

THREE / THE HAGIOGRAPHY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY OF SONG LOYALISM

In traditional Chinese history-writing, as Professor Twitchett puts it, biographies of individuals and groups were intended to "illuminate the actions of men as 'subjects and ministers' and present precepts and examples for future generations of Confucian officialdom."¹ As such, a didactic and moralistic concern is particularly striking in both the official and unofficial historiography of the Song loyalists, who became exemplars to be emulated by contemporaries and those who experienced subsequent dynastic collapses. This chapter examines Wen Tianxiang's collected writings, a major source for the *Songshi* (History of the Song) biographies of the loyalists.² It also discusses discrepancies which have survived in present accounts of Song loyalism, followed by an assessment of the social and political climate under which loyalist writings were produced and circulated. After examining later loyalist writings reflecting a local and limited perspective, we unravel the myth-making mechanism that has contributed to the hagiographical tradition of Song loyalism.

Wen Tianxiang's Writings and Influence on Loyalist Literature

Sources on the Song loyalists are disparate and voluminous, often unsystematized and mutually conflicting. They yield both a confusing picture of the last years of the Southern Song and a traditional, incomplete account of

1. D.C. Twitchett, 109.

2. For additional information on the primary sources cited in this monograph, see Yves Hervouet; Franke, *Sung Biographies*; Franke, "Some aspects," 117-29; Rao Zongyi, *Jiulong yu Songji shiliao*.

Chapter Three

the events and personalities of the resistance movement. The Song loyalists themselves were the first to record their experiences and feelings about the demise of the Song; about fifty of these men left extant writings in the form of prose and poetry collections, group biographies of fellow loyalists, and notebook miscellanies.¹ The predominant literary collection is Wen Tianxiang's *Wenshan xiansheng quanji* (Complete writings of Wen Tianxiang), particularly the sections entitled *Zhinan lu* (Record pointing to the south), *Ji Dushi* (Rearranged Du Fu poems), *Yinxiao ji* (Collection of whistling and humming) and *Jinian lu* (A chronological record).² The *Zhinan lu* is a collection of poems with long prefaces and in two parts. The first covers the period from September 1275 to May 1276, and recounts Wen's arrival from his native Jiangxi province at the Song capital of Hangzhou, his detention by Bayan and escape from captivity, and his eventual arrival in Wenzhou to join the loyalist forces. The sequel, the *Zhinan houlu*, extends from January 1279 to June 1282, covering the period of his second incarceration through to his captivity and imprisonment in Dadu. The dates and content of the *Yinxiao ji* coincide with the *Zhinan lu*. The *Ji Dushi* is a collection of two hundred five-word stanza poems with prefaces, completed in 1280. Wen composed these poems by rearranging random lines from Du Fu's (712-70) poetry to describe his experience in the loyalist resistance and to praise the loyalist men under his personal command. Lastly, the *Jinian lu* is a chronological account of his life from birth to the spring of 1282, when he was still in Dadu awaiting execution.³

In these writings Wen's primary objective was to express for posterity his thoughts on the events and personalities of the collapse of the dynasty and the resistance, and thus a highly self-centered and personal tone pervades ev-

1. See the Bibliography for the extant writings of the loyalists cited in this study.

2. For various editions of the *Wenshan ji*, see Brown, 6-11. In the SBCK edition, the sections which have particular relevance to the resistance appear as follows: *Zhinan qianlu*, 13; *Zhinan houlu*, 14; *Yinxiao ji*, 15; *Ji Dushi*, 16; *Jinian lu*, 17.

3. The SBCK edition of the *Jinian lu* contains commentaries by a member of the Yuan Bureau of Inspection as well as parts of Wen's biography by Deng Guanlian.

ery page. Wen repeatedly provides minute details of his narrow escape from death and records in full his eloquent conversations with the Yuan officials Bolot (fl. 1270-1300), Zhang Hongfan, and Bayan. All too often Wen passes moral judgment on the conduct of other loyalists. To his own followers, friends, and the obscure men who assisted the Song cause or himself and died in the process he is generous with praise, often devoting an entire poem and preface to each personality or event. To his rivals in loyalist circles he is unfair and overly critical. He says that Li Tingzhi "had been in Yangzhou for over ten years: a coward without long-range plans, he could only close his gates and rely on defensive measures. He was no help in saving the country."¹ Although Wen admits that Zhang Shijie was indispensable in restoring Fujian to loyalist control, he pointedly blames Zhang for lacking any "long-range ambition; surrounding himself with large armies and extraordinary wealth, he aspired only to flee far away, thus courting defeat."² Su Liuyi is seen as "sulking because his ambitions were not realized; his quick temper made him unapproachable."³ Wen claims that Chen Yizhong had neither moral principles nor political skills, but disappeared at critical moments.⁴ Chen's disagreement with Wen's plans to restore the Jiangxi region is illogically interpreted as a selfish attempt to redeem himself for fleeing from the Song capital earlier.⁵

Apart from being a highly subjective and emotional account, Wen's work suffers from another fundamental weakness: the selective nature of its material. Wen's activities were limited to his military headquarters, and he received only second- or third-hand accounts about the refugee loyalist court. We are thus merely informed in detail about Wen's personal experiences, which did not in fact involve other resistance centers and cannot be relied

1. Wen Tianxiang, 16.7b.

2. *Ibid.*, 16.11a-b.

3. *Ibid.*, 16.11b-12a.

4. *Ibid.*, 16.5a, 16.15b-16a.

5. *Ibid.*, 16.20a.

Chapter Three

upon to yield a comprehensive account of the entire resistance movement. It was Lu Xiufu who recorded the events of the loyalist court in a diary which he had entrusted to a fellow loyalist, Deng Guangjian, before leaping into the sea with the infant emperor Di Bing (d. 1279). Unfortunately the diary is not extant, but Deng's *Tianhai lu* (Record of filling the sea) was based on it and survives in excerpts.¹

Deng Guangjian, a fellow townsman of Wen Tianxiang, had earlier joined the loyalist court after his whole family perished at the hands of bandits. After the Yaishan defeat he had tried to drown himself, but was rescued and later became family tutor to Zhang Hongfan, the Yuan general who captured Wen Tianxiang. Deng later found himself making the journey to Dadu with Wen Tianxiang in 1279, and the two captives composed poetry to each other's rhymes and shared despondent feelings about the collapse of the Song. They became such close friends that Wen instructed his younger brother to request Deng Guangjian to inscribe his epitaph because Deng "entirely knew his mind and intent."² To fulfill this objective, Deng undoubtedly had complete access to Wen's writings.

Deng Guangjian's biography of Wen and the *Wen chengxiang dufu zhongyi zhuan* (Collection of biographical notices of the loyalists in Chief Minister Wen's military headquarters) were in fact completed years later.³ Deng was to a large extent faithful to Wen's records, particularly in the choice of subjects to be covered and in the selection of information on their fate. All the loyal men commemorated by Wen in his writings were incorpo-

1. Parts of the *Tianhai lu*, together with Huang Jin's comments, are in "Postscript to the biography of Lu Xiufu," in Huang Jin, 3.6a-8b.

2. Wen Tianxiang, 17.40b. Deng Guangjian also wrote an encomium for Wen. See Zheng Yuanyou, 1.15.

3. Parts of Deng's biography of Wen survive scattered in Wen Tianxiang's *Jinian lu* (Wen Tianxiang, 17). They appear in scattered form in Yang De'en, and in Li An, 49, 128, 132, 135-36, 156, 160. Deng Guangjian's *Wen Chengxiang dufu zhongyi zhuan* is in Wen Tianxiang, 19.41a-52b.

