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The Textual History of Tao Zongyi’s *Shuofu*: Preliminary Results of Stemmatic Research on the *Shengwu qinzheng lu*¹

Christopher P. Atwood
University of Pennsylvania

**INTRODUCTION**

Scholars of Song and Yuan-era literature have long been familiar with the *Shuofu* 説郛 or “Purlieus of Exposition,”² a vast anthology assembled by the private scholar Tao Zongyi 陶宗儀 (courtesy name Jiucheng 九成, sobriquet Nancun 南村, 1316–1403)³ during the violent Yuan-Ming transition. First compiled in 1361,⁴ the *Shuofu* was an example of the genre of anthologies (*lei shu* 類書), which became common in the Song dynasty (960–1279) as a way of dealing with the vastly increasing literary

---

¹ My research on the SQL and the *Shuofu* has been aided by the kind assistance of many colleagues. I would like particularly to thank Prof. Lucille Chia (University of California, Davis), Prof. Dang Baohai 党宝海 (Peking University), Ms. Wen-ling Liu (Indiana University, Herman B. Wells Library), Prof. Matsuda Koichi 松田孝一 (Osaka International University), Prof. Nakami Tatsuо 中見立夫 (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies), Prof. Tachibana Makoto 橘誠 (Shimonoseki University), Prof. Ulaanbars (Qi Guang 齐光; Fudan University), Ms. Wang Han 王函 (National Library of China), Dr. Wu Zhijian 吴志坚 (Hangzhou Library), Mr. Xu Sanjian 徐三见 (Linhai City Museum), Dr. Hsiao-ming Yu (Central National Library, Taipei), Mr. Zhou Qiao 周峤 (Fudan University), and Mr. Zhou Qing 周卿 (Shanghai Library). I would like also to give a special thanks to Prof. Ma Xiaolin 马晓林 (Nankai University) who in the course of preparing the Chinese translation made a number of very helpful suggestions and corrections.

² I would like to thank Victor Mair for allowing me to use his elegant rendition of this difficult title.

³ Tao Zongyi’s dates have been a matter of controversy; I follow the conclusions of Chang 1979: 407–482.

⁴ Until recently, one could only say that the earliest version of the *Shuofu* preceeded Tao’s other great compilation, the *Nancun chuogeng lu* 南村輟耕録, completed in 1366 (Chang 1979: 12–13). The Mao 毛 (or Jiguge 汲古閣) manuscript, however, preserves the date of the earliest draft as 1361; see Xu 1994: 112.
output in China. After the founding of the Ming, Tao Zongyi continued to expand the *Shuofu*. Committed to a rather mild form of Yuan loyalism, his eclectic interests included a wide range of Inner Asian topics.

Tao Zongyi was often criticized for credulity and superstitious beliefs, but his openness to the exotic, as well as living under the Mongol Yuan dynasty, seems to have made him more aware of the broader world than were most Chinese scholars. His 1366 collection of anecdotes, research notes, and commonplaces, the *Nancun chuogeng lu* 南村輟耕録 (*Nancun's Notes Upon Rest from the Plow*) included a wide range of information on the Mongols, *semuren* 色目人 (*peoples of various categories,* i.e. Westerners), and other peoples in the Yuan. Among the rare and secret documents which Tao cited in this work was the official genealogy of the Mongol imperial family, “The Genealogy of the Ten Ancestors” (*Shizu shixi lu* 十祖世系録). His *Shuofu* incorporated both the *Shengwu qinzheng lu* 聖武親征録, itself a lightly edited version of the *Veritablé Records* 實錄 of Chinggis Khan and Ögedei Qa’an, and the *Meng-Da bei lu* 蒙韁備錄, the only general description of the Mongols and Chinggis Khan written in his lifetime. In his *Shushi huiyao* 書史會要 (*Brief History of Calligraphy*), published in 1376, he included a chapter on foreign scripts: Uyghur, Sanskrit, Japanese, and Arabic. In the *Shuofu*, he included a number of works on Inner Asian dynasties and Southeast Asian kingdoms that otherwise might have been lost (see Table 1).


6 On Tao Zongyi’s life, see Chang (1979: 2–10, 407–482), and Frederick W. Mote’s *T’ao Tsung-i and His Cho Keng Lu* (1954a: 1–12, 15–77), which is condensed in Mote 1954b. Sun Zuo’s biography written in 1374 is the single main source on Tao Zongyi; it is translated in Mote (1954a: 29–31). But Chang Bide has put together many isolated references to paint a much fuller picture.

7 See the listing in Mote 1954a: 147, 149–150, 160.

8 See *Yuan shi* 107/2729; cf. the note by Paul Pelliot in Hambis (1945: 144), and the discussion in Atwood (2012).


11 Mote 1954a: 82–87, esp. 85–86.
During almost the entire Ming dynasty, the work circulated only in manuscript. Only about 250 years later was the work printed, in a blockprint edition made by the Wanweishantang 宛委山堂 publishing house of Hangzhou 杭州 during the Chongzhen 崇禎 era (1628–1644). This new block-print eliminated some of the previous contents of the Shuofu (including the Shengwu qinzheng lu) and added new works as well, expanding the 100 sections (juan 卷) of most Ming-era Shuofu manuscripts into 120 juan.\footnote{There is a large literature about this printed edition of the Shuofu, but many problems remain. See Chang 1979. The reprint of it in Shuofu sanzhong 說郛三種 (Shanghai: Shanghai Old Binding Press, 1988) gives the full contents of the original Chongzhen printing, but rather confusingly adds the Li Jiqi 李際期 and Wang Yinchang 王應昌 prefaces which were first attached to the quite different early Qing 清 re-printing of 1646. Likewise the SF found in the Kyoto Research Institute of Oriental Culture, whose contents are given in the catalogue Tōhō bunka gakuin Kyōtō kenkyūsho kanseki mokuroku (1938: 324–347), is confusingly said to date to Shunzhi 順治 3 (1646) and been sponsored by Li Jiqi, when it is actually the Ming printing.} In the early Qing, the blocks were reused for several more reprints, in which the contents were rearranged and also preemptively expurgated of Song-era works that contained comments about “barbarians” that the publishers thought might be offensive to their new Manchu sovereigns — the Meng-Da beilu 倪大北極 fell victim to this purge, for example.

In the course of my studies of the Shengwu qinzheng lu (hereafter: SQL) and the Meng-Da beilu (hereafter MB), it was imperative to understand the Shuofu, through which these works were transmitted. My work on these two texts likewise illuminated the textual transmission of the Shuofu in ways that significantly challenge the previous consensus on the history of the Shuofu. This paper thus constitutes a preliminary analysis, based on my investigation of the SQL as embedded in thirteen different manuscripts or editions of the Shuofu. An earlier version was published in 2014 in Chinese translation.\footnote{See Aiwude 2014.}

**SHUOFU STUDIES TO DATE**

While the Shuofu includes a vast range of important materials found nowhere else, use of it has been impeded by the collection's major textual problems. Both manuscripts and printed versions circulate in a wide variety of versions differing radically in length and organization. Which version came first
and what are their interrelations are all questions on which eminent scholars such as Chang Bide and Jao Tsung-i have returned very different answers. Meanwhile, the progress of bibliographic scholarship in the mainland of China has resulted in an increasing number of Ming-era manuscripts being identified and catalogued. Yet how these manuscripts fit into the history of the Shuofu is still unclear.

As known to Qing-era scholarship, the Shuofu was a 120-juan work, with content focused mostly on classical and literary topics — the Inner Asian and overseas exotica that formed a significant part of the Ming-era manuscripts and the first 120-juan blockprint had mostly been purged. Catalogues however occasionally noted the existence of Shuofus of various lengths, most often 100 juan, but also 60 or 70 juan. Scholars such as Wang Guowei 王國維 and Paul Pelliot were especially intrigued by the evidence that these Shuofu manuscripts, when accessed, gave readings of works like the Zhou Daguan's Zhenla fengtuji 真臘風土記, the SQL, and the MB that seemed far superior to the existing manuscript traditions (which as it turns out in the beginning had all been derived from the Shuofu itself, although this was not necessarily clear at the time).

Modern Shuofu studies began from their efforts in the 1920s, focusing on the relation of the late Ming and early Qing printings to each other and to the 1496 mid-Ming version of Yu Wenbo 郁文博. Yu Wenbo's preface was found in the first printed Shuofu, and it was often assumed (wrongly, as it turned out), that his editorial activity must have been central to the manuscript tradition. This phase of research was concluded by Chang Bide, in his Shuofu kao 說郛考 (first edition 1962; revised and expanded edition, 1979), which made basically obsolete previous studies, such as those Paul Pelliot, Watanabe Kōzō, King P'ei-yuan, and Kurata Junnosuke.¹⁴

A landmark event in Shuofu studies was the 1927 publication of a movable type version of the Shuofu in 100 juan by Shanghai's Commercial Press. Edited by Zhang Zongxiang 張宗祥, this edition was an attempt to get behind the 120-section (juan) blockprint edition and reconstruct in printed form the Shuofu as it existed in manuscript before the 1620s.¹⁵ To do so, Zhang used four more or less

¹⁴ Pelliot 1924; Watanabe 1938; King 1946; Kurata 1950.

¹⁵ Tao Zongyi, Shuofu (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1927), 100 juan in 40 volumes in four cases, described as “a typeset edition collated on the basis of Ming-era MSS preserved in the Wetlands Fragrance House (Hanfenlou 涵芬樓).” In Chinese, this is generally known as the Hanfenlou 100-juan edition. This edition was reprinted by the Commercial Press in
fragmentary manuscripts, all in 100 yuan but all incomplete, three of which contained the SQL, in chapter (juan 卷) 55. One of these two was a set of fragmentary Shuofu MSS acquired by Fu Zengxiang 傅增湘 that Wang Guowei had used to establish the “Shuofu text” of the SQL, whose parts variously dated to the late fifteenth century and 1505, and the other was a Wanli era (1573–1619) MS kept by the Commercial Press in its “Wetlands Fragrance House” (Hanfenlou 涵芬樓) in Shanghai. A third one was a MS kept by the scholar Sun Yirang, of which Zhang Zongxiang had a copy made. Scholars of the Shuofu text were disappointed that Zhang collated the MSS without any scholarly apparatus and took aim at Zhang’s overly ambitious claim to have reconstructed Tao Zongyi’s original Shuofu. Thus, Watanabe Kōzō and others early on pointed out the presence of texts of the Yongle era (1403–1424) that refuted Zhang’s claim to have reconstructed Tao’s original form as created in the Hongwu era (1368–1399). In reality, all the manuscripts used by Zhang Zongxiang dated from after 1450 and contained texts that could only have been added to the text after Tao Zongyi’s death. Yet even so, this new version was far closer to Tao’s original work than the block-printed 120-yuan Shuofu.

Since the publication of Chang Bide’s research, studies outside of China came to a long stand still. Only two Ming-era manuscripts of the Shuofu exist outside of mainland China (one in Hong Kong and one in Taiwan), so it was not until the resumption of scholarly activity in the People’s Republic in the late 1970s, that Shuofu studies began slowly to recommence. Since the 725-title, 100-yuan manuscript tradition seemed to be adequately represented by Zhang Zongxiang’s edition, research has tended to focus on the identification and description of MSS of the Shuofu independent of the 100-yuan manuscript tradition and the relation of 100-yuan manuscripts to the original Shuofu of Tao

---

16 I follow Jia in designating this composite set the Fu MS 傅本; see more in the Appendix.

17 I follow Jia Jingyan in designating this as the Zhang MS 張本; see more in the Appendix.

18 I designate this the Sun 孫本 MS; see more in the Appendix.

Zongyi. Given the tremendous bulk of the Shuofu manuscripts, essentially all of which are missing at least a few juan, scholars have mostly focused on trying to match the tables of contents with the cryptic suggestions in Ming scholarly writings that suggested the existence of earlier, non-100 juan Shuofus.

THE STEMMATIC APPROACH

Meanwhile a whole different line of approach was being pioneered by the late Jia Jingyan (courtesy name Baiyan 伯顔, 1924–1990), professor of history at Minzu University in Beijing. Working on a critical edition of the SQL, which he completed and printed in mimeograph form in 1979, he identified several manuscripts of the Shuofu that contained the SQL and by detailed comparison of their texts arranged these manuscripts in a tentative order of least corrupt to most corrupt. He also gave all the Shuofu manuscripts he worked with convenient names and descriptions that summarized much of the emerging catalogues of rare manuscripts in China. Had it achieved wide circulation, the relevance of this work to the study of the Shuofu would have been immediately apparent, but due to being printed only in mimeograph form, Jia’s edition of the SQL did not achieve due recognition or wide distribution, outside of a few Mongolian studies scholars.

Jia’s research showed that the interconnections between various Shuofu manuscripts could be studied not just by the extensive survey of their contents and arrangement of works, but also by the intensive study of one (or more) selected works contained within the Shuofu. As is well known in the stemmatic methodology of textual criticism, examination of works copied in manuscript can identify how each manuscript inherits certain indicative errors from the exemplar or exemplars from which it was copied, and in turn adds a few more such errors which it passes down to all manuscripts copied from it, and so on. Thus careful examination of multiple manuscripts permits the researcher to draw up a “family tree” or stemma, which indicates the relationships between the manuscripts examined.

20 One exception has been the work of Huang Fushan (2000) who has focused on how some of the chenwei 譜緯 or “predictive weft-texts” were assembled in the γ recension texts and then partially lost and supplemented in the ζ recension block print version. Unfortunately, he followed Chang Bide’s mistaken understanding of the composition of the γ recension (his “100-juan edition”) and was unable to consult the Mao MS.
Although Jia did not himself use a stemmatic methodology his work opened the way to doing so, by locating and giving initial descriptions of most of the relevant manuscripts currently available in libraries.

The greatest practical difficulty in drawing up such a stemma is determining in any given place what is the primitive reading and what are the derived ones. Particularly when both readings make some kind of sense, such a determination is often frustratingly subjective. It is here that Tao Zongyi’s interest in exotica from the defunct Yuan dynasty gives a crucial advantage. The SQL in particular is perfectly suited to such an analysis because it has both a complete Persian parallel and a partial Mongolian parallel. Moreover, the extensive Mongolian transcriptions are such that random corruptions in the Chinese manuscripts can usually be detected immediately because they result in names which are not reconstructable as Mongolian.

Two examples will show the utility of these controls:

In a name which some manuscripts consistently give as Beilu Kehan 盛禄可汗, the first character bēi 盛 is sometimes found as bēi 杯, mèng 孟, yíng 盈, or mì 蓋. Comparison with Mongolian histories shows, however, that this name corresponds to that of Buyruq Qa’an, and that while bēi 杯 might be a possibly primitive reading, mèng 孟, yíng 盈, or mì 蓋 cannot be correct, and those readings must be the result of textual corruption.

In a second example, under the autumn of year gui/you 癸酉, there is a description of a Mongol siege of the city of Zhuozhou 涿州. Some manuscripts say the city fell, within the “specified time” (keri 刻日), others that two previously specified commanders were “both commanded” (er ming 二命日) to take it, another has a strange reference to a possible divination (er bu ming ri 二卜命日), while the two others say the siege took more than twenty days (ershiyu ri 二十餘日). While some of these readings might be more acceptable than others, a final decision would be difficult, except that the Persian parallel of this passage, in the Compendium of Chronicles by Rashid al-Din, states clearly that the Mongol armies “laid siege for twenty days and captured the city.” Thus it is the last version that is unquestionably primitive, and all others show a greater or lesser degree of corruption.

