

*causes and to subsequent exfoliated consequences. Actors have complex motivations and an interior depth which often imparts a rich flavour to the generally ironic unfolding of events . . .*⁸⁶

The primary reason why these texts have been overlooked is ascribable to their genre. Written either as courtly poetry, folk epics or diplomatic reports, their historical content is ‘hidden’ to us, but understood by their contemporaries by their ‘texture’, the sub-generic markers, shifters etc. within texts that informed their audience of their historical intent. As yet history *sui generis* did not exist as a genre, but historical consciousness did and was written in literary modes prevalent in the culture.

Of course, these were still regional histories. As stated earlier, there was as yet no nation of India, and so we may partly concur with the notion that James Mill, with all his prejudices, wrote the first history of the sub-continent. Nevertheless, important reorientations in outlook and writing were occurring in some sections of the population that indicate that even prior to the colonial impact, a definite sense of historical consciousness was emerging.

East and South East Asia

Shamanism and history: the origin of the ‘*shi*’

Finally we turn to East and South East Asia, where we see a long tradition of historical writing established first in China. In order to discuss the trends of development in Asian historiography from the eighteenth century onward, it seems necessary briefly to review this tradition, which bore characteristics distinct from those of other historical cultures in the Middle East, South Asia, and Europe. In its formative years, for example, shamanism played an important role in the gestation of both the written language and historical culture in ancient China. The earliest records of history were found in oracle inscriptions on animal bones and tortoise shells during the Shang period (c. 1600–1066 BCE). These records were mostly made by a shaman-cum-king for the purpose of divination and incantation. In a later time, a position called *shi* was created and during the long course of the Zhou dynasty (1121–249 BCE), the *shi* multiplied and became ubiquitous at Zhou court. Modern Chinese now tend to translate *shi* as ‘historian’, but in Zhou times, the *shi*’s responsibility was not exclusively historical – he was also a scribe and an astrologer; as the latter he carried on the shamanic duty of interpreting the implication of heavenly movement for human affairs.⁸⁷

That historical writing originated from shamanic activities and that the *shi* was initially a government position left an enduring imprint in Chinese historical thinking. Writing history in China was often an official undertaking, though prior to the seventh century many historians did not turn to history under a government order and after the seventh century there was still a vigorous practice in private history writing. In ancient texts, such as the 'Six Classics', which it is believed that Confucius might have helped edit and preserve, there was already reference to history as a mirror, reflecting the past rights and wrongs that were deemed beneficial for the present. The causes of the Shang's fall, it said, were already mirrored in the fall of the Xia (2207–1766 BCE), its predecessor, for both committed similar errors. History thus was regarded as a repository of political wisdom, which became a lasting belief broadly held in China's imperial period. It prompted the dynastic ruler, after his ascent to the throne, to order the compilation of the history of the preceding dynasty. From the seventh century onwards, this became standard practice for historical writing in China, which in no time also exerted a notable influence in Korea, Vietnam and Japan.

The formation of Confucian historiography

The much-quoted statement that history in China was written 'by the bureaucrats for the bureaucrats' describes the official nature of dynastic history writing. However, it does not do full justice to the diverse tradition of historical writing in imperial China because private interest in historical writing was both persistent and lively throughout China's imperial era. Nor does the statement take into account that the tradition of official historical writing was not fully set in place until the seventh century. Sima Qian (145–87 BCE), for example, arguably the greatest historian in imperial China, pursued by and large the same interest as did Herodotus when he set out to compile the *Records of the Historian* (*Shiji*), which was to satisfy his curiosity for extraordinary occurrences and preserve historical memory. Though he was born into a hereditary *shi* family, Sima wrote his magnum opus on his own without the emperor's patronage. His goal was 'to explore the boundary between the realm of Heaven and the realm of humanity, to comprehend the process of changes in times past and present, and to establish the tradition of one family'.⁸⁸ Sima did not intend it simply as a service to the emperor.

At the time when Sima Qian began his writing, narrative history had already taken root in China, to which Sima was indebted in developing his

own style – ‘to establish the tradition of one family’.⁸⁹ Yet in his effort to ‘comprehend the changes in times past and present’, or to seek out the governing law in history, Sima was inspired more by Confucius, who had established that history writing ought to help establish a normative sociopolitical order. To Confucius, this order had already been exemplified by the rulership of previous historical eras, such as that of the Zhou – thus he lamented the decline of Zhou political culture in his own age. By revising the existent *Spring and Autumn Annals* (Chunqiu), compiled by the *shi* of his home state Lu, Confucius hoped not only to chronicle the degeneration of history but also to censure those culpable for such regression. What he did was to alter slightly the records in the *Annals* by replacing certain words (e.g., changing ‘killed’ to ‘murdered’) in order to achieve a stronger moral condemnation on illicit behavior. By exercising this so-called ‘pen-law of the *Spring and Autumn*’ (Chunqiu bifa), Confucius demonstrated that the historian’s pen was used not only to record the past, but also to pass moral and political judgement.

In the works of Confucius and Sima Qian there were frequent references to the *tian* (Heaven), or the Chinese notion of God. This showed that during their time, the shamanic belief in the Heaven–humanity correlation remained influential. This influence did not go away quickly. However, by moralizing the writing of history, Confucius did inject a worldly tone into the historiographical tradition and enhanced the agency of historical writing: he hoped to restore by the historian’s pen what he considered a Heavenly order, whereby good and evil were made known to the public. To Confucius and his followers, the historian’s straightforwardness was not devoid of a moral standard; it rather meant that the historian should set his record ‘straight’ to uphold the moral standard, not ‘bend’ to political pressure or coercion.⁹⁰

Given the influence of Confucianism, which became a state ideology in the Han dynasty (206 BCE–220 CE), historiographical compilation thus pursued a dual goal. It was both historical and normative, motivated as much by the desire to build a repository of historical knowledge as by the pursuit of an ideal sociopolitical order. Thus Sima Qian’s *Records* follow a hierarchical structure, a microcosm of his own ideal world perhaps, to house his vividly and colourfully styled biographies. For example, the ‘basic annals’ section contains the biographies of the imperial houses from antiquity to the Han, the ‘hereditary houses’ section portrays the deeds of noteworthy ministers, and the ‘arrayed biographies’ section depicts the lives of people from different social strata whom Sima regarded as either important or interesting.⁹¹ By ranking and grouping historical figures this

way, Sima demonstrated what the ideal sociopolitical order was supposed to be. However, from a typical Confucian perspective, Sima's historical practice was not perfect because he often deviated from his own model. As a historian, he at times showed too much interest in describing the unique and the extraordinary at the expense of moral didacticism. Nonetheless, the annals-biography style Sima invented was later adopted, after some modification, as the standard form for dynastic history writing in imperial China and elsewhere in the Sinitic world.