Hagiography and Historiography

rated into Deng's work but the order of listing was not followed.¹ For some unknown reason Deng Guangjian chose not to use Lu Xiufu's diary in these biographies and refused to release it to a fellow loyalist and friend of Lu, Gong Kai (1222-1307).² Besides, Deng's family did not submit his *Tianhai lu* to the Yuan history bureau until after the *Songshi* was completed.³

Gong Kai, however, had no difficulty obtaining from Deng a handwritten copy of Wen's *Jinian lu*, on which he subsequently based biographies of Wen and Lu Xiufu.⁴ Zheng Sixiao (1241-1318) of Pingjiang also owned copies of Wen's *Zhinan lu* and drew upon it for a biography of Wen in his controversial *Xinshi* (History from the heart).⁵ In Annam, where he had fled after the Yaishan defeat, another loyalist survivor, Chen Zhongwei, wrote a postscript to the anonymous *Songji sanchao zhengyao* (Essential policies of the last three reigns at the end of the Song). This postscript, the *Erwang benmo*, was brought back to China in the early 1280s.⁶ Numerous internal inconsistencies and several stages of editing have rendered the work useless as a historical source. Some editing took the form of direct copying from

1. Deng Guangjian followed the list supplied by Wen so closely that no biography was provided for the valiant general Ma Shilong, who fought in the same capacity as Yin Yu, who was given a biography. The *SS* also relied on Deng's biographies so exclusively that it, likewise, omitted Ma Shilong. See Zhao Yi, 26.520.

2. See Gong Kai's biography of Lu Xiufu, in Cheng Minzheng, 10.10b-11a.

3. Huang Jin, 3.6a.

4. In his biography of Wen, Gong Kai says that it was based on a manuscript of Wen's *Jinian lu*, which he saw in Deng Guangjian's house. See Cheng Minzheng, 10.7b.

5. "Account of Chief Minister Wen," in Zheng Sixiao, *Xinshi*, 92.

6. Rao Zongyi, *Jiulong yu Songji*, 3-6. The *Songji sanchao* used the wrong titles to refer to the Song princes. Wan Sitong and the publisher of *Siming congshu* have also expressed doubt about this work's reliability. See Wan Sitong, *Songji zhongyi lu*, 2.23.

Chapter Three

Wen's *Ji Dushi*.¹ Strikingly similar in many passages to the *Erwang benmo* and suggesting that either one copied from the other is another loyalist work, the *Qiantang yishi* (Remnant events of Hangzhou).² The anonymous *Zhaozhong lu* (Record of loyalists) contains biographies of 130 loyalists (including those who fought against the Mongols in the 1230s); it seems to have utilized independent sources as well as Wen Tianxiang's work.³ The *Zhongyi ji* (Collection of loyalist writings) is a fourteenth-century anthology of poems accompanied by biographies written by contemporaries extolling the virtues of the individual loyalists.⁴ These biographies appear verbatim in the *Zhaozhong lu*.

The liberal use other loyalists made of Wen Tianxiang's writings on the loyalist resistance points to their extensive circulation and considerable influence on their own works. In contrast, none of Wen's loyalist rivals left any extant writings. As a result, Wen's personal biases and interpretations of the last events of the Southern Song and the loyalist resistance have been transmitted to modern scholarship.

However, divergent interpretations and appraisals based on personal connections are responsible for discrepancies and conflicting material among loyalist sources, in spite of Wen's writings serving as a common source. One example is Deng Guangjian's biography of Wen Tianxiang. While contemporary and traditional versions are hostile to Zhang Hongfan, the Yuan general of Chinese ethnicity who inflicted defeat on the loyalists at Yaishan, Deng

1. Verbatim passages occur in the *Ji Dushi* (Wen Tianxiang, 16.11b-12a) and the *Erwang benmo* (located at the end of *Songji sanchao*, 6.67). See also Rao Zongyi, *Jiulong yu Songji*, 3.

2. Liu Yiqing's *Qiantang yishi* is a more valuable work and covers more events; it has a rough chronological order and is topically organized. Zhou Mi's *Qidong yeyu* seems to have been one of its sources. The *Songji sanchao* is a chronological account.

3. The authorship of the *Zhaozhong lu* is unknown; however, the work must have been finished after 1289, as its biography of Xie Fangde records his death in 1289.

4. Zhao Jingliang's *Zhongyi ji* is an anthology of poems by Liu Xuan (1240-1319), his son, and other contemporaries.

Hagiography and Historiography

sees Zhang as a human-hearted person who treated Wen with courtesy and who even on his death-bed pleaded with Qubilai to spare Wen's life.¹ Deng had apparently developed a warm relationship with Zhang while in his service as family tutor; he later wrote the preface to Zhang's collected writings.² In another example, the author of *Qiantang yishi* appears to have personally known Lü Wenhuan, the Song general who surrendered Xiangyang and entered the service of the Mongol Yuan. Lü is seen in sympathetic circumstances: exhausted after fighting for six years he had no choice but to surrender in order to spare the city and his family from a Mongol massacre.³ Zheng Sixiao's writings are friendly to both Chen Yizhong and Zhang Shijie, but his *Xinshi* has often been rejected by modern scholars as spurious on the basis of much conflicting and inaccurate material about the Song resistance. Such inaccuracies ranged from the whereabouts of Zhang Shijie and Chen Yizhong to the Mongols devouring Wen Tianxiang's heart. Zheng's work is an example of how the lack of information in the years immediately after the resistance (ca. 1283) could result in pure speculation and groundless rumors circulating in the city markets. In his biography of Wen Tianxiang, Zheng admits that he had not consulted Wen's entire writings and that his sources amounted to about one or two parts out of ten on the whole account.⁴ Zheng actually had a personal relationship with a member of the Song royalty in Sanjiang (in Fujian), but because the two friends lost contact after the resistance, Zheng was not able to draw on him as an informant about the events he described in the *Xinshi*.⁵ Zhou Mi, the versatile talent in art connoisseur-

1. Wen Tianxiang, 17.37a-b, 17.39a.

2. This preface is in Zhang Hongfan, 2a-3a.

3. Lü's surrender is portrayed as a difficult decision dictated by famine and the threat of massacres which had just occurred in Fancheng. See Liu Yiqing, 6.7, 8.4-5.

4. Zheng Sixiao, *Xinshi*, 92.

5. Zheng wrote a preface to the genealogy of the Zhao imperial clansmen in Sanjiang, Fujian, in which he recounted his close friendship with a certain imperial relative who joined the loyalist resistance and died some years later. This preface is in Zhao Xinian, 2.12-13.

Chapter Three

ship, poetry, and random jottings, also wrote a great deal about the loyalist resistance and the loyalists. His personal informants included relatives of the imperial family, Yuan officials formerly in Song service, and northerners sojourning in Hangzhou.¹ Because of his personal loyalty to friends, he did not criticize those among them who surrendered to the Yuan or later served, but satirized cruelly other defectors whom he did not count as belonging to his personal circle.

In sum, although the loyalists drew upon Wen Tianxiang's work and took over its basic contents and biases, each writer's individual point of view was largely responsible for discrepancies and divergent judgments. There are also many cases of conflicting information that are difficult to prove one way or the other. One example is relatively easy to determine: the unreliable *Erwang benmo* is surely wrong in showing Su Liuyi to have died of malaria in 1277, contradicting more reliable sources which indicate that Su had in fact survived the defeat at Yaishan and died later in 1279 while attempting to revive the resistance.² Another case is more difficult to assess: whether Xie Fangde fled to Fujian province before or after the collapse of Hangzhou (and thus to confirm or deny his participation in the resistance movement after the collapse of the capital). A Qing work, the *Xu Zizhi tongjian*, could not decide and thus made two separate entries of Xie's departure to Fujian.³ In the next chapter, I will use Xie's writings to show that he participated in the loyalist resistance for a few months after the surrender of Hangzhou.

The Songshi Coverage of the Song Loyalists

The writings of the loyalists as described above do not, however, provide a clear chronological and broad perspective of the events of the last years of the Southern Song and the resistance movement. The official histo-

1. Rao Zongyi, *Jiulong yu Songji*, 84-89. Zhou Mi's informants for his random jottings are either given in the text or listed at the end of the entries.

2. *Songji sanchao* 6.67.