In other passages, the parallel offered by the Secret History of the Mongols, which the SQL cited

---

extensively as its source, can also assist in determining which reading is primitive and which is
derived. Assembling such bits of evidence thus makes a clear stemma or family tree, showing the
relationship of the SQL texts within the Shuofu manuscripts. Such a relationship can with caution
then be treated as a preliminary hypothesis for the stemma of the Shuofu manuscripts as a whole.

As with Jia Jingyan (1979), Wang Guowei (1926a), and Paul Pelliot (1924; Pelliot and Hambis
1951), my interest in the text of the Shuofu is the outcome of my previous interest in the SQL. As part of
preparing a critical edition of the Shuofu, I have collated the text of the SQL found in the 1927 edition,
and nine different manuscript copies of the Shuofu, and have also examined all the readings supplied
by previous scholars for the SQL found in three different Shuofus whose location is currently unknown.
The nine manuscripts include all but two of the major Shuofu manuscripts listed in the major Chinese
catalogues of rare books and/or discussed in the literature on the Shuofu. They are as follows (I have
adopted here the convenient names for them given by Jia Jingyan), listed with their current location
in rough order of most primitive to most derived:

- Zhao 趙: National Library of China, Beijing
- Niu 鈕: National Library of China, Beijing
- Sun 孫: Yuhailou 玉海楼 museum, Ruian 瑞安, Zhejiang
- Zhang 張: National Library of China, Beijing
- Fu 3 傅(3): Shanghai Library
- Taipei 台: Central National Library, Taipei
- Uang 汪: Zhejiang Library, Hangzhou
- Shi 史: National Library of China, Beijing
- Shen 沈: Fung Ping Shan Library, University of Hong Kong.

The three manuscripts that were collated by previous scholars, but whose location is currently
unknown are:

22 The other Shuofu MSS listed lack the SQL.
23 The Fu MS is a composite MS, comprised of three or four different fragmentary Shuofus, boxed together to make an
almost complete set. The SQL is in the third part, which I thus designated Fu₃.
• Chang 閶: Copy made in Suzhou and used by Zheng Jie 鄭杰 in his unpublished 1778 study of the SQL.
• She 涉: used by Wang Guowei for his 1926 edition of the SQL; Wang’s notes were also used by Jia Jingyan for his SQL.
• Fu-Metropolitan 傅京(師): used by Zhang Zongxiang for the 1927 Commercial Press edition of the Shuofu, and by Jia Jingyan for his SQL. So-called because it is a copy of the Fu MS made on stationery of the Metropolitan Library in Beijing.

Further information on these MSS will be found in the appendix.

My stemmatic research has led to a number of important conclusions, for example that the Shen MS in Hong Kong is not close to Tao Zongyi’s original one, as was suggested by its preface and by Jao Tsung-i, but is actually a rather late and corrupt mid-Ming version, and that the Taipei MS, upon which Chang Bide based his research, is actually a twentieth-century forgery.

I also took the opportunity of my research trips to examine the other two manuscripts which do not contain the SQL, that is, the Mao 毛 or Jiguge 汲古閣 MS in the Linhai City Museum (Linhai shi bowuguan 臨海市博物館) and the Hunan Printing House (Hunan shushe 湖南書舍) MS, kept in the National Library of China. While these MSS do not contain the SQL and thus cannot be directly added to the stemma, they are very distinctive in organization, and I believe they can be provisionally related to the picture of the Shuofu’s development set out here.

The currently extant Shuofu texts (including the first blockprinted version) can be divided into five different recensions, each differentiated on the basis of length and/or organization. To these may be added another, unfortunately non-extant, recension whose basic organization can be surmised from the internal evidence of two other recensions. Following usual text-critical practice, I label them with Greek letters, listed here with the exact or approximate date of completion of its earliest exemplar and a list of extant exemplars:

A 60 juan, 366 titles; dated to 1361; extant in Mao MS.
B 100 juan, c. 600 titles; c. 1370; not extant, but contents roughly reconstructable from γ
Γ 100 juan, 725 titles; c. 1440; extant in Zhao, Niu, Sun, Zhang, Fu, Taipei, and Uang MSS, and the 1927 Commercial Press printed edition
Δ 100 juan, c. 650 titles; 1496?; extant in Hu MS
E 69 unnumbered juan, estimated 725 titles; Jiajing era (1521–1566)?; extant in Shi and Shen MSS.
Z 120 juan; 1,236 titles; c. 1615; extant in the Wanweishan Tang blockprints

In the rest of this article I will survey what is known of these recensions, how they were created, and their interrelations. My conclusions as to their interrelations are given in Figure 1.

FIGURE 1: Hypothesized Relationship of Recensions with Rough Chronological Framework. Dates indicate known or hypothesized time of creation of first version of recension.

THE A RECENSION

In its original form, the Shuofu consisted of 60 juan as described in the preface written by Tao Zongyi’s friend and Yuan loyalist Yang Weizhen:
Master Tao Jiucheng of Tiantai 天台 has taken books from the classics and histories and biographical narratives on down through the varied writings of the hundred schools, works of more than a thousand authors, and has compiled them into 60 juan 卷 totaling many tens of thousands of passages. He has named it *Shuofu* 説郛, taking part of a sentence from the great thinker Yang 杨. He asked me to write a preface for it. I have read it over the space of months. It has been able to supply facts which my studies have overlooked. Scholars obtaining this book will find that it can expand to a great degree what they have heard and seen.

The preface was dated to two days before full on the ninth moon of autumn, year xīn/chōu 辛丑 of the Zhizheng 至正 period, or November 12, 1361. Fifteen years later, in a preface to Tao’s “Brief History of Calligraphy,” another of Tao’s distinguished friends, the famous early Ming Confucian and chief editor of the *Yuan shi*, Song Lian 宋濂, described the compilation thus:

> Jiucheng has read various biographical narratives by more than a thousand authors, most of which are ones the world of scholarship has never seen. So he imitated Zeng Zao’s 曾慥 *Leishuo* 類説 (“Classified Literature”) and made the *Shuofu* (“Purlieus of Exposition”) in a certain number of chapters (juan 卷). Whenever there was...
something he compiled, he abridged it; gentlemen called the resulting words both very deep and very broad.²⁸

In other words, the work was basically a set of Tao Zongyi’s “reading notes” (*dushu biji* 筆記), and as such bore the imprint of his eclectic character.

The only extant manuscript of the *Shuofu* that preserves its original 1361 form is the 60-juan Mao MS,²⁹ now kept in the Linhai City Museum, Zhejiang province. It was described in 1994 by Xu Sanjian, with a full table of contents.³⁰ It stands out for three very distinctive characteristics: its sloppiness, its brevity, and its organization. The writing was described by one collector, Mao Yi 毛扆 in 1710, as having “blunders cropping up everywhere” and “almost unreadable” and by the twentieth-century bibliophile and scholar Zhang Zongxiang 張宗祥 (1882–1965) thus: “It was copied only by a vulgar hand, is dotted with wrong characters, and almost unreadable.”³¹ The tendency to use alternate characters (*tongjiazi* 通假字), often based on the author’s native dialect, is pervasive, making *er* 儿 into *li* 立, *jue* 觉 into *jiao* 角, and *zhi* 治 into *huo* 活, and so on.³² Despite these errors, however, the Mao MS has already demonstrated its great value for textual research.³³ It is also the shortest known complete *Shuofu* text, containing only 60 juan and 366 separate titles.


²⁹ I give it this designation from being held by Mao Jin 毛晉 (1599–1659) and his son Mao Yi 毛扆 in their famous Jiguge 汲古閣 (“Chamber for Exploration of the Classics”) Library. (Mao Yi later probably sold the MS.) Xu Sanjian calls it the Jiguge MS, but in line with Jia’s practice of using single-character names based on the MS’s earliest or best-known owner, I prefer to call it the Mao MS. The manuscript’s provenance is given by Xu (1994: 112). Mao Jin wrote a colophon to the *Nancun Chuogenglu* referring to the 100-juan *Shuofu* as an incomplete work; see Tao 1997: 385; evidently he was judging from the contrast between the 100 juan widely referred to and the 60 juan in the copy in his possession.

³⁰ Xu 1994. There is also a good description of this MS, with photographs of selected pages in the chapter “Shanben miji ‘Shuofu’” of Zhou and Xu (2002: 245–48).


³³ See Wu (2009) who notes that despite some obvious errors like 蒙 for 萊, the Mao MS text of the *Luoyang qielan jì*: (1) preserves correct readings and omitted sentences found in no other MS or edition; (2) helps decide between readings
The Mao MS is also the only Shuofu MS with a consistent organization. Rather than the topical organization of other anthologies (leishu 類書), however, the extracts are classified according to the final character(s) in the works' titles. The final part of the title was usually a word such as “notes” or “records” or “biography,” so his method amounted to a rather crude arrangement by genre. Juan 1–14 was a special section for works already collected into congshu 叢書 (“collection”), 15–16 for those ending in jing 經 (“classic”), 17–18 for shi 史 (“history”), 19–20 for bian 編 (“compilation”), followed by pu 譜 (“register”), chao 抄 (“copy”), biji 筆記 (“notebook”), jiwen 紀聞 (“notes on contemporary events”), tan 談 (“discussion”), shi 事 (“narratives”), hua 話 (“talk”), shuo 説 (“tales”), zhi 志 (“treatise”), ji 記 (“memoirs”), and finally lu 錄 (“records”). The last section would have been where the SQL would be but like many other works known to have been in the Shuofu later, it is not found in the Mao MS. Clearly this late Yuan manuscript was not the final version of the Shuofu.

THE B AND Γ RECENSIONS

At present, every other known manuscript of the Shuofu apart from the Mao MS is based at least partially on exemplars deriving from a later class of Shuofu manuscripts with 725 titles and organized into 100 juan — what I call the “γ recension.” Manuscripts of the γ recension, which are quite the most common type of Ming manuscript of the Shuofu, all have a similar organization and contents, quite different from the α recension’s Mao MS. Comparing the contents of the Mao MS, as representative of the α recension, and the various exemplars of the γ recension, all the works found in the α recension’s 60 juan are crowded into the first 30 juan of the γ recension. Thus 70 additional juan of new material were then added to the γ recension, raising the total number of works included from 366 to about 725. The old organization according to the last character of the title was mostly ignored in the new

---


35 In a detailed comparison of the contents of the Mao MS Shuofu and the γ recension, as seen in Zhang Zongxiang’s printed 100-juan Shuofu, I found that only 6 of the 366 Mao MS Shuofu titles and sub-titles were found in any juan past 30
material, and even the titles inherited from the old Shuofu in the first thirty juan were shuffled around. As a result, the material in the γ recension was organized according to a confusing mix of topical, genre, and final character considerations. These γ recension exemplars still have the old Yang Weizhen preface, but its date was removed and the count of 60 juan was changed to 100 juan to fit the new scale of the anthology.

One way in which the γ recension MSS resembled the old α recension was in the frequency of simplified and unorthodox characters. These can be seen particularly in the Zhao, Zhang, and Fu MSS, which on stemmatic evidence are relatively primitive and which retain a large number of simplified characters. Although the kind of tongjiazi 通假字 and outright errors found in the Mao MS are not common, simplified forms used commonly include bei 傇 (for 捕), cheng 称 (for 称), gui 善, nan 难, qin 禽 (for 撄 "capture," not “bird”), and tīng 听 while others used inconsistently include bāo 报, biān 边, fū 抚, huán 还, tān 摇, wū 无, suǒ 所, yìn 因, hào 号, jǐn 尽, jū 惧, shí 执 vs. zhī 执, suī 虽, yú 与, and zōng 拙. Just as distinctive as the use of these vulgar forms is their inconsistency, even within a single text such as the SQL.

All but one of the extant γ recension MSS date to the sixteenth century or after. The Zhao MS is dated to year gēng/shēn 庚申 of the Hongzhi era (i.e. 1500) and the Fu MSS (i.e., the third of three or four fragmentary Shuofu texts together forming an almost complete Shuofu first described by twentieth-century scholar Fu Zengxiang) is dated to Hongzhi 弘治 18 (1505). Almost certainly earlier in the γ recension. Likewise out of the 281 titles found in the first 30 juan of the γ recension, only 36 (not counting duplicates and works taken from the Baichuan xuehai) do not derive from the Mao MS. (The difference in count of titles comes from differences in whether the extracts in topical anthologies are counted separately or only under the anthology’s larger title.) Published contents of other γ recension MSS, all essentially identical to that of Zhang Zongxiang’s, include that of the Zhang MS in Shangwu yinshuguan (1951: vol. 3, Zi 子, 57b–63a) and the Taipei MS in Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben shumu (1986: vol. 4, pp. 1445–84).

36 In the Mao MS, for example, Tao Zongyi began with 14 juan of congshu or collectanea — smaller collections now to be included in a larger one. In the γ recension, the material on the Confucian canons (jing), previously in juan 34–35 was given pride of place in juan 1 and 2. Later, an anonymous editor reorganized the 100-juan Shuofu in a new way (the ε recension, exemplified by the Shen and Shi MSS), putting all works concluding in the character jìng 经, many of which were recently written canons of taste (wine, horse-riding, etc.), not real classics, in juan 1.

37 See the manuscript descriptions on these four Fu MSS. Based on my examination of the MS in the Shanghai Library, the
than either of these, however is the first of the three or four MSS in Fu Zengxiang’s *Shuofu*, containing *juan* 1–25. This manuscript, which I designate Fu,
was written on paper of the Congshutang 叢書堂 library of Wu Kuan 吳寛 (1435–1504). Jao Tsung-i guessed that it might date to a few years earlier than Chenghua 成化 8 (1472), when Wu Kuan received his *jinshi* 進士 degree. Since all the Fu MSS have the same organization (which is what enabled them to be cobbled together into a single almost complete *Shuofu*), this pushes the date of the earliest γ recension back to the third quarter of the fifteenth century. Moreover, the text of the SQL in the Zhao and Fu MSS are sufficiently different that several instances of copying must have elapsed between their time and that of their common ancestor, again pushing the date of their common ancestor well back into the fifteenth century. Thus, the expansion of the 60-juan Mao MS into the γ recension was an affair of the mid-fifteenth century at the latest.

Some of the works added to this γ recension, including the SQL, appear to have been copied relatively early in the Yuan-Ming transition, when Tao Zongyi still thought of himself as a Yuan loyalist. To each work, Tao added the author (where known) and the author’s dynasty. Several works of the Yuan dynasty appear in the γ recension with the authors dated to the *Huang Yuan* 皇元 “Sovereign Yuan” dynasty. And two works have the author dated to the “End of the Song, beginning of our dynasty” (*Song mo guo chu* 宋末國初). In the text of the SQL, references to the Mongol emperors are always given special honorific spacing, a feature probably of the original work, but one scrupulously preserved by Tao in his copying.

preface to the Fu MS is not extant.