The History Bureau and dynastic history

From a modern view, however, Sima Qian's greatness may lie precisely in his deviation from the Confucian ideal because after him, history writing became increasingly straitjacketed due to government intervention. Beginning in the Tang dynasty (618–907), it was turned into an official undertaking by the establishment of the History Bureau. The Tang rulers showed a great interest in making history a resourceful mirror from which useful political lessons could be learned to improve their rule and prolong the dynasty. The Bureau's task, or the task of its historians, was, on the one hand, to compile histories of previous dynasties, and, on the other, to collect and preserve documents and sources for the current regime. These sources were vetted and organized under such categories as 'court diaries', 'daily calendar' and 'veritable records', on whose basis a contemporary history, called 'national history' (*guoshi*), would be compiled.⁹²

The Tang system of official historical writing exerted a paradigmatic influence in Korea and Vietnam, and later in Japan, so much so that dynastic histories in these places were written in Chinese as late as the end of the nineteenth century. Conversely, valuable records of early histories of Japan, Korea and Vietnam were found in Chinese historical works. In Japan, the *Rikkokushi* (Six National Histories), written originally in Chinese, were patterned on the Tang model of official history writing.⁹³ The notion that history was a mirror for the present propagated by Tang rulers and historians also resonated well in Japan. During the eighth and twelfth centuries, there appeared a group of historical texts, *Ōkagami*, *Imakagami* and *Mizukagami*, and more famously, *Azumakagami*, all bearing the word 'mirror' (*kagami*) in their titles. But their content and style were becoming increasingly more Japanese than Chinese, indicating that the Chinese influence had gradually waned. Indeed, unlike in Korea and Vietnam, the Chinese tradition of dynastic history was never solidified in feudal Japan, partly because prior to the seventeenth century, Japan had

not established a unified dynastic power. But despite the frequent warfare, efforts were continually made by Japanese historians to record history and examine the causes of the rise and fall of powers. The proliferation of the 'battle-day literature' (*Gunki monogatari*) was a case in point.⁹⁴

The Tang practice of historical writing, and its idea of history as a mirror, was not particularly moralistic, if judged by the Confucian standard. After the fall of the Han in the third century, Buddhism had entered China proper and Tang culture was characteristically Buddhist, especially with respect to its influence in Japan and Korea. Buddhist hagiographic writing, as well as its exhortative intent, succeeded in merging with the existing tradition of biographic writing in Tang historiography. But Confucianism revived during the Song dynasty (960–1279); sometimes known as Neo-Confucianism in Western scholarship, it reasserted the moralist position in historical writing. This reassertion, however, was not immune to Buddhist influence. In the Song discourse of history, historians deployed such metaphysical concepts as the 'principle' (*li*) or 'Heavenly principle' (*tianli*) to moralize historical writing, a practice rarely seen in classical Confucianism.⁹⁵

The spread and influence of dynastic historiography

The Song practice of history thus differed from that of the Tang, and the Neo-Confucian practice differed from that of the early Confucians. Empowered by their knowledge of the cosmological order, members of the literate class turned to history to remonstrate with their emperor against any deviation from the 'Heavenly principle'. That is, these literati believed that they held *shiquan* (the authority of history), with which they could delimit the otherwise omnipotent imperial power. Sima Guang's (1019–1086) undertaking of *Zizhi tongjian* (The Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government) was a famous example. At first glance, this general history, covering over 1,300 years, exercised the time-honoured idea of making history a political mirror for government. But Sima Guang perhaps sought beyond that; his masterpiece could be viewed as offering a master narrative that generalized the rise and fall of dynasties in the past. It distilled valuable political wisdom for improving imperial rulership.⁹⁶

In other words, from the Song period onward, dynastic historiography became increasingly monarch-centred. It had departed from the model established by Sima Qian in the Han period, which now looked almost panoramic in its coverage. While dynastic historians narrowed the scope of their work, they increased tremendously its size, many dynastic histories

being composed of a great number of volumes. Because of its stupendous size, once completed, one dynastic history was only printed in several copies. They were usually kept in the royal palace and imperial library, inaccessible to the general public. And this was not just a Chinese phenomenon. As China's closest neighbours, Korea and Vietnam both established the system of official history writing under Chinese influence from the twelfth century on, if not earlier.⁹⁷ In 1145, Kim Pu-sik (1075–1151) compiled the *Samguk sagi* (Historical Records of the Three Kingdoms), which is the earliest surviving history in Korea.⁹⁸ During the Chosŏn dynasty (1392–1910), which saw more Chinese influence in the form of Neo-Confucian learning, greater efforts were made to promote history writing.⁹⁹ The *Koryŏsa* (History of Korea), compiled in 1451, was Korea's first complete dynastic history. The *Tongguk t'onggam* (Comprehensive Mirror in the Eastern Kingdom [Korea]), on the other hand, was an emulation of Sima Guang. In their effort to uphold the Confucian world order, Korean historians followed the principle of flunkeyism (*sadae*) and placed the biographies of Korean kings in the 'hereditary houses', instead of the 'basic annals', in order to mirror Chosŏn Korea's tributary bondage to China.¹⁰⁰ However, this might be an isolated case because dynastic histories in Vietnam of the same period were intended to glorify the feats of *Dai Viet*, or 'Great Viet', as in *Dai Viet su luoc* (An Outline History of Great Viet) and *Dai Viet su ky* (Historical Records of Great Viet). The *Dai Viet su ky toan thu* (Complete Version of the Historical Records of Great Viet), compiled by a court historian Ngo Si-lien (dates unknown) in 1479 was another example, even though all these historical texts invariably also registered the influence of Confucian moral values.¹⁰¹ Meanwhile, Buddhist, or South Asian, influence in Vietnamese historiography should not be ignored. The *Viet dien u linh tap* (Compilation of the Departed Spirits in the Realm of Viet) from the thirteenth century was written by a custodian of a Buddhist library.¹⁰² Finally in Japan, dynastic history writing entered a period of revival from the seventeenth century, which saw the compilations of the *Honchō tsugan* (Comprehensive Mirror for Our Dynasty) and *Dai Nihonshi* (History of Great Japan); the latter was launched by a member of the Tokugawa family, the shogun (general) that ruled a unified Japan in the emperor's name.