3. Bi Yuan, 182.4974 (for the first month of 1275) and 183.4986 (for the fifth month of 1276).

Hagiography and Historiography

ries of the period, the *Songshi* and the *Yuanshi* (History of the Yuan), are helpful in filling this gap.¹ The veritable records for Lizong's reign did not survive, and those for Duzong and Gongdi were not written; thus, the historical archives collected upon the surrender of Hangzhou in 1276 had little bearing on the subject.² In the absence of these Song official sources, the *Songshi* compilers had to rely mostly on a Yuan official work, the *Ping Song lu* (Pacifying the Song), and biographies of illustrious Yuan generals who took part in the Song campaigns in order to draw up a logical chronology in the annals of Lizong, Duzong, and the Duke of Yingguo (Gongdi). An account of the two Song princes enthroned by the loyalists is appended to the *Songshi* annals of the Duke of Yingguo; in addition, the loyalists are given biographies. Fourteen separate biographies of the loyalists appear in the general biography section, seventy-seven in the *zhongyi zhuan* (group biographies of the loyal and righteous men), and two others are put with the *rulin* (Confucian scholars).³ In these biographies there is strong evidence that the *Songshi* used, among other sources, Wen Tianxiang's collected writings and Deng Guangjian's biographies of Wen and his followers, together with the

1. The *SS* (41.783-47.948) and the *YS* (5.81-10.219) annals provide parallel coverage of the last years of the Southern Song and the loyalist resistance. The *YS* sometimes gives more details than the *SS*, e.g. the exact date of Li Tingzhi's death, in *YS* 9.185.

2. See Jin Yufu, *Zhongguo shixue shi*, 97, and Hok-lam Chan, "Chinese official historiography," 84.

3. The fourteen separate biographies, in *SS* 405-425, are those of Liu Fu, Gao Side, Ma Tingluan, Wang Lixin, Jiang Wanli, Wang Yue, Zhang Jian, Chen Yizhong, Wen Tianxiang, Jia Xuanweng, Li Tingzhi, Chen Zhongwei, Xu Zongren, and Xie Fangde. Wang Yinglin and Huang Zhen are in the *rulin* group biography (438). In the *zhongyi* biographies, the seventy-seven loyalists at the end of the Song appear in random order among loyal men of other periods in the Song (*SS* 446-55). See Appendix A.

Chapter Three

Zhaozhong lu.¹ The fourteen separate biographies of the loyalists are in random order, and not all the leaders of the loyalist resistance are among them. All except four loyalists appearing in the *zhongyi zhuan* are martyrs who died for or because of the Song cause in 1273-79 (See Appendix A). These seventy-seven biographies are interspersed among the remaining 201 *zhongyi* personalities covering various periods in Song history. They represent 28% of all those eulogized for loyalty to the dynasty. The two men appearing in the *rulin* (Confucian scholars) section were not treated as loyalists by the *Songshi* compilers.

Due to the haste with which the *Songshi* was compiled, the general shortcomings of the project have direct relevance to the coverage of the Song loyalists.² Apart from the random appearance of the biographies of loyalists, conflicting material and inaccuracies also occur in the biographies. Another serious problem is the absence of biographies of important loyalists such as Deng Guangjian.

A conspicuous feature of the accounts of the loyalists is the reinforcement of Yuan official views. In the preface of the collective biographies of the *zhongyi*, the *Songshi* compilers state that their instructions were to record without fear of censorship the loyal acts and personalities of the former Song dynasty. The biographies were primarily based on private Song loyalist writings, but evidently some editing was done to make explicit the official Yuan perspective and to tone down the loyalists' anti-Mongol statements. The scholar-official in charge of the project was Ouyang Xuan (1283-1357) of

1. The biographies of Wen's personal followers are essentially identical in Deng Guangjian's *Wen Chengxiang dufu zhongyi zhuan* and the *SS*. See, e.g. the biography of Chen Zijing in *SS* 454.13356 and in *Wen Tianxiang* 19.47a. The *Siku quanshu* editors are mistaken in saying that the *SS* did not use the *Zhaozhong lu*. See Ji Yun, 57.1274-75. There are verbatim statements in the *Zhaozhong lu* and the *SS*; moreover, the order in which biographies appear in *SS* 450 follows that of *Zhaozhong lu*, 12-14.

2. Deficiencies of the *SS* are enumerated in Zhao Yi, 24.464-67. In one example of erroneous information in the *SS*, Hong Fu, a servant of Xia Gui who had surrendered to the Yuan army and later revolted, is seen only as a loyalist martyr (*SS* 451.13269). For details of this incident, see Li Zefen, vol. 3, 177-80. For an account of Ming and Qing criticism of the *SS*, *Liaoshi*, and *Jinshi*, see Hok-lam Chan, "Chinese official historiography," 88-95.

Hagiography and Historiography

Luling, Wen Tianxiang's place of birth. Ouyang Xuan was sympathetic to the Song loyalists, as shown by his preface to the collected writings of Wang Yanwu (1252-1324), loyalist and personal follower of Wen Tianxiang and fellow graduate of Ouyang's father.¹ But although Ouyang Xuan admired Song loyalism, a pro-Yuan bias is noticeable throughout the accounts of loyalist activities. In the annals, the Mongols are already referred to as "Da Yuan" in 1232, even though the Yuan was not proclaimed as the title of the Mongol dynasty until 1271.² Accounts of the conquest of the Song repeatedly emphasize Qubilai's enlightened policies. The loyalists are commended for adherence to moral commitment to the Song, but the generous sympathy of the Mongol generals is also put into the official record. For example, in the biographies of Bian Juyi (d. 1275) and Zhao Maofa, Bayan is depicted performing sacrificial rites for the martyrs; Aju, too, is shown admiring Jiang Cai's loyal spirit and courage.³ The loyalists are praised for their efforts to save the Song, but these acts are interpreted as being against the will of Heaven and totally in vain. Abusive language used against the Mongols and Song defectors has been edited out of the original biographies. As for the loyalists who did not cooperate with the Mongols and died horrible deaths such as being minced and mutilated, the biographies merely record "unwilling to compromise they died." The portrayal of the Song loyalists in the *Songshi* is not the full picture, but it nevertheless casts some doubt on the official Yuan myth of easy conquest, mild resistance, and bloodless victories.

Song Loyalist Writings and Censorship

In discussing the writing and transmission of loyalist writings it is appropriate to consider the political climate in which they were written and circulated. The ubiquitous presence of the Yuan official view in the coverage of

1. Ouyang Xuan's biography is in *YS* 182.4196-99; for this preface, see Wang Yanwu, preface.2a-3b.

2. *SS* 41.797.

3. For the sympathy shown by Bayan to Bian Juyi and Zhao Maofa, see *SS* 451.1325 and 450.13260; for Aju's admiration of Jiang Cai, see *SS* 451.13269.

Chapter Three

the loyalists indicates that as late as the 1340s when the *Songshi* was compiled, the Yuan was still sensitive on the issue of Song resistance. There are at present two divergent views about freedom of expression in the Yuan. Traditional and some modern Chinese historians stress that because of the repressive political situation under the Mongols, the loyalists used veiled language and ambiguous phraseology to convey their thoughts. In the West, Franke and Mote feel that because eccentric loyalists such as Zheng Sixiao did not constitute a political threat, the Mongol authorities simply paid no attention to what they wrote.¹

To be sure, the situation under the Yuan compares favorably with the Ming and Qing literary inquisitions, in which authors of condemned works frequently suffered the death penalty or posthumous disgrace.² The closest equivalent in the Yuan was the burning of Daoist books and woodblocks in 1258 and 1281,³ but there are no known cases of literary inquisitions in which an individual was arrested and executed for reviling Yuan rulers and officials. The three years of Song resistance are even included in the *Songshi* annals of the last Song emperor, whereas the Southern Ming movement during the early Qing period is never mentioned in the *Mingshi* annals. Furthermore, the Mongols have often been considered generous in their treatment of the Song imperial family, compared to the savage attitude of the Jurchen Jin. Loyalty was a virtue admired in Mongol tradition since the time of Chinggis Qan, and when the Song was conquered, the Yuan government sought to employ especially diehard loyalists like Wen Tianxiang and Xie Fangde. The motive for this policy was to bring the newly conquered empire more readily into submission by persuasive example. Thus, the Mongols had no intention to be hostile to those who still felt a lingering loyalty to the for-

1. On the repressive atmosphere of the early Yuan, see Fu Lo-shu, "Teng Mu," 44, 48, 53. For references to the Yuan being free from censorship, see Franke, "Some aspects of Chinese private historiography," 117-18; Mote, "Confucian eremitism," 285; Li Zefen, vol. 4, 778-90.

