Emperor versus Moral Exemplar: Huang Daozhou's (1585-1646) Fateful Performance of *Zhongxiao* Ethics

Ying Zhang

In the historical documentation of the last dynastic transition in Chinese history, from the Ming to the Qing, the literatus-official Huang Daozhou stands out as *the* loyal literatus-official, *the* impeccable Confucian man. Prior to the Ming fall, Huang Daozhou was known as an upright official and erudite literatus. Captured by the Manchus after an ill-prepared military expedition was shattered, he refused to offer his allegiance. After brief imprisonment he was executed and thus became a loyalist martyr for the Ming cause.

Huang Daozhou strove to become "a perfect man" (*wanren* or *zhiren*), and during his lifetime was indeed considered to exemplify the Confucian virtues. Late-Ming literatus and geographer Xu Hongzu's (1587-1641) has so commented: "There is only one perfect man (*zhiren*), Shizhai (Huang Daozhou). His calligraphy and painting are the best among the Academicians, his essays the best in this dynasty, his character the best in the country, and his scholarship—inherited directly from Duke Zhou and Confucius—the best in history."[1] After the dynastic transition, Sun Qifeng (1584-1675), a widely respected Confucian thinker, identified Huang as one of the only two figures throughout the Ming dynasty "whose loyalty was complete" (*zhong dao zuse*), because his martyrdom was the most fearless, best manifesting his achievements in Confucian learning.[2] Such extravagant eulogies, though reflecting people's admiration for an extraordinary figure, have often been quoted in historical scholarship as authoritative evidence.[3] But how did Huang Daozhou come to

epitomize moral perfection and what does it tell us about late-Ming moral-political environment? To answer these questions is to draw attention to the centrality of *zhongxiao* (literally "loyalty-filial piety") not just in Huang's moral reputation, but also in dynastic politics and in literati historical consciousness—at once as an ideal, a practice, and a political tool.

Zhong and *xiao* both appear frequently in the Confucian classics *The Analects* and *Mencius,* though not the compound *zhongxiao.* While in the pre-Qin Confucian classics the two virtues were linked, clearly filial piety took discursive priority over loyalty. But under the new political system since the Han, loyalty to the ruler was emphasized with the strengthening of imperial authority, a historical trend foreshadowed by the earliest textual appearance of the compound *zhongxiao* in the third-century BCE text *Han Feizi*.[4] In the *Book of Filial Piety* (*Xiaojing*), a Confucian classic whose importance ascended in the Han, "filial piety is no longer the direct and candid manifestation of love for parents, but is concomitantly transformed into loyalty that can be transferred to the sovereign."[5] Filial piety became an "imperial virtue"[6] conjoined in Dong Zhongshu's (180-115 BC) framework of "three cardinal bonds" (ruler-minister, father and son, husband and wife), which were together naturalized by the theories of yin and yang, heaven and earth. This Correlative Confucianism[7] took a practical form in the Han dynasty's policy of offering government positions to filial sons. "Seeking loyal officials in filial men" gradually became a common belief. But the discursive tension between these half-fused virtues never ended in imperial China. Indeed, it is this very complicated relationship between them—the coexistence of collaboration and competition—that makes the ethics of *zhongxiao* a useful lens on late-

imperial Chinese governmentality. The Confucian beliefs in "governing by filial piety" (*xiaozhi*) and "seeking loyal officials in filial men" (*qiu zhongchen yu xiaozi*), far from being empty or fixed ideals, permeated imperial rhetoric and actively shaped literati-officials' behavior and decisions in life and in politics.

Scholarship on "governing by filial piety" in education, society and family has been abundant. I shall draw upon these studies but focus on illuminating how the *zhongxiao* ideal shaped literati-officials' political experience and subjectivity in the particular historical context of the Ming-Qing transition. In this study I use the term *zhongxiao* as an analytical category to illustrate how the conceptual *connection* between loyalty and filial piety functioned in late-Ming politics. I treat the *zhongxiao* ideal as a flexible discourse prone to political appropriation and manipulation. Despite the tension between loyalty and filial piety, there was a constant drive to integrate these two virtues by exploiting their rich volatile meanings. They became almost inseparable conceptually and linguistically. I hope to show that *zhongxiao* does not signify a simple combination of the two virtues or a parallel relationship. A malleable notion, *zhongxiao* could be very specific, but it also appears as a general term of moral praise with no neat correspondence to specific actions of loyalty or filial piety, as we shall see in this study.

The *zhongxiao* ethics was promoted by rulers and in society, for different reasons in different periods and with different consequences, and there were accompanying changes in its articulation and practice. In terms of its development in Ming-Qing transitional politics, Norman Kutcher identifies a breakdown of the "parallel conception of society,"[8] when the Qing emperors regularly demanded the Han officials to mourn in office without staying at

home for approximately three years, or *duoqing* (cutting short or suspending an official's mourning). He suggests that the *zhongxiao* ideal became superficial and had less impact on the bureaucracy and politics than before. In contrast, Yang Haiying's study of the turncoat official Hong Chengchou (1593-1665) shows that the portrayal of Hong either as an emblem of *zhongxiao* (*zhong-xiao liang quan*) or its complete opposite by his contemporaries reflected the different attitudes, stakes, and self-positioning in relation to the new Manchu regime among Chinese literati.[9] These authors' observations exemplify valuable efforts to reveal how *zhongxiao*, never a static doctrine, persisted, functioned, and changed in Chinese history.

Presented here is a case study of the late Ming, a period notorious for factionalism and profound political crisis, hence a perfect stage for performing loyalty. Huang Daozhou was one of many who promoted and practiced the idea that the two focal points of a literatus-official's devotion, his parents and the court, should determine his reputation in life and death. We find a situation where a man's images as a loyal official and a filial son were mutually enhanced, producing a powerful moral example with which he and his colleagues engaged in factional struggles and negotiated with imperial autocracy. Furthermore, Sun Qifeng's praise of Huang Daozhou quoted above reveals that performance of loyalty could even be ranked. Huang's manly self-discipline indeed enhanced the value of his loyalty and reinforced his image as the emblem of *zhongxiao*.

The ways in which the Chongzhen emperor (r. 1628-44) and his officials, especially Huang Daozhou, invoked *zhongxiao* in that particularly fractious political environment, demonstrate how the emperor and various factions of officials employed it in attacks, in self-

defense and justification, and in political image-building. I aim to accomplish two main tasks. First, I will show that during this period, debates about *duoqing* in court concerned the political mobilization of *zhongxiao* more than reflecting subtle changes in attitudes toward mourning. As mentioned above, I shall not emphasize the tension between loyalty and filial piety but try to illuminate the fact that the *zhongxiao* ethics remained an ideal against which literati-officials were scrutinized for political reasons. Secondly, I will consider an issue created by the entanglement of literati-officials' various public and private virtues for the advocates of *zhongxiao* in real-world politics: Specifically which moral issues were legitimate targets of political scrutiny? I will briefly explore how the *zhongxiao* discourse operated in conjunction with the Confucian gender ideals in shaping the image of the ideal Confucian official.

An Imperfect Political Career

In the last seventy years of the Ming, intensified factionalism and imperial autocracy significantly weakened the government's ability to deal with a cluster of difficult issues internally and externally. The deterioration started during the Wanli reign (1572-1620), when confrontations among cliques of officials affected major policy debates, producing endless controversies and deepening animosities. During the Tianqi reign (1621-27), the trauma inflicted by the eunuch Wei Zhongixan (1568-1627) and his associates on many officials, who were considered members of the Donglin, rendered more salient the

factionalist discourse of *junzi* vs. *xiaoren*,[10] thereby establishing a stark contrast between the moral-loyal and the immoral-disloyal.

During the Chongzhen reign, the relationship between the emperor and officials did not improve but turned more bitter. Though the Chongzhen emperor seemed to surpass the previous several emperors in his attitude toward governing, his sense of moral-political responsibility and ambition to defend his empire were so urgent that he sought only instant successes and simple solutions.[11] In a sense he was an inconsistent moralist. He was critical of himself but trusted his officials still less. Stemming from his intense frustration at the officials' chronic factionalism and the self-righteousness of their memorials, this deep distrust led to contemptuous treatment and impulsive arrests of officials.[12] He knew literati-officials' employment of moral language well and cleverly used that same political tool to challenge them. An official with moral vulnerabilities could not withstand the emperor's relentless fault-finding on top of the relentless moral attacks launched by factional enemies. So the Donglin officials needed someone as "perfect" as Huang Daozhou and chose him to represent them in front of the emperor.[13]

The confrontations between the Chongzhen emperor and Huang Daozhou fixed on the question of *zhongxiao* for good reasons. The *zhongxiao* discourse had picked up a somewhat sensational tone in the late Ming. As Miaw-fen Lu's research shows, the *Book of Filial Piety* had attracted increasing interest, and indeed passion, among literati since the late sixteenth century. This was more than promoting a personal virtue or rhetoric; they saw this classic and the idea of "governing by filial piety" as the ultimate Confucian wisdom, a means of self-cultivation and self-expression as well as "a way of communicating with a higher

authority."[14] The loud call for "governing by filial piety" demanded a great deal of dedication from the emperor, too; for he was a pivotal figure in the Confucian cosmological-moral universe. These concerns certainly shaped Huang Daozhou's behavior. That he hand-copied the text of the *Book of Filial Piety* a hundred and twenty times in prison as a way of expressing his belief in *zhongxiao* and defiance to the emperor's political decisions has become one of the most memorable and legendary episodes in late-Ming political history.[15] Meanwhile, urged by some literati-officials and probably also motivated by his own moral aspirations, the Chongzhen emperor had taken measures to promote the *Book of Filial Piety* and *zhongxiao* doctrine.[16] It was against this historical background that the drama of the moral paragon Huang Daozhou unfolded.

In Tianqi 2 (1622), Huang Daozhou and two friends, Wen Zhenmeng (1574-1636) and Zheng Man (1594-1639), became *jinshi* and entered the central government. Wen and Zheng attempted to impeach the powerful eunuch Wei Zhongxian. Huang Daozhou had promised that he would join them in this effort, but then hesitated because he wanted to first move his mother and wife to the capital from his home province far in the south, Fujian. Here is the only example of loyalty and filial piety being at odds in his career: in the end he did not join his friends as he had promised.[17] "I composed three memorials but burned them all because I had to bring my mother to the capital," he later recalled.[18] The decision to prioritize filiality over loyalty and friendship kept him from participating in his friends' heroic action against Wei Zhongxian. The failure to act on the principle of the Confucian friendship and the failure to pursue the harmonious unity of *zhong* and *xiao* turned into a moral burden for him. This early guilt complex may have made Huang Daozhou more

determined to insist on the inseparability of loyalty and filial piety, not only in politics but also in his self-presentation in his subsequent career.