As dynastic historiography established itself as the norm of historical writing in the Sinitic world, back in China where it originated, its compilation had become a matter of course, no longer performing the same role as before in preserving useful lessons from the past for guiding the present. During the Ming dynasty (1368–1644), the augmentation of imperial

power meant that it became more and more difficult for the historians of the History Bureau to record faithfully the events happening around the court, let alone those elsewhere. The quality of Ming official historiography suffered as a result. Private history writing, by comparison, flourished in the Ming period, in part because historians worked in private, inspired continually by the Neo-Confucian political ideals, intent on exposing the concealments in official historiography.¹⁰³ The proliferation of private history writing in the Ming also benefited from the growth of a commercial culture and a book market which began in the sixteenth century. Thanks to the development of trade and commerce, an urban society emerged in south-east China, which created a new readership among the urban dwellers who turned to history mainly for entertainment. Tailoring to such an interest, new genres appeared in Ming private historiography in which the line between history and fiction became increasingly porous.¹⁰⁴

‘To seek the truth from facts’: the rise of evidential learning

After the Ming’s fall in the seventeenth century, the Manchus established the Qing dynasty (1644–1911) in China, hoping to restore and continue the Sinitic cultural order. But to Confucian scholars, including those in Korea and Japan, the collapse of the Ming dynasty marked the end of a historical era. Korean Confucians thus attempted to turn Korea into *Sojunghwa* (Little China), or a new centre of Chinese culture.¹⁰⁵ Japan under Tokugawa’s reign (1603–1868) saw a notable development of commercial culture, parallel to that of Ming and Qing China. In response to the needs and interests of the growing number of the townspeople, Japanese scholars employed different hermeneutic strategies in interpreting the Confucian classics, which led to the unravelling and fragmentation of the Neo-Confucian orthodoxy endorsed by the shogunate. Of the many schools emerging at the time, the National Learning School, led by Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801), was particularly significant; buoyed by a proto-nationalist sentiment, it doubted the universal value of Confucian teaching and questioned its cultural relevance to Japan.

In China, a similarly critical attitude toward Neo-Confucianism was manifest in the school of evidential learning (*kaozhengxue*), which rose in the wake of the Ming–Qing dynastic transition from the mid-seventeenth century. Neo-Confucianism, or its development in the Ming period, was now deemed culpable for the Ming’s fall in the Qing scholarly community, though on the official level, Neo-Confucianism continued to receive

endorsement from the Qing court.¹⁰⁶ Intent on promoting practical learning and knowledge of statecraft, Qing scholars became displeased and disillusioned with the Neo-Confucian interpretation of Confucian teaching. They distanced themselves from Ming Neo-Confucian metaphysics and endeavoured to restore the classical Confucianism of the Han period and earlier. To this end – analogous to the Renaissance humanists' restoration of Greco-Roman classical culture – Qing scholars turned to the methods of philology, phraseology, phonology, etymology and epigraphy, hoping to fathom and wrest the original (hence true) meaning of the Confucian classics.

This reorientation of intellectual culture, characterized by Benjamin Elman as a move 'from philosophy to philology', exerted a significant impact on the study of history.¹⁰⁷ It pointed to a marked change in historical thinking in that the evidential scholars' rejection of Neo-Confucianism was predicated on the argument that since the Neo-Confucians lived over a thousand years after Confucius, there was no reason to worship their works as orthodox and authoritative interpretations of Confucian teaching. This charge of anachronism had appeared earlier, in the Song period.¹⁰⁸ But never before had it become so widespread and influential as in the eighteenth century. Evidential scholars, such as Hui Dong (1697–1758) and his Suzhou School, focused on restoring Han Confucian learning and advocated the Han superiority to the Song in Confucian scholarship. Hui argued that since the Han was much closer to Confucius' age, Han scholars' study of Confucian teaching had benefited from an oral tradition unavailable to the Neo-Confucians of later ages.

Although the Suzhou scholars were later criticized for their over-enthusiasm for Han learning, it was noteworthy that their restorationist project was motivated not only by an interest in the old(er), but also in the true(r). Indeed, for evidential scholars, *Shishi qiushi* (to seek truth in actual facts), a Han adage, was a motto. This was embodied most typically in the scholarship of Dai Zhen (1724–77), a luminary in the Qing scholarly constellation. Inspired by Hui Dong in his early career, Dai took an interest in Han scholarship. But he soon went beyond that and eventually acquired fame as the most erudite person of the age. Dai's scholarship was encyclopedic, ranging from phonology, etymology and phraseology to geography, astronomy and mathematics. Although he was not primarily a historian, he studied ancient institutions and regulations. His main goal in pursuing such a broad array of knowledge was to gain a better understanding of Confucian teaching. Different from the Neo-Confucians, especially those of the Ming who had prized intuition and epiphany, Dai focused on restoring the appropriate historical context in order to

apprehend the meaning of the Confucian classics on their own terms. He maintained that if one hoped to understand the meaning of the text, one had first to understand the meaning of the words.¹⁰⁹ Like the humanists and antiquarians in Europe of the same period, Dai and his followers believed that philology was the queen in classical learning. In particular, they emphasized the study of ancient phonology because pronunciations changed over time and, in ancient times, many characters had been interchangeable due to their then similar pronunciations.¹¹⁰ Thus viewed, Hui Dong's worship of Han scholarship also made sense; not so distant from the age of Confucius, scholars of the Han had a clear advantage in detecting those interchanged characters, for their pronunciation was not as different as it would become in a later time.

The Qing scholars' interest in ancient history was not unprecedented. Given the long tradition of historical writing in China, the Chinese had possessed a good knowledge about their past, perhaps better than any other people in the world at the same period. They acquired this knowledge by studying and mastering the masterpieces bequeathed to them from the past. The towering status of Sima Qian, for example, spawned many imitations across the Sinitic world. However, at times efforts were also made to evaluate the master's work critically, checking the validity and reliability of its content. Liu Zhiji (661–721), a Tang historian, was a good example. In his *Shitong* (Comprehensive Perspectives on Historiography), arguably the first historiographical study produced in the Sinitic world, Liu offered a critical, sometimes scathing, evaluation of previous histories and classics.¹¹¹ Indeed, historiographical study was a respected scholarly tradition in imperial China – scholars had made tremendous efforts to gloss, examine and annotate earlier historical works.

The Qing evidential project continued this tradition. But it also went much further. Wang Mingsheng's (1722–97) *Shiqishi shangque* (Critical Studies of the Seventeen Histories), Qian Daxin's (1728–1804) *Ershi'ershi kaoyi* (Examination of Variances in the Twenty-two Histories) and Zhao Yi's (1727–1814) *Nian'ershi zhaji* (Notes on the Twenty-two Histories) were the best examples of Qing evidential scholarship, showcasing its critical spirit and sophisticated methods. As shown in their titles, the subject of their critical study was the revered dynastic histories that had been previously regarded as 'standard histories' (*zhengshi*). Yet Wang, Qian and Zhao subjected them to critical scrutiny, comparing their records with myriad other sources, including inscriptions on bronze and stones. Armed with their erudition, they also provided detailed and usually correct explanations for the people, events, official titles, places and institutions

mentioned in them. In addition, they, especially Zhao Yi, discussed general patterns and trends of social, cultural and institutional developments.¹¹²