39 See Jao 1966:93.

40 These dates were first remarked on by King (1946: 4). *Huang Yuan* 皇元 appears in the following works (references are to *juan* and page number in the printed 1927 *Shuofu*: *Chun meng lu* 春夢録 (42/18b), *Annan xingji* 安南行記 (51/18b); *Shengwu qinzheng lu* 聖武親征錄 (55/1a), *Anya tang jialing* 安雅堂酒令 (56/1a), *Jingbei yin ji* 鯨背吟集 (57/1a). *Song mo guo chu* 宋末國初 appears in *Gusu biji* 故蘇筆記 (57/20a) and *Xue zhou cuo yu* 雪舟脞語 (57/20b).
Judging from these features, all of these works should have been added to the *Shuofu* while Tao still considered himself a Yuan man. Together these include all the works attributed to the Yuan between the *juan* 40 to 60, except for *Kunxuezhai zalu* 困學齋雜録 whose author is dated merely to the *Yuan* 元. 41 Yuan-era works from *juan* 64 on, however, are dated simply to the *Yuan* 元. Oddly, though, those works which precede *juan* 40, including many copied into the *Shuofu* already in the Mao MS, simply have *Yuan* 元, even though Tao Zongyi was then certainly writing under the Yuan dynasty. 42 My guess is then that the materials in *juan* 42 to 57 with the *Huang Yuan* attribution were added during a period when Tao was particularly concerned to emphasize his Yuan identity, most likely from 1367, when Tao's two sisters and sister-in-law all committed suicide in 1367 to avoid rape at the hands of Ming soldiers to the first year or two of the new Ming dynasty. 43 This should be the period when he was collecting the works that later formed *juan* 40–60 of the *Shuofu*.

Other titles, however, were certainly added to the *Shuofu* much later. All of the γ recension MSS contain several Ming dynasty works:

1. *Qian pu* 錢譜, described as an anonymous work of the Ming, containing references to the Yongle era (1402–1424); in *juan* 84
2. *Gu ge lun* 古格論, by the Ming author Cao Zhao 曹昭, and dated to Hongwu 洪武 21 (1388); in *juan* 87
3. *Quan shan lu* 勸善錄, by the Ming Empress Renxiao Huanghou, maiden name Xu 徐 (1362–1407, enthroned as empress 1403); in *juan* 97;

41 See 1927 *Shuofu* 52/17a.
42 See *Pei chu xuan ketan* 佩楚軒客談 (7/22b; Mao MS, *juan* 11), *Hua jian* 畫鑒 (13/1a; Mao MS, *juan* 6); *Suichang shan qiao zalu* 遂昌山樵雜録 (19/6; Mao MS, *juan* 58), *Haoranzhai yi chao* 浩然齋意抄 and *Haoranzhai shiting chao* 浩然齋視聽鈔 (20/1a and 7a; *juan* 24), *Shanfang suibi* 山房隨筆 (27/12a; Mao MS, *juan* 28). In some cases there is conflict over the era of the author. For example, *Qiantang yishi* 錢塘遺事 (7/29a; Mao MS, *juan* 31) is attributed to the Song in the Mao MS, but to the Yuan in the γ recension *Shuofu* MSS. I have included only those attributed to the Yuan in both the Mao MS and the γ recension *Shuofu* MSS.
43 These three women were celebrated in essays by Yang Weizhen and Song Lian and were entered into the *Yuan shi*’s biographies of model women; see *Yuan shi* (200/4512) and Chang Bide (1979: 445–46) who cites Yang’s essay.
4. *Xiao pin ji* 效顰集, by the Ming author Zhao Bi, with an early draft in middle Yongle 永樂 to Xuande 宣德 3 (1427), and probably completed in Zhengtong 正統 1 (1436); in *juan* 97.\(^4^\)

By the time of these last two works, Tao Zongyi was certainly dead; thus the \(\gamma\) recension as attested in the existing MSS was certainly completed not by Tao Zongyi, but by a continuator (or continuators). There is one possible clue to the identity of this person. In the Fu MS, which appears to be the earliest surviving exemplar of the \(\gamma\) recension, there is a statement about editorial activity. After a statement that it was compiled by Tao Zongyi (*Nancun zhenyi Tao Zongyi zuan* 南村真逸陶宗儀纂), there is another line stating that it was edited by Gong Fu of Nanzhai (*Nanzhai Gong Fu jiaozheng* 南齋龔鈇 校正). This statement was reprinted in Zhang Zongxiang’s 1927 edition, but I have not been able to identify this Gong Fu 龔鈇. Could he be the person who created the \(\gamma\) recension? Further research will be needed on this issue.

Be that as it may, both internal and external evidence shows that the *Shuofu* must have been expanded from the 366 titles of the Mao MS to the 725 titles of the mid-Ming MSS not in one stage, but in two stages. Or to put it differently, in between the \(\alpha\) recension and the \(\gamma\) recension was a now-lost \(\beta\) recension. Citations from Tao’s contemporaries confirm that Tao Zongyi did indeed compile a 100-*juan* *Shuofu*, although its 100 *juan* did not include as many works as the sixteenth-century one. When Yang Weizhen praised the first version of the *Shuofu* as having “more than a thousand authors,” he was engaging in literary hyperbole, since the first version had only 366. But within Tao’s lifetime, his *Shuofu* had reached 100 *juan* in size, and almost twice as many titles as before. Sun Zuo’s 1374 biography of Tao describes his writings as follows:

\---

\(^{44}\) Watanabe 1938: 230; King 1974: 5–6; Jao 1966: 94. On the dating of the works, see Chang (1979: 366, 370, 386, and 388), and Xu (1994: 115). The citation of these early Ming era works was embarrassing for Zhang Zongxiang, who originally claimed that his 100-*juan* *Shuofu* published by the Commercial Press in 1927 was the work as Tao Zongyi left it. He later acknowledged that the 1927 *Shuofu* edition actually included works of the Yongle era (1403–1424) which must have been added after Tao’s death. His argument is that in these few cases, defective manuscripts must have been supplemented by new sources. See Zhang Zongxiang, “Tieruyiguan suibi” 鐵如意館隨筆, *Zhonghua wenshi luncong* 中華文史論丛, 1984, no. 1, cited by Xu (1994: 115). Detailed textual analysis of the *SF* text of the *Xiao pin ji* 效顰集 might be able to determine its date in relation to the dated drafts of the work and hence its earliest date of incorporation.
Of late he has taken ever more to barring his gate and writing books. There are the *Shuofu* known throughout the world in 100 *juan* [or: Those known throughout the world are the *Shuofu* in 100 *juan*], the *Chuogeng lu* (“Notes Upon Rest from the Plow”) in thirty *juan*. . . . 45

Similarly, Ye Sheng (葉盛 1420–1474, *jinshi* degree 1445), in his *Shuidong riji* 水東日記, wrote apropos Tao Zongyi:

Recently I have heard that the *Shuofu* in 100 *juan* is still preserved in his family, without my knowing which ones are the passages which Jiucheng has personally added or deleted. It is indeed an incomplete work!46

These passages attest to a 100-*juan* Shuofu personally created by Tao Zongyi, a text no longer extant, but which I call the β recension. Of course, as Ye Sheng said, the *Shuofu* was essentially a collection of Tao Zongyi’s private reading notes, and as such never had a completed and fixed form in his life. Ye Sheng’s description of the manuscript describes a work which was still in progress up to his death, some time not long after 1401. Minor changes here and there in the β recension probably occurred frequently.

It seems, however, that after Tao died (shortly after 1401), his original β recension Shuofu was then compressed into fewer than 70 *juan* and 30 more *juan* of works were added, creating the standard mid-Ming γ recension *Shuofu*, with its 725 titles and 100 *juan*. The only reference to this second reorganization comes from the fifteenth-century writer Du Ang 都卬 — a figure datable only from being the father of the better known Du Mu 都穆 (1459–1525) — who described it from hearsay in his *Sanyu zhuibi* 三餘贅筆: “The *Shuofu* was originally in 70 *juan*; as for the latter 30 *juan*, someone in Songjiangfu took writings from the *Baichuan xuehai* 百川學海 and added them in.”47 Since many

45 Cited by Xu (1994: 115–16); cf. the English translation in Mote (1954a: 31).


47 Cited in Rao (1970: 159–160). This observation was repeated in the *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* (Yongrong 1933: 123/2584);
items from the *Baichuan xuehai* are indeed found in the γ recension MSS,\(^48\) it must be this “someone in Songjiangfu” (who may also be one of Tao’s family who were keeping the manuscript according to Ye Sheng or may be the mysterious Gong Fu mentioned in Fu,) who created the first exemplar of the γ recension *Shuofu* that became common in the sixteenth century.

Chang Bide’s thorough analysis of the γ recension *Shuofu* confirms the essential accuracy of what Du Ang heard.\(^49\) The γ recension\(^50\) has, as said, 725 separate titles. Of these, however, Chang found 72 to be also found in the *Baichuan xuehai*, and the vast majority of these *Baichuan xuehai* titles were added in after *juan* 67.\(^51\) This distribution indicates that up to *juan* 67 of the γ recension is roughly the same in contents as Tao’s original β recension, and that the β text had somewhere between 572 and 649 titles.\(^52\) A division between Tao’s material and later material somewhere in the

---

\(^{48}\) cf. Pelliot 1924: 175; Chang 1979: 13. The *Baichuan xuehai* was a thirteenth-century Song collection (*congshu* 叢書) containing integral texts; it was first printed in the Ming era.

\(^{49}\) I have used Chang’s analysis on the placement of the *Baichuan xuehai* material in the 100-*juan* *Shuofu*. But I disagree with his interpretation of this data. I believe his mistake was to think that the editorial work of Yu Wenbo (described in a preface of his which appears in the printed version of the Ming-Qing transition) had anything to do with the production of the standard γ recension. In fact, genuine Ming-era γ recension *Shuofu* has any preface of Yu Wenbo’s. Chang Bide relied on the fact that the Taipei MS does mention Yu Wenbo, but my textual analysis proves beyond a doubt that the T MS is actually a twentieth-century copy done in awareness of the textual scholarship of the time. Yu Wenbo’s name was likely added at that time. Thus the T MS is irrelevant to determining the nature of Yu Wenbo’s text. Reading Yu Wenbo’s preface without preconceptions, it clearly applies to a different type of *Shuofu* than the standard γ recension, and he is presumably innocent of the charges of dishonesty directed at him by Chang.

\(^{50}\) Chang used the the T MS and Zhang Zongxiang’s 1927 Commercial Press edition. As far as the contents go these are essentially identical also to the Zhao, Niu, and Zhang MSS, which I have examined personally.

\(^{51}\) See Chang Bide’s conclusions (1979: 13–22, esp. pp. 15–16). *Juan* 1–67 contain 8 works out of 580 which can be traced to the *Baichuan xuehai*, while *juan* 68–100 contain 64 works out of 145 which can be traced to the *Baichuan xuehai*. Xu Sanjian (1994: 115) draws similar conclusions based on the research of Zhang Zongxiang.

\(^{52}\) It would have 572 titles if we assumed that all Tao’s original material was moved to *juan* 1–67, and the 8 out of 580 works in that part also found in the *Baichuan xuehai* were all interpolated. It would be 649 if we took the 725 of the standard 100-*juan* Ming *Shuofu* and simply subtracted the four latest Ming works and all titles shared with the *Baichuan xuehai*. The real figure is likely to be between the two, but closer to the lower figure.
area between juan 60 and 70 is confirmed by the fact that all the Ming works occur in juan 84 or after, and that the last work whose author attribution shows a Yuan loyalty is in juan 57.\textsuperscript{53}

The upshot of this discussion is that the SQL was copied into the Shuofu by Tao Zongyi as part of the $\beta$ recension. This occurred sometime between 1361 when the $\alpha$ recension of the Shuofu was created and 1374, when Sun Zuo already knew of a much larger 100-juan Shuofu. The subsequent reorganization and additions made by the "someone from Songjiangfu" to create the $\gamma$ recension did not affect the SQL. Since the expanded version of the Shuofu was produced just around the Yuan-Ming transition and included works on the rise of the Yuan it is tempting to speculate on how these reading notes reflected Tao's view of the dynastic transition. The second set of works anthologized in the Shuofu contains a higher number of works related to border and overseas issues (see the sample in Table 1).\textsuperscript{54} Was Tao dealing with the fall of the Yuan by attempting to understand its legacy as a non-Han dynasty? Or was he capitalizing on a spree of book buying as collectors sold off volumes on "barbarian" topics that were no longer of interest in the new Ming dynasty? One also notices a relatively higher number of Yuan authors in the second compilation (there were very few in the first compilation of the Shuofu).\textsuperscript{55} Here too one may speculate about whether with the passing of the dynasty (whether imminent or very recent), Tao was attempting to preserve some of its less well-known literary ventures. And finally, one may speculate whether the presence of the Meng-Da beilu 蒙鞑備録 and the SQL in the second compilation was due in part to Tao Zongyi's realization that, despite his lukewarm loyalism, the Yuan had in fact fallen and its taboos would never again be enforced. The Meng-Da beilu was a Song work of 1221 which described the Mongols from the Song

\textsuperscript{53} See the list of Ming works above. The last work with a Yuan-loyal dating is in juan 57/20b (Xue zhou cuo yu 雪舟脞語, attributed to Song mo guo chu 宋末國初). The next works with a plain Yuan dating are Xu ji shan lu 續積善録 (64/54) and Jingxinglu 景行録 (64/6b).

\textsuperscript{54} Only three of these works, the Qidan guozi 契丹國志 and Dajin guozi 大金國志 in juan 86, and the Liaodong zhilue 遼東志略 in juan 97 would likely have been added in during the posthumous reorganization that expanded the number of titles from c. 600 to 725.

\textsuperscript{55} This may be most easily verified by skimming through the author eras in the table of contents for Shuofu juan 1–30 and 30–67 in the catalogue of the Han (Commercial Press) edition in the Tōhō bunka gakain Kyōto kenkyūsho kanseki Mokuroku (1938: 310–321) or of the Taipei MS in Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben shumu (1986: IV, 1445–84).
perspective, although sometimes quite positively, and used for them throughout the word “Tatar” (Dada 鞑靼), one discouraged under the Yuan as derogatory. On the other hand, the SQL as an edited version of the Veritable Records of the dynasty was only allowed to be read by official readers as long as the dynasty lasted. Both of these works would have been inappropriate for public circulation during the Yuan itself. Despite the honoring of the anonymous author as a writer of the “Sovereign Yuan” (Huang Yuan), inclusion of such works at the turn of the dynasty effectively marked the Shuofu as a post-Yuan book.

Apart from the speculative questions about Tao as reader, bibliophile, and editor, the more important questions about the Shuofu’s original copy of the SQL are whether it was a complete text, and whether it was reliably copied. Song Lian said that whenever Tao anthologized a work he included only the essential parts. Was the SQL abridged in that way and if so, how? Given the number of almost incomprehensible passages left in the account of Chinggis Khan, it seems that he must have copied the entire text that was available to him, despite not being able to understand it. (Was this a sign of Yuan loyalism or of his interest in the bizarre and exotic?). For the text on Öködei, the situation is less clear; given the extremely sketchy account of Öködei’s final years it is possible that Tao abridged his material somewhat at that point. I think it is more likely, however, that Tao’s copy is complete of what he had, and the abridgement of Öködei Qa’an’s reign is due to abridgment in his source. But Tao did presumably abridge the work in the sense that the second juan, titled the Qinzheng lu, and covering the reigns of from Güyüg and Möngke to Qubilai Qa’an was eliminated without a trace, although its title appeared in the SQL title.

As I will summarize below, and will discuss at length in my critical edition of the SQL, the SQL text in the Shuofu underwent constant and cumulative corruption. Much of this process was random, but much of it was also driven by constant harmonization with the text of the Yuan shi. But in some cases, examination of the text in comparison with Yuan shi and/or GH seems to indicate that even the archetype (that is, the most ancient reconstructable text) of the SQL in the Shuofu is already significantly corrupted. Most of these corruptions seem to be clearly just mistakes, while others seem to be cases of harmonization with the Yuan shi, or attempts at improving the text. The original Mao

56 See §40, for example, of the SQL for what I argue are old harmonizations.
MS was, as mentioned, extremely sloppy and at points almost unreadable. If the second batch of Shuofu materials were copied in the same way, then much of the corruption in the SQL text would have entered in not due to later Ming-Qing copyists but at the very beginning of the text’s transmission as a Shuofu work.