When the political chaos caused by *yandang* (associates of Wei Zhongxian) was worsening, Huang Daozhou lectured for the Tianqi emperor in his capacity as a Hanlin Compiler (*bianxiu*). He defied the practice that the Lecturer should kneel when presenting texts to the emperor, an action interpreted as defiance against Wei. At the height of Wei's bloody persecution of Donglin officials, in Tianqi 5 (1625) Huang Daozhou requested a leave to take care of his mother and extended it to observe the mourning period after she died.[19] In Chongzhen 3 (1630), upon the new emperor's summon, he returned to the capital. Soon, his defense of the Grand Secretary Qian Longxi (1579-1645) in the treason case of Yuan Chonghuan (1584-1630) irritated the Chongzhen emperor and earned him a demotion. In Chongzhen 5 (1632), he got permission for a leave and returned to Fujian. Over the next four years, he spent most of his time repairing and guarding his parents' tombs, and lecturing on Confucian classics.

Soon after re-entering the government in Chongzhen 10 (1637), Huang Daozhou became deeply involved in a series of political struggles between Donglin officials and other officials such as Wen Tiren (1573-1639) and Yang Sichang (1588-1641), whom the Donglin crowd considered unworthy and incompetent factionalists. In his attempts to impeach Yang Sichang for his violation of mourning rules and to defend Zheng Man against moral charges such as mother-beating and sexual immoralities, Huang Daozhou was frustrated in several confrontational exchanges with the emperor and received one more demotion. He submitted yet another request for leave and went back to Fujian.

But a year later he was arrested for suspicion of factionalism when Xie Xuelong (1585-1645), then Jiangxi provincial governor, suggested to the emperor that Huang Daozhou's qualities and loyalty entitled him to an important government position.[20] Suspecting factionalist agenda behind this recommendation, the emperor not only imprisoned Huang for a year and half but also punished several other officials with imprisonment, flogging, and exile.[21] In late Chongzhen 14 (1641), when the emperor granted an amnesty, Huang Daozhou was freed and allowed to serve out his penalty at a remote military station. This exile was later waived and the emperor tried to get him back to the court. But Huang excused himself on account of illness and returned home. He then spent most of his time in Fujian writing and lecturing, until the Ming fell and the Southern Ming Hongguang court in Nanjing called upon him. After the Manchus conquered Jiangnan, Huang Daozhou joined the Longwu court (1645-46) in Fujian and became a Grand Secretary. The military expedition he organized and led against the Qing in southern China quickly collapsed, leading to his capture and execution in 1646.[22]

Such a rugged political life, despite the paucity of substantial contributions to policy making, earned Huang Daozhou a great reputation as an official.[23] The obvious dissonance here manifested the realities of the time. The most admired official was often an excellent scholar and moral paragon whether or not he surpassed others in political skills and administrative ability. He was expected to act in conformity with the time-honored Confucian tenet of Five Cardinal Relations, which set forth interconnected roles and responsibilities for official, father, son, husband, brother, and friend. Helping the ruler govern with Confucian principles, his effectiveness as a critic was predicated on his own

moral performance in public and private life. Despite the fact that these moral-political ideals were so lofty that few literati-officials could realize them, nonetheless they were manipulated in political struggles, *as if* equivalent to the norm, and produced real political effects. It was not coincidental that during the Song, a time of brutal factionalism, the official Fan Zhongyan (989-1052) claimed, "One should expect to be reproached in policy matters, but one's private life must be above reproach."[24] Late-Ming factionalism and imperial autocracy made such a caution all the more necessary, and also created a moralistic atmosphere. In particular, attention to the *zhongxiao* principle became prominent, as we shall see in this article. Limited space here does not allow for analysis of Huang's whole political career. We shall look at Huang Daozhou's political actions in the 1630s to see how his embodiment of and insistence on the *zhongxiao* ethics in life and in politics both legitimized and undermined his participation in court politics.

The Perfect Movement between the Tombs and the Court

Huang Daozhou upheld *zhongxiao* as a principle and practiced it religiously. After he returned to the court in Chongzhen 3 (1630), he forcefully emerged as a unique political character; he was outspoken and uncompromising at court, yet passionate in performing rituals of filial piety during periods of stay at home. His contemporary Zhang Dian recalls: "The master (Huang) would leave this place only when going to offer his criticisms to the emperor, and he would resume attending to the tombs when he returned. One could say that in this place gathered the noble spirits of a hundred years."[25]

This pattern had begun in the year of Tianqi 5 (1625), with his leaving for home in passive protest against eunuch power. He buried his father in the Beishan Mountains, built a hut, and carried dirt himself there to construct the tomb. He erected a stele there on which he had inscribed his father's virtuous deeds. When carving this inscription, he would pause after each character and kowtow one time. The tomb site was a long-term, carefully designed project, taking him many years to accomplish. Huang Daozhou had built and arranged everything with his own hands, and felt that by residing next to the tombs he was being with the deceased parent.[26] The next year his mother passed away. He confined himself longer in the Beishan and continued to build the site. From Tianqi 7 (1627) to Chongzhen 1 (1628), he buried his mother, grandmother, uncles, and his deceased first wife in this place. He told others that fulfilling these filial and familial responsibilities was his only worldly interest.[27]

Throughout his political career, Huang Daozhou experienced four major ups and downs. The language of "leaving the tombs behind and stepping out of the mountains" *(qi mu chushan*) and "building a hut and taking residence in the tomb area" (*jielu shoumu*), with which he and his admirers describe his trips to and from the capital (and thus in and out of the center of political struggles), reveals the inseparability of his two identities—a loyal political man and a filially pious son. The metaphor of "mountains" in this phrase happens to coincide with the fact that he had indeed built and lived in a hut by his parents' tombs in the mountains to fulfill his filial devotion. The chart below shows the pattern of his political and personal life.

Tianqi 2 *jinshi*/official status

→ Tianqi 5 leave/*shoumu*

Chongzhen 3	*chushan*	
		→Chongzhen 5 leave/*shoumu*
Chongzhen 9	*chunshan*	
		→ Chongzhen 11 demotion/*shoumu*
Chongzhen 13	imprisonment/*chushan*	
		→ Chongzhen 15 exile-amnesty/*shoumu*
Chongzhen 17	Southern Ming/*chushan*[28]	

This pattern of movement between the tombs and the court created a powerful image for his moral-political endeavors. Other factors attached to this pattern, such as Huang Daozhou's teaching and writing about the *Book of Filial Piety* and the famous calligraphic copies of the classic made by both himself and his wife Cai Yuqing, added intellectual, artistic, and even sensational glamour to his commitment to and performance of *zhongxiao*. One of his most devoted disciples, Hong Si, writes: "The master's Dao only lies in *zhongxiao*" (*fuzi zhi dao zhongxiao er yi*).[29]

By Chongzhen 3 (1630), the emperor's weaknesses had crystallized. With such a ruler, the uncompromising official Huang Daozhou could not but clash repeatedly. Their first major clash took place in Chongzhen 4 (1631). Huang Daozhou memorialized to defend the Grand Secretary Qian Longxi, who had been imprisoned in the Yuan Chonghuan treason case. Arguably one of the most competent general-officials in the Chongzhen reign, Yuan was arrested and executed because he was accused of plotting against the emperor. Before provoking the emperor's suspicion by rushing to the capital as the Manchus invaded, Yuan had killed a general, Mao Wenlong (1576-1629), without the emperor's permission.[30] Some officials, retaliating the earlier efforts led by Qian Longxi to dispel *yandang*, memorialized to the Chongzhen emperor that Qian was complicit in Yuan's evil agenda. The emperor had Qian Longxi imprisoned.[31]

Huang Daozhou's memorial tried to warn the emperor about the serious political consequences of imprisoning let alone executing a Grand Secretary on the basis of frontier-related controversies; it raised the historical examples of two emperors who had killed their top officials, one of them being the Ming Jiajing emperor (re. 1522-1566). He implied that the Jiajing emperor's inconsistent frontier policy and obsession with Daoist practices had been the real reasons contributing to the execution of then Grand Secretary Xia Yan (1482-1548). Huang also bluntly suggested that some might be trying to "borrow the emperor's hands" to eliminate Qian Longxi.[32] By this, he meant to attack former *yandang* officials who had hated Qian for his role in punishing them.[33]

Huang Daozhou's attempt to petition on behalf of Qian Longxi angered the emperor. The emperor wrote an extremely harsh response, singling out Huang's use of the Jiajing emperor as a historical reference and criticizing his disrespect in commenting on the late emperor's personal life. The Chongzhen emperor obsessively pressed Huang Daozhou to admit that incidents during the Jiajing reign should not be cited as references, because it seemed other officials had already seen parallels in these two incidents and the styles of the two emperors. He pursued a game of rhetoric with Huang Daozhou and demanded him to justify his arguments presented in the first one.[34]

In the second and third memorials, Huang Daozhou had to address some trivial terminological issues raised in the emperor's response, such as whether it was proper to use the term *zaixiang* (the prime minister)—a crucial administrative function in the government that had been abolished in the Ming—as an expression to refer to the Grand Secretary.[35] He also apologized at length for his reckless references to the Jiajing emperor in the first

memorial, blaming the impropriety on poor writing.[36] In his criticism the emperor, by suggesting impropriety in Huang's use of historical reference, had implicitly hinted at disloyalty. Huang's reaction proved he was loyal not only in his political views but also in speech and manner, which was in accordance with how he understood the essence of "governing by filial piety" (*xiaozhi*): care and respect (*ai-jing*).[37] He might have proved his loyalty, but after this exchange, the Chongzhen emperor was satisfied that he had frustrated Huang Daozhou. He dismissed Huang's arguments, dropped the debate, and did not even bother to discuss the real question at issue, the punishment of Qian Longxi. He then demoted Huang Daozhou by three degrees of official rank.[38]

These memorials are the earliest and representative examples of Huang's employment of the *zhongxiao* expression of *shoumu-chushan*. When the emperor demanded that he submit a second memorial to explain himself, he proudly claimed, "Having attended to the tombs (*shoumu*) for three years and served in the court for six years (*chushan*), I am just a rude commoner unfamiliar with the taboos."[39] In the third memorial, he defended his loyalty by contrasting the silence and irresponsibility of many officials with his own actions: even while filially living by his parents' tombs in the mountains, he had not stopped reading government briefs; faraway from the capital at his *shoumu* site, he foresaw the danger arising in Qian Longxi's arrest.[40] Then in a memorial submitted immediately after this round of frustrating exchange with the emperor, he requested a leave so that he could go back and "be close to the parents' tombs."[41]

The *shoumu-chushan* metaphor in these three instances defines Huang Daozhou as a Confucian official and enhances the rhetorical power of his memorials. For it helps claim an

archetype of loyalty distinct from blind obedience to the throne, illuminates the mutual cultivation of filial virtue and political wisdom, and draws on literati-official tradition of using filial piety as a political strategy to express resentment and stage political protest. However, the emperor did not respond to these invocations of *zhongxiao*. Huang Daozhou left and returned to his parents' tombs, living beside them in temporary retirement until summoned to serve again. During the next period of service, once again the emperor and his moral exemplar battled over the ethics of *zhongxiao*.