To conduct their studies in this way, these historians were motivated by the traditional desire to establish history as a mirror. Yet they also argued that history played an equally important role as the study of the classics, a bold argument unseen before. This trend of historicism in Qing intellectual culture led to a ‘historicization’ of classical learning.¹¹³ This process was best summarized in the statement, ‘all Six Classics were histories’, entered emphatically by Zhang Xuecheng (1738–1801) in his *Wenshi tongyi* (General Principles of Literature and History), even though Zhang’s own scholarly interest extended beyond evidential study. By emphasizing and restoring the historicity of the classics, Qing evidential scholars succeeded in unravelling the Neo-Confucian hermeneutic edifice, which had considered the classics as sacred and immutable, and raised the status of history by emancipating it from its traditional role as auxiliary to classical study. They pursued and maintained the belief that the right and wrong, or the greatness of the classics, would reveal themselves once the historical truth was established. This belief was not dissimilar to Leopold von Ranke’s (1795–1886) in his well-known maxim, ‘*wie es eigentlich gewesen*’. Zhao Yi, for example, criticized the Neo-Confucian historiographical method, for it rewrote some previous historical works not to correct their mistakes but so that they better espoused Confucian ideals.¹¹⁴

All the scholars mentioned above, Wang Mingsheng, Qian Daxin, Zhao Yi, and to a lesser extent Zhang Xuecheng, were contemporaries of Dai Zhen. In fact, they befriended one another; Qian, for example, was a friend of Dai’s and was related to Wang by marriage. Together with many others, they formed a scholarly community, or a Republic of Letters, which consisted of several schools emerging from where these savants worked as school teachers and independent scholars. Wang Mingsheng, for instance, belonged to the Suzhou School. Dai Zhen later developed his own – the Anhui school – attracting a large following, as did Qian Daxin, though on a smaller scale due to his modesty. The emergence of this Republic of Letters benefited from the boom of a book culture in the Ming and Qing periods. According to one estimate, by 1750 this book culture had printed more books in China than the sum of all books printed in the rest of the world.¹¹⁵ Qing scholars often published their works in a number of volumes, even though some of them, such as Zhang Xuecheng, lived in poverty.

This explosive growth of a book culture in Qing China was associated with impressive economic development and consistent population growth. As mentioned earlier, an urban society in south-east China had already

emerged in the Ming period. By the eighteenth century, a national market had formed, characterized by its long-distance trade both at home and abroad. As merchants gained more social respect, they interacted and associated through marriage with the literati class. To some extent, the augmented interest in practical learning and evidential study in the Qing suited the need of merchants in an increasingly urban and commercialized cultural setting. By allying with merchants, the literati families also gained a more stable economic footing, which was increasingly necessary because, thanks to population increase, the traditional channel of upward social mobility through civil service examinations had become increasingly narrower. The rise of the merchant class undermined the traditional social hierarchical order of literati, peasants, artisans and merchants, which Neo-Confucianism had hoped to uphold. Just as evidential learning loosened the foundation of the Neo-Confucian intellectual order, economic change shook the Neo-Confucian social order. And the two, needless to say, were correlated.¹¹⁶

Associated with the social change outlined above, the Republic of Letters also grew; many scholars who had succeeded in the civil examinations retired early from government in order to devote their time to teaching and scholarship. Qian Daxin and Wang Mingsheng were well-known examples. Their decision was made possible by the availability of teaching positions in many academies. During Ming and Qing China, the number of academies reached an unprecedentedly high level. Many scholars thus were able to support themselves and, more importantly, exchange their ideas with one another by teaching in an academy. The development of a commercial culture mentioned above also provided financial support to some members of the literati class for their interest in scholarly pursuits. Wealthy merchants, for example, usually offered a handsome amount of royalty and commission to a noted scholar or poet for writing a eulogy or poem for a deceased family member or ancestor. During the eighteenth century, though the odds of passing the highest level of the civil examination appeared to have worsened, the number of candidates succeeding at the lower levels increased, suggesting a rise in literacy – estimated between twenty and thirty per cent among the male population – and an expanded readership for books in history and other genres.¹¹⁷ If a ‘reading public’ indeed was emerging in Ming and Qing China, it was also aided by the increase in the literacy rate among women, as revealed by recent studies of Chinese women’s history.¹¹⁸

The interest in evidential learning, too, spilled over to the Qing court. Emperor Qianlong (r. 1735–95), who was well known for his grandiose

ambitions and extravagant projects, commissioned the compilation of the *Siku quanshu* (Complete Works of the Four Treasuries). It was a stately attempt to screen, abstract and catalogue all worthy books published in the past, and it organized them under four categories: classics, history, philosophy and belles-lettres, a traditional bibliographical system first used during the pre-Tang period. The *Four Treasuries* project reaped the fruits of evidential study; the latter's ideas and techniques in textual and historical criticism were applied to examine and ascertain the authenticity of the books, and investigate and ensure the integrity and veracity of their contents. In fact, Dai Zhen, the doyen of evidential learning, was made an editor for the project.¹¹⁹

From a different perspective, the emperor's interest in and patronage of the *Four Treasuries* project could have been an insidious scheme, aiming at thought control of the literati class. It might have been intended to channel the intellectual energy to something meticulous and time-consuming in order to preempt subversive acts. During the Qing period, there indeed occurred several bloody and notorious cases of the so-called 'literary crimes' (*wenziyi*), in which a writer, historian or poet was executed by the emperor, along with his family, relatives and even disciples, for alleged treasonable ideas found in his writings. Emperor Qianlong might come across as a dilettante in literati culture. Yet in so far as his political thinking was concerned, he was certainly more dependent on Neo-Confucian learning for its emphasis on moral cultivation and sociopolitical order. Thus viewed, evidential learning was tinged with a dissident overtone. At the very least, it showed an unwillingness among some members of the literati class to lend overt support to Manchu rule.

The Tokugawa shogun in Japan also detected the potentially subversive power in evidential study, though as an intellectual movement it did not reach Japan until the end of the eighteenth century. The Kansei Prohibition (1790)¹²⁰ was an example of the shogunate's attempt to shore up Neo-Confucian orthodoxy and fend off its critics and the challenges from various schools, including the emergent evidential learning advocated by Inōe Kinga (1732–84) and Yoshida Kōtan (1745–98) in Japan.¹²¹ Despite the prohibition, evidential learning continued to attract a following and reached maturity during the nineteenth century, whereas it declined apparently in Qing China.

In Chosŏn Korea, critics of Neo-Confucian learning, including those with a bent for evidential learning, were gathered together in the School of Practical Learning whose rise mirrored the intellectual change of the Ming and Qing in China.¹²² An Chŏng-bok (1712–91), an acclaimed evidential

historian, demonstrated his excellent skills in source criticism and enviable erudition in both Korean and Chinese histories in his *Tongsa kangmuk* (An Outline of Eastern [Korean] History), a chronicle bearing a deceiving Neo-Confucianist title. Spurred on perhaps by an embryonic nationalist sentiment in light of the Ming's fall, he and especially his followers began to shed doubt on the Sinocentric world order that had traditionally undergirded Chosŏn Korea's tributary relation with China.¹²³ In the work of Le Quy Don (c. 1726–84), a well-respected Vietnamese historian, similar efforts were made to broaden the use of sources, thanks to the influence of evidential learning. Le's multi-volume *Le Trieu Thong Su* (Complete History of the Le Dynasty) departed from official Vietnamese historiography. Enriched by vivid biographic accounts, it was more a prosopography than a chronicle, reminiscent of Sima Qian's *Records*.¹²⁴ In sum, prior to the intrusion of Western powers, the intellectual life of the Sinitic world exhibited a great deal of vitality and dynamism, highlighted by the ebb and flow of evidential learning. In the following centuries, the interest and focus nurtured by evidential learning were to condition and characterize the efforts by historians in the region to accommodate and appropriate Western influences, to which we will turn in the next chapter.