There is a further possibility that unfortunately cannot be confirmed or denied, due to the remaining uncertainty of the date. The SQL was being copied into the Shuofu sometime between 1361 and 1374. At the same time, the Yuan shi was being compiled from the Veritable Records by the historians of the victorious Ming dynasty from 1369 to 1370. Chronologically, it is not impossible then that Tao Zongyi, who was a good friend of the Yuan shi’s chief compiler, Song Lian, was actually aware of the Yuan shi as he was copying the Veritable Record text into his Shuofu. This might account for some of the very early instances of harmonization, for example, in which surnames are inserted for Jurchen and Kitan persons in the SQL, or in which all the MSS of the SQL share with the Yuan shi a corrupt text, for example, Hulan-Zhance 忽蘭-盞側 (in Yuan shi 1/7 and SQL §15.3) for correct 忽蘭·虎惕.

There are also two cases of character variation found in the earliest MSS, where harmonization with Yuan shi in the very earliest texts seems rather likely. In these two cases, those of Sa’ari Steppe (薩里~撒曆) and Küchülüg Qa’an (屈出律~曲出律), one type of transcription uses characters not found elsewhere for transcription in the SQL, but which match that of the Yuan shi, while the other type of transcription uses common transcription characters. For these reasons, I tend to think that


58 Of course in this latter case, the other possibility, that the corruption occurred early in the source text and was then handed on independently to both the Yuan shi and the SQL, also cannot be ruled out.

59 Sa’ari is found in the SQL in §§3.1, 14.4, and 16.1, each of which has a parallel in Yuan shi 1/3, 1/6, and 1/7. The Yuan shi has 薩 throughout, the SQL has 薩 in §§3.1 and 16.1 but not in §14.4. Küchülüg is found in the SQL in §§33.2, 36.2, and 47; the first two have parallels in Yuan shi 1/13 and 1/14 (cf. YSRMSY p. 458). Yuan shi 1/13 and 1/14 use 曲 in both cases; in the most primitive MSS of the SQL, this is used only in §33.2 and elsewhere 曲 is used. More derived MSS harmonize usage with the Yuan shi change most or all of the instances of 曲 to 曲. The first instance of 曲 may well be a result of harmonization also.
Tao Zongyi himself compared his source text to that of the *Yuan shi* as he was copying the SQL into his *Shuofu*. This would mean that he added the SQL to his *Shuofu* only after 1370.

**THE Γ RECENSION AND THE MID-MING BOOK TRADE**

Beginning in the Chenghua 成化 era (1464–1487), book production in the Ming dynasty entered a sustained rise that would continue through the end of the dynasty and into the Qing. This rise gathered momentum in the Zhengde 正德 period (1505–1521) and by the Jiajing 嘉靖 era (1521–1566) printing and book production had reached levels orders of magnitude higher than those prevailing during the early Ming.⁶⁶ Although not printed until the very end of the dynasty, the *Shuofu* participated in this boom in manuscript form. Except for the Mao MS and the fragmentary Fu MS, all other extant MSS of the *Shuofu* date to the Hongzhi 弘治 era (1487–1505) or later. Beginning in the Hongzhi era, editors also began experimenting with new ways of improving the text of the *Shuofu* and repacking its structure, creating a confusion of manuscript editions and texts that would continue until the present.

One of the most common ways of “improving” a *Shuofu* text was to find other exemplars of the text being copied and borrow “good readings” from them. These other exemplars might be contained within other *Shuofu* texts, but might just as well be independent of the *Shuofu* tradition altogether. Thus, the SQL text as embedded in the *Shuofu* was often compared with the parallel text in *Yuan shi*, *juan* 1 and 2, and harmonized with it where it differed. Sometime before 1505 an anonymous editor of the text did this in a massive way, albeit still within the context of a standard γ recension text. This editor was working with something very close to the extant Zhang or Sun manuscripts of the *Shuofu*; indeed the Zhang MS may be a draft made in the process of producing his text. From the exemplar he used, the editor inherited several parablepses⁶¹ as well as a strange corruption that altered over half of the instances of *du* 都 (commonly used in transcription to transcribe Mongolian -*du* or -*tu*) into *xiang* 星.

---

⁶⁶ Chia 2003: 303–06.

⁶¹ “Oversights” where the eye jumps from one character to the same character further down the text, thus eliminating a whole chunk of text. These are particularly common in copying difficult texts like the SQL.
相. This changed, for example, **badu** 拔都, the standard transcription of Mongolian **ba’atur** “knight, hero” to the incomprehensible **baxiang** 拔相.

But building on a foundation much like the extant Zhang MS, the editor erected a substantially different edifice through harmonization with the **Yuan shi**. In addition to eliminating the honorific spacing for Yuan imperial titles, the new editor noticed that an entry for the year **yi/hai** 乙亥 (1215) was missing from the account. Thus he took what the **Yuan shi** had under that year and directly interpolated this 121-character passage into the text at the end of §41. He did not notice, or perhaps did not care, that the events described were mostly found elsewhere in the SQL, albeit in different versions and placed under different years.\(^6\) He also began to change the transcriptions to make them more like those of the **Yuan shi**, altering the transcription of Ong Qa’an from **Wang Kehan** 王·可汗 to **Wanghan Kehan** 汪罕·可汗, Muqali from **Muhuali** 木花里 to **Muhuali** 木華黎, Altan from **Antan** 按攤 to **Andan** 按彈, Idu-Qut from **Yidu-hu** 奕都·護 to **Yidu-hu** 亦都·護, and much more. The author made hundreds of other such minor changes throughout the text, sometimes just making errors, but many times making difficult readings easy by harmonizing them with the **Yuan shi**. The editor also made an idiosyncratic replacement in about half of its appearances as a transcription character, of **zhēn** 真 with **zhēn** 贞; fortunately in this case the pronunciation was not changed.

Whether by chance or because it made the SQL text more “readable,” the **Shuofu** manuscript with the resulting text in which these changes occurred — what I call the Hr (for “harmonized”) exemplar — was quite successful, prolifically generating a large number of daughter MSS.\(^6\) In fact only three extant MSS of the **Shuofu** (Zhao, Niu, and Zhang) show no influence from this Hr exemplar. The **Fu** 3 MS, dated to 1505, shows the results of this editorial change, along with some additional corruption, so this editing certainly predated that year.\(^6\)

\(^{62}\) This inconsistency, while typical in reality of the attempts made to harmonize the SQL text as embedded in the **Shuofu** with the **Yuan shi**, confused William Hung into thinking that the text resulting from these sorts of changes, such as the interpolation after §41, was actually original to the SQL. See Hung (1951: 480 n. 116).

\(^{63}\) Ming MSS deriving more or less directly from this episode of editing, without passing through any further major changes include the **Fu** 3 and She MSS. Also the twentieth-century Fu-Metropolitan and Taipei MS were copied from the **Fu** 3 (or perhaps She MS for the Taipei MS). I call these works the Fu-She family. See the descriptions of these MSS.

\(^{64}\) In a previous article, I speculated that this editing may have been part of Yu Wenbo’s 郁文博 reorganization of the
Perhaps due to the greater currency of manuscripts, one can also note a tendency for more manuscripts to be produced by comparing two texts of the *Shuofu*. An editor, having made a copy of one manuscript, would then compare this copy to another, noting the different readings and substituting them for those in his base text, where it seemed appropriate. At least in the SQL, this is generally done on an eclectic basis, frequently preferring wrong readings in one paragraph and correct readings in the next. In a few cases, however, such as the Uang MS, where a harmonized exemplar of the SQL text was then collated with a text fairly similar to that of the Niu *Shuofu*, the result was a substantially improved text, although still well short of what could be achieved with full access to a wider range of MSS and the non-Chinese parallels. Many of these later MSS also attempted to reform the vulgar characters characteristic of the older $\gamma$ recension texts. Presence of older character forms may thus be a mark in *Shuofu* MSS of a relatively earlier mid-Ming date.

**THE $\Delta$ RECENSION**

Other editors directed their efforts towards reorganizing the *Shuofu* as a whole, either expanding the number of texts or weeding out the redundancies or works found elsewhere. One of the best known of these efforts to rework the $\gamma$ recension was that of Yu Wenbo 郁文博. As he told the story, Yu Wenbo (b. 1418, jinshi degree 1454) acquired a 100-juan (presumably a $\gamma$ recension one) text in the Shanghai area near Tao Zongyi’s home around 1481. Examining the text, he noticed that it had numerous errors and repetitions. As he lent his copy out to be copied by various officials in the area, negligent scribes allowed further errors to creep in. Eventually, after retiring, he had a clean new copy made, at which point he also decided to eliminate the 63 works in the *Shuofu* which were duplicated in the newly published *Baichuan xuehai*. The remaining material he re-organized into 100 juan, with a preface dated to the waxing third moon of Hongzhi 9 (March, 1496). 65

---

*Shuofu* in Hongzhi 弘治 9 (1496). See Atwood 2011. This was in part due to my then reliance on Chang Bide’s linking of this editing with the Taipei MS, which I had not yet analyzed. As I will show below, however, this Taipei MS is not a *Shuofu* of the Yu Wenbo family, and neither are the other ones showing these editorial changes. Thus there is no evidence linking this editing episode with Yu Wenbo.

Assuming that Yu's original text was a \( \gamma \) recension one, the conclusion from his preface would be that he created a roughly 662-title, 100-juan Shuofu. Since he mentions suffering loss in the process of copying, the total number of titles was probably less than 662. In any case, it could not be identical to any extant \( \gamma \) recension, with its 725 titles. Except for a concatenation of unfortunate historical accidents, this conclusion would have been apparent to scholars long ago. The extant MSS of the \( \gamma \) recension have no visible connection whatsoever with Yu Wenbo's recension. They have only Yang Weizhen's preface, and no preface by Yu Wenbo,\(^{66}\) their 725 titles, and 100 juan, show no trace of the reorganization discussed by Yu Wenbo in his preface, and finally the extant and dated 725-title MSS, particularly the Zhao MS of 1500 and Fu\(_3\) MS of 1505, show too much variation in their texts (at least of the SQL) to be plausibly derived from a common ancestor dating as late as 1496. Add in the Fu, MS associated with the Congshutang library of Wu Kuan, who died in 1505, and it is undisputable that the \( \gamma \) recension Shuofu predates the year 1496, when Yu Wenbo says he created his new recension. All these considerations should have made it clear from the beginning that the 725-title Shuofu had nothing to do with Yu Wenbo.

But since Yu Wenbo's preface was attached to the block-printed Shuofu editions produced during the Ming-Qing transition era, it was unfortunately assumed that his version must have been the textus receptus of the Ming dynasty. It was thus also assumed that any attempt to reconstruct a version of the mid-Ming Shuofu would be reproducing Yu Wenbo's version. This assumption, implicit in the writings of scholars like Pelliot and Jing Peiyuan, was made explicit by Chang Bide. Working in Taiwan, he had access only to the 1927 Commercial Press edition of the Shuofu and to a single manuscript kept in the Central National Library (Guoli zhongyang tushuguan 國立中央圖書館) in Taipei (no. 000525628). As seen by its published table of contents, this MS is a standard \( \gamma \) recension, and it has only one preface, that by Yang Weizhen.\(^{67}\) In the first page of juan 1, however, it has the note:

\(^{66}\) I have examined (in microfilm or in photocopies) the prefaces and contents of Zhao, Niu, Zhang, and Taipei MSS. Zhang Zongxiang's 1927 edition, based on the standard 100-juan Ming MSS also lacks it (2nd preface "Shuofu xu" 說郛序, pp. 1a–1b).

\(^{67}\) Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben shumu 1986: vol. 4, pp. 1445–84. For a photocopy of the preface and table of contents, I am indebted to Hsiao-ming Yu, Director of the Special Collection in the Central National Library (Taipei), with the kind assistance of Indiana University East Asian librarian Wen-ling Liu.
“Revised by Du 都 [sic, for Yu 郁] Wenbo of Houxue 後學, Shanghai 上海.” 68 From this note, Chang Bide drew the far-reaching conclusion that the γ recension MSS were actually all descendants of Yu Wenbo’s MS of 1496. 69 Needless to say, this meant that Yu Wenbo’s preface suddenly seemed very misleading, not to say dishonest, since the works he said he had eliminated were all included in his supposed manuscript!

The real origin of this note on Yu Wenbo has only emerged from my detailed examination of the Taipei MS’s text of the SQL. As I will demonstrate at length in my critical edition of the SQL, this text shows that the Taipei MS is not a Ming-dynasty manuscript, but a forgery produced after 1926; for the SQL it hybridized the SQL text of the Fu 3 MS with Wang Guowei’s 1926 scholarly edition. This conclusion on the basis of the SQL text is absolutely indisputable. Given that fact, and the absence of a Yu Wenbo preface in any other γ recension text, it seems unavoidable that the Taipei MS as a whole, including its first juan, is a modern copy in which a reference to Yu Wenbo was interpolated. 70 And given the crudity with which the editor of T MS’s SQL text tried to “improve” his copy by simply following Wang Guowei’s readings throughout the first half of the text, he cannot have had any scruples either about adding a reference to Yu Wenbo, based, of course, on the well-known scholarly consensus of the 1920s about the Ming Shuofu. 71

As a result, it seems that the only certainly extant witness to Yu Wenbo’s recension is the Ming-Qing printing of the Shuofu (to be discussed below), whose printers must have had access to his

68 I have not found a reference to Houxue 後學 as a village or as the name of Yu Wenbo’s residence, but there is a Houxuecun 後學村 village in Qufu 曲阜 in Shandong 山東 province.


70 The forger used the Fu 3 MS for the SQL, so one would presume he had access to Fu’s entire set of four MSS (Fu 1–Fu 4 ). But since the Taipei MS has Yang Weizhen’s preface, and the Fu 3 MS does not have any prefaces or tables of contents, the forger must have used some other MS, not included Fu’s set as one of his base texts. This other text was probably the 120-juan printed edition.

71 The Taipei manuscript also eliminates in juan 97 the two obviously Ming-era works (the also Ming-era works in juan 84 and 87 are present); see Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben shumu 1986: vol. 4, pp. 1482–83, cf. p. 1480. Given that the manuscript is, even on its own claims, a middle Ming manuscript, I fear that this too is not an indication of its earliness, but rather another crude attempt to make the manuscript seem more old and genuine than it really is.
manuscript since they included his preface. Unfortunately, the blockprinted edition does not include the text of the SQL. However, it does include that of the Meng-Da beilu, and my preliminary examination of that text indicates that the block-printed text of that work is independent of the γ recension texts with which I have compared it (Zhao, Niu, and Zhang MSS), and it preserves many older readings lost in other such γ recension MSS. This suggests that its text, like that of the blockprint's preface, may derive from an independent Yu Wenbo version of the Shuofu. In that case, Yu Wenbo's original copy of the Shuofu, which he acquired in 1481 and made the base text for his 1496 manuscript, would be also independent of other extant γ recension MSS. Since there is no Shuofu MS definitely known to be derived from Yu Wenbo's, and containing the MB, this suggestion of mine must remain speculative until stemmatic analysis of a wider variety of texts is undertaken.

