
SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 271

June, 2017

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

by
Christopher P. Atwood

Victor H. Mair, Editor
Sino-Platonic Papers
Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305 USA
vmair@sas.upenn.edu
www.sino-platonic.org

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

FOUNDED 1986

Editor-in-Chief
VICTOR H. MAIR

Associate Editors
PAULA ROBERTS MARK SWOFFORD

ISSN
2157-9679 (print) 2157-9687 (online)

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS is an occasional series dedicated to making available to specialists and the interested public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished. The editor-in-chief actively encourages younger, not yet well established, scholars and independent authors to submit manuscripts for consideration. Contributions in any of the major scholarly languages of the world, including romanized modern standard Mandarin (MSM) and Japanese, are acceptable. In special circumstances, papers written in one of the Sinitic topolects (*fangyan*) may be considered for publication.

Although the chief focus of *Sino-Platonic Papers* is on the intercultural relations of China with other peoples, challenging and creative studies on a wide variety of philological subjects will be entertained. This series is **not** the place for safe, sober, and stodgy presentations. *Sino-Platonic Papers* prefers lively work that, while taking reasonable risks to advance the field, capitalizes on brilliant new insights into the development of civilization.

Submissions are regularly sent out to be refereed, and extensive editorial suggestions for revision may be offered.

Sino-Platonic Papers emphasizes substance over form. We do, however, strongly recommend that prospective authors consult our style guidelines at www.sino-platonic.org/stylesheet.doc. Manuscripts should be submitted as electronic files, preferably in Microsoft Word format. You may wish to use our sample document template, available here: www.sino-platonic.org/spp.dot.

Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* has been published electronically on the Web at www.sino-platonic.org. Issues 1–170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web.

Please note: When the editor goes on an expedition or research trip, all operations (including filling orders) may temporarily cease for up to three months at a time. In such circumstances, those who wish to purchase various issues of *SPP* are requested to wait patiently until he returns. If issues are urgently needed while the editor is away, they may be requested through Interlibrary Loan. You should also check our Web site at www.sino-platonic.org, as back issues are regularly rereleased for free as PDF editions.

Sino-Platonic Papers is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

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* 說郛 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 Tatsuo 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 馬曉林 (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* preceded Tao's other great compilation, the *Nancun chuogeng lu* 南村輟耕錄, 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.⁵ After the founding of the Ming, Tao Zongyi 陶宗儀 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.⁶

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* 南村輟耕錄 (“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.⁷ 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* 十祖世系錄).⁸ His *Shuofu* incorporated both the *Shengwu qinzheng lu* 聖武親征錄,⁹ itself a lightly edited version of the *Veritable Records* 實錄 of Chinggis Khan and Ögedei Qa’an, and the *Meng-Da beilu* 蒙鞞備錄, the only general description of the Mongols and Chinggis Khan written in his lifetime.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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).

5 On the *leishu* as a genre, see Wilkinson (2000: 601–612; 2012: 955–962).

6 On Tao Zongyi’s life, see Chang (1979: 2–10, 407–482), and Frederick W. Mote’s *Tao Tsung-i and His Cho Keng Lu* (1954a: 1–12, 15–77), which is condensed in Mote 1954b. Sun Zuo’s 孫作 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).

9 See Wang [1926] 1962a; Jia 1979. A partial French translation is in Pelliot and Hambis 1951. I am currently in the process of preparing a complete critical edition with text, translation, notes, and commentary.

10 The text is studied in Wang Guowei ([1926] 1962b). Translations include Munkuev (1975), Olbricht and Pinks (1980), and Mōngkejayağ-a (1985).

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 blockprint 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*.¹² In the early Qing, the blocks were reused for several more reprintings, 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* 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.¹³

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

¹² 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 sanzong* 說郭三種 (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.

¹³ See Aiwude 2014.

and what are their interrelations are all questions on which eminent scholars such as Chang Bide 昌彼得 and Jao Tsung-i 饒宗頤 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 *Shuofu*s 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* 說郭考 (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 *juan* 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 1505,¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ A third one was a MS kept by the scholar Sun Yirang, of which Zhang Zongxiang had a copy made.¹⁸ 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).¹⁹ 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-*juan* *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-*juan* 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-*juan* manuscript tradition and the relation of 100-*juan* manuscripts to the original *Shuofu* of Tao

Taipei in 1972, and also in 1988 as the first two volumes of the ten-volume set *Shuofu sanzong*. Volume 10 of this edition has an index to the works; Chang (1979: 43–405, 483–506) provides both an index and a brief description of all the works found in this Zhang Zongxiang edition.

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.

¹⁹ Watanabe 1938: 230; King 1946: 3–4.

Zongyi.²⁰ 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 賈敬顏 (courtesy name Baiyan 伯顏, 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* 讖緯 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* 盃禄·可汗, the first character *bēi* 盃 is sometimes found as *bēi* 杯, *mèng* 孟, *yíng* 盈, or *mì* 覓. 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* 覓 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 ri* 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 (*ershuyu 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 Rashīd al-Dīn, states clearly that the Mongol armies "laid siege for twenty days and captured the city."²¹ 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

²¹ Rashid ad-Din/Smirnova 1952: 169; Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998–1999: 219.

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*.²² 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 玉海樓 museum, Ruian 瑞安, Zhejiang
- Zhang 張: National Library of China, Beijing
- Fu₃ 傅(3)²³: 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 閻: 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 Hūnan Printing House (*Hunan shushe* 滄南書舍) 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* 說郛, taking part of a sentence from the great thinker Yang 楊.²⁴ 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.²⁵

The preface was dated to two days before full on the ninth moon of autumn, year *xīn/chǒu* 辛丑 of the Zhizheng 至正 period, or November 12, 1361.²⁶ 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* 類說 (“Classified Literature”)²⁷ and made the *Shuofu* (“Purloin of Exposition”) in a certain number of chapters (*juan* 卷). Whenever there was

24 Yang Xiong 楊雄 (53 BC–AD 18) *Fayan* 法言, *juan* 4 reads: “Within the borders of Heaven and Earth all things are enclosed; within the limits of the Five Classics all other literature is enclosed.” Thus the anthology’s name “Enclosure of Literature” implied that it contained a range of works, yet all within the bounds of the Five Classics. See Mote 1954a: 79, 100; Pelliot 1924: 163 n.1.

25 Text in Tao Zongyi/Zhang 1927: “Shuofu xu [2nd],” p. 1a; Tao 1988: III, 1; Mote 1954a: 79. I have replaced the “100 *juan*” found in all later copies and editions with the original “60 *juan*” as found in the Mao MS; see Xu (1994: 112, 116).

26 The date is found only in the Mao MS; see Xu (1994: 112, 116).

27 The *Leishuo* 類說 of Zeng Zao 曾慥 (1091–1155) is one of the earliest anthologies. Zeng Zao also composed an anthology of Daoist texts, the *Daoshu* 道樞 (“Pivot of the Dao”) in 108 chapters.

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* 讀書筆記), 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 毛辰 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 (*tongjiazì* 通假字), often based on the author's native dialect, is pervasive, making *er* 兒 into *li* 立, *jue* 覺 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.

28 Cited by Chang (1979: 10–11) and Xu (1994: 117); partial English translation in Mote, *T'ao Tsung-i*, p. 100.

29 I give it this designation from being held by Mao Jin 毛晉 (1599–1659) and his son Mao Yi 毛辰 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 mijū lun 'Shuofu' 善本秘籍《说郛》" of Zhou and Xu (2002: 245–48).