Notes

- 1 See Ernst Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern* (Chicago, IL, 1983); Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, CA, 1990).
- 2 Masaki Miyake, 'Millennial Movements and Eschatologies in Europe and Asia: A Comparative Approach', in *Time: Perspectives of the Millennium* (Westport, CT, 2001), 213–27; for Europe, Karl Löwith, *Meaning in History: The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History* (Chicago, IL, 1949).
- 3 See W. G. Beasley and E. G. Pulleyblank, eds, *Historians of China and Japan* (Oxford, 1961), 5; also E. Balacz, 'L'historie comme guide de la pratique bureaucratique', *ibid.*, 78–94.
- 4 Jörn Rüsen, ed., *Western Historical Thinking: An Intercultural Debate* (New York, 2002).
- 5 Peter Burke, 'Western Historical Thinking in a Global Perspective', *ibid.*, 15–30.
- 6 Georg G. Iggers (1926–), 'What is Uniquely Western About the Historiography of the West in Contrast to that of China?', *ibid.*, 101–10.

- 7 On China, see Benjamin Elman, *From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China* (Cambridge, MA, 1984).
- 8 See Donald R. Kelley, *Foundation of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law, and History in the French Renaissance* (New York, 1970).
- 9 There is a tremendous literature on the Enlightenment. Some titles: Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2005); Martin Fitzpatrick, Peter Jones, Christa Knellswolf and Iain McCalman, *The Enlightenment World* (New York, 2004); Ellen Judy Wilson, Peter Hanns Reill, *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment* (New York, 1996); James Schmidt, ed., *What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions* (Berkeley, CA, 1996); Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation*, 2 vols (New York, 1966–9); Carl Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century French Philosophers* (Ithaca, NY, 1931); Isaiah Berlin, *Three Critics of the Enlightenment: Vico, Hamann, Herder* (Princeton, NJ, 2000); a different interpretation of eighteenth-century natural science: Peter Hanns Reill, *Vitalizing Nature in the Enlightenment* (Berkeley, CA, 2005).
- 10 Paul Hazard, *La Crise de la conscience européenne 1680–1715* (Paris, 1935); English: *The European Mind* (Cleveland, OH, 1963); also Hazard, *European Thought in the 18th Century: From Montesquieu to Lessing* (New Haven CT, 1964).
- 11 J. H. Brumfitt, *Voltaire, Historian* (Oxford, 1958).
- 12 *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts, et des métiers* published between 1751 and 1776 with later supplements. Diderot was chief editor; contributors included d'Alembert, Condillac, Baron d'Holbach, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Turgot and Voltaire among many others. See Robert Darnton, *The Business of the Enlightenment: A Publishing History of the Encyclopédie, 1775–1800* (Cambridge, MA, 1979); Philipp Blom, *Enlightening the World: Encyclopédie: The Books That Changed the Course of History* (New York, 2005).
- 13 Catherine Macaulay, *History of England from the Accession of James I to that of the Brunswick Line*, 8 vols (London, 1763–83).
- 14 A useful selected edition of Robertson's works is Felix Gilbert, ed., *The Progress of Society in Europe* (Chicago, IL, 1972).
- 15 John Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. 1, *The Enlightenment of Edward Gibbon, 1737–1764* (Cambridge, 1999); Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Gibbon's Contributions to Historical Method', in Momigliano, *Studies in Historiography* (New York, 1966), 40–55.

- 16 Montesquieu, *Considerations of the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline* (New York, 1965).
- 17 *Histoire philosophique et politique des établissemens et du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes* (Amsterdam, 1773–74).
- 18 Cited in English in Georg G. Iggers, ‘The European Context of German Enlightenment Historiography’, in Hans-Erich Bödeker, Georg G. Iggers, Jonathan Knudsen, and Peter Hans Reill, eds, *Aufklärung und Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1986), 240.
- 19 Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Past: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, MA, 1981).
- 20 David Knowles, *Great Historical Enterprises: Problems in Monastic History* (London, 1963).
- 21 Daniel Roche, *Le siècle de lumières en province: Académies et académiciens provinciaux, 1680–1789*, 2 vols (Paris, 1975); Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2005), with bibliography on academies in the French, British, and Spanish worlds; Notker Hammerstein, ‘The Enlightenment’, in Lawrence Stone, ed., *The University in Society* (Princeton, NJ, 1974), vol. 2, 625.
- 22 Peter Reill, *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism* (Berkeley, CA, 1975); Herbert Butterfield, *Man on His Past: The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1955).
- 23 Ludovico A. Muratori, ed., *Rerum italicarum scriptores* (Milan, 1723–51).
- 24 One of the most outspoken critics of established Roman history was Louis de Beaufort (1703–95), *Dissertation sur l’incertitude des cinq premières siècles de l’histoire romaine* (Utrecht, 1738).
- 25 English (Princeton, NJ, 1985).
- 26 *The New Science*, translation of the 1744 edition by Thomas G. Bergin and Max Fisch (Ithaca, NY, 1984); Isaiah Berlin, *Vico and Herder: Two Studies in the History of Ideas* (London, 1976).
- 27 On women historians, see Natalie Z. Davis, ‘History’s Two Bodies’, *American Historical Review*, 93:1 (February 1988), 1–30; also Davis, ‘Gender and Genre: Women as Historical Writers, 1400–1820’, in Patricia Labalme, ed., *Beyond their Sex: Learned Women of the European Past* (New York, 1980), 153–82.
- 28 Charles McClelland, *State, Society and University in Germany, 1700–1914* (Cambridge, 1980); R. S. Turner, ‘University Reformers and Professorial Scholarship in Germany 1760–1860’, in Stone, *The University in Society*, vol. 2, 495–531.
- 29 Nicholas Phillipson, ‘Culture and Society in the 18th-Century Province: The Case of Edinburgh and the Scottish Enlightenment’, in Stone, *The University in Society*, vol. 2, 449–94.