There is, however, one manuscript, from the Hūnan Printing House (Hunan shushe 湖南書舍), which I think is likely to be also a copy of the Yu Wenbo Shuofu. This manuscript, which is the only extant exemplar of the δ recension, has 100 jüan (of which only 55 survive), but the contents of these 100 jüan match only those of the first 60 or so jüan of the standard γ recension (see Table 2). The MS as far as known generally follows the order of the γ recension, with a few exceptions in its jüan 71–72. It is a working copy with numerous proofreaders' marks (○ and 丶), as well as notes in the top margins and corrections between the lines.72 Fu Zengxiang also discussed it briefly, praising its good readings.73 Since it includes three Yongle and later works — Quan shan lu 勸善録, Xiao pin ji 效顚集 (Hu's jüan 80=γ recension's jüan 97), and Qian pu 錢譜 (Hu's jüan 70=γ recension's jüan 84) — it cannot be earlier than the mid-fifteenth century. Unfortunately, the first jüan, which would contain the prefaces to confirm my proposed identification with Yu Wenbo's recension, is missing. Likewise the remaining 55 jüan do not seem to contain either the SQL or the MB, so I cannot currently say anything about its stemmatic position. But the overall organization and date seem similar to what is described in Yu Wenbo's preface. Moreover, of all the works in the δ recension I have been able to

72 The presence of both original text and corrected text opens intriguing possibilities. Was the extant MS being collated with some other MS? If so, can that MS's text be identified? The fact that it was written on the stationery of a publishing house might also suggest that an otherwise unknown blockprint edition of the Shuofu was at some point contemplated. Much about this manuscript remains to be researched.

73 Mo 1993: 10B/752 (second Shuofu listed).
identify, none are found in the *Baichuan xuehai*, which is exactly to be expected if the δ recension is in fact the Yu Wenbo recension. The ultimate proof of this identity, however, can only come from close comparison of Hu MS texts with those of the blockprinted one. Since the blockprinted edition did have access to the Yu Wenbo recension and cited its preface, there should be some works at least, where the blockprinted text is more or less identical to the Hu MS text, but rather different from, and perhaps superior to, the γ recension MSS. If, on the other hand, after comprehensive textual examination, there are no such cases where the blockprint texts align with the Hu MS, then this identity I am tentatively advancing here would have to be rejected.

**THE E RECENSION**

Another *Shuofu* with a reorganized format is extant in two manuscripts, one kept in Hong Kong and one in Beijing. The Hong Kong manuscript, designated the Shen MS, is a 69-juan manuscript, first described in 1970 by Jao Tsung-I, that was copied for Shen Han (jinshi degree, 1535), and now held in the University of Hong Kong’s Fung Ping Shan Library.74 The one in Beijing has catalogue no. A01507 in the National Library, and is called the Shi MS.75 Together these two MSS, whose texts of the SQL are extremely close to each other, form the ε recension of the *Shuofu*.

The two manuscripts of this ε recension lack both a table of contents and numbering of the juan. This absence of a table of contents has made it very inconvenient for scholars to give a full description of the contents of such a manuscript; to date no one has. Jao Tsung-i, however, did describe the contents of some of the volumes of the Shen MS, and I have given the organization of that part of the Shi MS before and after the SQL text. The results of both show the organization to be completely different from that of the standard γ recension (see Tables 3 and 4).76 Another striking

---

74 Described at length in Jao (1966), Rao (1970), and at somewhat greater length in his 1982 article reprinted in Rao 1993. This manuscript is first described in Fu Zengxiang’s supplements to Mo (1993: 10B/752), as the last of the *Shuofu* listed.


76 There is some inconsistency in the organization between the two MSS. In the Shen MS, the SQL is immediately followed by the *Bei yuan lu* 北軻錄, while in the Shi MS, the *Bei yuan lu* 北軻錄 is in the 10th fascicule, preceding the 11th fascicule which contains the SQL. But given the fact that the Shi MS is extremely fragmentary, while the Shen MS is virtually
feature, which does not show up in a comparison of the contents, is the identical *mise en page* of the two MSS, in which each character is placed in exactly the same place in the column — where one or the other MS (usually Shen, which was more carelessly copied) omits a character, another character is duplicated at the column foot to keep the same alignment. Where Jao describes the arrangement of the subtitles in collective chapters such as *Zhuzi suishi* 諸子隨識 (“Random Opinions from the Great Thinkers”) or *Zhuzhuan zhai xuan* 諸傳摘玄 (“Notes on the Occult from Biographies”), the arrangement in the Shen Han MS is even further from that of the Mao MS than is that of the standard γ recension manuscripts.\(^{77}\) The creator of this ε recension was evidently moving toward a content-based topical organization.\(^{78}\) Moreover, while the 69 *juan* is close in number to the 70 which Du Ang said was the number of *juan* in the original Shuofu, the actual number of titles is much closer to that of the γ recension than to the Mao MS.

Both the Shen and Shi MSS include the SQL in the extant portions.\(^{79}\) The text in these two MSS, which I designate the ε recension, is also very distinctive. Compared to other SQL it has three major features: (1) its base text is a close descendant of the Hr exemplar, the massively harmonized γ recension exemplar that was also used for the Ming-era Fu, Uang, and She MSS. (2) This Hr exemplar text was, however, then collated with a now-lost primitive exemplar of the SQL that was circulating independently of the *Shuofu*.\(^{80}\) (3) Finally, it was harmonized once again to a truly exceptional degree complete, I guess that in this case, the Shi ordering is a result of rebinding a broken-up MS.

---

\(^{77}\) See Rao 1993: 661.

\(^{78}\) In the Mao MS, for example, Tao Zongyi began with 14 *juan* of *congshu* or collectanea — smaller collections now to be included in a larger one. In the later 69–70 *juan* MS, he seems to have taken the material on the Confucian canons (*jing* 經), previously in *juan* 34–35 and given it pride of place in *juan* 1 and 2. The ε recension, on the other hand, put those works concluding in the character *jing* 經, many of which were recently-written canons of taste (wine, horse-riding, etc.), not classics, in *juan* 1.

\(^{79}\) Partial contents of the two MSS are given in the tables. Unfortunately none of the contents of the very fragmentary Shi MS, of which only a fourth or a fifth of the original SF overlap with the very cursory description of the contents of Shen given by Jao. But both are clearly very different from the γ recension.

\(^{80}\) This primitive exemplar was allied to another non-Shuofu MS also used by the ancestor of the Lu 陸 MS (Seikadō Bunko 靜嘉堂文庫 Library, Tokyo) and Zheng 鄭 MS (National Library of China), both of the SQL alone.
with the *Yuan shi*, with 23 larger or smaller interpolations from the *Yuan shi* text not shared with any other manuscripts, as well as many smaller text changes. As a result the ε recension texts present one of the most distinctive appearances of any SQL text. The occasional readings from the primitive, non-Shuofu exemplar are extremely valuable, but often hidden by these massive harmonizations and idiosyncratic readings, particularly in the Shen MS, which in the transcriptions of Mongolian names, made several further choices, such as altering *zha*札 to *qi*杞 or *mie*蔑 and *mie*蔑 to *fa*茷. The results for the reading of Mongolian names are, of course, disastrous.

It is not known when and by whom the first MS of the ε recension was created. The Shen Han MS is dated to the Jiajing era (1521–1566), but it must be at least one copy away from the common ancestor of the family. However, the ε recension texts are not particularly primitive. As I mentioned, that of the SQL is clearly based on a copy of the Hr exemplar, which is itself a late-fifteenth, early sixteenth century branch off the common family tree of the γ recension. Likewise, with regard to the *Meng-Da beilu* text, my preliminary collation shows that the Shen MS text has the most numerous shared innovations (synapomorphies) compared with those from other γ recension texts (mostly closely with Zhang and more distantly with Zhao and Niu). The textual evidence is thus clear: the ε recension’s organization is not, as Jao Tsung-i thought, evidence of its primitivity but rather a result of taking a standard γ recension manuscript and reorganizing it in a way that would *seem* closer to Tao Zongyi’s original intention.

Presumably the editor was working in a reading market already familiar with Ye Sheng and Du Ang’s doubts about the original form of the text, and perhaps Yu Wenbo’s reorganized text as well. The comments of these well-known bibliophiles primed the book market for a 70-juan Shuofu. To those rendered suspicious of the *Shuofu* texts, the ε recension could seem like something much superior to the “parasitic additions and random overturning of the order” supposedly characteristic of other *Shuofus.*81 In reality it was the SS text creator who was guilty of such bibliographic offenses.

81 See the comments of the Shen Han MS’s owner Lu Qiao 陸樵 (fl. *ji/chou*己丑, probably 1589) cited in Jao (1966: 91); Chinese text cited in Rao 1993: 657. Was he basing his comments only on Du Ang’s doubts about the standard 100-juan *Shuofu*? Or was he also aware of the Yu Wenbo recension and its preface?
THE Ζ RECENSION

Given the growing interest in the Shuofu, it was only a matter of time before someone would think of block-printing the work. Sometime before 1621, the Wanweishan Tang 宛委山堂, a Hangzhou printing house, tried to produce the first printed edition of the Shuofu. As the core of the new work, the printers must have had access to a rare manuscript in the Yu Wenbo tradition (thus, as I hypothesize, of the δ recension) since they included his preface, but that manuscript was perhaps incomplete, and in any case did not include all the 725 titles readers would have expected. So like other new versions of the Shuofu, the printers must have used multiple manuscripts to produce the text. The result was a final version, the ζ recension, whose precise manuscript affiliations are still unclear.

Already the manuscripts in the Shuofu tradition were sufficiently corrupt that they sought to use printed versions of the items taken from other anthologies wherever possible. The hunt for new works was incessant, and the new volume was expanded to 120 juan, with an additional “continuation”

82 The most convenient access to the blockprinted edition is that in Shuofu sanzhong “Three Kinds of Shuofu.” The “three kinds of Shuofu” reprinted are Zhang Zongxiang’s 1927 printed version of the 100-juan Shuofu, the 120-juan blockprint Shuofu printed of the Ming-Qing transition, and the 46-juan Shuofuxu 説郛續 or “Shuofu Sequel” that was included along with the Ming-Qing transition printing. But it is important to note that the edition printed in Shuofu sanzhong is not a facsimile of any actually existing printing, but a composite reprint, mixing copies of a late-Ming printing with the early Qing prefaces. The actual contents reprinted and the arrangement of the text is that of the first, Chongzhen 崇禎 era, printing, identical to that of the copy preserved in the Institute of Oriental Culture in Kyoto. Thus it includes the Inner Asian works deleted in later printings. But the printing also includes the Shunzhi 順治 (A.D. 1646) prefaces by Li Jiqi 李際期 and Wang Yingchang 王應昌, which were added only after those Inner Asian works were deleted. It is also worth noting that the catalogue entry for the Kyoto copy found in the Tōhō bunka gakuin Kyōtō kenkyūsho kanseki mokuroku (1938: 324ff) also includes the name of Tao Ting 陶珽, the Li Jiqi preface and the Shunzhi 3 date even though none of these things are found anywhere in the edition, and the copy is unquestionably a Chongzhen era one, as was long ago determined by Watanabe Közō.

83 For what follows I have relied on Chang Bide’s masterful detective work; see his Shuofu kao (1979: 25–35). Huang Fushan (2000) has also added to our knowledge of this process through his analysis of how some of the chenwei 諭緯 or “predictive weft-texts” added to the classics, which had been gathered in the γ recension texts, were partially lost and then supplemented in the ζ recension block print version.
(xu 續) in 47 juan. In Yang Weizhen’s preface the character ㄧ 一 had been changed to 二 二, whether deliberately or by corruption, and now Tao Zongyi was said to have based the Shuofu on his reading of 2000, not 1000, authors! To fill up this mythical number, the printers scoured anthologies to incorporate new works, chopped up large works into separate one, duplicated works under alternate names, and even listed unavailable works they thought Tao Zongyi might have included in the table of contents with the notation “missing.” The new edition was given a topical organization, with most travelogues to the north or east being grouped in juan 55 and 56, and descriptions of remote provinces and Southeast Asian regions in juan 62. The effort to increase the number of works to 2000 resulted in the inclusion of a number of interesting works on foreign peoples not included in Tao’s original anthology (see Table 1). 84

Just before the work was to be published, however, the 1621 fire destroyed much of Hangzhou. 85 All or most of the wooden printing blocks survived, but the publishing house could no longer fund the printing and the wooden blocks were sold off to other printing houses in Hangzhou, where with a little altering they were used as part of the printing for six different other anthologies. Finally in the Chongzhen 崇禎 era (1628–1644) of the late Ming, the Wanweishan Tang 宛委山堂 press recovered the blocks and made two separate printings of a Shuofu edition in 120 juan, with a 46-juan sequel anthologizing Ming works. The total number of titles was around 1,360. 86 The prefaces

84 See, for example, Liu Yu’s Xishiji on the Il-Khanate; Shi Maoliang’s Birong yehua on the Jurchen Jin; Hu Jiao’s Xianlu ji on the Kitan Liao; Song Yande’s Gaochang jixing on Uyghuristan; and Fang Feng’s Yisu kao and Xu Jing’s Shi Gaoli lu on Korea.

85 Chang (1979: 27–28) believes that there is a literary reference to a pre-1621 test printing, but that no actual copy of this printing has survived to the present.

86 Chang Bide identifies the printed edition purchased in 1943 by the Centre Franco-Chinois d’Études Sinologiques in Beiping and discussed by King (1946: 6–9), as the very first known printing. A complete table of contents (based on cat. no. 4104–87–3560) is published in Seikadō bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku (1930: 966–990). The Ming print kept in Kyoto’s Institute of Oriental Culture and discussed by Watanabe Kōzō in his “Setsu-bu kō” in 1938 he identifies as a later, slightly expanded, printing made by 1643 at the latest. Its contents have been published in the Tōhō bunka gakujin Kyōto kenkyūsho kanseki mokuroku (1938: 324–47). The first printing had 120 juan and 1360 titles (of which 124 were labeled “missing”) together with 44 juan of continuation (containing 544 titles of which 6 were labeled “missing”), while the second had 1364 titles (of which 113 were labeled “missing”) together with 46 juan of continuation (containing 542 works of which 8 were labeled “missing”), of continuation. See Chang 1979: 30–31.
were those of Yu Wenbo and Yang Weizhen, together with a notice from the publisher on “reading the Shuofu” (du Shuofu 讀説郛). Yet whether because they were missing in all the manuscripts, or because their blocks were never recovered, a small number of works from the γ recension did not make it into any of the block-printings; among them was the Shengwu qizhenglü. 87

The turmoil of the Ming’s fall and the campaigns of the new Manchu Qing dynasty (1636–1912) to conquer the Ming territory prevented this first printing from gaining currency. Under the new dynasty, moreover, works such as had earlier been included in the Shuofu that reflected Song attitudes to the Kitans, Jurchen, and Mongol regimes were problematic. Printing works cursing rulers from Manchuria as running a “cowards’ court” (Luting 虜廷) — and worse — was not something a prudent publisher would risk. So when the same press reprinted the work in 1646 and the Shuofu finally became a widely available work, it retained neither the SQL nor the Meng-Da beilü. Of the 14 works on the Kitan Liao, Jurchen Jin, and Mongol Yuan dynasties found in the first Chongzhen printing, only three or at most four found their way into later Qing-era printings. 88 Edited by Li Jiqi 李際期 (jinshi 1640), some printings added new prefaces by Li himself, as well as by Wang Yingchang 王應昌, while

87 Among the works listed above as dealing with topics outside China proper, only the SQL, the Shi Liao lu (“Record of an embassy to the Liao”) and the Qingtang lu on Kökenuur of all the works found in the 100-juan version appear to be missing from the early blockprint version. Chang Bide counted 206 works found in the original 725 titles of the 100-juan Shuofu which are not found in block-printed version (p. 30). Wang Zhuyao, writing in 1917, compared the 1361 Mao MS with the block-printed edition and found over 860 works in the block-printing that were not in the Mao MS and somewhere over 100 works in the MS that were not in the printed work (cited in Xu 1994: 113). If this is the case, then works on foreign topics show an unusually high rate of retention in the Ming blockprint edition. It is quite possible, however, that lacking the convenient index found in volume 10 of the Shuofu sanzhong edition which I used, that there are works found in block-printed version which they missed.

