opinions, but they did not rely on 信 the canon.

Quite a different approach to the *Yü-kung's* reliability is found in Chang's "Hsüeh Shu ta-chih."<sup>44</sup> Here he points to the natural changes of the world, like the shift of the course of the Yellow River. He notices that the sources and termini of the rivers, waters, and marshes of the provinces of Chi 冀, Yen 兗, Ch'ing 青, Hsü 徐, and Yü 豫 have been altered. He concludes that in this world 天地 the rivers and seas, mountains, hills, soil, and rocks all are subject to their own fated determinants (literally, "calculations") of diminution and growth 消長之數. He doubts whether there is any fixed form that would be the same now as it was in antiquity.

Chang goes on to observe that the existence of shells of sea animals on rocks quite distant from the coast and layers of belt-like rock formations prove that once the coastal line ran differently. For Chang it follows clearly that rivers "daily move," mountains "daily grow," and rocks "daily solidify." Consequently, the ancient geography of the *Yü-kung* and today's geography are not the same. "How do we not know that this is not due to the changes and shifts, and diminutions and growths of heaven and earth?"

This last statement of Chang Huang is crucial; it counters the claim that actual geographic discrepancies are due to faults in the *Yü-kung* text. Geographic dispositions can change because rivers change their courses, rocks somehow emerge, and so on. But what remains? It is the most basic geographic framework that, according to Chang's earlier remarks, Great Yü had defined by his surveying and describing. In other words, the *Yü-kung* deals with enduring geographic and especially agricultural *qualities* (as in his argument, above, concerning soil types and local products and their effect on a large region's character and economy). This endurance tends to validate the reliability of the text.

But obviously there are more changes than continuities, and if such changes are unwittingly linked with administrative geography and mere names, then they cause serious misinterpretation. At this point, any scho-

<sup>43</sup>This is Chu Hsi's crucial point, aside from the point that the text cannot be totally correct merely because of its reputed editing by Confucius, which, Chu argued, barred all reasonable criticism; see his "Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien," pp. 5a-8a. Chang Huang does not agree; see below.

<sup>44</sup>For the following discussion, see "Hsüeh Shu ta-chih," in *TSP* 31, pp. 38b-39b.

<sup>40</sup>This and the other references, below, to "K'un-lun chiu-chou" (including translated passages) are taken from *TSP* 10, pp. 28b-29b. Here the phrase cites Sun, *Shang-shu* 3A, p. 1b; Karlgren, "Documents," p. 12.

<sup>41</sup>See n. 36. <sup>42</sup>See n. 37.

larly attempt at precision will fail. And here Chang and Chu Hsi seem to have the same opinion. Yet Chang feels that the *Yü-kung* text itself must be treated on a separate level, one of reverence for the continuity of its truths as constituted by its long historical transmission, beginning with the origins of Confucianism itself. These positions of Chang are remarkable and show us much about his motives.

Chang Huang's "Yü-kung i-i" shows a countering of important tenets of Chu Hsi's critical arsenal, in this case particularly those in Chu's "Chiu-chiang P'eng-li pien" 九江彭蠡辨, well known to Chang. This piece was filled with Chu's discoveries of wrong statements in the *Yü-kung*. Chu had also rejected the solemnity with which the text had been treated, a solemnity that barred criticism. But Chang's position is that this sort of new criticism goes too far. Chang tries in a sense to turn back the wheel of time and to restore transcendent values to the *Yü-kung*, thus eliminating critical revision of the words of the text themselves. Chang believes he has argued successfully for these transcendent values partly by being, in fact, more empirically accurate than Chu Hsi.

In the Sung and post-Sung eras interest in historical geography and its various themes became widespread amongst literati. In the first place, such texts as the *Yü-kung* were automatically subject to new analyses and scholarly attention simply because they were old writings, in this case a canonical writing. In China this was an important time of scholarly renaissance in the fields of commentative literature. Moreover, specialized geographic research was undertaken at the behest of agencies responsible for compiling, for example, "monographs on geography."<sup>45</sup>

These geographic researches often took the form of exhaustive collations of geographic names. An example is Lo Pi's 羅秘 (fl. 1176 A.D.) *Lu-shih* 路史. There he includes essays entitled "San-chiang hsiang-cheng" 三江詳證 ("Detailed Documentation [Concerning the Name] San-chiang"), "Chiu-chiang hsiang-cheng" 九江詳證 ("Detailed Documentation [Concerning the Name] Chiu-chiang)," and "Tien kao-shan ta-ch'uan" 奠高山大川 ("[On Great Yü's] Regulating the High Mountains and Great Rivers"), the latter directly referring to the *Yü-kung*. Lo brings into his discussion the works of early exegetes like K'ung An-kuo 孔安國 (156-74 B.C.), Pan Ku 班固 (32 A.D.-92 A.D.), Cheng Hsüan 鄭玄 (127-200 A.D.),

and Ch'eng Ta-ch'ang.<sup>46</sup> To Lo Pi, the vast network of commentaries and explanations is tantamount to true study of historical geography, but at the same time indicates how names and explanations became mixed together.<sup>47</sup> Lo's historical geography certainly deserves a separate treatment because it is a good example of the kind of study that preceded the welter of new movements in scholarship during the late Ming and Ch'ing.

In this same general period historians of geography self-consciously made conclusions based on individual insight and observations. Such things must have come easy to Chang Huang, especially since he lived most of his life in the area south of Mount Lu and close to Lake P'o-yang. He could associate names like P'eng-li and Hu-k'ou with reality. Chang reconciled a traditional adherence to canonical text, including all its scholarly considerations and requirements, with practical results of field work and long familiarity. His aim was to restore confidence in the melding of a bibliographic with a historical tradition. He was a scientifically-minded radical traditionalist.

Through Chang's discussions and his general positions concerning canonical writing and its veracity, we come to understand how the *Yü-kung*, for him, needed to be explained in the context of "plans" and "documents" (the "Ho-t'u" and "Lo-shu" and their derivative — maps) that primarily laid forth perfect cosmic and geographic order. In this fashion, Chang could instruct his students to understand and support the enactment of moral and political order, the end result of which was generally thought to be the well-being of the nation.

It is in this latter message, combined with his radical traditionalism and his effort to maintain and safeguard the true context of geographic names rather than their mere orthographic or textual correctness, that Chang Huang is important for the study of historical geography in its incipient *k'ao-cheng* stage.

<sup>46</sup>Lo Pi, *Lu-shih yü-lun* 路史餘論 (SPPY edn.) 10, pp. 4a-8a; 9, pp. 7a-b.

<sup>47</sup>Lo, *Lu-shih yü-lun* 10, p. 4b, referring to Pan Ku.

#### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

TSP *T'u-shu pien* 圖書編

<sup>45</sup>See Florian C. Reiter, "Bergmonographien als geographische und historische Quellen, dargestellt an Ch'en Shun-yü's 'Bericht über den Berg Lu' (*Lu-shan chi*) aus dem 11. Jahrhundert," *ZDMG* 130 (1980), pp. 397-407. See *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu* 70, *shih-pu* sect. 26, pp. 617-18.