- 30 See Jonathan B. Knudsen, *Justus Möser and the German Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1986).
- 31 Johann Christian Gatterer, *Abriss der Universalhistorie* (Göttingen, 1765).
- 32 August Ludwig Schlözer, *Vorstellung seiner Universal-Historie*, 2 parts (Göttingen, 1772–73).
- 33 *Ibid.*, 14–19; Schlözer contrasts a world history which is an ‘aggregate’ of all special histories – implicitly a critique of the English *Universal History* – and one which seeks to construct a ‘system in which the world and mankind are a unity’.
- 34 See Eduard Fueter, *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (München, 1936), 322, arguing that the *Universalgeschichte* does not belong in the Enlightenment. For an excellent discussion of the critical reception of the *Universal History*, see Johan van der Zande, ‘August Ludwig Schlözer and the English *Universal History*’, in Stefan Berger, Peter Lambert, and Peter Schumann, eds, *Historikerdialoge: Geschichte, Mythen und Gedächtnis im deutsch-britischen kulturellen Austausch 1750–2000* (Göttingen, 2003), 135–56.
- 35 Adam Ferguson (Westport, CT, 1979); Keith Michael Baker, *Condorcet: from Natural Philosophy to Social Mathematics* (Chicago, IL, 1975).
- 36 Ferguson, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1763).
- 37 Meiners, *Geschichte des weiblichen Geschlechts*, 4 vols (Hannover, 1788–1800).
- 38 See the *Wikipedia* article on Voltaire; Google, ‘18th-century Racism’.
- 39 See E. M. Bernard, *Herder on Social and Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1969).
- 40 Herder, *Ideas on the Philosophy of the History of Humanity* (1784–91); *Letters for the Advancement of Humanity* (1793–97).
- 41 Chase Robinson, *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge, 2003), 48. Robinson cites the example that Orosius’ *Historiae adversus paganos* was translated into Arabic in Spain in the tenth century. But Franz Rosenthal, in *A History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden, 1968), 80–1, does not think that this particular translation had ‘any sort of influence on Muslim historiography’.
- 42 Franz Rosenthal, ‘The Influence of the Biblical Tradition on Muslim Historiography’, in Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt, eds, *Historians of the Middle East* (London, 1962), 35–45.
- 43 See Rosenthal, *Muslim Historiography*, 50–1. It has been noted that Jean Bodin’s *Method* is comparable to Ibn Khaldūn’s *Muqaddimah*, for the latter also deals with, among other things, historical methodology.

- 44 Karen Armstrong, *Islam: A Short History* (New York, 2000), 5. See also, A. A. Duri, *The Rise of Historical Writing among the Arabs*, ed. and tr. Lawrence I. Conrad (Princeton, NJ, 1983), 137–8.
- 45 Tarif Khalidi, *Arabic Historical Thought in the Classical Period* (Cambridge, 1994), 4–5; Duri, *Rise of Historical Writing among the Arabs*, 12–20. See also, Rosenthal, *Muslim Historiography*, 18–24, although Rosenthal disputes the historical nature of the battle-day literature because it usually was not presented ‘under the aspect of historical cause and effect’.
- 46 Rosenthal, *Muslim Historiography*, 26.
- 47 Duri, *Rise of Historical Writing among the Arabs*, 23.
- 48 For a brief discussion of the importance of *Qur’ān* and *hadīth* in guiding Muslims, see R. Stephen Humphreys, *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry* (Princeton, NJ, 1991), 21–3.
- 49 Khalidi, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 30–4; Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 20–30.
- 50 R. Stephen Humphreys, ‘Turning Points in Islamic Historical Practice’, in Q. Edward Wang and Georg G. Iggers, eds, *Turning Points in Historiography: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Rochester, 2002), 92–3; also his ‘Modern Arab Historians and the Challenge of the Islamic Past’, *Middle Eastern Lectures*, 1 (1995), 121–2.
- 51 Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 28–30.
- 52 Al-Tabarī’s work has been translated by various translators into English under the title *The History of Al-Tabarī* (Albany, 1985–).
- 53 Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 35–6; 97–100; Khalidi, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 81–2; also Tarif Khalidi, ‘Ahmad ibn Abī Ya‘qūb al-Ya‘qūbī’, in *Global Encyclopedia of Historical Writing*, ed. Daniel Woolf (New York, 1998), vol. 2, 981.
- 54 Humphreys, ‘Turning Points in Islamic Historical Practice’, 90–4 and *Islamic History*, 72, 91; also Julie Scott Meisami, *Persian Historiography, to the End of the Twelfth Century* (Edinburgh, 1999), especially 281–3; Bernard Lewis, *From Babel to Dragomans: Interpreting the Middle East* (Oxford, 2004), 411–12.
- 55 Bernard Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* (New York, 1982), 150–7.
- 56 Rosenthal, *Muslim Historiography*, 113–18.
- 57 Warren E. Gates’s article, ‘The Spread of Ibn Khaldūn’s Ideas on Climate and Culture’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 28:3 (July–September, 1967), 415–22, offers evidence of Ibn Khaldūn’s influence on European thinking in the seventeenth century.

- 58 Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 102; also Lewis, *From Babel to Dragomans*, 402.
- 59 Cf. Cornell Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli (1541–1600)* (Princeton, NJ, 1986).
- 60 Lewis V. Thomas, *A Study of Naima*, ed. Norman Itzkowitz (New York, 1972), 110–19.
- 61 Bernard Lewis describes certain works of Ottoman historians as ‘mere verbiage and bombast’. See his *From Babel to Dragomans*, 422. But entertainment had always been a major reason for Muslims to turn to history, for which a work’s orality and aurality were usually prized. See Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 171–7.
- 62 Lewis, *Islam in History*, 100.
- 63 *Ibid.*, 109–10.
- 64 Virginia H. Aksan, *An Ottoman Statesman in War and Peace: Ahmed Resmi Efendi, 1700–1783* (Leiden, 1995), xv–xvi, 18–23; also her *Ottomans and Europeans: Contacts and Conflicts* (Istanbul, 2004), 32.
- 65 Lewis, *Islam in History*, 111.
- 66 See Thomas Philipp, ‘Class, Community, and Arab Historiography in the Early Nineteenth Century: The Dawn of a New Era’, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 16:2 (May 1984), 161–75; Steve Tamari, ‘Biography, Autobiography, and Identity in Early Modern Damascus’, *Auto/biography and the Construction of Identity and Community in the Middle East*, ed. Mary Ann Fay (New York, 2001), 37–50.
- 67 Whether the Ottomans represented a declining age for the Muslims has been questioned by Rifa‘at ‘Ali Abou-El-Haj’s *Formation of the Modern State: the Ottoman Empire, Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries* (Albany, NY, 1991) and analysed in Gabriel Piterberg’s *Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play* (Berkeley, CA, 2003). For a recent historiographical review, see Jane Hathaway, ‘Rewriting Eighteenth-Century Ottoman History’, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 19:1 (June, 2004), 29–53.
- 68 Leopold von Ranke, ‘On the Character of Historical Science (A Manuscript of the 1830s)’, in Georg G. Iggers and Konrad von Moltke, eds, *Leopold von Ranke: The Theory and Practice of History* (Indianapolis, IN, 1973), 46. The passage reads: ‘Finally we can devote but scant attention to those peoples who remain today in a kind of state of nature and who lead us to assume that they have been in this state from the beginning – that the prehistoric condition has been preserved in them. India and China claim an old age and have a lengthy chronology. But even the cleverest chronologist cannot understand it. Their antiquity is legendary, but their condition is rather a matter of natural history.’