88 Based on my personal examination of four copies in the Toyo Bunko (cat. nos. V–5–A–11, 12, 13, and 14) and one Qing printing in the Seikadō Bunko (cat. no. 8505–163–305–2). The contents of a typical such bowdlerized Shuofu blockprint can be found in Seikadō bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku (1930: 990–1014), based on cat no. 8505–163–305–2. Cf. King 1946: 15. Note that in no case were the actual whole blocks re-carved; the variation was simply one of using or not using particular blocks and in the table of contents carving out certain offending titles and gluing in strips with the revised titles carved onto them.
others stuck with the previous printing’s assemblage of front matter.\textsuperscript{89} Li Jiqi’s mutilated edition was in turn made the basis for the text of the \textit{Shuofu} in the Manchu Qing dynasty’s colossal imperial literary compendium, the \textit{Siku quanshu} (“Complete Library of the Four Treasuries”) of 1772–1794. Until 1927, it remained the standard text of the \textit{Shuofu}, despite its vast divergence from Tao Zongyi’s original anthology.\textsuperscript{90}

The printing of the \textit{Shuofu} slowed the production of further manuscripts of the work as the blockprint versions came to define what people meant by “the \textit{Shuofu}.” Manuscripts did survive and were occasionally consulted. Thus in 1778, comparing a separate MS of the SQL, Zheng Jie had a friend copy a text of the SQL which he found in a manuscript \textit{Shuofu} he located at a collector’s site near Changmen \[閶門\] Gate in Suzhou. There is no further information from which one could identify the particular recension of the \textit{Shuofu} in question, but judging from the readings which Zheng recorded, the text of the SQL is one not otherwise attested in any \textit{Shuofu} text.\textsuperscript{91} This interesting manuscript is an illustration both of how much is still unknown about the \textit{Shuofu} textual tradition and of the many fragmentary manuscripts that may still remain to be discovered and identified.

\textbf{THE 1927 COMMERCIAL PRESS EDITION}

As I have already mentioned, the 1927 Commercial Press edition of the \textit{Shuofu} was a milestone, in which the $\gamma$ recension, once dominant in the manuscript tradition but since the end of the Ming

\begin{footnotesize}
89 Toyo Bunko, no. V–5–A–11 has the old front matter, while Toyo Bunko no. V–5–A–12 and Seikadô Bunko no. 8505–163–305–2 used the new version with the Li Jiqi and Wang Yingchang prefaces. Those with the new front matter also inserted a reference on the first contents page to Tao Ting \textsuperscript{陶珽} (from Yao’an 姚安 in Yunnan \textsuperscript{雲南}, \textit{jinshi} degree, 1610) as having re-organized the text. As Chang (1979: 22–25) argues, however, the fact that the biographical sources on him seem to know absolutely nothing of any such enterprise on his part cannot be explained away and makes his involvement very uncertain.

90 A composite text, including the new front matter of the Li Jiqi printing, but the full contents of the second Chongzhen-era printing of the \textit{Shuofu} and \textit{Shuofu xu} (“Sequel to the Enclosure of Literature”) was reprinted in 1988 as the third to tenth volumes of the \textit{Shuofu sanzhong}.

91 It is, however, very similar to the \textit{Wāng} \textsuperscript{汪} text of the SQL kept in the Nanjing Library.
\end{footnotesize}
dynasty eclipsed by the block-printed $\zeta$ recension, returned into scholarly view. Edited by Zhang Zongxiang, the Commercial Press *Shuofu* is essentially identical to the Zhang MSS in contents.\(^92\)

Zhang Zongxiang gave virtually no information about how he edited the volume, except for a brief listing of the MSS in a colophon at the end of his printed edition. Dated to ren/xu 壬戌 (A.D. 1922), the colophon lists six MSS of the 100-juan *Shuofu*, all incomplete, which he claims to have used.\(^93\) The first, from the Metropolitan Library (京師圖書館) covered up to juan 32, the next was the composite Fu MS, currently held in the Shanghai Library, while the third, kept in the Hanfenlou, is what I follow Jia in designating the Zhang MS (from Zhang Yuanji, who first described it). The last MS, the Sun MS, he implies he used only to make up the juan missing from the others. In other words, the implication is that for each work in the *Shuofu*, his edition is based on a single MS. Of these MSS, the latter three are all extant, but the first is no longer extant, to my knowledge.\(^94\)

Jia Jingyan already noted, however, that there is something puzzling about Zhang Zongxiang’s recension of the *SQL*. First he pointed out that of all the MSS Zhang listed, it is the Fu₃ MS from Hongzhi 18 that contains the *SQL*. Jia continues:

Yet this reprinted *Shuofu* text’s *Qinzheng lu* is not similar to the Fu text in Wang Guowei’s commentary or as recorded by Pelliot, nor is it similar to the Zhang text.

---

\(^92\) This edition is widely available in the original 1927 printing and in a photographic reprint in the *Shuofu sanzhong* edition of 1988.

\(^93\) See Tao/Zhang 1927: ba 跋, 1a–b; Tao 1988: 1358c–d.

\(^94\) Can the contents of this MS be reconstructed? To a certain extent I believe they can be. As I mention below, there is a copy in the Zhejiang Library of the MS Zhang Zongxiang used while compiling his edition of the *Shuofu*. In this MS his base text (with occasional implicit editorial emendations) is written in black, while collated readings from other MSS are added in red ink. By comparison with the other MSS which Zhang used and which are extant (Fu₃, Zhang, and Sun), one could presumably isolate those titles in the *Shuofu* whose texts clearly differ from any of these three. Such texts would then presumptively be derived from Zhang’s first MS.
Where the characters are inferior, it looks like it is in between them, so where in the world did it come from?\footnote{Jia 1979: I, zhuiyan, p. 4a.}

Stemmatic analysis resolves Jia’s puzzlement, by showing that the 1927 recension was based not on a single MS but on a collation of two MSS, the Zhang MS and what Jia called the Metropolitan MS, because it was written on the stationery of the Metropolitan Library in Beijing.\footnote{Jia’s “Metropolitan” MS, which I call the Fu-Metropolitan MS, was kept in the National Library, where it was used by Jia, and included the SQL in juan 55; it should not be confused with the “Metropolitan” MS of Zhang, which was kept in the Metropolitan Library, but did not go beyond juan 32.} This second MS in turn is a rather poor modern copy of Fu$_3$, occasionally collated with the earliest scholarly edition of the SQL, printed in 1894. For this reason, I prefer to designate it the Fu-Metropolitan MS. This stemmatic analysis is confirmed by the draft manuscript prepared by Zhang for his printed edition. Now held in the Zhejiang Library (no. 7437),\footnote{A complete table of contents of this MS is given in Zhejiang Tushuguan guji bu 2002: 670–80.} this manuscript preserves Zhang’s base text, written in black, which for the SQL corresponds largely to the Fu$_3$ MS, but with some minor editorial emendations. In red ink, however, Zhang added readings taken from the Zhang MS. This evidence demonstrates that the texts in the 1927 edition are not, as one might expect from Zhang’s description of his practice, each simply taken from one particular manuscript. Rather they are as a rule hybrid texts eclectically merging two or more $\gamma$ recension MSS. This hybrid nature was, at least in the case of the SQL, somewhat less visible, because the MSS he used for it, the Zhang and Fu$_3$ MSS were already quite close to each other.\footnote{As I will demonstrate in my critical edition of the SQL, the two MSS are very close because in the Ming dynasty’s Hongzhi era when the Fu$_3$ MS was being created, the editor already used the Zhang MS or something very like it to collate the MS.} In other cases, where the MSS chosen are less obviously related, the hybrid nature of the 1927 edition readings might be more obvious.
CONCLUSION

The conclusions presented here are only the beginning of the analysis of the texts of the works included with the *Shuofu*. They are based on a detailed analysis of the *SQL* and a preliminary analysis of the *MB* and the Yang Weizhen preface. As a result there are many questions still unanswered or for which the answers are only tentative. These include the proposed identification of the δ recension with that of Yu Wenbo, and the precise MSS which were used to create the ζ recension.

Moreover, there is no guarantee that all the works within a given manuscript of the Shuofu have the same stemmatic relationship to those in other Shuofus. My preliminary examination of the *MB* indicates that a stemma based on its text would indeed match that of the *SQL*. However, it was not uncommon for a particular work in a Shuofu MS to be copied not on the basis of a single exemplar, but of two or more exemplars. Thus, of the *SQL* texts found in the *Shuofus* I have examined, the Fu, Uang, Shi, and Shen MSS all show evidence of having collated one base text against another manuscript. In other words, scholars who produced these MSS had access to more than one Shuofu text, and it is always possible that they might have preferred one MS for one title with the *Shuofu*, and another MS for another.

Moreover, it is unlikely that Ming-era Shuofu MSS were always complete. Someone wishing to make a complete *Shuofu* text in the sixteenth century might well have been reduced to the same expedient as Fu Zengxiang or Zhang Zongxiang in the twentieth century: cobbling together one hundred *juan* with a wide variety of more or less fragmentary *Shuofu* MSS. A copy based on such fragmentary *Shuofus* would show differing stemmas depending on the title chosen for analysis. Thus only a detailed analysis of each of the 725 or so titles contained within the Shuofu can eventually give a complete picture of the development of this complex collection of texts. One further benefit of such a broad-based study of each text is that it will allow the identification of the large number of very fragmentary *Shuofus* currently kept in Chinese libraries, containing only five or ten *juan*, or even fewer. It is not impossible that among them may be found fragmentary exemplars of extremely valuable MSS. Identification would have to proceed one by one, however, based on an understanding of the stemma of each particular title as derived from the better preserved and better known exemplars of the same sort as I have outlined in this article. Such a colossal task is obviously beyond
the abilities of any one scholar, and can only be the goal of a team effort, drawing scholars interested in the full range of topics covered by Tao Zongyi's eclectic interests. It is to be hoped that this small preliminary analysis will be helpful to scholars thinking to undertake this great task.
APPENDIX: MSS OF THE SHUOFU

I. Extant and Catalogued SHUOFU MSS

1. Mao 毛 (See Figure 2): Currently held in the Linhai City Museum. A recension. 60 juan, completely extant in 20 fascicles. The SQL is not included. A full table of contents of the manuscript has been published.99 One preface, by Yang Weizhen 楊維楨; contents organized by final character and radically different from the 1927 Commercial Press edition. The MS is written on unlined paper with no “fish tail” or running header. The text has 9 columns per page and 17 characters per standard column. There are corrections both in black ink, probably by the original editor, and red ink, by subsequent owners.

History: The MS is generally believed to be of the Ming era. The inconsistency in character forms, particularly for the rare character zhou 彈, which Tao Zongyi specially chose to replace the more usual juan 卷, would seem to indicate that it is at least several copies away from the original 1361 copy prepared by Tao Zongyi. The earliest known owner is Mao Yi 毛扆, who made corrections in red ink and left a colophon in juan 20 with his stamp “Yushan Maoyi shougao 虞山毛扆手校.” It was then acquired by Ma Yutang 馬玉堂 (courtesy name Huzhai 矧齋, sobriquet Qiuyao 秋藥, degrees 1821 and 1845) and in the Tongzhi era by Wang Yongni 王咏霓 (1839–1916, courtesy name Zichang 子裳, sobriquet Liutan 六潭, jinshi degree 1880), who deposited it in the Jiufeng Shuyuan 九峰書院 (later known as the Huangyan Jiufeng Library 黃嚴九峰圖書館) in Taizhou 台州 (modern Linhai). His landsman Wang Zhouyao (1855–1925, courtesy name Meibo 玫伯, sobriquet Mo'an 默庵) also made further proofreader’s corrections in red ink and added a colophon following the preface.100

2. Zhao 趙 (see Figure 3): Currently held in the National Library of China (no. 3907). Γ recension. 61 \textit{juan} extant in 50 fascicules. The SQL forms \textit{juan} 55 of text.\textsuperscript{101} One preface, by Yang Weizhen 楊維楨; contents show only occasional minor differences from the 1927 Commercial Press edition. The paper is lined in blue with two “fish tails” and blue header blanks on the page fold; however, the spaces have neither numbers nor any running header.

History: At the end of \textit{juan} 24, Jia Jingyan found the following note, “copied in Hongzhi year geng/shen” 弘治庚申依本錄, thus dating the copy to 1500. It contains stamps and inscriptions from a large number of scholars: Mr. Zhao from Wu (吳郡趙氏), Ruan Yuan 阮元 (1764–1849), Weng Binsun 翁斌孫 (1860–1922), and others.\textsuperscript{102} Jia Jingyan speculates that the Mr. Zhao from Wu might be Zhao

---


\textsuperscript{102} Other owners listed by Jia Jingyan (1979: I, shuiyan, 3a) include: Zhang Ruizhong 張睿鐘, Xu Tieyi 徐鎮鈞, Zhao
Huanguang 趙宦光 (Wanli 萬曆 era, 1572–1620) or his son Zhao Jun 趙均 (Chongzhen 崇禎 era, 1627–1644). Weng’s collection was the immediate source before it was acquired by the National Library.

FIGURE 3: The Zhao MS, juan 54, text from the Beiyuan lu 北轅錄 and the Meng-Da beilu 蒙靼備錄. Courtesy of the National Library of China.

3. Niu 鈕 (see Figure 4); Currently held in the National Library of China (no. 2408). Γ recension. 97 juan extant, grouped in 70 fascicles; the SQL forms juan 55 of text.\textsuperscript{103} A full table of contents of the manuscript has been published.\textsuperscript{104} One preface, by Yang Weizhen 楊維稹; the contents show only occasional minor differences from the 1927 Commercial Press edition. The paper is lined in blue with no “fish tails” but with white header blanks on the paper fold; the spaces are not numbered but have


\textsuperscript{104} See Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui 1989: 1/10a–24b (pp. 19–48 in the continuous pagination added to the 1990 reprint), and Weng 2005: 1919–1923.
the running header *Shixue lou* 世學樓. This was the residence of the Ming collector Niu Shixi 鈕石溪 of Shaoxing 紹興, who therefore must have been responsible for the copying of this *Shuofu* MS.\(^{105}\)

History: Jia Jingyan notes that this MS was held by He Zhao 何焯 and Chen Kui 陳揆 (courtesy names Zizheng 子正 and Zhun 准; 1780–1825) of Changshu 常熟. The Qing-era catalogue *Lüting zhijian chuaben shumu* 郧亭知見本書目 also mentions this MS as being in the possession of Chen Kui. Jia further notes that most of Chen Kui’s library derived from that of Qian Qianyi 錢謙益 (1582–1664), also of Changshu, and that the catalogue of Qian’s private library mentions a *Shuofu* in 100 *juan*, which Jia believes should be this MS.\(^{106}\)

\(^{105}\) Although he seems to have been widely known, I have not yet been able to identify his precise era.