The Imperfect Friend and Imperfect Colleagues

From the emperor's perspective, Huang Daozhou sounded as if he would never agree, as if his job was to oppose to the emperor with empty talk about *zhongxiao*. Below I will examine this by looking at Huang Daozhou's two defeats in the year of Chongzhen 10 (1637). He failed to defend his friend Zheng Man, and failed to convince the emperor not to promote Yang Sichang in violation of mourning prohibitions, i.e. with a *duoqing*. In Chongzhen 8 (1635), Zheng Man was arrested on the dubious accusation of beating his mother, the most heinous crime against filial piety, along with other ethical charges (such as sexually harassing his female family members) brought forth by Wen Tiren, the then Grand Secretary, who was in obsessive rivalry with the Donglin officials. After the emperor made Wen Zhenmeng a Grand Secretary and summoned Huang Daozhou back to the government, Wen Tiren took action against their friend Zheng Man. He also plotted successfully to force Wen Zhenmeng to retire around the same time.[42] Meanwhile, in Chongzhen 9 (1636), somewhat desperate in

the search for more effective personnel and for strategies to suppress the rebels and deal with the Manchu threats, the emperor appointed Yang Sichang the President of the Board of War, when the latter should be staying at home observing a mourning term.[43]

With Zheng Man's imprisonment and Wen Zhenmeng's retirement, Huang Daozhou hesitated, waiting a year before answering the emperor's call. When he eventually arrived in the capital, several officials had just failed to impeach the Grand Secretary Wen Tiren for incriminating Zheng Man based on unverifiable charges. One of these was an influential Donglin official, Liu Zongzhou (1578-1645). Liu's memorial sharply criticized Chongzhen's blind confidence in the self-described non-factionalist Wen Tiren, who had formed his own clique and eliminated his political opponents. This memorial angered the emperor so much that he stripped Liu Zongzhou of his official status.[44] At this moment, the *zhongxiao* issue had not been so central to court politics since Zhang Juzheng's (1525-1582) *duoqing* controversy in the late 1570s.[45]

Huang Daozhou decided to engage the latter issue first. He memorialized against Yang Sichang's *duoqing* case upon Yang's arrival in the capital. This memorial consists of two parts. The first part argues against Yang's appointment on the principle that *duoqing* violates the basic moral-political conventions. The second part criticizes Yang's proposals to raise funds for military campaigns.[46] Yang Sichang had anticipated Huang Daozhou's attack. For months Yang had repeatedly submitted memorials begging the emperor to reconsider this politically controversial *duoqing* order.[47] But the emperor continued to urge him to rush to the capital. Finally, he accepted the appointment and embarked on the journey. When he neared Beijing, he stopped and memorialized one more time. In that memorial, he reflects

on some *duoqing* precedents in Ming history, reminding the emperor that these cases, though justified by military emergencies, always provoked controversy and had negative impacts on the individuals so recalled.[48] By the time Huang Daozhou submitted his protest against Yang Sichang's violation of filial duty, the emperor had already received and rejected several petitions from Yang himself. The historical references Huang used in his memorial to make the case against Yang and the *duoqing* order had been cited by Yang himself already! No wonder the emperor shrugged off Huang's moral attack. Yang Sichang's repeated petitions might have seemed hypocritical in his attackers' eyes. But his actions clearly demonstrated the power of the *zhongxiao* ideal and the real political risks associated with *duoqing*.

Secondly, to raise funds for the military operations, Yang Sichang had proposed new taxes. Whether Yang's proposals were practical or not,[49] Huang Daozhou's alternatives were not persuasive: he suggested the emperor promote outspoken officials, emphasizing that the devastating droughts that had been occurring were Heaven's negative reaction to the emperor's promotion of an unfilial son and his inability to listen to critical voices.[50] The emperor understood Huang Daozhou's insistence on *zhongxiao* both as a strategy and a moral-political belief,[51] but he did not believe Huang offered anything pragmatic or new. So he ignored what he considered Huang Daozhou's moral preaching and factional agenda and went along with Yang Sichang's proposals.

Failing in his attempt to stop Yang Sichang, Huang Daozhou moved to his other task, rescuing Zheng Man. Within a month, Huang Daozhou submitted a series of memorials, on the one hand requesting a sick leave and on the other urging the emperor to

practice benevolent rule by promoting upright loyal men, to reject the smearing of Donglin officials and their followers in Fushe Society,[52] and in particular to release officials who had been imprisoned on dubious charges. In these memorials, he gradually made his ultimate agenda clearer: he was attempting to save Zheng Man.[53]

The first memorial does not mention Zheng Man; it was tortuous. It raises concerns about the trying political environment: the emperor's excessively critical attitude toward officials seemed to have only benefited "wicked reprobates," who made advances by attacking good officials. Huang Daozhou argues that the most pressing issue faced by the emperor is to tolerate and exonerate officials who had expressed criticism or been arrested on groundless charges.[54] The second memorial, "On my three faults, four shameful actions, and seven defects" (hereafter "Seven Defects"), lists Zheng Man as one of the worthy officials who surpassed Huang himself and deserved to be given important government positions. The third memorial, written after Huang had received a furious reaction from the emperor to his praise of Zheng Man in the second memorial, explicitly defended Zheng's record of loyalty and filial piety. At Wen Tiren's instruction, an imperial student and Zheng Man's townsman, Xu Xi, had presented to the emperor a damaging testimony against Zheng Man, citing vernacular novels that had been produced to show Zheng's sexual immorality and mother-beating. The sensational—and almost pornographic—literary depictions of Zheng Man's alleged affair with his father's concubine and rape of his daughter-in-law clearly reinforced the case against his violation of filial piety. In the meantime the novels suggested Wen Tiren was the lone, trustworthy and loyal official. Although these novels are fictional, they influenced public assumptions about officials and contemporary politics. Whether or not

these novels depict Zheng Man's real experience was less important than the simple fact that these stories were in circulation and *suggested* his domestic immorality. Once the imaginary linkage between Zheng Man and promiscuity was established, it tarnished Zheng's moral image and would influence court politics in a very real way.[55] Huang Daozhou's third memorial shows he was extremely alarmed by the fact that these narratives had been presented in court and were actually being considered by the emperor. He urged the emperor to insist on the principle of not allowing officials to bring domestic affairs into court discussion, because true loyalty was defined by conducting politics properly.

Han Qi, an official of the Song dynasty, held office in the Grand Council. Every time he came across memorials that exposed other officials' personal mistakes, he would cover those words with his hands. The emperor Renzong called him "a loyal official." Yan Zhenqing in the Tang dynasty once attacked Li Heji for lacking filial piety. But later he admitted his attack was improper words spilled out as a result of drunkenness. In other words, discussing others' personal problems should not happen in a good political environment. Nowadays, locals enjoy getting together and gossiping to entertain themselves. Everywhere, dishonest men fabricate smears to make a profit. Where the local culture does not encourage honesty and purity, disorder would appear. The government must put it under control quickly.[56]

Here, Huang Daozhou tries to define "loyalty" with the moral principle that a righteous man should not defame others, especially regarding domestic matters. But he is ambiguous in the meaning of "domestic matters." Does this phrase include violation of filial piety, which not only constituted a crime but also betrayed the principle of *zhongxiao*? Or, do the "personal

mistakes" in this memorial only refer to the other unverifiable charges leveled against Zheng Man and not include filial piety because Zheng's *zhongxiao* was assumed to be incontestable? Huang Daozhou only stresses that those who tried to implicate Zheng Man with the moral charges were the ones disloyal to the emperor. His ambiguity reflects a particular kind of tension within the Confucian political philosophy, which does not separate personal morality and politics. It also exemplifies a dilemma created by the Confucian moralists themselves: talking about others' sexual immorality per se constituted an ethical violation.

The Chongzhen emperor confined himself to simply warning Huang Daozhou that he should focus on solving the pressing issues and not to try to achieve fame by initiating meaningless moral challenges to the throne.[57] In other words, by asserting his authority as *the* moral judge, the emperor frustrated Huang Daozhou's attempts to contest the throne's self-presentation of "governing by filial piety," and also reasserted his privilege to define the meaning of "loyal ministers." Although both sides resorted to the *zhongxiao* discourse and claimed to have followed its principle, their agendas and emphases could not have disagreed more. That *zhongxiao* was a flexible concept and language allowed it to be manipulated so easily. But impasses in their negotiation aside, at this point, the emperor seemed to have not imagined executing Zheng Man for the unverifiable charges. How the incident escalated to that level of tragedy and brutality is the focus of the next section. The repeated references to Huang Daozhou's memorial the "Seven Defects" in a series of political debates leading up to Zheng's death shows how the importance of *zhongxiao* in politics was sustained by its frequent deployment as a useful rhetoric.

A Perfect Man and His "Seven Defects"

As mentioned above, the "Seven Defects" was one of Huang Daozhou's explicit attempts to rescue Zheng Man. "Seven defects" is a self-depreciating rhetoric meant to advise the emperor to promote some literati, whom Huang Daozhou identified as worthy men whose talents and virtues surpassed his. But these eleven men happened to include some names irritating to the emperor: first, three officials (Liu Zongzhou, Fu Chaoyou [?-1639] and Wu Zhiyu) had been punished precisely for their criticism of the imprisonment of Zheng Man. Secondly, Huang also mentioned Zheng Man and Qian Qianyi (1582-1664), two officials punished for alleged moral scandals; in both cases the emperor relied on unverifiable factionalist accusations. The emperor had branded Qian Qianyi a "rascal" and stripped him of official status on groundless moral charges.[58] Huang Daozhou told the emperor that he admired these two officials for their literary talents and stamina.[59] From the emperor's perspective, including Zheng and Qian in this list of "worthy men" must have looked lunatic and insulting; these two names explicitly challenged his authority as the ultimate moral judge.

Thirdly and most importantly, this list of worthy men roused suspicions of factionalism in the emperor: many of them had been seen as Donglin leaders; Fu Chaoyou and Wu Zhiyu passed the *jinshi* exams in the same year as Huang Daozhou, Zheng Man, Wen Zhenmeng, and Ni Yuanlu (1593-1644); these officials, as so-called *tongnian*, would be seen as belonging to the same clique. Therefore, the worthy men presented in Huang Daozhou memorial were not what the emperor would accept as "loyal men."[60] In the depths

of despair at the chronic factionalism in the government, the Chongzhen emperor considered only non-factional officials as truly loyal.

Meanwhile, faced by literati-officials prone to employing *zhongxiao* as a political language, the emperor found a compelling political talking point in Zheng Man's alleged ethical violations. Instead of questioning Huang Daozhou's loyalty, the Chongzhen emperor questioned his judgment, which was presumably corrupted by factionalism: "This memorial, as well as his earlier ones and attached explanations, is full of ambiguous language. He confuses the right and the wrong, and even claims that he is not as good a person as someone who has violated fundamental ethics by beating his mother and a betrayer of the teachings of the sages! What is on his mind?"[61] While both resorted to the *zhongxiao* rhetoric, the emperor and his official each framed Zheng Man's case differently for their own purposes, and they interpreted the *zhongxiao* principle sometimes generally and sometimes quite literally, depending on the specific agenda.[62]

At this moment the Grand Secretary Wen Tiren was removed. The Donglin officials felt ready to put Huang Daozhou into this powerful position. Huang's moral perfection strengthened the Donglin officials' claim that they deserved the emperor's trust in policy and personnel decisions. The Chongzhen emperor knew that Huang Daozhou could not assume responsibility as a "prime minister at the time of crisis" because of his rigid adherence to "moral principles."[63] Instead, he promoted Xue Guoguan (?-1641) to replace Wen Tiren. Xue Guoguan and Zhang Zhifa (*jinshi* Wanli 29), another Grand Secretary, were seen as party to Wen's anti-Donglin camp and a continuation of Wen's corruption and incompetence.