- 69 'As Indians do not have any history in the sense of historiography, they do not have history as actions (*res gestae*), i.e., no development towards a truly political status.' Cited in Michael Gottlob, ed., *Historical Thinking in South Asia: A Handbook of Sources from Colonial Times to the Present* (New Delhi, 2003), 8.
- 70 Thus the Indian historian R. G. Bhandarkar (1837–1925) stated: 'The historical curiosity of the Indian people was satisfied by legends.' Cited in Gottlob, *Historical Thinking in South Asia*, 2. See also Romila Thapar, 'Indian Historiography – Ancient', in Woolf, *Global Encyclopedia of Historical Writing*, 455–8.
- 71 Cited in Gottlob, *Historical Thinking in South Asia*, 7.
- 72 Cited in *ibid.*, 9.
- 73 Vinay Lal, *The History of History: Politics and Scholarship in Modern India* (New Delhi, 2003), 50.
- 74 It should be kept in mind that in ancient India there were also Buddhist and Jaina writings which, reflecting the particular worldviews of those sects and their social backgrounds, expressed a different type of historical consciousness and form. The monastery chronicles of both these religions are rich in secular information and have a temporal eschatology based on the historicity of their founding fathers.
- 75 C. A. Bayly, 'Modern Indian Historiography', in Michael Bentley, ed., *Companion to Historiography* (London, 1997), 678.
- 76 Thus, the *Rajtarangini* would be 'useful for kings as a stimulant or a sedative, like a physic, according to time and place'. Cited in Sumit Sarkar, *Writing Social History* (Delhi, 1997), 8.
- 77 Cited in Sarkar, *Writing Social History*, 11.
- 78 In the high-Hindu conception of time, there were four *yugas* (ages) in endless recurrence: from the *yugas* of *Satya*, to *Treta*, *Dwapar* and finally *Kali* there is a progressive degeneration from a 'golden age' (*Satya-yuga*) to social chaos (*Kali-yuga*), until the cycle is repeated again.
- 79 Sarkar, *Writing Social History*, 8.
- 80 John F. Richards used his own set of criteria and refers to this period as 'early modern' instead of 'Mughal India' or 'late medieval India' or 'late pre-colonial India'. See 'Early Modern India and World History', *Journal of World History*, 8 (1997), 197–209.
- 81 On intellectual transformation in India in the eighteenth century, see Jamal Malik, 'Mystik: 18. Jahrhundert', in Stephan Conermann, ed., *Die muslimische Sicht (13. bis 18. Jahrhundert)* (Frankfurt am Main, 2002), 293–350.

- 82 Cited in Malik, 'Mystik', 305.
- 83 Sumit Guha, 'Speaking Historically: The Changing Voices of Historical Narration in Western India, 1400–1900', *American Historical Review*, 109:4 (October, 2004), 1084–103.
- 84 Kumkum Chatterjee, 'History as Self-Representation: The Recasting of a Political Tradition in Late Eighteenth-Century Eastern India', *Modern Asian Studies*, 32 (1998), 913–48.
- 85 V. N. Rao, David Shulman and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Textures of Time: Writing History in South India, 1600–1800* (New York, 2003), 136.
- 86 Rao, Shulman and Subrahmanyam, *Textures in Time*, 136.
- 87 Several modern Chinese scholars have offered explanations for the origin and function of the *shi* in ancient China and some of their works are collected in Du Weiyun and Huang Jinxing, eds, *Zhongguo shixueshi lunwen xuanji* (Selected Essays in the History of Chinese Historiography) (Taipei, 1976), vol. 1, 1–109. For an updated English summary, see On-cho Ng and Q. Edward Wang, *Mirroring the Past: the Writing and Use of History in Imperial China* (Honolulu, 2005), 1–7.
- 88 Ng and Wang, *Mirroring the Past*, 62.
- 89 Ronald Egan, 'Narratives in *Tso Chuan*', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 37 (1977), 323–52; *The Tso Chuan: Selections from China's Oldest Narrative History*, tr. Burton Watson (New York, 1989) and Watson's introduction.
- 90 Cf. Q. Edward Wang, 'Objectivity, Truth, and Hermeneutics: Re-reading the *Chunqiu*', in Ching-i Tu, ed., *Classics and Interpretations: The Hermeneutic Tradition in Chinese Culture* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2000), 155–72.
- 91 Wai-ye Li, 'The Idea of Authority in the *Shih chi* (Records of the Historian)', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 54:2 (December 1994), 345–405; Ng and Wang, *Mirroring the Past*, 53–67. For monographic studies of Sima Qian's historiography in English, see Burton Watson, *Ssu-ma Ch'ien: Grand Historian of China* (New York, 1958); Stephen W. Durrant, *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian* (Albany, NY, 1995), and Grant Hardy, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo: Sima Qian's Conquest of History* (New York, 1999).
- 92 Denis Twitchett, *The Writing of Official History under the T'ang* (Cambridge, 1993).
- 93 Sakamoto Tarō, *Rikkokushi* (Six National Histories) (Tokyo, 1972).
- 94 Tarō, *Nihon no shūshi to shigaku* (Historical Compilation and Study in Japan) (Tokyo, 1991), 67–86, 132–7. Cf. Hugh Burton, 'A Survey of

- Japanese Historiography', *American Historical Review*, 43:3 (April 1938), 489–99, especially 490–2.
- 95 Peter Bol, *This Culture of Ours: Intellectual Transitions in T'ang and Sung China* (Stanford, NJ, 1992); Yu Yingshi, *Zhu Xi de lishi shijie* (The Historical World of Zhu Xi) (Taipei, 2003); Wm. Theodore de Bary, 'Some Common Tendencies in Neo-Confucianism', in David Nivison and Arthur Wright, eds, *Confucianism in Action* (Stanford, NJ, 1959); Wm. Theodore de Bary, ed., *The Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism* (New York, 1975).
 - 96 E. G. Pulleyblank, 'Chinese Historical Criticism: Liu Chih-chi and Ssu-ma Kuang', in W. G. Beasley and E. G. Pulleyblank, eds, *Historians of China and Japan* (Oxford, 1961), 135–166; Xiao-bin Ji, 'Mirror for Government: Ssu-ma Kuang's Thought on Politics and Government in *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien*', in Thomas H. C. Lee, ed., *The New and the Multiple: Sung Senses of the Past* (Hong Kong, 2004); Xiao-bin Ji, *Politics and Conservatism in Northern Song China: the Career and Thought of Sima Guang (1009–1086)* (Hong Kong, 2005).
 - 97 Zhu Yunying, 'Zhongguo shixue duiyu Ri, Han, Yue de yingxiang', (The Influence of Chinese Historiography in Japan, Korea and Vietnam), in Du and Huang, *Zhongguo shixueshi lunwen xuanji*, vol. 2, 1056f. It was also said that during the twelfth century, a civil service examination system and a national university modelled on the Tang were instituted in Vietnam. See K. W. Taylor, 'Vietnamese Confucian Narrative', in Benjamin A. Elman, John B. Duncan and Herman Ooms, eds, *Rethinking Confucianism: Past and Present in China, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam* (Los Angeles, CA, 2002), 343–4; K. W. Taylor, *The Birth of Vietnam* (Berkeley, CA, 1983), 250f.
 - 98 Li Runhe (Lee Yun-hwa), *Zhonghan jindai shixue bijiao yanjiu* (A Comparative Study of Modern Chinese and Korean Historiography) (Beijing, 1994), 17.
 - 99 Cf. Wm. Theodore de Bary and JaHyun Kim Haboush, eds, *The Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea* (New York, 1985) and Martina Deuchler, *The Confucian Transformation of Korea: A Study of Society and Ideology* (Cambridge, MA, 1992).
 - 100 Zhu, 'Zhongguo shixue duiyu Ri, Han, Yue de yingxiang', 1060; Li, *Zhonghan jindai shixue*, 13–20.
 - 101 See Alexander Woodside, *Vietnam and the Chinese Model: A Comparative Study of Nguyen and Ch'ing Civil Government in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1971), 18–22.
 - 102 Taylor, *Birth of Vietnam*, Appendix O, 349–59; John K. Whitmore, 'Chung-hsing and Cheng-t'ung in Texts of and on Sixteenth-century