31 Xu 1994: 113, 115.

32 Xu 1994: 116–17. On *tongjiazì* 通假字, see Wilkinson (2000: 421–23; 2012: 45–46).

33 See Wu (2009) who notes that despite some obvious errors like 蒙 for 萊, the Mao MS text of the *Luoyang qielan ji*: (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* 說 ("tales"), *zhi* 志 ("treatise"), *ji* 記 ("memoirs"), and finally *lu* 錄 ("records").³⁴ 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 725.³⁵ The old organization according to the last character of the title was mostly ignored in the new

found in two large classes of sources; and (3) demonstrates superior readings compared to those found in the 1927 Commercial Press edition of the *Shuofu*, based on γ recension manuscripts. Wu (2015) has also published a similar study of the Mao MS's value for *xiaoshuo* 小說 literature.

³⁴ Xu 1994: 113, and the table on pp. 118–27.

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.³⁶ 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 Fu₃ MSS, which on stemmatic evidence are relatively primitive and which retain a large number of simplified characters. Although the kind of *tongjiazì* 通假字 and outright errors found in the Mao MS are not common, simplified forms used commonly include *bei* 徧 (for 徧), *cheng* 称 (for 稱), *gui* 歸, *nan* 难, *qin* 禽 (for 擒 “capture,” not “bird”), and *ting* 听 while others used inconsistently include *bao* 报, *bian* 边, *fu* 抚, *huan* 还, *tan* 摊, *wu* 无, *suo* 所, *yin* 曰, *hao* 号, *jin* 尽, *ju* 惧, *shi* 執 vs. *zhi* 执, *sui* 虽, *yu* 与, and *zong* 摠. 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 *geng/shen* 庚申 of the Hongzhi era (i.e. 1500) and the Fu₃ MS (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).³⁷ 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 *jing* 經, 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 吳寬 (1435–1504).³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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 Fu₃ 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).⁴⁰ 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.

38 On the fragmentary MSS put together to form the *Shuofu* of Fu Zengxiang 傅增湘 (1872–1950), the best source is Mo (1993: 10B/751–52). The descriptions given by Zhang Zongxiang in his colophon to his 1927 edition (Tao/Zhang 1927: *ba* 跋, 1a; Tao 1988: 1358c) is least accurate; somewhat better is the 1988 "explanation" (*shuoming* 說明) in Shanghai guji chubanshe [1986] 1988: 1.

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* 春夢錄 (42/18b), *Annan xingji* 安南行記 (51/18b); *Shengwu qinzheng lu* 聖武親征錄 (55/1a), *Anyang tang jiuling* 安雅堂酒令 (56/1a), *Jingbei yinji* 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* 困學齋雜錄 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* 遂昌山樵雜錄 (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* 97.⁴⁴

By the time of these last two works, Tao Zongyi was certainly dead; thus the γ 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_1 MS, which appears to be the earliest surviving exemplar of the γ 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 γ 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 α recension and the γ recension was a now-lost β 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 19746: 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" 铁如意馆随笔, *Zhonghua wenshi luncong* 中华文史论丛, 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 a propos 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 都印 — 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).

⁴⁶ Cited by Chang (1979: 19) and Rao (1970: 160); cf. the French translation in Jao Tsong-yi (1966: 89).

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 recension⁵⁰ 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

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.

48 Chang 1979: 15.

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* 57.⁵³

The upshot of this discussion is that the *SQL* was copied into the *Shuofu* by Tao Zongyi as part of the β recension. This occurred sometime between 1361 when the α 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 γ 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).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*).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* 蒙鞞備錄 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

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* 續積善錄 (64/5a) and *Jingxinglu* 景行錄 (64/6b).

54 Only three of these works, the *Qidan guozhi* 契丹國志 and *Dajin guozhi* 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.

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 gakuin Kyōtō kenkyūsho kanseki Mokuroku* (1938: 310–321) or of the Taipei MS in *Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben shumū* (1986: IV, 1445–84).

perspective, although sometimes quite positively, and used for them throughout the word "Tatar" (*Dada* 韃靼), 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.⁵⁶ 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 1370.⁵⁷ 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·虎楊.⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹ For these reasons, I tend to think that

57 *Yuan shi*, appendices, "Jin Yuanshi biao" 進元史表, pp. 4673–74, and "Song Lian mulu houji" 宋濂目錄後記, pp. 4677–78; cf. the "Introduction," to Cleaves's translation of the *SHM* (1982: xlv–l).

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 屈 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 屈. The first instance of 屈 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.⁶⁰ 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*

60 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.⁶² 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, İdu-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 *zhen* 真 with *zhen* 貞; 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.⁶³ In fact only three extant MSS of the *Shuofu* (Zhao, Niu, and Zhang) show no influence from this Hr exemplar. The Fu₃ MS, dated to 1505, shows the results of this editorial change, along with some additional corruption, so this editing certainly predated that year.⁶⁴

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 Fu₃ and She MSS. Also the twentieth-century Fu-Metropolitan and Taipei MS were copied from the Fu₃ (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 γ recension texts. Presence of older character forms may thus be a mark in *Shuofu* MSS of a relatively earlier mid-Ming date.

THE Δ 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 γ 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 γ 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.

65 Yu Wenbo's preface is preserved in printed editions of the *Shuofu*; see *Shuofu yibaiershi juan* 說郛一百二十, pp. 1–3 in Tao 1988. It is also reprinted in Chang (1979: 13–14). Pelliot (1924: 170–74) gave a French paraphrase.

Assuming that Yu's original text was a γ 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 γ 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 γ 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 Fu₃ 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 Fu₁ MS associated with the *Congshutang* library of Wu Kuan, who died in 1505, and it is undisputable that the γ 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 γ 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" 說郭序, 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 Fu₃ 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.

69 Chang (1979: 14–15 and Pl. 1). Jao (1966: 92–93) followed Chang's conclusion.

70 The forger used the Fu₃ MS for the *SQL*, so one would presume he had access to Fu's entire set of four MSS (Fu₁-Fu₄). But since the Taipei MS has Yang Weizhen's preface, and the Fu₁ 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* 濬南書舍), 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 *juan* (of which only 55 survive), but the contents of these 100 *juan* match only those of the first 60 or so *juan* 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 *juan* 71–72. It is a working copy with numerous proofreaders' marks (○ and \), 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* 勸善錄, *Xiao pin ji* 效顰集 (Hu's *juan* 80 = γ recension's *juan* 97), and *Qian pu* 錢譜 (Hu's *juan* 70 = γ recension's *juan* 84) — it cannot be earlier than the mid-fifteenth century. Unfortunately, the first *juan*, which would contain the prefaces to confirm my proposed identification with Yu Wenbo's recension, is missing. Likewise the remaining 55 *juan* 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 ϵ 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.

⁷⁵ Beijing tushuguan 1987–1988: vol. 4 (*Zi bu*), p. 1695.

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* 北轅錄, while in the Shi MS, the *Bei yuan lu* 北轅錄 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* 滅 and *mie* 蔑 to *fa* 筏. 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 Z RECENSION

Given the growing interest in the Shuofu, it was only a matter of time before someone would think of block-printing the work.⁸² Sometime before 1621, the Wanweishan Tang 宛委山堂, a Hangzhou printing house, tried to produce the first printed edition of the *Shuofu*.⁸³ 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 sanzong* “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* 說郭續 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 sanzong* 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 3 (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 Kōzō.