Huang Daozhou's supporters were disappointed and anxious. But they immediately found an opportunity to fight back. Around this time, the emperor also appointed several literati-officials as mentors of the Heir Apparent. This honor, representing the imperial recognition of the appointees' virtue, talent, and political potential, was always bestowed on the most accomplished scholars at court.[64] Upon the release of the name list, one of them, the Donglin official Yang Tinglin, submitted a memorial arguing that Huang Daozhou was the most qualified for such an honor and expressed his willingness to concede the position to Huang. This action exhibited the Donglin officials' enthusiasm for replacing the "vicious and incompetent" grand secretaries with their own hopeful, Huang Daozhou. [65]

The Grand Secretary Zhang Zhifa submitted a memorial criticizing such a move.[66] While acknowledging Huang Daozhou's impeccable moral character, citing Huang Daozhou's old memorial "Seven Defects" and his praise for Zheng Man, he questioned whether Huang Daozhou really understood filial piety and, hence, whether he was qualified to serve as the Heir Apparent's mentor.[67] Feng Yuanbiao (?-1644), another popular Donglin figure, denounced Zhang Zhifa's attack. He reminded the emperor that questioning Huang Daozhou's *zhongxiao* performance was nothing but factionalist political machination, because Huang Daozhou's reputation as a filial son was an indisputable, widely acknowledged fact.[68]

The emperor did not support or punish anyone this time. But Huang Daozhou's superb reputation as a filial son and loyal official was further elevated by his Donglin colleagues, while the main issue of Zheng Man's "immorality," invoked again and again in such debates, remained unchallenged. In other words, the fact that the charges against Zheng

Man were groundless got obscured. It seemed politically convenient now that Huang's moral perfection and reputation as an emblem of *zhongxiao* should remain unassailable. A stark contrast between Huang Daozhou and Zheng Man inevitably emerged. Some Donglin officials felt they needed to depict them as one "true" Donglin and one "fake" Donglin so that Huang Daozhou and Donglin's political future would not be jeopardized. One such example is Chen Zilong (1608-1647), who tried to convince Huang Daozhou that he should "abandon [Zheng Man] to protect the reputation of righteous officials."[69] This kind of consideration played a crucial role in imaging the Donglin into a faction of moral men in the grand narrative of the Ming-Qing transition.

The emperor continuously appointed to the grand secretariat officials whom Donglin officials considered hostile, factionalist, and incompetent. One could even argue that the protests against these grand secretaries kept "Donglin" a relevant political identification, at the core of which was an image of moral perfection. Thus attacking the alleged violations by Zheng Man, who were seen by some as a Donglin, was crucial to the emperor's attempt to frustrate factionalism and weaken the Donglin claim that they were a faction of moral men and deserved more trust. This can be shown most vividly in the last court discussion about *zhongxiao* and Huang's old memorial "Seven Defects."

A Perfect Man vis-à-vis "the World of Duoqing"

Ever since the Chongzhen emperor assumed power, disciplining himself constantly with self-blame and later living an austere lifestyle, the last Ming emperor consistently resorted to

morality as his political language of choice. He had exhorted *zhongxiao* as the ultimate virtue that would help him keep the Mandate of Heaven. Wen Tiren must have realized that accusing Zheng Man of lacking filial piety would evoke the most intense reaction from the emperor. The emperor indeed threw Zheng Man into prison as soon as he heard about the violation. But when witnesses failed to prove Zheng's crimes, the emperor knew he had to deal with the case more carefully. When he heard of Zheng Man's illness, he ordered that his health be taken care of and that the official in charge would be severely punished should Zheng Man die.[70] Months later, when the emperor ordered Wen Tiren to "retire," it appeared the moment of Zheng Man's release would come soon. But another wave of political debates surrounding *zhongxiao* broke out: in Chongzhen 11 (1638), led by Huang Daozhou, some officials protested against Yang Sichang's next promotion, to the position of the Grand Secretary. The emperor's decision ignited old and new animosities in court. A new round of argument between the emperor and Huang Daozhou over *zhongxiao* occurred in just these circumstances.

Upon being nominated, Yang Sichang promoted Chen Xinjia (?-1642), an official who was considered by many to be an old accomplice of Wei Zhongxian, to supervise the war efforts in key strategic regions of Xuanda and Shanxi. For about two years Chen Xinjia had been at home observing a mourning period. The promotion with a *duoqing* would shorten his mourning duty by several months.[71] The literati-officials roared in protest, their collective trauma from both Zhang Juzheng's *duoqing* and Wei Zhongxian's atrocities being provoked by this move. Huang Daozhou submitted protests: one against Yang Sichang's

duoqing ru ge (entering the grand secretariat in violation of the mourning norm) and the second against Chen Xinjia's improper promotion.[72]

Yang Sichang's ties with the former *yandang* officials and his inability to manage urgent military and diplomatic crises might have triggered the efforts by the Donglin to remove him.[73] But rather than framing the case in terms of policy or politics, Huang Daozhou and his friends, consciously or unconsciously, imitated their predecessors who had heroically resisted Zhang Juzheng's *duoqing* nearly six decades earlier: they chose to rhetorically frame Yang's failing in terms of violation of filial piety. In his memorial, Huang Daozhou repeats the argument and some examples he had employed against Yang Sichang's first promotion a year before. He discusses two groups of *duoqing* cases in the Ming history. The first group of officials are from the mid-Ming, who, he says, must come back to lead important military campaigns. Huang Daozhou points out that one of these officials, Yang Bo (1509-1574), was already very close to the end of the mourning period when being summoned by the Jiajing emperor and implies this does not count as a *duoqing*.[74] However, one has to wonder, if Huang Daozhou could generously treat Yang Bo's case, why he would not do the same for Chen Xinjia, who had also completed most of his mourning duty?[75]

Another example in this group, Weng Wanda (1498-1552), was called upon when he was mourning at his father's tomb. After the Jiajing emperor turned down his plea to complete the mourning, Weng rushed back to Beijing from thousands of miles away. Waiting impatiently, the emperor was influenced by Weng's factional enemies and withdrew his favor and trust. Huang Daozhou says Weng's political demise resulted from his violation of filial piety.[76] In fact, Weng Wanda was a filial son and loyal official fallen victim to

factional politics.[77] When Huang Daozhou distorts facts to make a case against Yang Sichang and Chen Xinjia, he leaves the impression that he uses *zhongxiao* for political convenience, not motivated by a strong belief in the principle.

The second group of officials cited in his memorial was recent *duoqing* examples. Zhang Juzheng's *duoqing* marked the beginning of late-Ming factionalism. When he followed the Wanli emperor's *duoqing* order and would not take a mourning leave, many officials protested, either opposing the *duoqing* order on the ground it violated the *zhongxiao* principle or hoping to curb Zhang's controversial reforms and swelling power.[78] But it is a clear exaggeration on Huang Daozhou's part to claim that it was the Wanli emperor's decision to punish Zhang posthumously that helped bring relative peace to the frontiers. The other *duoqing* cases mentioned by Huang, those of Yuan Chonghuan and Cui Chengxiu (?-1627), a former associate of Wei Zhongxian, occurred when Wei was in power.[79] With these examples from the Wanli and Tianqi reigns, Huang argues that officials following the orders of *duoqing* and violating the *zhongxiao* principle were all doomed men, implying that *duoqing* was inauspicious and against Heaven's will.

Meanwhile, for Yang Sichang himself, fulfilling his *zhongxiao* duties had been the very factor that motivated him to accede to order of *duoqing*. The emperor knew this very well and might have taken advantage of Yang Sichang's urgent desire to vindicate his father. Yang's father, Yang He (?-1635), was once the emperor's most trusted official. He was appreciated for his incorruptible character, but he did not really know military strategy. His missteps in dealing with rebels in central China caused very serious consequences for the empire. For such failures he was arrested, imprisoned, and then exiled to Yuanzhou.[80]

Thanks to Yang Sichang's repeated plea to die in the place of his father, Yang He was exempted from the death penalty.[81] Yang Sichang had to justify his loyalty and *duoqing* with his particular form of filial devotion, i.e., to reclaim the Yang family honor. It was to redeem his father's reputation and repay the imperial favor bestowed upon himself that he had to answer the emperor's call and tackle the daunting task of eliminating the rampant rebels.

Huang Daozhou incited strong resentment on Yang Sichang's part, and prompted the latter to engage in moral attacks, too. Since Huang Daozhou framed the argument as an issue of *zhongxiao,* Yang used Zheng Man's case to effectively counter-attack. When the emperor summoned them to a face-to-face debate, Yang Sichang cited the "Seven Defects" memorial and suggested that Huang Daozhou might best steer clear of talking about his appointment or filial piety, since Huang had claimed he was "not as good as Zheng Man" ("bu ru Zheng Man"), which showed his poor judgment and problematic application of the *zhongxiao* principle.[82] This exchange thus virtually became a competition between Huang Daozhou and Yang Sichang's performances of *zhongxiao*. Huang Daozhou quickly reminded the emperor he had fulfilled his filial duty by building the tombs with his two hands; as a filial son he could not tolerate *duoqing* in this court. Then he corrected the emperor and the attackers: in "Seven Defects" he did not say "he was not as good as Zheng Man;" the original language in the memorial read that his "literary skill was not as good as Zheng Man's" (*chen wei wenzhang bu ru Zheng Man*). To make himself clear, he likened his admiration for Zheng Man's literary skill to Confucius's praise for Zaiyu's communication skills (*Kongzi zi yun ciling wu bu ru Zaiyu*).[83] Zaiyu was one of Confucius's disciples, whom, it was said, Confucius recognized for his ability to communicate well.[84] But *The Analects* also contains a

very unpleasant conversation between them, in which Confucius was annoyed by Zaiyu's rejection of the idea of observing three years of mourning for deceased parents.[85] Obviously, Huang Daozhou chose a poor historical reference: the clumsy reference to Confucius and Zaiyu sounded as if Huang Daozhou admitted Zheng Man, like Zaiyu, was indeed unfilial, but he—like Confucius—still recognized the unfilial man's other talents.

Huang Daozhou could not convince the emperor, who believed the accusations were factional tactics. In response, Huang Daozhou presented an argument that was rhetorically powerful but inconsistent in principle: Yang Sichang could follow the *duoqing* order when stationed at the frontier, but as the chief official of the Board of War he should not violate the mourning norms. If his violation could be somehow tolerated as the chief official of the Board of War, it should not be tolerated when he entered the Grand Secretariat; even if an exception should be made in this case, it was absolutely unacceptable if Yang brought in Chen Xinjia whose promotion would also violate this principle. Such compounding of violations would create a dangerous "world of *duoqing*" (*Duoqing shijie*)! [86] This reasoning does not help with Huang Daozhou's argument but instead sounds self-contradictory: Was it acceptable to order Yang's *duoqing* or not?