2. For accounts of Ming and Qing literary persecutions, see Ku Chieh-kang, and L. Carrington Goodrich, *The Literary Inquisition of Ch'ien-lung*.

3. Goodrich, *Literary Inquisition*, 3-4.

Hagiography and Historiography

mer Song dynasty.

However, judging by their writings, the loyalists felt that the climate was not entirely conducive to free expression. A literatus in 1369 noted that "at the time when the Yuan was first established, those expressing opinions often used concealed and obscure phraseology."¹ Two works discussed earlier in this connection are the *Songshi* and Chen Zhongwei's *Erwang benmo*. In regard to Wen Tianxiang's work, Zheng Sixiao writes that he saw both the original and later editions, in which derogatory references to the Mongols had been revised:

The references to the [Mongol] bandits as "Great Yuan" and "Chief Minister," and to himself as "Tianxiang" in Wen's prefaces were not the original words of the venerable [Wen]. The earlier editions railed blatantly at the caitiffs and did not record their chieftains' names. Readers should detect these concealed and falsified words. It must have happened that those misguided by the bandits anticipated catastrophe and thus changed [the offensive language] to innocuous words. The fierce berating of the bandits in the poems [of the *Zhinan lu*] have also not been transmitted [to the new edition].²

Some loyalists used historical analogies to express their thoughts about foreign conquest. Hu Sanxing (1230-1302) was a loyalist in Qingyuan who revealed his outrage by means of his annotations on the *Zizhi tongjian*

1. See Hu Han's (1307-81) commentary on Xie Ao's "Record of weeping at the western terrace," in Cheng Minzheng, 3.7b.

2. Zheng Sixiao, *Xinshi*, 92. It seems that in the Qing there still existed a 1276-78 edition of the *Zhinan lu* in five *juan*, in which some characters were missing and some passages deleted with black ink. See Mo Youzhi, 71-72.

Chapter Three

(Comprehensive mirror as a guide to government).¹ When his work was published in the late Yuan, it appears to have been subjected to some editing. However, the revisions were only randomly done, as many pejorative phrases have survived. Xie Fangde also annotated Confucian classics and Tang poems to convey his distress about foreign rule,² but here too it would appear that if tampering had in fact occurred, it was not thoroughly carried out.

There are other indications that loyalists used obscure and allusive language in their writings because they did not feel the political atmosphere to be entirely free of restraint and danger. An incident described by Song loyalists in such a manner is the rescue of the Song imperial relics in Kuaiji (Shaoxing).³ In order to pay last respects to the Song dynasty while at the same time protecting their identity, poets gathered there and wrote highly allusive poetry. In 1284, Xie Ao (1249-95), a follower of Wen Tianxiang, wrote an essay which was later hailed as a masterpiece of loyalist literature.⁴ In the essay, Xie identifies neither the persons nor events mentioned, presumably in order to avoid being accused of seditious acts. Several years later, Xie served as a judge in a poetry competition held in Wuzhou, in which the theme assigned, rustic pleasures in the spring, was allusive rather than straightforward. The entries were couched in obscure language and submitted under pen names.

Of relevance to a discussion of Yuan censorship is the *Xinshi* of Zheng Sixiao, a collection of vitriolic essays enclosed in an iron case and

1. Hu's death is usually given as 1287, but it should be 1302, as shown in Zhou Zumo, "Sanxing shengzu xingli kao," 113-16. Chen Yuan noted concealed meanings and references to the former Song in Hu Sanxing's work. See his *Tongjian Huzhu biaowei*, 18-19, *et passim*.

2. See the Bibliography for titles of Xie's annotations.

3. On the response of the loyalists in Kuaiji to the desecration of the Song imperial tombs, see Chapter 5. On the poetry gatherings which took place at the same location in 1279, see Kang-i Sun Chang.

4. This essay is in Cheng Minzheng, 3.7b.

Hagiography and Historiography

suspended in a dry well, at the monastery in Pingjiang where Zheng had lived. The preface indicates that the work was completed by 1283, but the iron case was not retrieved until 1638, a time coinciding with the impending conquest of the Ming dynasty by the Manchu Qing. The *Xinshi* is in essence a work laced with strong abusive language hurled against the Mongols and foreign rule; it advocated a Song restoration. On the basis of its inaccuracies in describing Mongol customs and the Song resistance, the relatively well-preserved state of the work, and the timing of its discovery, the *Xinshi* has been dismissed as a Ming forgery intended by its author to arouse nationalistic and ethnic emotions and instigate animosities against the Manchus. This was certainly the view of some Qing scholars and the *Siku quanshu* compilers.¹ However, Ming loyalists such as Gu Yanwu (1613-82) and Wang Fuzhi (1619-92), and modern Chinese nationalists contended that the *Xinshi* had truly been authored by Zheng Sixiao.² In more recent times, the work has been accepted as authentic by Mote and Kuwabara, but the last word has not yet been spoken.³ The Qing historian Quan Zuwang (1705-55) wavered: he first regarded the work as a forgery, but later treated it as authentic.⁴ An alternative view that the work was written by a group of patriots who were

1. See Ji Yun, 174.3761; Zhang Xincheng, 1159. Qing scholars who considered the *Xinshi* a forgery included Tan Rumu, Xu Qianxue, Yan Baishi, Zheng Xiaoxu, and Yuan Mei. For a summary of arguments for and against the proposition that the work is spurious, see Yang Ligui, 85-101.

2. Those believing in the work's authenticity included Gu Yanwu, Zhang Hong, Yao Jiheng, Yu Jiaxi, Peng Guodong, and Zhou Guanhua. See Yang Ligui, 84-85.

3. See Mote, "Confucian eremitism," 28; Kuwabara, 2, 9-13. A recent study reaffirms Liu Zhaoyou's earlier opinions about the *Xinshi*'s spurious nature; see his "Xinshi zuozhe kao-bian." Luo Xianglin treats the work as a Ming forgery in his *Pu Shougeng zhuan*, 12, 31-32, but accepts it as authentic in his "Song wangtai yu Songji zhi haishang xingchao," 140-41.

4. Quan Zuwang is generally believed to have dismissed the *Xinshi* as a forgery; however, I find that he was in favor of its authenticity in some references (see his *Jiqiting ji, waibian* 44.1337, *shiji* 4.1507) and against elsewhere (*waibian* 25.1000, 34.1143-44; *shiji* 5.1525).

Chapter Three

Zheng Sixiao's contemporaries has also been put forward.¹

After considering the arguments on both sides and reading the *Xinshi*, I have concluded that neither its authenticity nor its spuriousness can be proved beyond doubt. The *Xinshi* should, however, be included as a source on Song loyalism, albeit with reservation for the following reasons. To use the factual inaccuracies of the work as an argument against its authenticity is weak. Zheng's contemporary, Zhou Mi, in depicting Mongol and other foreign customs, also quoted fantastic tales that he had heard at second or third hand, but the authenticity of his notebook miscellanies has never been questioned. The language and repetitive style used in the *Xinshi* can be found in Zheng's other extant writings. Furthermore, the individual that emerges from the *Xinshi* is consistent with the eccentricity of Zheng as conveyed by his paintings and by contemporary accounts.²

Zheng explains in the *Xinshi* that his main objective for writing it was "to respect legitimate and orthodox succession, repel the barbarians, praise the loyal subjects, execute the treacherous bandits, and to encourage the world and posterity to become loyal subjects."³ His instructions were to destroy the work should it be retrieved before the Song was revived. Zheng may have concealed the *Xinshi* because he feared that the Mongols might discover his writings and learn about a Song restoration movement.