\(^{106}\) Jia (1979: I, *zhuiyan*, 3b); Mo 1993: 10B/751; Qian 1965: 2/17b. However, as noted by Jao Tsung-i, the Niu MS in the National Library is bound in 70 fascicles while that recorded in the Shugutang catalogue is bound in 32 fascicles. If they are the same, then one would have to presume a rebinding took place in the meantime. See Jao 1966: 93; Rao 1993: 659.
4. Zhang 張 (see Figure 5): Currently held in the National Library of China (no. 7557). Γ recension. 91 juan extant, in 29 fascicules; the SQL forms juan 55 of text.\(^{107}\) A full table of contents has been published.\(^{108}\) One preface, by Yang Weizhen 楊維楨; contents essentially identical to 1927 Commercial Press edition.\(^{109}\) The paper is lined in blue with one “fish tail” and white header blanks on the paper fold; however, the pages have neither numbers nor running headers.

History: Listed as a Ming-era copy. Zhang Zongxiang attributes it to the Wanli 萬曆 period (1572–1620), but I think it is likely to be much earlier, preceding the Fu₃ copy. Jia Jingyan notes on the


\(^{109}\) The MS itself has only a partial table of contents covering juan 1–8 at the beginning, with no author or dynasty attributions.
volume the stamps only of the collector Zhang Yuanji 張元濟 (1867–1959) and the Hanfenlou 淵芬樓, i.e., the company library of the Commercial Press, in which Zhang Yuanji was the editorial chief. It was the third of the MSS used in the production of the 1927 Commercial Press edition, used to collate the text of the SQL, whose base text was the Fu 3 MS.

FIGURE 6: The Sun MS, juan 55, text of the Shengwu qinzheng lu 聖武親征錄.
Courtesy of the Yuhailou Museum.

110 On him, see Manying Ip (1985).
111 Jia 1979: 1, zhuiyan, 3b.
112 This MS is the same as the “Hanfenlou 淵芬樓 MS” mentioned in Zhang Zongxiang's colophon. Zhang description of it in his colophon runs as follows: “One is a MS kept in the Hanfenlou library, which seems to be a Wanli era copy and does not lack a single one of the juan. In front of each juan there is a table of contents and the present table of contents has been copied from this MS”; see Tao/Zhang 1927: ba 跋, 1a; Tao 1988: 1358c. This description would seem to preclude this MS being the Zhang MS, since it seems to state that it is complete and lacks no juan. However, Zhang's 1927 description here is misleading. In the more accurate description of the MSS used by Zhang Zongxiang given in the reprint Shuofu sanzhong 說郛三種, it is stated that this Hanfenlou MS is an incomplete Ming MS with 91 juan, the exact number of the Zhang MS. See Shanghai guji chubanshe [1986] 1988: 1.
5. **Sun 孫** (see Figure 6): Currently held in Yuhailou 玉海樓 museum, Rui’an 瑞安 city, Zhejiang province. I’ recension. 52 juan extant, bound in eighteen fascicules; the SQL forms juan 55 of text.\(^\text{53}\) The paper is lined in blue with one faint upper “fish tail” on the paper fold. No numbering or running header. Text written in black ink.

History: Ming-era MS. Held at the former residence of Sun Yirang 孫詒讓 (courtesy name Zhongrong 仲容; 1848–1908), and the fourth manuscript used by Zhang Zongxiang for the 1927 Commercial Press edition.

6. **Fu 傅** (see Figure 7): A set of three or four\(^\text{114}\) different fragmentary MSS assembled by Fu Zengxiang 傅增湘.\(^\text{113}\)

---


\(^{114}\) There is a difference of opinion among bibliographers on whether there is a separate Fu₃ document. The differences in paper and handwriting between Fu₁, Fu₂, and Fu₃ are obvious. But Fu Zengxiang also separates out Fu₂ (juan 31–67) and Fu₃ (juan 68–70) as two separate texts even though both are on very similar black lined paper with 13 columns per page and “Shuofu 說郛” printed on the paper fold. See Mo 1993: 10B/751–52. Zhang Zongxiang, on the other, does not distinguish Fu₃.
傅增湘（1872–1950）to make an almost complete set. Currently kept in the Shanghai Library (nos. 786660–786719). All are Γ recensions; the SQL is found in juan 55. A complete table of contents of the entire Fu MS set has been published. Fu （juan 1–25）is on black-lined “Congshutang 叢書堂” stationery, 10 columns per page; Fu （juan 26–30 and 96–100）is on blue-lined “Hongnong Yang shi 弘農楊氏” stationery, 11 columns per page; Fu （juan 31–67）and Fu （juan 68–70）are on black-lined “Shuofu 説郛” stationery, 13 columns per page.

History: Fu 1 is written on stationery of the Congshutang 叢書堂 library of Wu Kuan 吳寛 (1435–1504). Fu 2 is written on stationery of a Mr. Yang (Yang shi 楊氏) of Hongnong 弘農, but I have not yet been able to identify this person. Fu 3 has a note in juan 62: “completed in the third month of Hongzhi 18” or A.D. 1505. The three (or perhaps four) MSS were brought together by Fu Zengxiang, as indicated by his Shuangjianlou 雙鑒樓 stamp at the beginning of Fu. Stamps of Wang Tiren 王體仁 (courtesy name Shoushan 綬珊, 1873–1938) and the Shanghai Library stamp found periodically throughout the set. This was the second of the MSS used by Zhang Zongxiang in the 1927 Commercial Press edition. The text of Fu 3 was used as the base text for that edition’s SQL.

7. Uang 汪 (see Figure 8): Currently held in the Zhejiang Library (no. 7434). Γ recension. 41 juan extant in 26 fascicules; SQL found in juan 55. A full table of contents has been published. 118 Juan with

---

115 Zhang Zongxiang notes in his colophon to his printed edition that “the numbering of the juan has some discrepancies with the table of contents,” but this must refer to only the very minor discrepancies that can likewise be found between the table of contents and the actual text in the Zhao, Zhang, and other MSS.

116 See Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui 1989: 1/38a (pp. 49–75 in the continuous pagination added to the 1990 reprint), and Weng 2005: 1923–1927.

117 The seal reads: Hangzhou Wang shi Jiu Fengjiulu cangshu zhi zhang 杭州王氏九峰舊廬藏書之章.

118 Zhejiang Tushuguan guji bu 2002: 651–54. This entry in the Zhejiang library catalogue (see next note) must be referring to the same manuscript said to contain 45 juan 卷 found in Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui 1989: 1/38b
preface(s) and/or contents missing. The organization has a number of differences in detail from the 1927 Commercial Press edition. The paper is lined in light blue, with 9 columns per page and 24 characters per column. The page fold has one “fish tail” and a header blank. Running header with \textit{juan} number and page numbers throughout.

History: Ming-era copy. Stamps of Wang Wenbo 汪文柏 (courtesy name Jiqing 季青, sobriquet Keting 柯庭), active in the Kangxi era (1662–1722), originally of Xiuning 休寧 (Anhui), later of Tongxiang 桐鄉 (Zhejiang).\textsuperscript{119} Zhang Zongxiang located this copy in the Zhejiang library in 1952 and used it to collate his published 1927 edition of the Shuofu, which notes the editors of \textit{Shuofu sanzhong} reproduced in an appendix.\textsuperscript{120}

\begin{figure}
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.9\textwidth]{fig8.png}
\end{center}
\caption{The Uang MS, \textit{juan} 54, from the \textit{Meng-Da beilu} 蒙鞑備錄. Courtesy of the Zhejiang Library.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{119} His stamps read \textit{Xiuning Wāng Jiqing jia cang shuji} 休寧汪季青家藏書籍 and \textit{Gu xiang lou} 古香樓.

8. **Hu 滬**: Currently held by the National Library of China (no. 0485).\(^{121}\) \(\Delta\) recension. 55 \(juan\) extant in 17 fascicules; does not include the SQL. Table of contents and preface(s) not preserved, but a later owner wrote in the contents of each fascicle on the reverse of its cover page. Selected contents listed in Table 2. Paper lined in orchid (\(lan\) 蘭) with 13 columns per page and 19–20 characters per column. The page fold has two “fish tails” defining two header blanks. The lower one has the running header *Hunan shushe* 滬南書舍. Single line border on all four sides.

History: may be related to the Yu Wenbo 郁文博 recension completed in 1496. Copied by the Húnan Printing House (*Hunan shushe* 滬南書舍) onto its own stationery. The printing house or a subsequent owner added numerous proof-reader’s marks (○ and 丶), as well as annotations in the top margins and corrections between the lines.\(^{122}\) Commented on by Fu Zengxiang.\(^{123}\)

9. **Shi 史** (See Figure 9): Currently held in the National Library of China, as “*Shuofu* not divided into \(juan\)” (no. A01507).\(^{124}\) \(\varepsilon\) recension. 12 fascicules with contents equivalent to roughly 20 \(juan\). No \(juan\) numbering.\(^{125}\) Contents listed in Table 4. Paper lined in blue with 14 columns per page and an absolutely consistent 22 characters per column. The *mise en page* is identical to that of the other \(\varepsilon\) recension MS, Shen. It has white header blanks and a single border on all four sides. It has a single “fish tail” and a running header of *Shuofu* 説郛, but no page numbers.\(^{126}\)

History: Ming-era copy, with text superior to the Jiajing-era Shen MS. Stamp of Jieshushanfang

---


122 Since I have had access only to the black and white microfilm, I cannot tell if these annotations are, as one would expect, in red ink.

123 Mo 1993: 10B/752 (second *Shuofu* listed).


125 A later curator of the MS occasionally added in numbers. Thus with *Daye zaji* 大業雜記, the number 57 is written in. But this is derived not from counting up the \(juan\) in the actual Shi MS, but from the numbering in the \(\gamma\) recension.

Studio 借樹山房 of the scholar Shi Mengjiao 史夢蛟 (Qianlong era). A number of marginal notes or comments of three types: (1) proofreader’s corrections, found in the earlier five fascicules; (2) juan numbers, derived from the γ recension, pasted in or written in pen; (3) notes by a scholar with the courtesy name Xiaozheng 暉鉦, dated to year ding/si 丁巳, whom Jia identified with Qian Daxin 錢大昕 (courtesy name Xiaozheng 暉徵) and ding/si (Jiaqing 2, A.D. 1798). Acquired by National Library of China in the Republican period.

10. Shen 沈 (See Figure 10): Currently held in the Fung Ping Shan Library of the University of Hong Kong (cat. no. 善 837/77–11). E recension, complete in 69 juan, in 24 fascicules; the SQL forms the 60th juan. Described by Jao Tsung-i, with contents of representative juan. No prefaces, table of contents, or juan numbers. Four colophons written by Lu Qiao 鄧樵 (see below). Written on white tissue paper, lined in black with 14 columns per page and an absolutely consistent 22 characters per column. The mise en page is identical to that of the other ε recension MS, Shi. The page fold has three “fish tails” and a running header of Shen 沈.

127 See also Jia (1979: I, zhuiyan, p. 4a–b); Beijing tushuguan 1987–1988: vol. 4 (Zi bu), p. 1695. I know Shi Mengjiao only as the publisher of the complete works of the Ningbo scholar Quan Zuwang 全祖望 (1705–1755) entitled Jieqiting quanji 魚奇亭全集 and a chronology of Quan’s life Qing Quan Xieshan xiansheng Zuwang nianpu 清全謝山先生祖望年譜.

128 The library stamp reads Guo Li Bei Ping tushuguan suo cang 國立北平圖書館所藏.


131 As Jao notes in a footnote to his French article (1966: 90n.1), there are in fact four places where the juan no. is noted, but the numbering is not consistent with the current organization. Thus fascicule 20 has one juan labeled no. 6, fascicule 21 has one juan labeled no. 15, fascicule 22 has one juan labeled no. 40, and fascicule 24 has one juan labeled no. 40. Since fascicule 24 is the last one, and the Sn MS has a total of 69 MS, it seems clear that some fascicules which were originally near the end of the work have been moved towards the beginning of it. A similar phenomenon appears in the Shi MS.
FIGURE 9: The Sun MS, juan 55, text of the Shengwu qinzheng lu 聖武親征錄.
Courtesy of the National Library of China.
History: Jiajing-era MS. As noted by Jao Tsung-i, the stationery and stamp belong to Shen Han (courtesy name Yuanyue 原約, from Wujiang 吳江) and post-date his jinshi 進士 degree in 1535. Subsequent owners include Huang Jishui 黃姬水 (1509–1574) and Lu Qiao 陸樵, who added colophons dating his acquisition of the MS to ji/chou 己丑, probably 1589. Later owners include Lù Yunxiang 陸雲祥 (courtesy name Jiaqing 嘉卿, juren 舉人 degree 1627) of Wujiang 吳江, Lù Zhi 盧址 (1725–1794) in his Baojinglou 抱經樓 Residence, and Liu Chenggan 劉承幹 (courtesy name Zhenyi 貞一, sobriquet Hanyi 翰怡, 1881–1963) of Nanxun 南潯, before being acquired by the Fung Ping Shan library.

132 Jao Tsung-i did not present any additional information on Lù Qiao, but, given that the MS was certainly produced after 1535, and was in Lù Zhi’s possession by the Qianlong era, only dates of 1589, 1649, and 1709 are possible. The colophon’s criticism of the 100-juan MS as the most current one and the absence of reference to the 120-juan late-Ming-early-Qing printed edition would seem to exclude 1649 or 1709, leaving 1589 as the only possibility.
11. **Han draft 涵稿**: Currently held in the Zhejiang Library (no. 7437). Γ recension. All 100 juan extant in 52 fascicules; the SQL forms juan 55 of the text. A complete table of contents has been published.\(^\text{133}\) This MS is the draft for Zhang Zongxiang’s 1927 Commercial Press edition, designated by Jia as the Hanfenlou or Han 涵 edition. Prefaces and contents are thus identical with those of the printed edition. The base text for each work is written in black ink with corrections, usually based on some other manuscript, but in some cases based only on Zhang’s editorial judgment, written in red ink. The black ink text thus represents a copy of the manuscripts used by Zhang, i.e., the extant Fu, Zhang, and Sun MSS and the now lost Metropolitan MS. Thus, although for most juan it is of interest solely for understanding Zhang Zongxiang’s editorial process, for those juan where his base text was the lost Metropolitan text, this MS forms the only extant witness to the MS’s text.

**History:** This MS presumably derives from Zhang Zongxiang’s personal papers.

12. **Taipei 台**: Currently held in the Central National Library (Guoli zhongyang tushuguan 國立中央圖書館) in Taipei (no. 000525628). Γ recension. All 100 juan extant in 64 fascicules; the SQL forms juan 55 of the text. A complete table of contents has been published.\(^\text{134}\) One preface, by Yang Weizhen 楊維楨, and prefatory statement that text is based on Tao Zongyi’s as reorganized “Du” (error for Yu) Wenbo 鄭文博.\(^\text{135}\) Contents are very similar to those of the 100-juan Shuofu published by Zhang Zongxiang 張宗祥 in 1927, and Zhang MS. Each fascicule begins with separate table of contents. Paper is lined in blue with 11 columns per page with no “fish tails” and no running header. The size is 18.6 x 14.1 centimeters.

**History:** Forgery, post-dating 1926. The MS’s SQL text was created by copying the Fu 3 manuscript text and then collating it with Wang Guowei’s 1926 scholarly edition. This collation and the addition of the statement of Yu Wenbo 郁文博 and the omission of the clearly Yongle-era text in juan 97 probably related to the attempt to give an appearance of a highly valuable text.