The emperor mockingly replied that officials who had selfish intentions all resorted to moral preaching those days. He cited the imperial student and lower-level staff Xu Xi's sensational testimony against Zheng Man and excoriated Zheng as "having abandoned all the Five Cardinal Relations" (*wulun jin jue*). He admonished Huang Daozhou that his moral judgment could not even rival that of a staff! Huang Daozhou did not challenge Xu Xi's groundless allegations or defend Zheng Man against the emperor's serious condemnation.

Instead, to avoid appearing factionalist, he defended his own superb performances of *zhongxiao*, denying that he had aimed to rescue Zheng Man.[87]

In the end of this face-to-face debate, the emperor sided with Yang Sichang and dismissed Huang Daozhou as a factionalist.[88] The emperor had the power to assume the role of the ultimate moral judge and convict Zheng Man of immorality. Not only did Huang Daozhou lose his battle against Yang Sichang; Zheng Man's alleged crimes were again invoked and their validity consolidated. "Seven Defects" would not have been turned into a fatal weapon against Huang Daozhou and the friend he intended to rescue, had the deployment of the *zhongxiao* ethics as a political weapon not become so central to Huang's self-representation, self-expression, and political negotiation in the court.

Following Huang Daozhou's defeat, several other officials were disciplined or arrested because of their loud opposition to Yang Sichang's *duoqing*.[89] This also replicated the political chaos of the late 1570s, when factionalism escalated dramatically around Zhang Juzheng's *duoqing*. At this time of crisis, reproducing the drama of protesting *duoqing* would not bring about any meaningful political results. It could only establish the fame of officials like Huang Daozhou and deepen factionalism, as had happened during the Wanli reign: as a result of their protest Zhang's opponents had been considered by literati across China to be ideal Confucian officials. The parallel between these two incidents was too obvious to deny and naturally led the Chongzhen emperor to question the motives of Huang Daozhou and his colleagues.

The emperor ordered Zheng Man executed by *lingchi* ("death by a thousand cuts") in Chongzhen 12/8 (1639). This execution had little to do with punishing a literatus-official

who lacked filial piety or sexual morality. Rather, it signaled the emperor's unreserved favor toward whomever he believed would save his empire as well as his resolve vis-à-vis obstructionist malcontents.[90] In the next several years, all the three figures in the abovementioned *duoqing* debate died tragically. In Chongzhen 14 (1641), Yang Sichang killed himself, despairing of his campaigns against the rebels. Three years later the emperor committed suicide when the rebels captured Beijing. Another two years later, Huang Daozhou died as a loyalist. Huang was the last one among the three to die. Before his death, he sought to put a final spin on the tragedies surrounding *zhongxiao.*

Zhongxiao, *the Perfect Wor(l)d*

Zhongxiao as an important notion in literati's personal and pubic lives has been perpetuated both in practice and in literati writing. As a floating signifier it is embodied and grounded in their everyday life. It is a useful and—to some degree—indispensible moral language in the Confucian historiographical tradition, and literati were well aware of that. It supports a particular kind of moral-historical prism through which stories of political figures are filtered and projected. Records and memories about factionalism and the fall of the Ming, the two most important elements in late-Ming political history, offer abundant examples of the usage of *zhongxiao* as a general moral language with little reference to specific acts of loyalty-filial piety. These mentions of *zhongxiao* not only serve to confirm its significance, but also delicately draw its conceptual contours, reaffirming its connection with other moral ideals. They help continue the double-binary framework of moral-loyal/immoral-disloyal in politics

and in historical practice. Huang Daozhou's own writing and literati writing about him soon after the fall of the Ming offer two good examples.

Months after the suicide of the Chongzhen emperor, Huang Daozhou traveled northward to assume his new position in the Hongguang Southern Ming court. On his way to Nanjing, he paid a special visit to Zheng Man's old residence in Wujin. There he composed an epitaph for the joint tomb of Zheng and his wife. He recalls how Zheng Man was arrested and executed for groundless moral charges brought forth by vicious officials. He suggests that those who wanted to kill him decided to kill Zheng Man first. He was trying to help, but did not expect he would contribute to hastening the persecution.[91] In conclusion, Huang Daozhou writes: "While His Majesty still made efforts to collect public opinions from Zheng Man's hometown and listened to his family's own views, officials had already made the verdict…. His Majesty indeed deeply cared about him. Miyang (Zheng Man) possessed the virtue of *zhongxiao* but became a victim of an extraordinary misfortune (*zhongxiao er zao xian huo*); he was a talented literatus but his reputation was ruined unfairly. This kind of case had happened before in history. But none surpassed this one in gravity!"[92]

Here, as a loyal subject, Huang Daozhou praises the late Chongzhen emperor's care for his subjects (hence the emperor's "governing by filial piety"); as a faithful friend he defends Zheng Man's *zhongxiao* image. This was written as a piece of political and historical document to be read and used by others. Without specifying his praises, this perfect Confucian man makes a final effort to attribute the cause of Zheng Man's tragedy to some disloyal, vicious officials, who according to Huang's reading of the *Book of Filial Piety*, represent "the evil" (*e*) and pose threats to "governing by filial piety." If not for the evil

officials, the Chongzhen emperor and his officials would have had lived in the ideal world of *zhongxiao*, where loyal officials were filial sons appreciative of the intelligent guidance of the father/emperor, and the latter rules with care and respect.[93] It is obviously disingenuous to say that the Chongzhen emperor had followed the principle laid out in *The Book of Filial Piety*, for he did not show enough care or respect when working with officials. But *zhongxiao* is such a useful catchword in the Confucian world, where the appearance of moral perfection and propriety matters. With this language the historian and moral exemplar Huang Daozhou erases the traces of the bitter sentiments and brutal struggles between him and the late emperor over prosecuting Zheng Man and other issues in the past. It also allows him to praise Zheng Man's moral standing without reminding the reader of the scandalous charges or any details in his friend's domestic life. After all, mentioning someone's sexual life constituted a kind of violation of literati behavioral norms. Yet in a subtle way, the underlying assumption suggested by Huang's language undoubtedly aligns Zheng Man's fulfillment of *zhongxiao* with other Confucian moral expectations such as gender propriety.

This kind of employment of *zhongxiao*—especially the meaningful embedding of gendered moral expectations in *zhongxiao*—also appears in a historical documentation of Huang Daozhou by his contemporaries after he died. It is included in a collection of anecdotes of admirable people of the fallen Ming compiled by the early-Qing scholar Fang Bao (1668-1749), who supposedly passed it on from Du Jie (mid-seventeenth century), a Ming loyalist active in Nanjing cultural circles. This account provides an interesting story of Huang Daozhou, a self-disciplined Confucianist, in the unusual setting of the pleasure quarters. It relates how years before the fall of the Ming, Huang visited some friends in

Nanjing, a city famous for its beautiful and talented courtesans. Because he was known to strictly follow rules of proper behavior, his friends wanted to test him. They got him drunk and asked the most beautiful courtesan Gu to seduce him. But Huang showed incredible self-control. The courtesan was deeply moved and told the scholars after the incident that only Huang Daozhou would eventually become the emblem of *zhongxiao,* or moral perfection (*cheng sheng cheng fo, cheng zhong cheng xiao, zhong gui Huang gong*). It is said that this incident transformed the courtesan. When the rebels besieged the Ming capital, she had already been married to an official and moved there as his concubine. She told her husband: "If you want to become a martyr, I am willing to hang myself first." But he would not listen to her.[94]

The unreliability of this famous story aside, in the post-1644 years, any literatus would immediately recognize the courtesan in this widely-circulated anecdote as Gu Mei (1619-1664), one of the most famous courtesans in late-Ming Nanjing. The disloyal official in this anecdote was apparently Gong Dingzi (1615-1673), an aspiring official who failed to kill himself upon the fall of Beijing but instead served in the governments of the rebel leader Li Zicheng and then the Qing. This anecdote also recalls Huang's deeds in prison between his capture by the Manchus and his heroic death. The contrast between the loyalist Huang Daozhou and the turncoat Gong Dingzi, mediated and articulated by the courtesan Gu Mei in this story, perpetuates the double-binary of moral-loyal versus immoral-disloyal. Through the particular catchword *zhongxiao* from Gu Mei's mouth, Huang Daozhou's indifference to sexual distraction is linked to his moral-political accomplishments as a Confucian man. During the Ming-Qing transition, *zhongxiao* appeared frequently in literati writing as a

general language of praise for outstanding moral-political performance. It signified the most admirable Confucian manly qualities. As the famous loyalist Yan Ermei writes in a poem depicting Jiading, where literati leaders had staged the most fearless anti-Qing resistance and hence suffered a massacre: "The land of chastity and righteousness esteems the ancient way/ Even women and girls bespeak *zhongxiao*!"[95] Ultimately, the *zhongxiao* principle represents the Confucian ideal society where order and propriety prevail in both public and personal lives and create a perfectly moral world.

Conclusion

This study has examined how *zhongxiao* played a central role in shaping the dynamics and consequences of late-Ming court politics. The "righteous" officials' disputes over the moral problems with *duoqing* and Heaven's punishment of it were symptomatic of a factionalized, dysfunctional government and indeed helped to bring it about. Literati-officials were not purely victims of the *zhongxiao* ethics. Regardless of whether they sincerely believed in it, they actively participated in deciding how to deploy it, how to manipulate it, and how to stretch and redefine its meanings. While using the language of *zhongxiao* could help individual literati-officials gain a moral high ground, it could also serve the ruler well in disciplining his subjects. I would not argue that the emperor did not believe in the ethics of *zhongxiao*; rather, he had the power and authority to define it expediently, as did literati-officials. The fluidity and richness of the notion of *zhongxiao* allowed it to be utilized and manipulated in political struggles by all sides, which in turn helped maintain and even

enhance its value in politics. Their re-inscription of this concept onto everyday politics helped this core value of the Confucian ideology to last for so long and to function so effectively.

For example, consider the historical, political and moral implications of literati-officials' debates over an old question: could *duoqing* be considered legitimate when certain conditions were met, for example, the subject of *duoqing* being a military official crucial for national security? It is true that in the Ming history there were *duoqing* cases that did not provoke vehement protest; they were cited later as precedents to justify *duoqing* orders. But *duoqing* was *never* the ideal; the literal meaning of this word—"cutting short mourning"—carries negative connotations, serving to promote its opposite. For example, Yang Sichang's son bitterly challenged his father's attackers: "Who would want to risk violating the ethical requirement by complying with a *duoqing* order?!"[96] The uproar caused by Yang Sichang's *duoqing*, therefore, did not necessarily result from late-Ming officials' misunderstanding of *duoqing* rules.[97] Rather, the *zhongxiao* ideal stood firm and could always serve as a powerful weapon of control and attack, making *duoqing* cases extremely vulnerable to criticism.