Although Zheng Sixiao and traditional historians have exaggerated the repressive political climate under which the loyalists lived, there is evidence that the Mongol emperor distrusted Song loyalty in spite of his admiration for it. In this connection, one should mention a written statute forbidding the

1. See Yao Congwu, "Tiehan Xinshi zhong de nanren yu beiren de wenti," 109.

2. Zheng Sixiao painted orchids without soil to indicate his distress at the Mongol occupation of Song territory. In his collected works there are many poems and essays reproaching himself for being unfilial and disloyal to the Song, together with references to his peculiar habits and eccentric nature. See his *Zheng Suonan xiansheng shiji wenji*. Among Yuan literati who wrote about Zheng were Wang Feng (1319-88), "On the Song national university student Zheng Sixiao's ink orchid painting," in his *Wuxi ji*, 1.45b-46b; Zheng Yuanyou (1292-1364), 1.14-15; Tao Zongyi (ca. 1316-ca. 1402), *Nancun zhuogeng lu*, 20.246-47.

3. See his "Self-postscript," in Zheng Sixiao, *Xinshi*, 139.

Hagiography and Historiography

Chinese to congregate in public.¹ Moreover, among other specified groups, they were not allowed to carry arms, and the penalties for such an offense far outweighed banditry and thievery.² The Yuan authorities certainly suspected subversive activities, and in 1283 Qubilai responded to rumors that the last pretender to the Song throne, Di Bing, was still alive.³ He thus executed Wen Tianxiang after a plot to rescue the latter was discovered.⁴ In 1290 there were petitions to transfer Song imperial relatives to the capital, presumably out of fear that they might participate in a rebellion, possibly as figure-heads.⁵ I suggest that in view of this political climate, even though there were neither censorship laws nor cases of literary inquisitions, there existed fear of the consequences of defamatory language used against the Mongols. Thus, the loyalists, friends, colleagues, sons and disciples exercised caution and self-censorship. The editors and publishers also saw the need to tone down certain passages and revise a few offensive words. Then there were Lu Xiufu's diary which Deng Guangjian never released to his fellow loyalists, and Deng's *Tianhai lu* which Deng's family did not make available to the *Songsshi* compilers. One could speculate that these writings contained unflattering material about the Mongols which Deng dared not reveal and thereby court disaster. For, even if the Mongols did not seem to care what eccentrics like Zheng Sixiao wrote, the loyalists and their associates guarded against giving collaborators opportunities to implicate them on the basis of seditious literature.

A question to be asked is how extensive this voluntary editing was.

1. YS 7.141.

2. Bandits who robbed and killed suffered only the cane, but those found in possession of weapons received the death penalty. See Cheng Jufu, 10.395-96.

3. YS 13.276.

4. SS 418.12539-40.

5. YS 16.336. The provincial government of Jiang-Huai advised against moving the Song imperial relatives en masse to Dadu, citing the people's possible "restlessness" (i.e. rebelliousness) as the reason.

Chapter Three

Absent in most literary collections of the loyalists is a fierce condemnation of the Mongols, who are referred to as "Dabing" (Great army), "Da Yuan" (Great Yuan) and "Tianbing" (Heavenly army). The Mongol conquest is euphemistically talked about as "flames of war, submission, and the change of dynasties." The epithets used against the Mongols are "barbarians, northern people, northern visitors, caitiffs, and barbarian chieftains." It is sometimes difficult to determine whether the loyalists later reconciled themselves to foreign rule before using the Yuan reign titles, or their editors changed their wording. One thing is certain though, such mild language was not used at the beginning of the Mongol conquest in Song official writings. In imperial rescripts for the period 1273-75, drafted by the erudite scholar and loyalist Wang Yinglin and preserved in his collected writings, we can easily find insulting terms for the Mongols, who are compared to ugly beings, swine, and snakes preying on other people's blood.¹ As these rescripts survived through the Yuan, we can say that although there is evidence of editing, it was only randomly done.

While we might reasonably assume that the editing of loyalist writings in the Yuan was mostly done voluntarily and cautiously, the censorship of later periods was not. The Qianlong rescript of 1776 emphatically proclaimed that books by Ming authors which opposed the Qing dynasty must be burned; in the case of books dating from the Southern Song which criticized the Jin, or from the early Ming which criticized the Yuan, the offensive passages must be erased or revised, though not necessarily destroyed.² Song loyalist writings would surely have fallen into the second category. As the Qing rulers were descended from the Jurchens, material detrimental to the Jin would have to be revised. Indeed there exist examples of such revisions in Zhou Mi's notebook miscellanies where Jurchen Jin emperors are referred to by their temple names, and the Jin dynasty is called "Da Jin" (Great Jin).³ Given Zhou Mi's antipathy to the Jin, as was typical of Southern Song officials

1. See, e.g. Wang Yinglin, *Siming wenxian ji*, 5.26b and 5.28b.

2. Goodrich, *Literary Inquisition*, 144, 147.

3. Zhou Mi, *Guixin zazhi*, xu b.49a, bie a.37b.

Hagiography and Historiography

as well as northern Chinese in Yuan service, he would not have used that expression for the Jin, and Yuan editions would not have made the change. In addition to criticism of the Jin, the Manchus were sensitive to derogatory language used against the Khitan Liao and the Mongol Yuan.

The Local Perspective on the Song Loyalists

It was in view of the deficiencies of the *Songshi*, interest in local contributions to national history, and admiration of loyalism that alternative sources on the Song loyalists blossomed into a genre of loyalist literature. The *Song yimin lu* (Record of Song loyalists) is a Ming compilation of the writings and later eulogies of eleven *yimin* loyalists who were not included in the official histories.¹ Its compiler explains that he was upset at this omission and thus published their writings to preserve them for posterity.

Efforts to extol native loyalists resulted in works with a distinctly local perspective. Gazetteers and family genealogies collected biographical information on native personalities who had played a role in the attempted restoration of the Song. The early Qing historian Wan Sitong (1638-1702) used such gazetteers and unofficial sources to supplement the list of loyalists in his *Songji zhongyi lu* (Records of loyal and righteous men at the end of the Song).² The 544 men dealt with in the compilation include all the loyal men who fought against the Mongols, from the 1230s to the collapse of loyalist resistance in 1279. In this work Wan appended additional material to the *Songshi* biographies and also altered the text of the annals to make legitimate the reign of the two Song princes enthroned by the loyalists. The editors of the Qing imperial encyclopedia, *Gujin tushu jicheng* (Encyclopedia of past

1. Cheng Minzheng's *Song yimin lu* compiled the writings and relevant material on the following loyalists: Wang Yanwu, Xie Ao, Tang Jue, Zhang Yifu, Fang Feng, Wu Siqi, Gong Kai, Wang Yuanliang, Liang Longji, Zheng Sixiao, and Lin Jingxi. Quan Zuwang's comments on the imperial bones incident were inserted later.

2. Wan Sitong, *Songji zhongyi lu*. This compilation is very liberal and includes many former Song officials who served the Yuan without any hesitation or regrets. Wan also compiled material on the imperial bones incident (*Nan Song liuling yishi*); the various arguments about the ethnic background of the last Yuan emperor, Toghon Temür, are collected in the *Gengshen jun yishi*. Both volumes appear together under the title *Nan Song liuling yishi*.