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* 讖緯 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 *yī* 一 had been changed to *èr* 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 Beijing 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 gakuin Kyōtō 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* 讀說鄩). 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 qizhenglu*.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 beilu*. 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 (*jins* 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 Kōkenuur 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 Zhouyao, 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 sanzong* 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.⁸⁹ Li Jiqi's mutilated edition was in turn made the basis for the text of the *Shuofu* in the Manchu Qing dynasty's colossal imperial literary compendium, the *Siku quanshu* ("Complete Library of the Four Treasuries") of 1772–1794. Until 1927, it remained the standard text of the *Shuofu*, despite its vast divergence from Tao Zongyi's original anthology.⁹⁰

The printing of the *Shuofu* slowed the production of further manuscripts of the work as the blockprint versions came to define what people meant by "the *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 *Shuofu* he located at a collector's site near Changmen 閘門 Gate in Suzhou. There is no further information from which one could identify the particular recension of the *Shuofu* in question, but judging from the readings which Zheng recorded, the text of the *SQL* is one not otherwise attested in any *Shuofu* text.⁹¹ This interesting manuscript is an illustration both of how much is still unknown about the *Shuofu* textual tradition and of the many fragmentary manuscripts that may still remain to be discovered and identified.

THE 1927 COMMERCIAL PRESS EDITION

As I have already mentioned, the 1927 Commercial Press edition of the *Shuofu* was a milestone, in which the γ recension, once dominant in the manuscript tradition but since the end of the Ming

89 Toyo Bunko, no. V-5-A-11 has the old front matter, while Toyo Bunko no. V-5-A-12 and Seikadō 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 陶珽 (from Yao'an 姚安 in Yunnan 雲南, *jìnshi* degree, 1610) as having reorganized 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 *Shuofu* and *Shuofu xu* ("Sequel to the Enclosure of Literature") was reprinted in 1988 as the third to tenth volumes of the *Shuofu sanzong*.

91 It is, however, very similar to the Wāng 汪 text of the *SQL* kept in the Nanjing Library.

dynasty eclipsed by the block-printed ζ 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 sanzong* 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 (Fu_{1–4}, 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 presumably 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?⁹⁵

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.⁹⁶ This second MS in turn is a rather poor modern copy of Fu₃, 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),⁹⁷ this manuscript preserves Zhang's base text, written in black, which for the *SQL* corresponds largely to the Fu₃ 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 γ 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 Fu₃ MSS were already quite close to each other.⁹⁸ In other cases, where the MSS chosen are less obviously related, the hybrid nature of the 1927 edition readings might be more obvious.

⁹⁵ Jia 1979: I, *zhuiyan*, p. 4a.

⁹⁶ 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.

⁹⁷ A complete table of contents of this MS is given in Zhejiang Tushuguan *guji bu* 2002: 670–80.

⁹⁸ 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 Fu₃ MS was being created, the editor already used the Zhang MS or something very like it to collate the MS.

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 Fu₃, 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 fascicules. 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* 弓, 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 毛辰, who made corrections in red ink and left a colophon in *juan* 20 with his stamp “*Yushan Maoyi shougao* 虞山毛辰手校.” It was then acquired by Ma Yutang 馬玉堂 (courtesy name Huzhai 笏齋, 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 黃巖九峰圖書館) 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

⁹⁹ See Xu 1994: 118–27.

¹⁰⁰ See Xu 1994: 112–15, and “Shanben miji lun ‘Shuofu’” in Zhou and Xu (2002: 245–48). The later has photographs of several of the stamps and colophons of the MS.




FIGURE 2: The Mao MS, *juan* 40, text from the *Yanbei zaji* 燕北雜記 and the *Jinglong wenguan ji* 景龍文館記. Note the red ink annotations. Courtesy of the Linhai City Museum.

2. **Zhao 趙** (see Figure 3): Currently held in the National Library of China (no. 3907). 17 recension. 61 *juan* extant in 50 fascicules. The *SQL* forms *juan* 55 of text.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 *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.¹⁰² Jia Jingyan speculates that the Mr. Zhao from Wu might be Zhao

101 Beijing tushuguan shanben bu 1959, vol. 5, p. 37a; Beijing tushuguan 1987–1988: vol. 4 (*Zi bu*), p. 1694; Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui 1989: 1/38a (p. 75 in the continuous pagination added to the 1990 reprint); Weng 2005: 1927.

102 Other owners listed by Jia Jingyan (1979: I, *zhuiyan*, 3a) include: Zhang Ruizhong 張睿鐘, Xu Tieyi 徐鐵彝, 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* 蒙鞞備錄. 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 fascicules; the *SQL* forms *juan* 55 of text.¹⁰³ A full table of contents of the manuscript has been published.¹⁰⁴ One preface, by Yang Weizhen 楊維楨; 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

Yuanxiu 趙元修, Wei Quji 衛去疾, and the private libraries Changshu shezhuang 常熟捨莊, Mr. Yang's Shanqing Hall 楊氏善慶堂, Zhou Jianqi 周鑒齊, Xiao Hanjian 削漢劍, and Wei Weidou 魏慰斗主人.

¹⁰³ Beijing tushuguan shanben bu 1959, vol. 5, p. 36b; Beijing tushuguan 1987–1988: vol. 4 (*Zi bu*), p. 1694.

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 何棹 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 chuanben shumu* 邵亭知見傳本書目 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




FIGURE 4: The Niu MS, *juan* 54, text from the *Meng-Da beilu* 蒙鞞備錄. Courtesy of the National Library of China.

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/75i; Qian 1965: 2/17b. However, as noted by Jao Tsung-i, the Niu MS in the National Library is bound in 70 fascicules while that recorded in the Shugutang catalogue is bound in 32 fascicules. 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.




FIGURE 5: The Zhang MS, *juan* 54, text from the *Meng-Da beilu* 蒙鞞備錄. Courtesy of the National Library of China.

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

¹⁰⁷ Beijing tushuguan shanben bu 1959, vol. 5, pp. 36b–37a; Beijing tushuguan 1987–1988: vol. 4 (*Zi bu*), p. 1694; Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui 1989: 1/38a (p. 75 in the continuous pagination added to the 1990 reprint); Weng 2005: 1927.

¹⁰⁸ Shangwu yinshuguan 1951: vol. 3, *Zi* 子, 57b–63a.

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)¹¹⁰ and the Hanfenlou 涵芬樓, i.e., the company library of the Commercial Press, in which Zhang Yuanji was the editorial chief.¹¹¹ 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.¹¹²



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: I, *zhuiyan*, 3b.

¹¹² This MS is the same as the “Hanfenlou 涵芬樓 MS” mentioned in Zhang Zongxiang’s colophon. Zhang’s 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 sanzong* 說郭三種, 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.




FIGURE 7: The Fu₃ MS, *juan* 55, text of the *Shengwu qinzheng lu* 聖武親征錄.
Courtesy of the Shanghai Library.

5. Sun 孫 (see Figure 6): Currently held in Yuhailou 玉海樓 museum, Rui'an 瑞安 city, Zhejiang province. Γ recension. 52 *juan* extant, bound in eighteen fascicules; the SQL forms *juan* 55 of text.¹¹³ 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 four¹¹⁴ different fragmentary MSS assembled by Fu Zengxiang

¹¹³ See Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui 1989: 1/38b (p. 76 in the continuous pagination added to the 1990 reprint); Weng 2005: 1927; Shanghai guji chubanshe [1986] 1988: 1. The description in Tao/Zhang 1927: *ba* 跋, pp. 1a–b (=Tao 1988: 1358c–d) is, as usual, less accurate and less informative.