A trickier question is whether private matters should be brought into political debates—a difficult issue encountered by Huang Daozhou and his fellow advocates of *zhongxiao*. Some suggest that Huang Daozhou could not have won the debate with the emperor because he applied the principle of filiality with a double standard to Zheng Man and Yang Sichang.[98] I would argue this view overlooks the complexity of the ethical charges against Zheng Man: the attackers understood the political effectiveness of sexualizing a case of filial violation: it transformed the case into a broader and more volatile one. The *zhongxiao*

discourse and the discourse of gender propriety overlapped under the same moral framework, making a stronger case for political probing into officials' domestic lives. But such probing was met with resistance, partly because a virtuous Confucian man would hope to avoid discussing matters such as sexual behavior and domestic disputes, and partly because indeed it was difficult to completely disentangle literati gendered virtues and the *zhongxiao* requirement. The reluctance of some officials to discuss gender and sexual morality—despite the tendency of all parties in late-Ming politics to deploy the rhetoric of *zhongxiao*—urges us to examine carefully how political taboos and scandals were defined differently to serve specific purposes as well as the broader, long-term impacts of politicizing morality. The fluidity of the *zhongxiao* concept and its intersection with multiple moral requirements for literati-officials shows that moralism was never the same; it was a cumulative and multi-faceted experience for political elites in late-imperial China. In addition, moralism could metamorphose into various forms in and outside "high politics," in historical writing, and in socio-cultural practices spreading among the general populace for reasons that the elite could not fully control.[99] History never "ends" in the Confucian moral universe, and dynastic cycles do not simply repeat the same story of moral rise and decline.

Glossary

aijing 愛敬

bianxiu 編修

"bu ru Zheng Man" 不如鄭鄤

Cai Yuqing 蔡玉卿

Chen wei wenzhang bu ru Zheng Man 臣謂文章不如鄭鄤

Chen Xinjia 陳新甲

Chen Zilong 陳子龍

Cheng sheng cheng fo, cheng zhong cheng xiao, zhong gui Huang gong 成聖成佛，成忠成孝，終歸黃公

Chushan shi 出山詩

Cui Chengxiu 崔呈秀

Donglin 東林

Du Jie 杜岕

duoqing 奪情

duoqing ru ge 奪情入閣

duoqing shijie 奪情世界

e 惡

Fan Jingwen 范景文

Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹

Fang Bao 方苞

Fang Xiaoru 方孝孺

Feng Yuanbiao 馮元飆

Fu Chaoyou 傅朝佑

Fuzi zhi dao zhongxiao er yi. 夫子之道忠孝而已

Gong Dingzi 龔鼎孳

Gu Mei 顧眉

Gong zui bu ke you, si zui bu ke wu. 公罪不可無, 私罪不可有

Hong Chengchou 洪承疇

Huang Daozhou 黃道周

jielu shoumu 結廬守墓

junzi 君子

Kongzi zi yun ciling wu bu ru Zaiyu. 孔子自云辭令吾不如宰予

Liu Zongzhou 劉宗周

lingchi 凌遲

Mao Wenlong 毛文龍

Ni Yuanlu 倪元璐

Qian Qianyi 錢謙益

qi mu chushan 棄墓出山

Qian Longxi 錢龍錫

Qiu zhongchen yu xiaozi 求忠臣於孝子

San zui si chi qi bu ru shu 三罪四恥七不如疏

Shizhai 石齋

Sun Qifeng 孫奇逢

tongnian 同年

Wei Zhongixan 魏忠賢

Wu Zhiyu 吳執御

Xiaojing 孝經

xiaoren 小人

xiaozhi 孝治

Xie Xuelong 解學龍

Xu Xi 許曦

Xue Guoguan 薛國觀

wanren or *zhiren* 完人／至人

Wen Tiren 溫體仁

Wen Zhenmeng 文震孟

Weng Wanda 翁萬達

wulun jin jue 五倫盡絕

Yan Ermei 閻爾梅

yandang 閹黨

Yang Bo 楊博

Yang He 楊鶴

Yang Sichang 楊嗣昌

yidai wanren 一代完人

Yuan Chonghuan 袁崇煥

Zaiyu 宰予

zaixiang 宰相

Zhang Dai 張岱

Zhang Dian 張王典

Zhang Juzheng 張居正

Zheng Man 鄭鄤

Zhang Zhifa 張志發

zhong dao zuse 忠到足色

zhongxiao 忠孝

zhongxiao er zao xian huo 忠孝而遭顯禍

zhong-xiao liang quan 忠孝兩全

Bibliography

Chan, Alan K. and Sor-hoon Tan eds. *Filial Piety in Chinese Thought and History.* London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004.

Chen Ding. *Donglin liezhuan* (Biographies of the Donglin), in ed. Zhou Junfu*, Ming dai zhuanji congkan* (Collection of Ming biographies). Taipei: Mingwen shuju, 1991.

Chen Shengxi. *Ming-Qing yidai shi du jian* (Thoughts on the history of the Ming-Qing transition), enlarged edition. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006.

Chen Xushan. "Lun Huang Daozhou kang Qing jiuguo sixiang" (On Huang Daozhou's view on resisting the Qing and saving the country). In *Haixia liang'an Huang Daozhou xueshu yantaohui lunwen ji* (Anthology of the Mainland-Taiwan conference on Huang Daozhou, hereafter *Haixia liang'an*), 191-99. Dongshan: 2011.

--. "Li chao wu bai tian: Huang Daozhou di san ci ru chao wei guan pingshu" (Five hundred days in court: A study of Huang Daozhou's third periods of service in the government). In *Haixia liang'an*, 249-55.

Chen Zhiping. "Nanming kun ju yu Huang Daozhou jingshen" (The difficult situation of the southern Ming and Huang Daozhou's spirit). In *Haixia liang'an*, no page number.

Chen Zilong. *Chen Zilong zizhuan nianpu* (Biographical chronology of Chen Zilong by himself), in *Chen Zilong shiji* (The Collection of the poetry of Chen Zilong). Shanghai: Shanghai guji chunbanshe, 2006.

Dardess, John. *Blood and History in China: The Donglin Faction and Its Repression, 1620-1627*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.

Fan, Shuzhi. *Wan Ming shi: 1573-1644* (History of the late Ming). 2 volumes. Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe. 2005.

--."Donglin shuyuan de shitai fenxi: 'Donglin dang' lun zhiyi" (Historicizing the Donglin Academy: on the meaning of "Donglin dang"). *Zhongguo shehui kexue* (Chinese Social Sciences), 2001 (2): 188-208.

Fang Bao. *Wangxi xiansheng wenji* (The collection of the essays of Wangxi) in *Wangxi xiansheng quanji* (The complete collection of works of Wangxi). *Sibu beiyao* edition.

Fukumoto Masakazu. *Ming matsu Shin sho* (The late Ming and early Qing) *Vol. II*. Kyoto: Douhousha chuppan, 1993.

Holzman, Donald. "The Place of Filial Piety in Ancient China." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118:2 (Apr. – June 1998): 185-99.

Huang Daozhou. *Huang Zhangpu wenxuan* (The selected essays of Huang Daozhou). Taipei: Taiwan datong shuju.

--. *Huang shizhai xiansheng wenji* (The collection of the essays of Huang Daozhou). *Xu xiu Siku quanshu* edition.

--. *Huang Shizhai xiansheng chidu* (The collection of the letters of Huang Daozhou). Reprint. Shanghai: shangwu yinshuguan, Republican period.

--. *Xiaojing ji zhuan* (Annotated edition of *The Book of Filial Piety*), 1643. Reprint. *Meiguo Hafo daxue Hafo-Yanjing tushuguan cang zhongwen shanben huikan* (Collection of Chinese rare books at Harvard-Yenching Library), Vol. 1. Beijing & Guilin: Shangwu yinshuguan & Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 2003.

Huang, Ray. *1587, A Year of No Significance: the Ming Dynasty in Decline*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1981.

Ju Mingku, *Zaihai yu Mingdai zhengzhi* (Natural disasters and politics during the Ming dynasty). Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2011.

Knapp, Keith. *Selfless Offspring: Filial Children and Social Order in Medieval China.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.

Kutcher, Norman. *Mourning in Late Imperial China: Filial Piety and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Lai Xiaoyun. "Cong Huang Daozhou shu *Xiaojing* lun qi shufa yishu*"* (A study of Huang Daozhou's calligraphy through his renditions of *The Book of Filial Piety*). MA thesis, National Taiwan University, 2004.

Lee, Cheuk Yin. "Emperor Chengzu and Imperial Filial Piety of the Ming Dynasty." In *Filial Piety in Chinese Thought and History,* eds. Alan K. L. Chan and Sor-hoon Tan, 141-53. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004.

Liu, Tzu-chien. *Ouyang Xiu de zhixue yu congzheng* (Ouyang Xiu's philosophy and political career). Hong Kong: Xiya yanjiusuo, 1963.

Liu Zhengcheng. *Zhongguo shufa quanji* (The complete collection of Chinese calligraphic works) vol. 56 *Mingdai bian Huang Daozhou (fu Cai Yuqing*) (The Ming Dynasty: Huang Daozhou [and his wife Cai Yuqing]). Beijing: Rongbaozhai, 1994.

Lu, Miaw-fen. *Xiaozhi tianxia:* Xiaojing *yu jinshi zhongguo de zhengzhi yu wenhua* (Governing by filial piety*: the Book of Filial Piety* and early-modern Chinese politics and culture). Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan, 2011.

--. "Zuowei yishixing wenben de *Xiaojing*: Ming-Qing shiren *Xiaojing* shijian de ge'an yanjiu" (The *Classic of Filial Piety* as a ritual text: some case studies on the practice of Ming-Qing scholars). *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindai shi yanjiusuo jikan* (Journal of the Institute of Modern History, Academic Sinica) 60 (2008): 1-42.

--. "Religious Dimensions of Filial Piety as Developed in Late Ming Interpretations of the *Xiaojing*." *Late Imperial China* 27:2 (Dec. 2006): 1-37.

--. "Wan Ming shiren lun *Xiaojing* yu zhengzhi jiaohua" (Late Ming scholars' interpretations of *Xiaojing* [*Classic of Filial Piety*] and their political implications). *Taida wenshi zhexue bao* (Journal of literature, history and philosophy of the National Taiwan University) 61 (2004): 223-60.

Lu, Weijing, *True to Her Word: the Faithful Maiden Cult in Late Imperial China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.

Miller, Harry. *State versus Gentry in Late Ming Dynasty China, 1572-1644*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Struve, Lynn. *A Voice from the Ming-Qing Cataclysm: China in Tigers' Jaws*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Sun Chengze. *Chunming meng yu lu* (Remnants of dreams in Beijing). Hong Kong: Longmen shudian, 1976.

Sun Qifeng. *Xiafeng xiansheng ji* (The collection of works of Sun Qifeng). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004.

Theiss, Janet M. *Disgraceful Matters: the Politics of Chastity in Eighteenth-Century China*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2004.

Wang Tianyou. *Wan Ming Donglin dangyi* (On the Donglin faction of the late Ming). Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1991.

Wen Zhenmeng. *Wen Wensu gong riji* (The diary of Wen Zhenmeng). National Library of China, rare book collection, microfilm.

Wenyuan ge siku quanshu. Reprint. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1983.

Xia Xie. *Ming Tongjian* (Comprehensive history of the Ming). Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1998.