Chapter Three

and present books), also combed through official and alternative sources to compile records of 684 *zhongyi* subjects of the Song; out of this figure about one-third are loyalists who fought the Mongols.¹ These records of Song loyalists take up six chapters and constitute only a small section in its general coverage of loyal subjects since antiquity (See Appendix B). The Late Qing historian, Lu Xinyuan (1834-94), in his *Songshi yi* (Appendage to the *Songshi*) added many biographies of Song loyalists under the categories of *zhongyi* and *yixian* (surviving literati).² In his work Lu used gazetteers, funerary inscriptions, and other private sources. In more recent times, Chen Botao (1855-1930), feeling forlorn about the Republican Revolution of 1911, found consolation in the recollection of Song loyalists in Dongguan and in Kowloon. The *Dongguan yimin lu* (Record of remnant survivors in Dongguan) records the activities of the local loyalists during and after the collapse of Yai-shan.³

By compiling and adding biographies of local loyalists and anthologies of their writings to previous collections, the above works primarily sought to record local contributions to Song loyalism. Quan Zuwang is generally recognized as a major historian of the Zhedong school, inheriting the legacy of Huang Zongxi (1610-95) and Wan Sitong. Better known for his scholarship on Ming loyalism, Quan's work on the Song loyalists consists of a number of separate essays discussing certain aspects, events, and personalities of the Southern Song.⁴

In several essays Quan excitedly traces his ancestors to the eminent

1. Chen Menglei. Loyal men from antiquity to the Ming appear in *juan* 705-764. The coverage begins with prefaces and essays on loyalty, followed by biographies of loyal men in each dynasty. Loyal men of the Song take up six *juan* while those of the Ming take up twenty-nine. See Appendix B.

2. Lu Xinyuan.

3. Chen Botao.

4. Quan's work on the Song loyalists consists of about thirty references to the affairs and personalities of the late Southern Song. They appear in random order in his collected writings, the *Jiqiting ji*.

Hagiography and Historiography

Quan lineage of Kuaiji. From family registers and Song literature he documents his clan relationship to Empress Dowager Quan, mother of Gongdi. When the Song capital fell, Empress Dowager Quan's family (excluding her aged father) had accompanied the imperial entourage to Dadu and later died there.¹ The mothers of Duzong and Lizong were also related to the Quan family.² Furthermore, Lizong and his brother had been brought up by the Quan clan. Quan Zuwang emphatically states that although his ancestors had been prominent in the late Southern Song, they did not take advantage of their position to advance the family. In fact, after the fall of the Song, many relatives of the Quan family who had never served the Song decided to withdraw from political service because of their connections with Song royalty.³

In another essay, Quan claims descent from another clan member, Quan Quanweng (fl. 1260-1300), a poet who came in ninth in a poetry competition held in 1286-87.⁴ Quanweng's loyalty to the Song through withdrawal from public life is readily praised by Quan, who also credits Quanweng with playing a crucial role in the recovery of the Song imperial remains, a role hitherto never recognized. Dai Biaoyuan (1244-1310), a native of Qingyuan, was an affectionate friend of Quanweng; using Dai's writings together with the family registers, Quan informs his readers that because the new site for the imperial bones had then been in his family's possession, and because Quanweng was a close companion of Wang Yingsun (fl. 1260-1300, the mastermind behind the reburial of the imperial remains), Quanweng must have been involved in the planning and should accordingly be commemorated with the other participants of the incident.⁵ Quan goes so far as to say that without the participation of his family, the Song imperial relics would not have been recovered.

1. See Quan Zuwang, *ji* 36.4620-63; *waibian* 14.849-51.

2. *Ibid.*, *ji* 36.462-67.

3. *Ibid.*, *waibian* 21.939.

4. On Quan Quanweng as a poet, see *ibid.*, *ji* 36.468; *waibian* 14.850, 33.1132.

5. *Ibid.*, *ji* 33.417-18.

Chapter Three

In addition to his ancestors' direct participation in the events of the Southern Song, Quan was interested in loyalist personalities and sites that were connected with his own native place, Qingyuan. In this respect, he reveals new information about the loyalists Wang Yinglin, Hu Sanxing, and others during the first generation of Yuan rule.¹ In addition, Quan's work is valuable in supplementing the historical records relating to the local region. In one instance, he notes that the existing gazetteers did not record the historical significance of Jinzi mountain, where Zhang Shijie had camped with his forces and sought loyalist support in Qingyuan. Quan explains that the omission had resulted from deliberate suppression by the author of the gazetteer, Yuan Jue (1266-1327), in order to conceal his father's surrender to the Mongols.² Quan also provides additional information about the descendants of the loyalists, with whom he was acquainted.³

In his work Quan expresses general views about the traditional historiography of Song loyalism. According to him, individuals who survived the change of dynasty but did not serve the new rulers should be considered loyalists; their biographies should therefore be placed next to the *zhongyi* biographies.⁴ He argues that Liu Yin (1249-93) and Xu Heng (1209-81), who were born under the Yuan, would not have damaged their integrity if both had served. However, he criticizes Yuan Haowen (1190-1257), who lived under the Jin but still recommended over forty former Jin subjects to office in

1. For essays on Hu Sanxing, Wang Yinglin, and others, see *ibid.*, *waibian* 18.906-07, 25.1008-09.

2. *Ibid.*, *waibian* 14.842-43; *shiji* 2.1482.

3. For example, Quan was acquainted with the descendants of Fang Feng and Wang Ying-sun. See *ibid.*, *waibian* 25.1000, *shiji* 7.1573-74. Quan's daughter became the grand-daughter-in-law of Fang Feng's descendant. See Chen Yuan, *Chen Yuan shiyuan xue zawen*, 56.

4. Quan Zuwang, *waibian* 42.1299-1300.

Hagiography and Historiography

the Yuan.¹ Sometimes this appraisal is not very logical and shows his partiality, as when he chides Dai Biaoyuan for serving the Yuan as an instructor in a prefecture and defends Wang Yinglin for serving as a local school director, his reasoning being that the latter office was at the local level and received no orders from the Yuan throne.² And, as mentioned earlier, Quan has not been consistent in his views about the authenticity of the *Xinshi*. In arguing for the prominent role his ancestors had played in Southern Song, he points out that although his family had the potential to do so, it did not interfere with court politics; he later contradicts himself by saying that Duzong's accession to the throne was largely due to the efforts of his family (Jia Sidao is traditionally credited with Duzong's enthronement), but it was Jia Sidao who was solely responsible for ruining the empire.³ Quan also draws flawed conclusions: on the strength of two short extant poems which had placed ninth in an amateur poetry competition, he considered Quan Quanweng a giant among poets. In sum, Quan's concern with his family and local history, together with his personal prejudices, definitely undermined his objectivity as a historian.

A more recent interest in local contributions to Southern Song history is reflected in the debates in the 1950s involving several prominent scholars in Hong Kong: Jian Youwen, Luo Xianglin, and Rao Zongyi. In connection with the role Hong Kong and Kowloon played in the events of the loyalist resistance, the key issues raised are the route taken by the refugee loyalist court, the identification of local relics with real or imaginary historical per-

1. On Quan's attitude toward Liu Yin and Xu Heng, see Quan Zuwang, *waibian* 33.1128; on Yuan Haowen, see *waibian* 31.1101. For their biographies, see respectively, *YS* 171.4007-10 and *YS* 158.3716-30; Toghto, *Jinshi*, 126.2742-43. On Liu Yin's political withdrawal, see, *inter alia*, Tu Wei-ming. On Yuan Haowen's contributions to the *Jinshi*, see Hok-lam Chan, *Historiography*, 5-8, 67-119.

2. On Dai Biaoyuan, see Quan Zuwang, *ji* 5.61; on Wang Yinglin, see *waibian* 19.915-20.

3. *Ibid.*, *waibian* 14.850-51.

Chapter Three

sonalities or events, and the reliability of various sources including folklore.¹ It is generally agreed that in February 1276, Gongdi's brothers, Shi and Bing, left Hangzhou and passed through Wuzhou; in May and June they arrived at Wenzhou and Foochow respectively. In December 1276, pursued by the Mongol fleet, the loyalist court sailed by Quanzhou and Xiamen (Amoy), Chaozhou, Haifeng, Guangzhou, reaching Guanfu (Kowloon and Hong Kong) in April 1277. For six months in 1277 the loyalist court sojourned in Guanfu chang (now identified as Jiulong cheng), Guta (Fotang men, also in Jiulong cheng), and Qianwan (Quanwan), all within the present Kowloon territory.²

For centuries relics have reminded Hong Kong inhabitants of this episode in Song history: the rock used as a dressing table by Imperial Concubine Yang, the Erwang dian (Palace of the two princes), and the Song wangtai (a large rock identified as the remains of a lookout tower located on Sacred Hill). There are also relics traditionally associated with the refugee court which the scholars proved to be imaginative folklore; for instance, the Houwang miao (Temple of Prince Hou) had nothing to do with the brother of Imperial Concubine Yang, and the Jin furen mu (Tomb of Lady Jin) could not be the alleged grave of the sister of Di Shi.³ As early as 1899 the site itself was recognized by local inhabitants to have historical significance and successful appeals were made to the British authorities to have it thus declared to prevent commercial development on the premises.⁴ The original Song wangtai platform no longer exists, having been destroyed by the Japanese in World War II in order to extend Kai Tak airport. But the rock itself with the

1. On the debate, see in particular Jian Youwen, *Songmo erdi nanqian nianlu kao* and his *Song huangtai jinian ji*; Luo Xianglin, "Song wangtai," 99-146; Rao Zongyi, *Jiulong yu Songji*, preface and 221-22.