¹¹⁴ There is a difference of opinion among bibliographers on whether there is a separate Fu₄ document. The differences in paper and handwriting between Fu₁, Fu₂, and Fu₃ are obvious. But Fu Zengxiang also separates out Fu₃ (*juan* 31–67) and Fu₄ (*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 recensions¹¹⁵; the *SQL* is found in *juan* 55. A complete table of contents of the entire Fu MS set has been published.¹¹⁶ Fu₁ (*juan* 1–25) is on black-lined “*Congshutang* 叢書堂” stationery, 10 columns per page; Fu₂ (*juan* 26–30 and 96–100) is on blue-lined “*Hongnong Yang shi* 弘農楊氏” stationery, 11 columns per page; Fu₃ (*juan* 31–67) and Fu₄ (*juan* 68–70) are on black-lined “*Shuofu* 說郛” stationery, 13 columns per page.

History: Fu₁ is written on stationery of the Congshutang 叢書堂 library of Wu Kuan 吳寬 (1435–1504). Fu₂ 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. Fu₃ 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 Fu₁. Stamps of Wang Tiren 王體仁 (courtesy name Shoushan 綬珊, 1873–1938)¹¹⁷ 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 Fu₃ 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

and Fu₄, thus seeing the Fu Zengxiang *SF* set as composed of only three MSS. See Tao/Zhang 1927: *ba* 跋, 1a; *Shuofu sanzong*, p. 1358c and the “explanation” in Shanghai guji chubanshe (1988: 1). Between *juan* 67 and 68, a new hand clearly starts, but that would not necessarily mean they derive from different manuscripts of the *SF*. Nor do the very slight differences in stationery seem to me incompatible with their being simply differing printings from the same blank stationery block-print. I thus would lean towards Zhang Zongxiang’s viewpoint on this issue.

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: 1/25a–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 Jiufengjiulu 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 *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).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 *Shuofu sanzong* reproduced in an appendix.¹²⁰




FIGURE 8: The *Uang MS*, *juan* 54, from the *Meng-Da beilu* 蒙鞞備錄. Courtesy of the Zhejiang Library.

(p. 76 in the continuous pagination added to the 1990 reprint), and in Weng 2005: 1927. The list of extant *juan* in these catalogues, however, does not at all match what is in the Zhejiang library catalogue, which seems to be more accurate.

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

¹²⁰ See Shanghai guji chubanshe [1986] 1988: 1ff.

8. **Hu 淳**: Currently held by the National Library of China (no. 0485).¹²¹ Δ 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 fascicule 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* 淳南書舍. 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 Hūnan Printing House (*Hunan shushe* 淳南書舍) onto its own stationery. The printing house or a subsequent owner added numerous proof-reader’s marks (○ and ∖), 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 E 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 ε 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* 說郛, but no page numbers.¹²⁶

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

¹²¹ See Beijing tushuguan 1987–1988: vol. 4 (*Zi bu*), p. 1694. Cf. Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui 1989: 1/38a (p. 75 in the continuous pagination added to the 1990 reprint); Weng 2005: 1927. I made a cursory examination of a microfilm of this MS in June, 2009, and spent more time with it in July, 2012, and December, 2013.

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).

¹²⁴ Beijing tushuguan 1987–1988: vol. 4 (*Zi bu*), p. 1695; Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui 1989: 1/38b (p. 76 in the continuous pagination added to the 1990 reprint); Weng 2005: 1927.

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 γ recension.

¹²⁶ Based on my personal examination of the microfilm and Beijing tushuguan 1987–1988: vol. 4 (*Zi bu*), p. 1695.

Studio 借樹山房 of the scholar Shi Mengjiao 史夢蛟 (Qianlong era).¹²⁷ 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 曉鉦, dated to year *dīng/si* 丁巳, whom Jia identified with Qian Daxin 錢大昕 (courtesy name Xiaozheng 曉徵) and *dīng/si* (Jiaqing 2, A.D. 1798). Acquired by National Library of China in the Republican period.¹²⁸

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).¹²⁹ 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*.¹³⁰ No prefaces, table of contents, or *juan* numbers.¹³¹ Four colophons written by Lu Qiao 陸樵 (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* 鮚奇亭全集 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 *Guoli Beiping tushuguan suo cang* 國立北平圖書館所藏.

129 See the Fung Ping Shan Library online catalogue at http://bamboo.lib.hku.hk/fpslindex/full_list.asp?RID+721.

130 See Jao 1966: 87–104; Rao 1970: 158–164; and Rao 1993: 654–666.

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 ξ n 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.




FIGURE 10: The Fu3 MS, *juan* 55, text of the *Shengwu qinzheng lu* 聖武親征錄. Courtesy of the Fung Ping Shan Library. Note the identical *mis en page* of the main text of the two MSS.

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 1589.¹³² Later owners include Lù Yunxiang 陸雲祥 (courtesy name Jiaqing 嘉卿, *juren* 舉人 degree 1627) of Wujiang 吳江, Lú 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 Lú 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). 7 recension. All 100 *juan* extant in 52 fascicules; the *SQL* forms *juan* 55 of the text. A complete table of contents has been published.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). 7 recension. All 100 *juan* extant in 64 fascicules; the *SQL* forms *juan* 55 of the text. A complete table of contents has been published.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 都 (error for 郁) 文博.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 Fu₃ 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(~都) 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.

¹³³ Zhejiang Tushuguan guji bu 2002: 670–80.

¹³⁴ *Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben shumu* 1986: vol. 4, pp. 1445–84, esp. p. 1470.

¹³⁵ See the page reproduced by Chang (1979: pl. 1).

II. CURRENTLY UNLOCATED *SHUOFU* MSS (ALL 1 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 Qiutao 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.

¹³⁷ Wang [1926] 1962a: 1b/2.

¹³⁸ Jia (1979: I, *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 Fu₃. 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 Fu₃ 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 粵 MS: In May of *jia/wu* 甲午 (1951), Zhang Zongxiang made a collation of a MS from Guangzhou's Yueyatang 粵雅堂 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 sanzong*, although the editors were unable to distinguish the notes pertaining to the Yueyatang 粵雅堂 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 sanzong* 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: I, *zhuiyan*, 4a, 5b.

¹⁴⁰ See Zhang/Chen [1986] 1988.

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. Γ_3 indicates the “Harmonized Exemplar” formed by extensive harmonization with Yuan shi text.

TABLES

Table 1: The addition and loss of works in the *Shuofu*, illustrated by a sample of works on Northern, overseas, and border topics.