Xiao Mu. *Jingfu lei gao* (The manuscript of Jingfu). Hefei: Huangshan shushe, 1992.

Xin Deyong. "Ji Nan Ming keben *Xicao qiu si*" (*Xi cao qiu si*, a collection of poems published in the Southern Ming dynasty). *Yanjing xuebao* (Yenching Journal of Chinese Studies), 18 (2005): 69-109.

Xu Hongzu. *Xu Xiake youji* (The travel diaries of Xu Hongzu). Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2010.

Yan Ermei. *Baida shanren shi* (The collection of poetry of Yan Ermei), in compl. Zhang Xiangwen, *Yan Gugu quanji* (The complete collection of works of Yan Ermei). Beijing: Zhongguo di xue suo, 1922.

Yang Haiying. *Hong Chengchou yu Ming-Qing yindai yanjiu* (Hong Chengchou and the Ming-Qing transition). Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2006.

--. "Longwu zhengquan de zhongxing zhanlue jiqi pomie—guanyu Longwu 'bing fa wu lu' shoufu Nanjing jihua de yanjiu" (The restoration strategy of the Longwu regime and its failure: a study of Longwu's plan to recover Nanjing from five directions"). In *Gu shi wen cun, Ming-Qing* (Historical research: Ming-Qing period) *juan* II, ed. Zhongguo shehui kexue yanjiuyuan. Beiing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2006.

Yang Sichang. *Yang Sichang ji* (The collection of works of Yang Sichang). Ed. Liang Songcheng. Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 2005.

--. Yang Wenruo xiansheng ji (The collection of works of Yang Sichang). Siku jinhui shu congkan edition.

Ye Jun. *Zheng Man yanjiu: jian lun Ming dai hou qi dangzheng* (A study of Zheng Man and late-Ming factionalism). Ph.D. diss., Fudan University, 2002.

Zeng Wuyue, "Tiandihui feng Huang Daozhou wei jiaofu kao" (A study of the Tiandihui's worshipping of Huang Daozhou). In *Haixia liang'an*, 288-97.

Zhang Tingyu et al., comp., *Ming shi* (History of the Ming). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.

Zhang Xiangming. "A Preliminary Study of the Punishment of Political Speech in the Ming Period." *Ming Studies* 62 (Nov. 2010): 56-91.

Zhang, Ying. "Morality and Politics during the Ming-Qing Transition." Ph. D diss., University of Michigan, 2010.

Zhang Yonggang. *Donglin dangyi yu wan Ming wenxue huodong* (The Donglin faction and late-Ming literature). Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2009.

Zhang Yuxing. "Ming-Qing yidai zhi ji zhong-er xianxiang tanze" (A research on the loyalists and collaborators during the Ming-Qing transition). *Qingshi luncong* (Symposium on the Qing history) (2003-2004): 47-92.

Zhangpu xianzhi (Zhangpu gazetteer). Ed. Shi Xiwei. Guangxu edition. Reprint. 1936.

Zheng Chenyin and Tang Yunzhu. "Huang Daozhou yu *Xiaojing* de lishi yuhe" (The historic encounter of Huang Daozhou and the *Book of Filial Piety*). *Xiaogan xueyuan xuebao* (Journal of Xiaogan University) 30:5 (2010).

Zheng Man. *Miyang caotang shiji* (Collection of poetry from Miyang's Hall). Siku jinhui shu congkan edition.

--. *Miyang caotang wenji* (Collection of essays from Miyang's Hall). Siku jinhui shu congkan edition.

Most dates appear in the text according to the Chinese lunar calendar in the following format: reign period and year, lunar month, and lunar day (year on western solar calendar in parentheses).

[1] Xu Hongzu, "Dian you riji qi" (The travel diaries from Yunnan 7), in *Xu Xiake youji* (The travel diaries of Xu Xiake), 299.

[2] The other official was Fang Xiaoru. Sun Qifeng, "Lin shu chao xu" (Preface to my son Lin's study notes), in *Xiafeng xiansheng ji* (The collection of works of Sun Qifeng), 121.

[3] For example, Chen Xushan, "Lun Huang Daozhou kang Qing jiuguo sixiang" (On Huang Daozhou's view on resisting the Qing and saving the country), 191; Zeng Wuyue, "Tiandihui feng Huang Daozhou wei jiaofu kao" (A study of the Tiandihui's worshipping of Huang Daozhou), 288; Zhang Yuxing, "Ming-Qing yidai zhi ji zhong-er xianxiang tanze" (A research on the loyalists and collaborators during the Ming-Qing transition), 55.

[4] Lee Cheuk Yin, "Emperor Chengzu and Imperial Filial Piety of the Ming Dynasty."

[5] Ibid., 193.

[6] Donald Holzman, "The Place of Filial Piety in Ancient China." For a more detailed historical review of this question, see Norman Kutcher, *Mourning in Late Imperial China: Filial Piety and the State*, chap. 1.

[7] A term referring to a strand of Confucianism "emphasizing that heaven, earth, and people were mutually interlinked and depended on each other." Keith Knapp, *Selfless Offspring: Filial Children and Social Order in Medieval China*, 126 fn. 5.

[8] The concept is created by Kutcher, referring to the Chinese notion that "loyalty to the state emanated from devotion of young to old." Kutcher, *Mourning in Late Imperial China*, 2.

[9] Yang Haiying, *Hong Chengchou yu Ming-Qing yindai yanjiu*, esp. chap. 5. Miaw-fen Lu's critique of Kutcher's interpretation makes the same point. See her book *Xiaozhi tianxia:* Xiaojing *yu jinshi zhongguo de zhengzhi yu wenhua* (Governing by filial piety*: the Book of Filial Piety* and early-modern Chinese politics and culture), 217-18.

[10] Weijing Lu has pointed out the connection between late-Ming factional politics, autocracy and extreme performance of moral heroism in chapter 1 of her book, *True to Her Word*.

[11] Liu Zongzhou, then governor of the Imperial Prefecture of Shuntian, spelled out this observation in a memorial in the fall of Chongzhen 2. Xia Xie, *Ming Tongjian* (Comprehensive history of the Ming), 2261. Yang Haiying summarizes this problem of Chongzhen's well in *Hong Chengchou*, 16.

[12] Zhang Xiangming's study of the experiences of memorializing officials summarizes the general pattern. Zhang, "A Preliminary Study of the Punishment of Political Speech in the Ming Period."

[13] The definition of "Donglin" is a very complex issue. See John Dardess, *Blood and History in China*; Fan Shuzhi, "Donglin shuyuan de shitai fenxi: 'Donglin dang' lun zhiyi" (Historicizing the Donglin Academy: on the meaning of "Donglin dang"), and chapter 6 of his *Wan Ming shi* (History of the late Ming) Vol. 1, 580-627; Harry Miller, *State versus Gentry in Late Ming Dynasty China*. See multiple Donglin lists collected in Zhang Yonggang, *Donglin dangyi yu wan Ming wenxue huodong* (The Donglin faction and late-Ming literature), Appendix.

[14] Miaw-fen Lu, "Zuowei yishixing wenben de *Xiaojing*: Ming-Qing shiren *Xiaojing* shijian de ge'an yanjiu" (The *Classic of Filial Piety* as a ritual text: some case studies on the practice of Ming-Qing scholars). For discussion about the spiritual connotations and religious functions of the text, see Lu's book *Xiaozhi tianxia*, esp. chaps. 4 & 5, and her article "Religious Dimensions of Filial Piety as Developed in Late Ming Interpretations of the *Xiaojing*."

[15] Miaw-fen Lu, "Zuowei yishixing wenben," 29-34. Also see Zheng Chenyin and Tang Yunzhu, "Huang Daozhou yu *Xiaojing* de lishi yuhe" (The historic encounter of Huang Daozhou and the *Book of Filial Piety*); Lai Xiaoyun, "Cong Huang Daozhou shu *Xiaojing* lun qi shufa yishu" (A study of Huang Daozhou's calligraphy through his renditions of *The Book of Filial Piety*); and Miawo-fen Lu, *Xiaozhi tianxia*, 196-201.

[16] Miaw-fen Lu, "Wan Ming shiren lun *Xiaojing* yu zhengzhi jiaohua" (Late Ming scholars' interpretations of *Xiaojing* [*Classic of Filial Piety*] and their political implications).

[17] Hong Si, "Huangzi zhuan" (Biography of Huang Daozhou) in *Huang Zhangpu wenxuan* [hereafter *HZPWX*] (The selected essays of Huang Daozhou), 365.
[18] Huang Daozhou, "Jiu Zheng Man shu" (Memorial to rescue Zheng Man) in *HZPWX*, 38; Zhuang Qichou, *Zhangpu Huang xiansheng nianpu* (Biographical chronology of Huang Daozhou), 413.

[19] Zhuang Qichou, *Zhangpu Huang xiansheng nianpu*, 414-15.

[20] *MS,* 7042-45.

[21] *MS*, 6599.

[22] Yang Haiying, "Longwu zhengquan de zhongxing zhanlue jiqi pomie—guanyu Longwu 'bing fa wu lu' shoufu Nanjing jihua de yanjiu" (The restoration strategy of the Longwu regime and its failure: a study of Longwu's plan to recover Nanjing from five directions). Most blame the lack of support from military leaders such as Zheng Zhilong for Huang's failed expedition, but Chen Zhiping argues that the Longwu southern Ming did not have the capacity to launch successful campaigns and that Huang's efforts only represented literati-officials' idealism. Chen Zhiping, "Nanming kun ju yu Huang Daozhou jingshen" (The difficult situation of the southern Ming and Huang Daozhou's spirit); Lynn Struve has included the translation of Huang Daozhou's memorials regarding his expedition in chap. 8 "'This Foundering Old Horse": A Righteous Minister's Last Crusade," in *A Voice from the Ming-Qing Cataclysm*, 122-40.

[23] Most revealing is the biography of Huang Daozhou in *Ming shi*, where the biographer points out none of Huang Daozhou's memorials prompted the emperor to take specific measures. *MS*, 6596.

[24] Fan Zhongyan quoted in Tzu-chien Liu, *Ouyang Xiu de zhixue yu congzheng* (Ouyang Xiu's philosophy and political career), 143.

[25] *Zhangpu Huang xiansheng nianpu*, p. 414. The biography of Huang Daozhou in the gazetteer of his home in Zhangpu County echoes: "From a very young age, he had been following the principles of loyalty and filial piety dutifully. He left home only when going to offer his criticisms to the emperor; he returned home only to attend to the tombs." *Zhangpu xianzhi* (Zhangpu gazetteer),15.30b-31a.

[26] Huang Daozhou, "Fu dai yu xiong shu" (To my brother upon my arrest) in *Huang Shizhai xiansheng wenji* (hereafter *HSZXSWJ*) (The collection of the essays of Huang Daozhou), 127-28.

[27] *Zhangpu Huang xiansheng nianpu*, 415.

[28] See the usage in, for example, his poem "Upon Leaving the Mountain" ("chushan shi"), Liu Zhengcheng, *Zhongguo shufa quanji* (The complete collection of Chinese calligraphic works) vol. 56 *Mingdai bian Huang Daozhou (fu Cai Yuqing*) (The Ming Dynasty: Huang Daozhou [and his wife Cai Yuqing]), 317-18.