- Vietnam', in Taylor and Whitmore, eds, *Essays into Vietnamese Pasts* (Ithaca, NY, 1995), 116–36.
- 103 Ng and Wang, *Mirroring the Past*, 193–222.
- 104 See Kai-wing Chow, *Publishing, Culture, and Power in Early Modern China* (Stanford, NJ, 2004); Cynthia Brokaw and Kai-wing Chow, eds, *Printing and Book Culture in Late Imperial China* (Berkeley, CA, 2005).
- 105 JaHyun Kim Haboush, 'Contesting Chinese Time, Nationalizing Temporal Space: Temporal Inscription in Late Chosŏn Korea', in Lynn Struve, ed., *Time, Temporality and Imperial Transition: East Asia from Ming to Qing* (Honolulu, 2005), 115–41.
- 106 On-cho Ng, *Cheng-Zhu Confucianism in the Early Qing: Li Guangdi (1642–1718) and Qing Learning* (Albany, NY, 2001); Chin-hsing Huang, *Philosophy, Philology, and Politics in Eighteenth-century China: Li Fu and Lu-Wang School under the Ch'ing* (Cambridge, 1996).
- 107 Benjamin A. Elman, *From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in late Imperial China* (Los Angeles, CA, 2000, rev. ed.); also Luo Bingliang, *18 shiji Zhongguo shixue de lilun chengjiu* (Theoretical Advancement in Chinese Historiography of the Eighteenth Century) (Beijing, 2000); Q. Edward Wang, 'The Rise of Modern Historical Consciousness: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Eighteenth-Century East Asia and Europe', *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, XL:1–2 (Winter–Spring, 2003), 74–95.
- 108 Cf. Lee, *The New and the Multiple*, particularly Lee's introduction.
- 109 Dai Zhen's major work, *Mengzi ziyi shuzheng*, has been rendered into English, entitled *Tai Chen on Mencius: Explorations in Words and Meaning*, tr. and intro. Ann-ping Chin and Mansfield Freeman (New Haven, CT, 1990).
- 110 Cf. Hamaguchi Fujiō, *Shindai kōkyogaku no shisōshi teki kenkyū* (A Study of Intellectual History on Qing Dynasty's Evidential Learning) (Tokyo, 1994).
- 111 E. G. Pulleyblank, 'Chinese Historical Criticism: Liu Chih-chi and Ssu-ma Kuang', 135–66; Ng and Wang, *Mirroring the Past*, 121–8.
- 112 Du Weiyun, *Qingdai shixue yu shijia* (Historiography and Historians in the Qing Period) (Beijing, 1988) and idem., *Zhao Yi zhuan* (Biography of Zhao Yi) (Taipei, 1983).
- 113 On-cho Ng, 'A Tension in Ch'ing Thought: "Historicism" in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Chinese Thought', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 54:4 (1993), 561–83; Benjamin Elman, 'The Historicization of Classical Learning in Ming-Ch'ing China', in Wang and Iggers, *Turning Points in Historiography*, 101–46.
- 114 Ng and Wang, *Mirroring the Past*, 245.

- 115 The estimate is in Ping-ti Ho, *The Ladder of Success in Imperial China: Aspects of Social Mobility, 1368–1911* (New York, 1962), 214.
- 116 Yu Yingshi, *Rujia lunli yu shangren jingshen* (Confucian Ethics and Merchant Spirit) (Guilin, 2004), 309; Lu Yuancong and Ge Rongjin, *Qingdai shehui yu shixue* (Practical Learning and Qing Society) (Hong Kong, 2000), 1–36; Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (Princeton, NJ, 2000).
- 117 Cf. Yu, *Rujia lunli yu shangren jingshen*; Elman, *From Philosophy to Philology*; Du, *Qingdai shixue yu shijia*. For the information on the literacy rate, see Brokaw and Chow, *Printing and Book Culture*, 30–1.
- 118 See Dorothy Ko, *Teachers of Inner Chambers: Women and Culture in Seventeenth-century China* (Stanford, NJ, 1994); Susan Mann, *The Precious Records: Women in China's Long Eighteenth Century* (Stanford, NJ, 1997).
- 119 Cf. R. Kent Guy, *The Emperor's Four Treasuries: Scholars and the State in the Late Ch'ien-lung Era* (Cambridge, MA, 1987).
- 120 Robert Backus, 'The Kansei Prohibition of Heterodoxy and Its Effects on Education', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 39:1 (1979), 55–106.
- 121 Zhu, 'Zhongguo shixue duiyu Ri, Han, Yue de yingxiang', 1053–4; Elman, 'The Search for Evidence from China: Qing Learning and Kōshōgaku in Tokugawa Japan', in Joshua A. Fogel, ed., *Sagacious Monks and Bloodthirsty Warriors: Chinese Views of Japan in the Ming-Qing Period* (Norwalk, CT, 2002), 158–84; Nakayama Kyūshirō, 'Kōshōgaku gaisetsu' (General Discussion of Evidential Learning), in Fukushima Kashizō *et al.*, eds, *Kinsei Nihon no jugaku* (Confucianism in Early Modern Japan) (Tokyo, 1939), 710–29.
- 122 Cf. Mark Setton, *Chōng Yagyong: Korea's Challenge to Orthodox Neo-Confucianism* (Albany, NY, 1997).
- 123 Shin Yong-ha, *Modern Korean History and Nationalism*, tr. N. M. Pankaj (Seoul, 2000), 5–14.
- 124 Cf. Li Tana, 'Le Quy Don', in Kelly Boyd, ed., *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing* (London, 1999), vol. 1, 210.