Topic	Author and era	Name	α	γ	ζ
Kitan Liao	— (Song) 宋闕名	<i>Shi Liao lu</i> 使遼錄	48	3	—
	Wu Gui (Song) 宋武珪	<i>Yanbei zaji</i> 燕北雜記	40	4	50
	Yang Boyan (Song) 宋楊伯喆	<i>Yi jian</i> (~cheng) 臆柬(~乘)	9	21	11
	Wang Yi (Song) 宋王易	<i>Chongbian Yanbei lu</i> 重編燕北錄	—	38	56
	Ye Longli (Song) 宋葉隆禮	<i>Liao zhi</i> (abridged) 遼志	—	86	55
	Hu Jiao (Five Dynasties) 五代胡峤	<i>Xianlu ji</i> 陷虜記	—	—	56
Jurchen Jin	Hong Hao (~Mai) (Song) 宋洪皓(~邁)	<i>Songmo jiwen</i> 松漠紀聞	29	8	55
	Wen Weijian (Song) 宋文惟簡	<i>Luting shishi</i> 虜廷事實	3	8	55
	— (Song) 宋闕名	<i>Beifeng yangsha lu</i> 北風揚沙錄	49	25	55
	Cheng Dachang (Song) 宋程大昌	<i>Beibian beidui</i> 北邊備對	—	52	56
	Zhou Hui (Song) 宋周輝	<i>Bei yuan lu</i> 北轅錄	—	54	56
	Yuwen Maozhao (Song) 宋宇文懋昭	<i>Jinguo zhi</i> (abridged) 金國志	—	86	55
	Shi Maoliang (Song) 宋石茂良	<i>Birong ye</i> (~jia) hua 避戎夜(~嘉)話	—	—	37
Mongol Yuan	Meng/Zhao Gong (Song) 宋孟(for 趙)珙	<i>Meng-Da beilu</i> 蒙鞞備錄	—	54	56
	— (Yuan) 元闕名	<i>Shengwu qinzheng lu</i> 聖武親征錄	—	55	—
	Liu Yu (Yuan) 元劉郁	<i>Xishiji</i> 西使記	—	—	56
Korea	Sun Mu (Song) 宋孫穆	<i>Jilin leishi</i> 雞林類事	31	7	55
	Fang Feng (Song) 宋方鳳	<i>Yisu kao</i> 夷俗考	—	—	55

Topic	Author and era	Name	α	γ	ζ
	Xu Jing (Song) 宋松兢	<i>Shi Gaoli lu</i> 使高麗錄	—	—	56
Vietnam	Xu Mingshan (Yuan) 元徐明善	<i>Annan xingji</i> 安南行記	—	51	56
Cambodia	Zhou Daguan (Yuan) 元周達觀	<i>Zhenla fengtuji</i> 真臘風土記	—	39	62
Burma	— (Tang) 唐闕名	<i>Piaoguo yuesong</i> 驃國樂頌	—	67	100
Yunnan	Li Jing (Yuan) 元李京	<i>Yunnan zhilue</i> 雲南志略	—	36	62
Manchuria	Qi Fuzhi (Yuan) 元戚輔之	<i>Liaodong zhilue</i> 遼東志略	—	97	62
Kökenuur	Li Yuan (Song) 宋李遠	<i>Qingtang lu</i> 青塘錄	—	35	—
Uyghuristan	Wang Yande (Song) 王延德	<i>Gaochang jixing</i> 高昌行紀	—	—	56

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 sanzong*).

Sources: Xu 1994: 118–27; personal examination of MSS in National Library of China, nos. 2408, 3907; Shangwu yinshuguan 1951: vol. 3, *Zi* 子, 57b–63a; *Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben shumu* 1986: vol. 4, pp. 1445–84; Chang 1979: 43–405, 483–506; Tao 1988; *Tōhō bunka gakuin Kyōtō kenkyūsho kanseki mokuroku* 1938: 324–47.

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

Hu MS <i>juan</i>	Equivalent <i>Juan</i> in Γ Recension	Representative Works (Selected)
6	3	<i>Tan lei</i> 談壘 (pt. 2), <i>Gu Hang meng youlu</i> 古杭夢游錄
7	4 (first half)	<i>Mo'e man lu</i> 墨娥漫錄 (pt. 1 to <i>Chouchi biji</i> 仇池筆記)
8	4 (second half)	<i>Mo'e man lu</i> 墨娥漫錄 (pt. 2 to <i>Feng shi wenjian ji</i> 封氏聞見記)
9	5 (first half)	<i>He lin yulu</i> 鶴林玉露
10	5 (second half)	<i>Chuanzai</i> 傳載
11	6	<i>Duzi sui zhi</i> 讀子隨識
15	8 (first half)	<i>Yujian za shu</i> 玉澗雜書
16	8 (second half)	<i>Men shi xin hua</i> 捫蝨新話
21	11	<i>Yuquan zi zhen lu</i> 玉泉子真錄
22	12 (first half)	<i>Yue sheng shui chao</i> 悅生隨抄
23	14 (end part), 12 (second half)	<i>Boyi zhi</i> 博異志 <i>Dongtian qing lu ji</i> 洞天清錄集
24	13	<i>Shu jian</i> 書鑿
25	14	<i>Jiu ri lu</i> 就日錄
26	15	<i>Yin hua lu</i> 因話錄
27	16 (first half)	<i>San qi tuyi</i> 三器圖義
28	16 (second half)	<i>Yunlin shi pu</i> 雲林石譜, <i>Xuanhe shi pu</i> 宣和石譜
29	17 (second half)	<i>Airizhai cong chao</i> 愛日齋叢鈔
30	18 (first half)	<i>Tanzhai bi heng</i> 坦齋筆衡
31	18 (second half)	<i>Biji manzhi</i> 碧雞漫志
32	19 (first half)	<i>Dama tu jing</i> 打馬圖經
33	19 (second half)	<i>Gan ze yao</i> 甘澤謠
34	20 (middle part)	<i>Rulin gongyi</i> 儒林公議
35	20 (end part)	<i>Zhiba jian tan</i> 植跋簡談
36	21 (end part)	<i>Zuo meng lu</i> 昨夢錄
37	22 (second half)	<i>Shanjia qing gong</i> 山家清供

Hu MS <i>juan</i>	Equivalent <i>Juan</i> in Γ Recension	Representative Works (Selected)
38	23 (first half)	<i>Bin tui lu</i> 賓退錄
39	23–24	<i>Xie shi</i> 諧史, <i>Zhu shi</i> 塵史, <i>Gui tian lu</i> 歸田錄, <i>Kongshi za shuo</i> 孔氏雜說, <i>Xiang shanye lu</i> 湘山野錄, <i>Yi geng</i> 逸更 [sic]
40	24 (second half)	<i>Moke hui xi</i> 墨客揮犀, <i>Ken qi lu</i> 肯綮錄
41	75, 25	<i>Tu lin jishi</i> 土林紀實, <i>Zhuoyi ji</i> 卓異記, <i>Ji yi ji</i> 集異記, <i>Tong pu</i> 桐譜
42	26	<i>Xuanzheng zalu</i> 宣政雜錄, <i>Luoyang mingyuan ji</i> 洛陽名園記
64	39 (middle)	<i>Tao zhu xinlu</i> 陶朱新錄, <i>Zhenla fengtu ji</i> 真蠟風土記
68	40	<i>Shenzi</i> 慎子
69	44	<i>Jinkang chaoye qian yan</i> 靖康朝野僉言
70	84	<i>Qian pu</i> 錢譜
71	74 (beginning and end)	<i>Chushi yishu</i> 褚氏遺書, <i>Dashiji</i> 大事記, <i>Baihutong de lun</i> 白虎通德論, <i>Bian huo lun</i> 辨惑論
72	74 (middle)	<i>Dazhong yi shi</i> 大中遺事
73	47	<i>Gongsun Longzi</i> 公孫龍子
74	48	<i>Aoyuzi xuxi suowei lun</i> 聶隅子歔歔瑣微論
75	50	<i>Shi yi</i> 識遺
76	51	<i>Yuzhang gujin ji</i> 豫章古今記, <i>Annan xingji</i> 安南行記
77	52	<i>Beibian bei dui</i> 北邊備對
78	53 (first half)	<i>Gou xuan</i> 鉤玄
79	53 (second half)	<i>Sichao wenjian zalu</i> 四朝聞見雜錄
80	97	<i>Jinshan zhi</i> 金山志, <i>Liaodong zhi</i> 遼東志, <i>Jigu dingzhi</i> 稽古定制, <i>Quan shan lu</i> 勸善錄, <i>Yi jian zhi</i> 夷堅志, <i>Shenseng zhuan</i> 神僧傳, <i>Xiao pin ji</i> 效顰集
88	58	<i>Jiang biao zhi</i> 江表志
89	60	<i>Pin cha yaolu</i> 品茶要錄
90	59 (first half)	<i>Shiji zhuyu</i> 史記注語, part 1
91	59 (second half)	<i>Shiji zhuyu</i> 史記注語, part 2