[29] "The master" refers to Huang. Hong Si, "Shouwen xu" (Preface to the Collection) in *HSZXWJ*, 2.

[30] Historians still debate about why the emperor eliminated Yuan. For example, see Chen Shengxi, *Ming-Qing yidai shi du jian* (Thoughts on the history of the Ming-Qing transition), 199-261.

[31] *MS*, 6485-86.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Huang Daozhou, "Yu Qiao Kepin" (To Qiao Kepin) in *Huang Shizhai xiansheng chidu* (The collection of the letters of Huang Daozhou), the third letter, no page number.

[34] Chongzhen's response is cited in Hong Si's footnote to Huang Daozhou's next memorial, "Jiu Qian Longxi" (To rescue Qian Longxi) (Chongzhen 4/1/18), 4.

[35] In the Ming this position was abolished by Taizu. But it was very common for literati to employ official titles used in earlier dynasties to name contemporary officials in their writing.

[36] Huang Daozhou, "Jiu Qian Longxi" Chongzhen 4/1/18), 4.

[37] Huang Daozhou emphasizes this point throughout his work on the *Book of Filial Piety*, esp. his annotations on the eighth chapter of this classic, "Xiaozhi zhang" (chapter on governing by filial piety). Huang Daozhou, *Xiaojing ji zhuan* (Annotated edition of *The Book of Filial Piety*), chap. 2, 34-41.

[38] The emperor's response is cited in Hong Si's notes to this memorial, 7-8. Qian Longxi was released in Chongzhen 4/5. *MS*, 6486-87.

[39] Huang Daozhou, "Jiu Qian Longxi" (Chongzhen 4/1/18), 4.

[40] Huang Daozhou, "Jiu Qian Longxi" (Chongzhen 4/1/27), 6.

[41] Huang Daozhou, "Ni tai rong lan qing su du yi zu junxu shu" (A memorial on meeting the needs of the military by reducing unnecessary expenditures and screening the officials), *HZPWX*,16.

[42] Wen Zhenmeng's diary shows a strong sense of alarm and urgency. He left the capital and never returned. *Wen Wensu gong riji* (The diary of Wen Zhenmeng), entries Chongzhen 8/8-11 (1635), no page number.

[43] Yang Sichang's father, Yang He, the former president of Board of War, died in late Chongzhen 8 (1635); his stepmother died in Chongzhen 9/9 (1636). See Yang Sichang, "Jing wen zhaoming feichang lixue kongci shu" (A memorial to reject the appointment painfully submitted upon hearing the shocking call from the court), *Yang Sichang ji* (The collection of works of Yang Sichang), 9.194.

[44] *Ming tongjian*, 2352-53. Zheng Man, *Miyang caotang shiji* (Collection of poetry from Miyang's Hall), 632.

[45] Wang Tianyou, *Wan Ming Donglin dangyi* (On the Donglin faction of the late Ming), chap. 4; Miller, *State versus Gentry,* chap. 1. Kutcher offers detailed accounts of the best-known *duoqing* cases in the Ming, including the ones involving Zhang Juzheng and Yang Sichang, in *Mourning in Late Imperial China*, chap. 2. But I disagree with some of his observations. See "Conclusion" and fn 97 of this article.

[46] Huang Daozhou, "Ni lun Yang Sichang bu ju liang sang shu" (A memorial to criticize Yang Sichang's failure to observe mourning terms for his parents), *HZPWX,* 24-28.

[47] The first memorial submitted after his father passed away was in Chongzhen 8/10, "Chen fu qi chen shen can shu" (A memorial on the sorrow of losing my father) in Yang Sichang, *Yang Wenruo xiansheng ji* (The collection of works of Yang Sichang), 134-36.

[48] Yang Sichang, "Weichen yi ru jinei shu" (A memorial to report entry into the capital area) in *Yang Sichang ji,* 9. 197-99.

[49] For discussions on this, see Chen Xushan, "Li chao wu bai tian: Huang Daozhou di san ci ru chao wei guan pingshu" (Five hundred days in court: A study of Huang Daozhou's third period of service in the government), 249; Ju Mingku, *Zaihai yu Mingdai zhengzhi* (Natural disasters and politics during the Ming dynasty), 360.

[50] Huang Daozhou, "Ni lun Yang Sichang bu ju liang sang shu."

[51] Seventy years before, Zhang Juzheng's attackers had made a connection between *duoqing* and disasters. Ju, *Zaihai yu Mingdai zhengzhi*, chap. 5.

[52] *Ming tongjian*, 2360.

[53] Three memorials on this subject: "Qiu yan shengxing shu" (A memorial on seeking suggestions and reducing punishments) (Chongzhen 10/6), "San zui si chi qi bu ru shu" (On my three faults, four shameful actions, and seven defects) (Chongzhen 10/6), and "Jiu Zheng Man shu" (A memorial to defend Zheng Man) (Chongzhen 10/7).

[54] Huang Daozhou, "Qiu yan shengxing shu," in *HZPWX,* 30-34.

[55] For an analysis of these novels, see Ying Zhang, "Morality and Politics," chap. 3.

[56] Huang Daozhou, "Gongyu Huang gong Daozhou jiu Zheng Man shu" (Huang Daozhou's memorial to defend Zheng Man) in *Miyang caotang wenji*, 16.502.

[57] The Chongzhen emperor cited in Huang Daozhou's memorial, "Qiu yan sheng xing shu," 30.

[58] Again, charges against Qian Qianyi were fabricated by his factional enemies. Sun Chengze, *Chunming meng yu lu* (Remnants of dreams in Beijing), 272-75.

[59] Huang Daozhou, "Seven Defects," 36.

[60] Zhang Dai pointed this out clearly in the biography of Huang Daozhou. *Shiguishu hou ji* (The subsequent collection of writings stored in a stone case), 628.

[61] Cited in Huang Daozhou's next memorial, "Jiu Zheng Man shu", 37.

[62] Ye Jun also points out the emperor's manipulation of this case. Ye Jun, *Zheng Man yanjiu: jian lun Ming dai hou qi dangzheng* (A study of Zheng Man and late-Ming factionalism).

[63] Chen Ding, *Donglin liezhuan* (Biographies of the Donglin), 622.

[64] Sun Chengze, *Chunming meng yu lu*, 389.

[65] Ibid. Xiang Yu also submitted a memorial of similar content, see Ji Liuqi, *Ming ji bei lue*, 222.

[66] *Ming tongjian* documents that another grand secretary, He Fengsheng, drafted this memorial for Zhang Zhifa. *Ming tongjian,* 2371.

[67] Sun Chengze, *Chunming meng yu lu,* 390.

[68] Ibid, 390-91.

[69] Chen documents this suggestion in his chronological autobiography. Chen Zilong, *Chen Zilong zizhuan nianpu (*Biographical chronology of Chen Zilong by himself), 656. A scholar of the late Qing, Xiao Mu, comments that Chen's documentation of the Zheng Man case made a hasty, shortsighted judgment without verifying the facts. Xiao Mu, *Jingfu lei gao* (The manuscript of Jingfu), 125.

[70] Zheng Man, *Tianshan zixu nianpu* (Biographical chronology of Zheng Man by himself) (hereafter *TSZXNP*) in *MYCTWJ*, 494.

[71] *MS,* 6636.

[72] Huang Daozhou, "Lun Yang Sichang shu" (Memorial on Yang Sichang) and "Lun Chen Xinjia shu" (Memorial on Chen Xinjia) in *HZPWX,* 52-56 and 54-57.

[73] There is no scholarly consensus on why Huang Daozhou so adamantly opposed the promotion. Some argue that the alleged connection between Yang Sichang and the former *yandang* was the key reason. See Xin Deyong, "Ji nan Ming keben *Xicao qiu si*" (*Xi cao qiu si*, a collection of poems published in the Southern Ming dynasty), 75-81. Xin argues that the anti-*yandang* effort was the true reason of Huang Daozhou's rigorous pursuit of Yang Sichang's *duoqing* case.

[74] Huang Daozhou, "Lun Yang Sichang shu," 52.

[75] The official history documents that Yang Bo had not completed the mourning period before assuming the official position in the military campaign. *MS*, 5657.

[76] Huang Daozhou, "Lun Yang Sichang shu," 52.

[77] *MS,* 5244-52.

[78] For a concise description of this case and how it triggered factionalism, see Ray Huang, *1587, A Year of No Significance: the Ming Dynasty in Decline*, chap. 1.

[79] For the details in Cui's case, see *MS*, 7848.
[80] *MS*, 6725-27. Yang He eventually died there.

[81] *MS*, 6509. Earlier memorials submitted by Yang Sichang to petition for his father's life can be found in Yang Sichang, *Yang Wenruo xiansheng ji*, 4.85-86.

[82] Sun Chengze, *Chunming meng yu lu,* 393.

[83] Ibid.

[84] *The Analects*, 11:3.

[85] Ibid., 17:21.

[86] Sun Chengze, *Chunming meng yu lu,* 393-94.

[87] Ibid., 394.

[88] Ibid., 394-95.

[89] Ibid., 395.

[90] Fukumoto Masakazu argues that by executing Zheng Man, Chongzhen was trying to assure Yang Sichang of his trust. Fukumoto, *Ming matsu Shin sho* (The late Ming and early Qing) *Vol. II*, 66.

[91] Huang Daozhou, "Zheng Miyang nianxiong ji yuanpei Zhou ruren muzhi" (Epitaph of my elder brother Zheng Man and his wife Madam Zhou), in *MYCTWJ*, 508-09. Note that *nianxiong* here literally means "elder brother" but was a common term used to formally address men who passed the civil service examinations in the same year.

[92] Ibid.

[93] For example, Huang Daozhou writes: "Why doesn't the *Book of Filial Piety* explicitly discuss the principle of employing officials? Because the spirit of *jing-ai* is the essence of working with officials." Huang Daozhou, *Xiaojing ji zhuan*, 49.

[94] Fang Bao, "Shizhai Huang gong yishi" (Anecdotes about Huang Daozhou) in *Wangxi xiansheng wenji* (The complete collection of works of Wangxi), 9.3a-4a.

[95] Yan Ermei, "Guo Jiading yu Kang Xiaofan" (Encountering Kang Xiaofan in Jiangding), in *Baida shanren shi* (The collection of poetry of Yan Ermei), 2.16b.

[96] Yang Shansong's footnote on his father's memorial, *Yang Wenruo xiansheng ji*, 136.

[97] Kutcher, *Mourning in Late Imperial China*, chap. 2, esp. 71. I would argue that his fn. 133 and 135 actually support my view.

[98] Xin Deyong, "Ji Nan Ming keben *Xicao qiu si,*" 16.

[99] Weijing Lu's analysis of the spread of the faithful maiden cult in *True to Her Word* is an excellent example. Janet Theiss' book on female chastity in the Qing offers a good case study to show the similarities and differences in the ideas and practices of female chastity under different emperors, without assuming a cyclic or linear course of development at either national or local levels. Theiss, *Disgraceful Matters*.