2. Rao Zongyi, *Jiulong yu Songji*, 24-31; Jian Youwen, *Songmo erdi*, 21-60; Luo Xianglin, "Song wangtai," 108-21.

3. Rao Zongyi, *Jiulong yu Songji*, 90-91; Jian Youwen, "The travelling palace of Southern Sung in Kowloon," 29-30.

4. Luo Xianglin, "Song wangtai," 112.

Hagiography and Historiography

inscription "Song wangtai" remains largely intact, and has been moved to a different site to commemorate the Song princes. In 1958, after the completion of gardens surrounding the rock, Jian Youwen was requested by the Zhao family clan in Hong Kong (which claims descent from the Song imperial family) to write a commemorative volume identifying the relics and places of historical interest relating to the Song imperial princes in Kowloon and Hong Kong.¹ Sparked by this interest, Luo Xianglin's main concern was to add details to many points raised. The primary purpose of Rao Zongyi's book was to question doubtful analyses and erroneous sources used by both Jian and Luo.

The three authors disagree on a number of issues, but the main bone of contention is the identification of Gangzhou, where the loyalist court had fled from the Kowloon sites in December 1277 and where Di Shi subsequently died. While traditional historians together with Jian Youwen and Luo Xianglin point to the Dayu shan on Lantau Island (on Kowloon territory), Rao Zongyi places it much farther to the west near Huazhou and Leizhou in western Guangdong province.² In support of their argument, both Jian and Luo draw from Chen Zhongwei's *Erwang benmo*, a work that Rao shows to have been drastically edited and therefore unreliable. Rao instead follows Deng Guangjian's biography of Wen Tianxiang together with Zhou Mi's *Guixin zazhi* and the *Yuanshi* to argue his point, but Jian and Luo have not been convinced. Their determination to locate Gangzhou within the present crown colony of Hong Kong is related to an attempt to enhance the cultural history of this region. Although the debate has ended, interest in the Song dynasty has not waned, as indicated by the opening of a commercial amusement park named Songcheng ten years ago.

After several months in Gangzhou, where Di Shi died and Di Bing succeeded to the throne, the loyalist court sailed back to eastern Guangdong, and at Yaishan (located in Xinhui district), it anchored and stayed for nine months. Temporary lodgings were built and preparations made for the final

1. Jian Youwen, *Song huangtai jinian ji*.

2. Jian Youwen, "Gangzhou hezai," 75-88; Luo Xianglin, "Song wangtai," 126-29; Rao Zongyi, *Jiulong yu Songji*, 51-83.

Chapter Three

battle in March 1279. Since 1980 this site has again been recognized for its historical significance and therefore become a tourist attraction.¹ Other sites of interest on the route of the refugee loyalist court continue to be pointed out by local inhabitants, but some claims are based on no more than unsubstantiated folklore. These include the cliff from which Lu Xiufu was thought to have jumped (in fact Lu leapt into the sea from the imperial boat) and a certain island where Wen Tianxiang's boat was to have been anchored and from where he witnessed the Yaishan battle.

Genealogies also reflect a local pride of participation in national history. I noted earlier that the compilers of gazetteers were interested in adding names of loyalists to already existing lists. Family registers also sought to put on record any relationship or contact with Song loyalists and the imperial family. In the case of the Huang family register of Taishan (Guangdong province), there is a record of a certain woman née Mi who cured Imperial Concubine Yang of an ailment.² The Zhao family register claims a continuous descent from the Song emperors. A large number of Zhao imperial clansmen had accompanied the two Song princes to Guangdong, and most of these came from Foochow branches. At present there are branches in Hong Kong, Xinhui, Taishan, Dongguan, and in North America.³ Wen Tianxiang's descendants are traced through several registers; some branches have spread to

1. "Xinhui Yaimen jiyou," *Dagong bao*, August 17, 1980.

2. Luo Xianglin, "Song wangtai," 139.

3. For example, the *Zhaoshi zupu*, compiled by Zhao Xinian, is the genealogy of the Xinhui branch of the Song imperial family, which originated in the Sanjiang branch in Fujian. In 1980 I interviewed in Seattle a seventy-year old gentleman, Willard Jue (Zhao), who had in his family collection a 1905 *puban* edition of *Foushi Zhaoshi zupu*, the genealogy of the Taishan branch of the Zhao family, claiming descent from the Song imperial family. It had been brought to Portland by his grandfather in 1907. He also had a 1966 reprint, a ballad narrative of the Zhao family history, an anthology of prose and poems of the Zhao family (Hong Kong, 1972), and a geographical treatise (1908 edition). In Hong Kong, the Zhao family clan (Chiu Clansmen's General Association) still publishes a quarterly newsletter and distributes it both locally and overseas. A branch association is active in Vancouver, Canada. The eminent linguist Y.R. Chao claimed to be the thirty-first generation descendant of the Song imperial family. See Y.R. Chao, 2.

Hagiography and Historiography

Huizhou, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Malaysia, and the United States.¹ The Xie family claims Xie Fangde and his wife in its registers.² The fact that these genealogies have been vigorously kept up to date shows that connections with the Song loyalists and the imperial family continue to be regarded with pride. Although these genealogies have elements of truth in regard to participation in the events of the end of the Song dynasty, one can hardly doubt that both exaggeration and distortion have occurred, since some of these genealogies state at the outset that those who brought shame to the clan would not be recorded. This concern for home and family by historians has often constituted a conspicuous aspect of the historiography of the Song loyalists and has contributed to the myth-making process.

Myth-making and Song Loyalty

I have just discussed the nature of some sources which gave rise to a number of myths associated with the loyalists and their resistance to the Mongols. The accessibility of Wen Tianxiang's writings caused his points of view to be heard above all other loyalists, and thus he emerges from the beginning as the leader of the resistance while the shortcomings of his rival loyalists are highlighted. For ideological reasons, the *Songshi* compilers depicted the conquest of the Song to have been compassionate and gentle in spite of some known Mongol atrocities. Admiration for the loyalist spirit and local interest in history gave rise to the erroneous view that the loyalist resistance was popularly supported by all the soldiers and common people, when in fact many were but mercenaries attracted by profit or tenants compelled by their landlords to join the armies.