Table 3: The Shen MS of the *Shuofu* in Comparison with the Mao and Γ Recension MSS

Work in Shen MS	Position in Shen MS	<i>Juan</i> in	<i>Juan</i> in Γ
		Mao MS	Recension MSS
<i>Xue dao xuan zhen jing</i> 學道玄真經	Fascicule (<i>ce</i> 冊) no. 1	—	54
<i>Gan ying jing</i> 感應經		16	9
<i>Yang yu jing</i> 養魚經		15	15
<i>Xiang he jing</i> 相鶴經		15	15
<i>Xiang ju (~bei) jing</i> 相具(~貝)經		15	15
<i>Tu niu jing</i> 土牛經		15	15
<i>Da ma tu jing</i> 打馬圖經		16	19
<i>Jiu jing</i> 酒經		—	44
<i>Du bei shan jiu jing</i> 讀北山酒經		—	44
<i>Zui xiang ri yue</i> 醉鄉日月		—	58
<i>Pin cha yao lu</i> 品茶要錄	One <i>juan</i>	—	60
<i>Xuanhe bei yuan gong cha lu</i> 宣和北苑貢 茶錄		—	60
<i>Bei yuan bie lu</i> 北苑別錄		—	60
<i>Da guan cha lun</i> 大觀茶論		—	52
<i>Mo'e man lu</i> 墨娥漫錄	One <i>juan</i>	40	4
<i>Fengtu ji</i> 風土記...		40	4
<i>Chouchi biji</i> 仇池筆記		—	4
<i>Zhu zi sui shi</i> (128 entries) 諸子隨識	Fascicule (<i>ce</i> 冊) no. 8	35	6
<i>Wenzi</i> 文子...		35	6
<i>Yinwenzi</i> 尹文子...		35	6
<i>Huainanzi</i> 淮南子....		35	6
<i>Lun heng</i> 論衡		—	100
<i>Zhu zhuan zhai xuan</i> 諸傳摘玄	Fascicule (<i>ce</i> 冊) no. 9	36	7
<i>Gaoseng zhuan</i> 高僧傳		36	7
<i>Wuming gong zhuan</i> 無名公傳		—	73

Work in Shen MS	Position in Shen MS	<i>Juan</i> in Mao MS	<i>Juan</i> in Γ Recension MSS
<i>Xie lue</i> 蟹略	Final <i>juan</i>	—	36
<i>Zhu yi feng su</i> 諸夷風俗		—	—
<i>Zhenla feng tu ji</i> 真臘風土記		—	39

Sources: Rao 1993: 661; Xu 1994: 118–27; Chang 1979: 43–405, 483–506.

Table 4: Contents of the Shi MS of the *Shuofu* in Comparison with the Γ Recension MSS

Fascicule (ce 冊)	Title	Juan in Γ Recension
I	<i>Chuanzai</i> 傳載	5
	<i>Cang yi hua yu</i> 藏一話腴	5
	<i>Moke hui xi</i> 墨客揮犀	24
	<i>Xu moke hui xi</i> 續墨客揮犀	24
	<i>Yipu zhezong</i> 藝圃折中	31
II	<i>Duzi sui zhi</i> 讀子隨識	6
	<i>Gui guzi san juan</i> 鬼谷子三卷	71
	<i>Kang cang zi</i> 亢倉子	71
	<i>Gui guzi wu juan</i> 鬼谷子五卷	71
III	<i>Mi lou ji</i> 迷樓記	32
	<i>Jiao fang ji</i> 教坊記	12
	<i>Zhuoyi ji</i> 卓異記	25
	<i>Jiyi ji</i> 集異記	25
IV	。。。 <i>Ba yin douching</i> 椌印斗秤	?
	<i>Quchao shilei</i> 趨朝事類	34
	<i>Lintai gushi</i> 麟臺故事	34
	<i>Beibian beidui</i> 北邊備對	52
V	<i>Shengxin quan yao</i> 省心詮要	35
	<i>Gan ze yao</i> 甘澤謠	19
	<i>Tieweishan cong tan</i> 鐵圍山叢談	19
	<i>Wei ju ting yu</i> 韋居聽輿	21
	<i>Bai ta sui</i> 白獺髓	25
	<i>Sanshui xiao du</i> 三水小牘	33
	<i>Qun ju jie yi</i> 羣居解頤	31
	<i>Gou xian</i> 鉤玄	53
	<i>Jigu ding zhi</i> 稽古定制	97
VI	<i>Liao zhi</i> 遼志	86

Fascicule (ce 冊)	Title	Juan in Γ Recension
	<i>Liaodong zhilue</i> 遼東志略	97
	<i>Jinguo zhi</i> 金國志	86
	<i>Yunnan zhilue</i> 雲南志略	36
VII	<i>Yangdi kaihe ji</i> 煬帝開河記	44
VIII	<i>Mozi</i> 墨子	46
	<i>Zihuazi</i> 子華子	46
	<i>Zengzi</i> 曾子	46
	<i>Yiwenzi</i> 尹文子	46
	<i>Kongcongzi</i> 孔叢子	46
IX	◦◦◦ <i>Wanji lun</i> 萬機論	?
	<i>Sushu</i> 素書	90
	<i>Aoyuzi xuxi suoweilun</i> 螿隅子獻欵瑣微論	48
	<i>Hanfeizi</i> 韓非子	47
X	<i>Bei yuan lu</i> 北轅錄	54
	<i>Meng-Da beilu</i> 蒙韃備錄	54
	<i>Luting shishi</i> 虜庭事實	8
	<i>Ximan congxiao</i> 溪蠻叢笑	5
XI	◦◦◦ <i>Changcheng ji</i> 長城記	?
	<i>Shengwu qinzheng lu</i> 聖武親征錄	55
XII	<i>Daye zaji</i> 大業雜記	57
	<i>Lingbiao lu yiji</i> 嶺表錄異記	34
	<i>Shanhai ji</i> 海山記	32