---

135 See the page reproduced by Chang (1979: pl. 1).
II. Currently Unlocated Shuofu MSS (all recension MSS)

1. Metropolitan 京: A manuscript used by Zhang Zongxiang for his 1927 edition of the Shuofu. (This should not be confused with the Fu-Metropolitan MS, called the Metropolitan MS by Jia Jingyan.) His description of it states that it was kept in the Metropolitan Library (京師圖書館):

   One [exemplar used] is a fragmentary edition in the Metropolitan Library (juan no. 3, no. 4, and nos. 23–32). This has no year dating, and is written on white tissue paper; the calligraphy is extremely big and tall. It seems to be a MS copied during the Longqing 隆慶–Wanli era.136

The holdings of the Metropolitan Library were inherited by the National Library of China, so presumably it should be extant. However it is not listed in any catalogue known to me. However, if Zhang Zongxiang did indeed use this MS as his base text for Juan 3, 4, and 23–32, then the black ink text of the Han draft manuscript for those Juan ought to be a more or less accurate copy of the Metropolitan MS. Further analysis could then identify the position of this MS in the stemma.

2. She 涉: A manuscript described by Wang Guowei as being of the Wanli era, and owned by Tao Xiang 陶湘 (courtesy name Lanquan 蘭泉, sobriquet Sheyuan 涉園, 1870–1940), from Wujin 武進. Wang Guowei visited Tao Xiang in Tianjin and borrowed the MS, using it to collate his edition of the SQL.137 Jia Jingyan also refers to the Sheyuan 涉園 or She 涉 MS, but instead of using it directly, he used a copy of the 1901 Japanese reprint of the He Qiuqiao edition of the SQL which had Wang’s notes in it, kept in the National Library of China.138 Neither Wang nor Jia made much use of this edition, seeing it as essentially identical to Fu₃. Indeed my analysis of their collations shows that its text of the

136 Tao/Zhang 1927: ba 跋, 1a; Tao 1988: 1358c.


138 Jia (1979: 1, zhuiyan, 5a). This volume is not listed in the catalogues of rare books in the National Library of China, presumably because the text in which Wang made his notes was not the 1894 Chinese edition, but the 1901 Japanese reprint.
SQL is likely a *codex descriptus*, identical to Fu. Given the description of Wang, who emphasizes its similarity to the Fu MS, it may be assumed to be a γ recension text.

3. **Fu-Metropolitan MS** 傅京: This MS is described by Jia Jingyan as a Ming-era copy of the *Shuofu*, which is copied onto stationery with the running header “Copy from the Metropolitan Library” (Jingshi tushuguan chao 京師圖書館鈔), hence its name. Since the Metropolitan Library existed only from 1909 to 1928, what Jia must mean is that it is a recent copy of a Ming-era MS. It is, he says, currently kept in the National Library of China, although as a twentieth-century MS it was evidently not included in the catalogues of rare books and MSS of the National Library.139 My stemmatic analysis shows that its text of the SQL is a copy of the Fu MS that incorporates a small number of editorial emendations, some derived from the then most current edition of the SQL, that of He Qiutao. Location of this MS would assist in understanding Zhang Zongxiang’s research on the *Shuofu* but would not have any significance for *Shuofu* MS studies.

4. **Yue MS** 粤: In May of jia/wu 甲午 (1951), Zhang Zongxiang made a collation of a MS from Guangzhou’s Yueyatang 粤雅堂 traditional publishing house against his 1927 printed edition, before making another collation against the Uang MS. These two collations were published together by the editors of the *Shuofu sanzhong*, although the editors were unable to distinguish the notes pertaining to the Yueyatang 粤雅堂 MS from those pertaining to the Uang MS.140 Thus what they reprinted is simply a list of all the alternative readings from these two collations, along with his own editorial notes. The Yueyatang MS has not, to my knowledge, been identified yet. Since, however, the Uang MS is extant, presumably comparison of all the collations given in *Shuofu sanzhong* with the Uang MS would enable one to exclude Uang readings, thus leaving only the Yueyatang readings, which could then be used to search for this MS. (It is also possible that the Yue MS is in fact written on Yueyatang stationery, which would make its identification much simpler.) Indeed, the collations listed by the

---

139 Jia 1979: 1, zhuiyan, 4a, 5b.

editors included those in *juan* 8, 19, and 93, which are not extant in the Uang *Shuofu*, at least according to the published table of contents. Thus those collations are likely to be from the Yue MS.

The relations of the various MSS, as far as can be told from the analysis of the SQL, are given in Figure 11.

![Figure 11: Hypothesized Relationship of MSS of the Shuofu Based on the SQL Text.
Approximate degree of divergence indicated by number of cross-lines. $\Gamma_1$ indicates the “Harmonized Exemplar” formed by extensive harmonization with Yuan shi text.](image-url)
### Table 1: The addition and loss of works in the *Shuofu*, illustrated by a sample of works on Northern, overseas, and border topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Author and era</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>γ</th>
<th>ζ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitan Liao</td>
<td>— (Song) 宋闕名</td>
<td>Shi Liao lu 使遼錄</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wu Gui (Song) 宋武珪</td>
<td>Yanbei zaji 燕北雜記</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yang Boyan (Song) 宋楊伯昻</td>
<td>Yi jian (~cheng) 臆東(—乘)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wang Yi (Song) 宋王易</td>
<td>Chongbian Yanbei lu 重編燕北録</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ye Longli (Song) 宋葉隆禧</td>
<td>Liao zhi (abridged) 遼志</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hu Jiao (Five Dynasties) 五代胡晉</td>
<td>Xianlu ji 陷虜記</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurchen Jin</td>
<td>Hong Hao (~Mai) (Song) 宋洪皓 (~邁)</td>
<td>Songmo jiwen 松漠紀聞</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wen Weijian (Song) 宋文惟簡</td>
<td>Luting shishi 虜廷事實</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— (Song) 宋闕名</td>
<td>Beifeng yangsha lu 北風揚沙録</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheng Dachang (Song) 宋程大昌</td>
<td>Beibian beidui 北邊備對</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhou Hui (Song) 宋周煇</td>
<td>Bei yuan lu 北轅録</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuwen Maozhao (Song) 宋宇文懋昭</td>
<td>Jinguo zhi (abridged) 金國志</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shi Maoliang (Song) 宋石茂良</td>
<td>Birong ye (~jia) hua 避戎夜 (~嘉)話</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongol Yuan</td>
<td>Meng/Zhao Gong (Song) 宋孟(趙)珙</td>
<td>Meng-Da beilu 蒙鞑備録</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— (Yuan) 元闕名</td>
<td>Shengwu qinzheng lu 聖武親征録</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liu Yu (Yuan) 元劉郁</td>
<td>Xishiji 西使記</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Sun Mu (Song) 宋孫穆</td>
<td>Jilin leishi 鸡林類事</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fang Feng (Song) 宋方鳳</td>
<td>Yisu kao 夷俗考</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Author and era</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>ζ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Xu Mingshan (Yuan)</td>
<td>Annan xingji 安南行記</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Zhou Daguan (Yuan)</td>
<td>Zhenla fengtuji 真臘風土記</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>— (Tang) 唐闕名</td>
<td>Piaoguo yuesong 驪國樂頌</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunnan</td>
<td>Li Jing (Yuan)</td>
<td>Yunnan zhilue 雲南志略</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchuria</td>
<td>Qi Fuzhi (Yuan)</td>
<td>Liaodong zhilue 遼東志略</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kökenuur</td>
<td>Li Yuan (Song)</td>
<td>Qingtang lu 青塘録</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uyghuristan</td>
<td>Wang Yande (Song)</td>
<td>Gaochang jixing 高昌行紀</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A recension = Mao MS. of 1361; γ recension = Zhao, Niu, Zhang, and Taipei MSS and 1927 Commercial Press Edition; ζ recension = late Ming print (as kept in Kyoto Institute of Oriental Culture and reprinted in Shuofu sanzhong).

Table 2: Contents of the Hu MS Shuofu Compared to the Standard Γ Recension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hu MS</th>
<th>Equivalent Juan in Γ Recension</th>
<th>Representative Works (Selected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Tan lei</em> 談壘 (pt. 2), <em>Gu Hang meng youlu</em> 古杭夢游錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 (first half)</td>
<td><em>Mo'e man lu</em> 墨娥漫錄 (pt. 1 to <em>Chouchi biji</em> 仇池筆記)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (second half)</td>
<td><em>Mo'e man lu</em> 墨娥漫錄 (pt. 2 to <em>Feng shi wenjian ji</em> 封氏聞見記)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 (first half)</td>
<td><em>He lin yulu</em> 鶴林玉露</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 (second half)</td>
<td><em>Chuanzai</em> 傳載</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Duzi sui zhi</em> 讀子隨識</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8 (first half)</td>
<td><em>Yujian za shu</em> 玉潤雜書</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8 (second half)</td>
<td><em>Men shi xin hua</em> 揗蝨新話</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Yuquan zi zhen lu</em> 玉泉子真錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>12 (first half)</td>
<td><em>Yue sheng shui chao</em> 悅生隨抄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>14 (end part),</td>
<td><em>Boyi zhi</em> 博異志</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (second half)</td>
<td><em>Dongtian qing lu ji</em> 洞天淸錄集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>Shu jian</em> 書鑒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Jiu ri lu</em> 就日錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Yin hua lu</em> 因話錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>16 (first half)</td>
<td><em>San qi tuyi</em> 三器圖義</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16 (second half)</td>
<td><em>Yunlin shi pu</em> 雲林石譜, <em>Xuanhe shi pu</em> 宣和石譜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>17 (second half)</td>
<td><em>Airizhai cong chao</em> 愛日齋叢鈔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>18 (first half)</td>
<td><em>Tanzhai bi heng</em> 坦齋筆衡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18 (second half)</td>
<td><em>Biji manzhi</em> 碧雞漫志</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>19 (first half)</td>
<td><em>Dama tu jing</em> 打馬圖經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>19 (second half)</td>
<td><em>Gan ze yao</em> 甘澤謠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>20 (middle part)</td>
<td><em>Rulin gongyi</em> 僑林公議</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>20 (end part)</td>
<td><em>Zhiba jian tan</em> 植跋簡談</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>21 (end part)</td>
<td><em>Zuo meng lu</em> 昨夢錄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>22 (second half)</td>
<td><em>Shanjia qing gong</em> 山家清供</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Equivalent Juan in Γ Recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>23 (first half)</td>
<td>銀退録</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>23–24</td>
<td>諸史, Zhu shi 禦史, Gui tian lu 歩田録, Kongshi za shuo 孔氏雜說, Xiang shanye lu 湘山野録, Yi geng 逸更 [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>24 (second half)</td>
<td>墨客揮犀, Ken qi lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>75, 25</td>
<td>土林紀實, Zhuoyi ji 卓異記, Ji yi ji 集異記, Tong pu 桐譜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>宣政雜録, Luoyang mingyuan ji 洛陽名園記</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>39 (middle)</td>
<td>陶朱新録, Zhenla fengtu ji 真蠟風土記</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>慎子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>靖康朝野僉言</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>錢譜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>74 (beginning and end)</td>
<td>褚氏遺書, Dashiji 大事記, Baihutong de lun 白虎通德論, Bian huo lun 辨惑論</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>74 (middle)</td>
<td>大中遺事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>公孫龍子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>聭隅子歔欷瑣微論</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>識遺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>豫章古今記, Annan xingji 安南行記</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>北邊備對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>53 (first half)</td>
<td>鉤玄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>53 (second half)</td>
<td>四朝聞見雜録</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>金山志, Liaodong zhi 遼東志, Jigu dingzhi 稽古定制, 勸善録, Yi jian zhi 夷堅志, Shenseng zhuan 神僧傳, Xiao pin ji 效蠱集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>江表志</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>品茶要録</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>59 (first half)</td>
<td>史記注語, part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>59 (second half)</td>
<td>史記注語, part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in Shen MS</td>
<td>Position in Shen MS</td>
<td><em>Juan in Mao MS</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Xue dao xuan zhen jing</em> 學道玄真經</td>
<td>Fascicule (ce 册) no. 1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gan ying Jing</em> 感應經</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yang yu jing</em> 養魚經</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Xiang he jing</em> 相鶴經</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Xiang ju (~bei) jing</em> 相具 (~貝)經</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tu niu jing</em> 土牛經</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Da ma tu jing</em> 打馬圖經</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jiu jing</em> 酒經</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Du bei shan jiu jing</em> 讀北山酒經</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zui xiang ri yue</em> 醉鄉日月</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pin cha yao lu</em> 品茶要録</td>
<td>One juan</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Xuanhe bei yuan gong cha lu</em> 宣和北苑貢茶録</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bei yuan bie lu</em> 北苑別録</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Da guan cha lun</em> 大觀茶論</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mo’e man lu</em> 墨娥漫録</td>
<td>One juan</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fengtui ji</em> 風土記...</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chouchi biji</em> 仇池筆記</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zhu zi sui shi</em> (128 entries) 諸子隨識</td>
<td>Fascicule (ce 冊) no. 8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wenzi</em> 文子...</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yinwenzi</em> 尹文子...</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Huainanzhi</em> 淮南子...</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lun heng</em> 論衡</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zhu zhuan zhai xuan</em> 諸傳摘玄</td>
<td>Fascicule (ce 冊) no. 9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gaoseng zhuan</em> 高僧傳</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wuming gong zhuan</em> 無名公傳</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work in Shen MS</th>
<th>Position in Shen MS</th>
<th>Juan in Mao MS</th>
<th>Juan in Recension MSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xie lue 蟹略</td>
<td>Final juan</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu yi feng su 諸夷風俗</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhen la feng tu ji 真臘風土記</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fascicule (ce 冊)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Juan in Γ Recension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Chuanzai  傳載</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cang yi hua yu 藏一話腴</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moke hui xi 墨客揮犀</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xu moke hui xi 續墨客揮犀</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yipu zhezhong 藝圃折中</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Duzi sui zhi 讀子隨識</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gui guzi san juan 鬼谷子三卷</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kang cang zi 亢倉子</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gui guzi wu juan 鬼谷子五卷</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Mi lou ji 迷樓記</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jiao fang ji 教坊記</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhuoyi ji 卓異記</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ji yi ji 集異記</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>。。。 Ba yin douching 柏印斗秤</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quchao shilei 趙朝事類</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lintai gushi 麟臺故事</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beibian beidui 北邊備對</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Shengxin quan yao 省心詮要</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gan ze yao 甘澤謠</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tieweishan cong tan 鐵圍山叢談</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wei ju ting yu 韋居聽軼</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bai ta sui 白獺髓</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanshui xiao du 三水小贛</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qun ju jieyi 羣居解頤</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gou xian 鉤玄</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jigu dingzhi 稽古定制</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Liaozhi 遼志</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascicule (冊)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Juan in Γ’ Recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Liaodong zhilue 遼東志略</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Jinguo zhi 金國志</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Yunnan zhilue 雲南志略</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Yangdi kaihe ji 暢帝開河記</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Mozi 墨子</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Zihuazi 子華子</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Zengzi 曾子</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Yiwenzi 尹文子</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Kongcongzi 孔叢子</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>。。。 Wanji lun 萬機論</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Sushu 素書</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Aoyuzi xuxi suoweilun 蠻隅子歔欷瑣微論</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Hanfeizi 韓非子</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bei yuan lu 北轅錄</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Meng-Da beilu 蒙鞑備錄</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Luting shishi 虜庭事實</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ximan congxiao 溪蠻叢笑</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>。。。 Changcheng ji 長城記</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Shengwu qinzheng lu 聖武親征錄</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Daye zaji 大業雜記</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Lingbiao lu yiji 嶺表錄異記</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Shanhai ji 海山記</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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