To take the end of the Song to be 1279 rather than 1276 is another distortion of historical fact. In February 1276, when Empress Dowager Xie surrendered Hangzhou, edicts were dispatched to order the entire empire to submit and to return the two princes who had fled to the southeast. The imperial family was then taken to the North, accompanied by thousands of offi-

1. See Li An, 251, on a Wen family descendant in New York. On the Malaysian branch, see Zheng Liangshu.

2. Xie Hongxuan, vol. 1, 128, 224-29.

Chapter Three

cials and gift-bearers. Yuan authorities immediately took possession of imperial archives and treasures, and set up a provisional government to represent Yuan interests in Hangzhou. The Mongol emperor, by performing the Chinese sacrificial rites to the ancestors and to Heaven (if only by proxy), also formally brought the Song to an end. He soon proclaimed that the Song should henceforth be referred to as Wang Song (Vanquished Song). As far as the Yuan was concerned, the Song dynasty was thus terminated for all intents and purposes with the fall of Hangzhou. In the *Songshi* annals of the Duke of Yingguo, however, an account of Di Shi and Di Bing is attached. By this gesture the Yuan acknowledged the fact that resistance had occurred without according any legitimacy to the three years of its duration. In 1276 many civilian and military officials also felt that the Song had collapsed and accordingly surrendered or fled into sparsely inhabited areas to nurse their grief. Some considered themselves to be *yimin* loyalists and began writing about the collapse of the country and their personal bereavement. Only a few central government officials such as Lu Xiufu, Zhang Shijie and Wen Tianxiang later felt that the mandate of Heaven had not been withdrawn from the Song house during 1276-79, as indicated in the posthumous will of Di Shi drafted by Lu Xiufu: "I have no pleasure in being emperor. It is only that Heaven has not released the Song [from holding the mandate of Heaven]!"¹ These reasons thus justify regarding the Song dynasty to have ended with the occupation of the capital in 1276. Although the loyalists found support in the southeastern provinces in 1276-79, they were not powerful enough to actually begin administering the regions which they held or recovered from the Yuan forces.

The inclusion of the three years of resistance as part of the Song dynasty was a result of rewriting Song history during the Ming and Qing dynasties. What gave rise to this interest was general dissatisfaction with the composition of the *Songshi* and the legitimate status given to the Liao and Jin dynasties by writing their separate histories.² Except for Wang Zhu who took an extremist position by denying legitimacy altogether to the Yuan dy-

1. Lu Xiufu, 2787.

2. See Hok-lam Chan, "Chinese official historiography," 96-104, and Jin Yufu, *Zhongguo shixue shi*, 139-44.

Hagiography and Historiography

nasty, most Ming scholars wanted to combine the three histories into one, with the Song commanding legitimacy and the Liao and Jin incorporated into the history of the Song. Nostalgia and admiration for the loyalist spirit accounted for their wish to represent Gongdi, Di Shi and Di Bing as legitimate Song emperors, and be respectively known as Gongzong, Duanzong and Di Bing. In the Qing, chronological histories such as Bi Yuan's *Xu Zizhi tongjian* adhered to the *Songshi* convention of ending the Song in 1276, but private writings such as Wan Sitong's *Songji zhongyi lu* revised the *Songshi* annals and loyalist biographies to accord legitimacy to the two princes and the three years of loyalist resistance. Most Chinese and Western works now take 1279 to be the end of the Song, attesting to the success of Ming and Qing revisions of Song history.¹ This is a curious and unjustified interpretation, especially in view of the fact that we regard the Ming dynasty to have ended in 1644 when the Ming capital was occupied by the Manchus, even though loyalist forces continued to threaten the new dynasty for several decades.

Another myth present in historical sources is the fantastic tale of Gongdi fathering the last Yuan emperor, Toghon Temür (Shundi, r. 1333-1368).² In March 1276, the six-year old Gongdi journeyed to Dadu and was formally dethroned and demoted to the rank of Duke of Yingguo. In 1288 he left for Tibet to practice Lamaist Buddhism. An early Ming unofficial history, the *Gengshen waishi* (Unofficial history of the *gengshen* year), states that many years later he was given a Muslim wife, who in 1320 gave birth to a son.³ It happened that Qoshila (the future Mingzong, r. 1329) was passing through Tibet, and considering the birth to be auspicious, took with him back to Dadu both mother and child (Toghon Temür, the future Shundi). Another

1. For examples of 1279 being used as the end of the Song, see Jin Yufu, *Song Liao Jin shi*, 109; Langlois, *China Under Mongol Rule*, 467; Hervouet, viii; Conrad Schirokauer, 185.

2. There are two other similar cases of fantasy: the Jin emperor Zhangzong (r. 1190-1208) was believed to have been the grandson of the abducted Song emperor Huizong, and Emperor Yongle of the Ming was said to have descended from a Mongol. On the Yongle legend, see Shao Hsun-cheng; cf. Henry Serruys, "A manuscript version." For the Jin Zhangzong rumor, see Zhou Mi, *Guixin zazhi*, xu b.47a.

3. Quan Heng, *Gengshen waishi*, a.10a-b.

Chapter Three

Ming source corroborates the story, but with some minor variation of detail.¹

Proponents of this story saw confirmation in Qoshila's admission that Toghon Temür was indeed not his own son.² They further sought to verify it with a remark made by the Yongle Emperor (r. 1403-1424) of the Ming, that the portrait of Shundi bore an uncanny resemblance to the founding Song emperor.³ Many Qing scholars such as Quan Zuwang and Zhao Yi accepted the notion that Gongdi had indeed fathered Shundi,⁴ but others believed the rumor to be a myth created by Song loyalists and their sympathizers to compensate for their loss of empire and ruler.⁵ It was further argued that Qoshila would not have considered adopting a child, not to mention the Yuan aristocracy permitting a non-Mongol to be enthroned. The renowned scholar Wang Guowei (1877-1927) also regarded the story as true on the basis of the *Fozu lidai tongzai* (Comprehensive account of Buddhist monks in history) recording the forced suicide of Gongdi in 1323.⁶ His contention is that Qoshila had felt threatened by Gongdi (who knew about the circumstances of the son's adoption) and therefore put him to death.⁷ This argument, however, is not convincing enough to confirm the story as historical fact, and the whole story is largely speculative.

Both the depiction of the Song loyalists as faultless exemplars and the idealization of their loyalism as a paradigm of virtues unchanged through the ages have been affected by the myth-making process. Wen Tianxiang, the paragon of loyalist integrity, is praised to the utmost, while his faults--arro-

1. This was Yu Ying's "Song of the flying dragon of imperial Song." See Wei Qingmang, 552.

2. Quan Zuwang, *waibian* 42.1287.

3. *Ibid.*, *waibian* 42.1289.

4. *Ibid.*, *waibian* 42.1289; Zhao Yi, 30.649-50.

5. Wei Qingmang, 574.

6. *Nianchang*, 22.734.

7. Wang Guowei, 21.1060-61.

Hagiography and Historiography

gance, extravagance and exaggeration of his own role--are not mentioned. On the other hand, as indicated in Chapter Two, Jia Sidao's crime as the "last chief minister" has been exaggerated. Not only are Wen and Jia portrayed as positive and negative counterparts of each other, but the entire group of loyalists emerges diametrically opposed to the collaborators and defectors. A deliberate attempt to stereotype and categorize has resulted in the widening and contrasting of the qualities of the two groups, and in the process our view of the large number of Song officials between these two extremes has been blurred.

Biographies of the Song loyalists in the *Songshi* include mainly those who died for or because of the Song cause, and thus they were martyrs whose integrity could not be questioned due to death. Although the *Songshi* preface to the biographies explains that those who survived the disasters but withdrew from society and concealed themselves should also be regarded as loyal men, only four such loyalists have been included. Unofficial historical sources outlined in the previous pages intended to supplement this gap by including biographies and accounts of the *yimin* loyalists who lived after the collapse of the Song but who did not eventually serve in the Yuan government. Thus two traditions of Song loyalists have been recognized so far, the martyrs and the survivors.

Such a classification scheme does not adequately consider those who later served the Yuan in minor educational offices and others who found themselves in compromising positions beyond their control. Some of these individuals have been included in the tradition of *yimin*, whereas others in exactly the same situation have been censured and lumped together with the defectors and collaborators. The prejudices and standards set by the individual writer determined who should or should not be criticized. Grouping these men with the collaborators in effect ignores the circumstances of their re-emergence into public service and the particular type of loyalism they felt. In fact, not a few collaborators and defectors felt loyalty and some changed sides only under difficult situations. Placing loyalists and collaborators into polar opposites overlooks the common background and similar sentiments of the two groups. In order to further explore the close connection between the two extremes, a third group--the marginal loyalists--should be examined. Their loyalty was somewhat tarnished by their socializing with Yuan offi-

Chapter Three

cials, or by taking up office in the new government after a period of withdrawal, or by withdrawing from public service only after a period of Yuan employment. These three traditions of Song loyalism are scrutinized separately in the following chapters.