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aiwude 艾鶩德 (Christopher P. Atwood). Trans. Ma Xiaolin 馬曉林. 2014. "Shuofu' banben shi— 'Shengwu qinzheng lu' banben puxi yanjiu de chubu chengguo" 《說郛》版本史--《聖武親征錄》版本譜系研究的初步成果 (Textual History of the "Purlicus of Exposition" — Preliminary Results of a Stemmatic Analysis of the Texts of the "Record of the Campaigns of Chinggis Khan"). *Guoji Hanxue yanjiu tongxun* 國際漢學研究通訊 (International Bulletin of Sinological Research), no. 9 (June), pp. 397–438.
- Atwood, Christopher P. Trans. Mukai Masaki 向正樹. 2011. "陶宗儀『說郛』と『聖武親征錄』 『蒙韃備錄』のテキスト伝承 ("Record of the Campaigns of Chinggis Khan" and "Complete Record of the Mongol–Tatars" and the Textual Filiation of Tao Zongyi's "Purlicus of Exposition"), *Tōyōshien* 東洋史苑 (Collection of Oriental History), vol. 77, pp. 127–50.
- Atwood, Christopher P. 2012. "Six Pre-Chinggisid Genealogies in the Mongol Empire," *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*, vol. 19, pp. 5–57.
- Beijing tushuguan 北京圖書館 (Beijing Library), ed. 1987–1988. *Beijing tushuguan guji shanben shumu* 北京圖書館古籍善本書目 (Catalogue of Old and Rare Books in the Beijing Library). 5 vols.: (1) *Jing* 經 (Classics); (2) *Shi* 史 (Histories); (3) *Zi* 子 (Thinkers); (4) *Ji* 集 (Anthologies); and (5) *Suoyin* 索引 (Index). Beijing: Shumu Wenxian Publishing House.
- Beijing tushuguan shanben bu 北京圖書館善本部 (Rare Book Department of the Beijing Library), ed. 1959. *Beijing tushuguan shanben shumu* 北京圖書館善本書目 (Catalogue of Rare Books in the Beijing Library). 8 vols. in 2. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Chang Bide 昌彼得. 1979. *Shuofu kao* 說郛考 (An Examination of the *Shuofu*). Taipei: Wen-shih-che Publishing House.
- Chia, Lucille. 2003. "Mashaben: Commercial Publishing in Jianyang from the Song to the Ming." In *The Song-Yuan-Ming Transition in Chinese History*, ed. Paul Jakov Smith and Richard von Glahn, pp. 284–328. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cleaves, Francis Woodman. 1982. *The Secret History of the Mongols*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Guoli zhongyang tushuguan shanben shumu* 國立中央圖書館善本書目 (Catalogue of Rare Books in the National Central Library). 1986. Second ed. 4 vols. Taipei: National Central Library.
- Hambis, Louis, with notes by Paul Pelliot. 1945. *Le Chapitre CVII du Yuan che*. Supplement to *T'oung Pao*, vol. 38. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Huang Fushan 黃復山. 2000. "Tao Zongyi 'Shuofu' baijuanben liuyan kao jiqi chenwei jiyi zhi wenxian jiazhi pingyi" 陶宗儀《說郛》白卷本流衍考及其讖緯輯佚之文獻價值評議 (An Examination of the Interpolations into Tao Zongyi's 100-juan "Purloined of Exposition" and an Evaluation of the Documentary Value of Its Reconstructed Fragments of the Predictive Weft-Texts). In *Yuandai jingxue guoji yantaohui lunwenji* 元代經學國際研討會論文集 (Papers of the International Symposium on Yuan-era Classical Studies), ed. Yang Jinlong 楊晉龍, vol. 2, pp. 795–835. Taipei: Central Research Institute, Chinese Humanities and Philosophy Research Center Compilation Office.
- Hung, William. 1951. "Transmission of the Book Known as *The Secret History of the Mongols*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 14, pp. 433–92.
- Ip, Manying. 1985. *The Life and Times of Zhang Yuanji, 1867–1959*. Beijing: Commercial Press.
- Jao Tsong-yi [Jao Tsung-i]. 1966. "Un inédit du *Chouo-fou*: Le Manuscrit de Chen Han, de la période *kia-tsing* (1522–1566)." In *Mélanges de Sinologie offerts à Monsieur Paul Demiéville*, vol. 1, pp. 87–104. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Jia Jingyan 賈敬顏, ed. 1979. *Shengwu qinzheng lu jiaoben* 聖武親征錄校本 (Collated Edition of the "Record of the Campaigns of Chinggis Khan"). Beijing: Minzu University mimeograph, 1979 (乙未 [1955], error for 己未 [1979]).
- King P'ei-yuan 景培元. 1946. *Études comparative des diverses éditions du Chouo fou*. Scripta Sinica Monograph series. Beijing: Centre Franco-Chinois d'Études Sinologiques.
- Kurata Junnosuke 倉田淳之助. 1950. "Setsu-bu hanhon shosetsu to shaken" 「說郛」版本諸說と私見 (Theories on the Editions of the "Purloined of Exposition" and My Own View). In *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyūsyō, Kyoto University*, pp. 287–304. Kyoto: Kyoto University Humanities Scholarship Research Center.
- Mote, Frederick W. 1954a. "T'ao Tsung-i and His Cho Keng Lu." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington.

- Mote, Frederick W. 1954b. "Notes on the Life of T'ao Tsung-i." In *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo, Kyoto University*, pp. 279–93. Kyoto: Research Institute in Humanities of Kyoto University.
- Mo Youzhi 莫友芝, supplemented by Fu Zengxiang 傅增湘, ed. Fu Xinian 傅熹年. 1993. *Cangyuan dingbu Lüting zhijian chuanben shumu* 藏園訂補邵亭知見傳本書目 (Catalogue of the Books Known to Be in Circulation in Lüting, Revised and Expanded from Library Holdings). 4 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Möngkejayağ-a, trans. 1985. "Mongğol-Tağar-un tuqai bürin temdeglel'-ün taiilburilağsan gerecilegsen bicig" (Commentary and Edition of the 'Complete Record of the Mongol-Tatars). In *Bogda Bagatur bey-e-ber daiilağsan temdeglel* (Record of the Campaigns of Chinggis Khan), ed. Ge. Asaraltu and Köke'öndör, pp. 93–156. Höhhot: Inner Mongolia Culture Press.
- Munkuev, Nikolai Tsyrendorzhievich, trans. 1975. *Men-da bei-lu: "Polnoe opisanie Mongolo-Tatar": faksimile ksilografy* (Meng-Da bei-lu "Full Record of the Mongolo-Tatars": Facsimile of the Xylograph). Moscow: Pamiatniki pis'mennosti Vostoka.
- Olbricht, Peter, and Elisabeth Pinks, trans. 1980. Based on the draft of Erich Haenisch and Yao Ts`ung-wu. *Meng-Ta pei-lu und Hei-Ta shih-lüeh: chinesische Gesandtenberichte über die frühen Mongolen 1221 und 1237*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1924. "Quelques remarques sur le *Chouo fou*," *T'oung Pao* 23, 163–220.
- Pelliot, Paul, and Louis Hambis, trans. and ed. 1951. *Histoire des Campagnes de Gengis Khan*. Chengwou ts'in-tcheng lou. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Qian Zeng 錢曾. 1965. *Shugutang cangshu mu* 述古堂藏書目 (Catalogue of Books in the "Hall for Recounting Antiquity"). Rpt. Taipei: Yiwen.
- Rao Zongyi [Jao Tsung-i] 饒宗頤. 1970. *Xianggang Daxue Feng Pingshan Tushuguan cang shanben shulu* 香港大學馮平山圖書館藏善本書錄 (Catalogue of Rare Books Kept in the Fung Ping Shan Library of Hong Kong University), comp. Hong Kong: Lungmen Bookstore.
- Rao Zongyi [Jao Tsung-i] 饒宗頤. 1993. "Shuofu' xin kao — Ming Jiajing Wujiang Shen Han chaoben 'Shuofu' jilue" 《說郛》新考 — 明嘉靖吳江沈瀚鈔本《說郛》記略 (A New Examination of the "Purlicus of Exposition" — A Description of the Manuscript of the "Purlicus of Exposition" of Shen Han from Wujiang in the Ming dynasty's Jiajing era). In *Rao*

- Zongyi shixue lunzhu xuan* 饒宗頤史學論著選 (Selected Historical Writings of Jao Tsung-i), pp. 654–66. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Press.
- Rashid-ad-Din, trans. O. I. Smirnova, notes by B. I. Pankratov and O. I. Smirnova, ed. A. A. Semenov. 1952. *Sbornik letopisei* (Compendium of Chronicles), vol. I, pt. 2. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press.
- Rashiduddin Fazlullah. Trans. and ed. W. M. Thackston. 1998–1999. *Jami'u't-Tawarikh: Compendium of Chronicles: A History of the Mongols*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Three volumes with continuous pagination.
- Seikadō Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku* 靜嘉堂文庫漢籍分類目錄 (A Topically Organized Catalogue of the Old Chinese Books in the “Hall of Tranquil Praise”). 1930. Tokyo: Seikadō Bunko.
- Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社 (Shanghai Old Books Press). [1986] 1988. “Shuofu jiaokan ji: Shuoming” 說郛校勘記·說明 (Notes on the Collation of the “Purlieus of Exposition”: Introduction). In *Shuofu sanzong* 說郛三種 (Three Versions of the “Purlieus of Exposition”), ed. Tao Zongyi et al. 陶宗儀等, vol. 2, appendix, pp. 1–3. Shanghai: Shanghai Old Binding Press
- Shangwu yinshuguan 商務印書館 (Commercial Press), ed. Preface by Zhang Yuanji 張元濟. 1951. *Hanfenlou jinyu shulu* 涵芬樓燼餘書錄 (Books Preserved from the Fire at the “Drenched Fragrance Tower”). Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1951.
- Tao Zongyi 陶宗儀. 1988. *Shuofu sanzong* 說郛三種 (Three Versions of the “Purlieus of Exposition”). 10 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Press.
- Tao Zongyi 陶宗儀. 1997. *Nancun chuogenglu* 南村輟耕錄 (Notes from a Southern Village while Resting from the Plow). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Tao Zongyi 陶宗儀, ed. Zhang Zongxiang 張宗祥. 1927. *Shuofu* 說郛 (Purlieus of Exposition). 100 *juan* in 40 volumes in 4 cases. Shanghai: Commercial Press.
- Tōhō bunka gakuin Kyōtō kenkyūsho kanseki mokuroku* 東方文化學院京都研究所漢籍目錄 (Catalogue of the Old Chinese Books in the Kyoto Institute of Oriental Culture). 1938. Kyoto: Tōhō bunka gakuin Kyōtō kenkyūsho.
- Wang Guowei 王國維, ed. 1962a. Orig. publ. 1926. “*Shengwu qinzheng lu jiaozhu*” 聖武親征錄校注

- (Collation and Commentary on the "Record of the Campaigns of Chinggis Khan")." In *Menggu shiliao sizhong* 蒙古史料四種 (Four Different Sources on the Mongols), pp. 1r–107v (1–220). Facsimile rpt. Taiwan: Cheng-chung Press.
- Wang Guowei 王國維, ed. 1962b. Orig. publ. 1926. "*Meng-Da beilu jianzheng*" 蒙鞑備錄箋證 (An Annotated and Corrected "Complete Record of the Mongol-Tatars"). In *Menggu shiliao sizhong* 蒙古史料四種 (Four Different Sources on the Mongols), pp. 431–57 (1a – 14b) + pp. 459–64. Facsimile rpt. Taiwan: Cheng-chung Press.
- Watanabe Kōzō 渡邊幸三. 1938. "Setsu-bu kō" 說郛考 (An Examination of the "Purlieus of Exposition"). *Tōhō gakuho* 東方學報 (Oriental Studies) (Kyoto), vol. 9, pp. 218–60.
- Weng Lianxi 翁連溪, ed. 2005. *Zhongguo guji shanben zongmu* 中國古籍善本總目 (A General Catalogue of Old and Rare Books in China), vol. 6: *Ji bu (xia), cong bu* 集部(下), 叢部 (Anthologies Section, Part II, Collectanea). Beijing: Xianzhuang shuju.
- Wilkinson, Endymion. 2000. *Chinese History: A New Manual: Revised and Enlarged*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wilkinson, Endymion. 2012. *Chinese History: A New Manual*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wu Jing 吳晶. 2009. "Shuofu' ben 'Luoyang qielan ji' de banben jiazhi" 《说郛》本《洛阳伽蓝记》的版本价值 (The Textual Value of the "Record of the Monasteries of Luoyang" Text in the "Purlieus of Exposition"), *Nanjing shifan daxue wenxueyuan xuebao* 南京师范大学文学院学报, March, no. 1, pp. 15–17.
- Wu Jing 吳晶. 2015. "Jizhong Wei-Jin-Nanbei chao xiaoshuo jijiao shangdui — yi Zhejiang Linhai Bowuguan cang Jiguge ben 'Shuofu' wei canjiao" 几种魏晋南北朝小说辑校商兑--以浙江临海博物馆藏汲古阁本《说郛》为参校 (Compiling and Collating Several Fictional Pieces of the Wei-Jin and North and South Dynasties — A Revision Based on the "Chamber for Revealing Antiquity" Copy of the "Purlieus of Exposition" Kept in the Linhai Museum), *Taizhou Xueyuan xuebao* 台州学院学报, vol. 37, no.2, pp. 32-35.
- Xu Sanjian 徐三见. 1994. "Jiguge cang Mingchao liushijuan ben 'Shuofu' kao shu" 汲古阁藏明抄六十卷本《说郛》考述 (A Brief Examination of the Ming Dynasty 60-juan "Purlieus of Exposition" Kept in the "Chamber for Revealing Antiquity"), *Dongnan wenhua* 东南文化 no. 6 (no. 106), pp. 112–27.

- Yongrong 永瑢, ed. 1933. *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 四庫全書總目提要 (Epitome of the General Catalogue of the Complete Works in Four Libraries). Shanghai: Commercial Press.
- Yuan shi* 元史 (History of the Yuan). Comp. Song Lian 宋濂, et al., ed. Yang Jialuo 楊家駱. 1976. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Zhang Zongxiang 張宗祥, ed. Chen Jiahe 陳稼禾. [1986] 1988. “Shuofu jiaokan ji” 說郛校勘記 (Collated Notes on the “Purlicus of Exposition”). In *Shuofu sanzong* 說郛三種 (Three Versions of the “Purlicus of Exposition”), ed. Tao Zongyi et al. 陶宗儀等, vol. 2, appendix, pp. 1–132. Shanghai: Shanghai Old Binding Press.
- Zhejiang Tushuguan guji bu 浙江圖書館古籍部 (Old Books Department of the Zhejiang Library), ed. 2002. *Zhejiang Tushuguan guji shanben shumu* 浙江圖書館古籍善本數目 (Catalogue of Old and Rare Books in the Zhejiang Library). Hangzhou: Zhejiang Educational Press.
- Zhongguo guji shanben shumu bianji weiyuanhui 中國古籍善本書目編輯委員會 (Compilation Committee for “Catalogue of Old and Rare Books in China”), ed. 1989. *Zhongguo guji shanben shumu: Congbu* 中國古籍善本書目·叢部 (“Catalogue of Old and Rare Books in China: Collectanea”). Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Press.
- Zhou Xiangchao 周向潮 and Xu Sanjian 徐三見, ed. 2002. *Lishi wenhua mingcheng Linhai* 历史文化名城临海 (Lin Hai, a Famous City of History and Culture). Hangzhou: Zhejiang People’s Press.

Since June 2006, all new issues of *Sino-Platonic Papers* have been published electronically on the Web and are accessible to readers at no charge. Back issues are also being released periodically in e-editions, also free.

For a complete catalog of *Sino-Platonic Papers*, with links to free issues, visit the *SPP* Web site.

www.sino-platonic.org