

The Source and Meaning of Ta-Chen 大眞,
The Dynastic Title of P'u-Hsien
Wan-Nu 蒲鮮萬奴

BY

Hirosato IWAI

CONTENTS

- I Foreword
- II Ta-Chên, the Dynastic Title of Wan-Nu
- III The Source and Meaning of Ta-Chên
- IV The Relation between Wang Kuei 王濬 and Wan-Nu
- V Conclusion

I Foreword

As soon as the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 of the Chin 金 dynasty, under the increasing pressure of the rising Mongolians, moved his capital from Chung-tu 中都 (the present Peking 北京) to Pien-liang 汴梁 (the present K'ai-fêng 開封), the influence of the Chin dynasty in Liao-tung 遼東 or Manchuria rapidly commenced to wane. The Mongols, eager to subjugate China proper, could not afford to engage themselves in establishing a firm footing in the Liao-tung region. This naturally led to a series of attempts to found an independent state in this region.

The rebellion of Yeh-lü Liu-ko 耶律留哥 was the first of these. P'u-hsien Wan-nu 蒲鮮萬奴 who was ordered to proceed to suppress the rebels was only another general burning with a similar ambition.

As the earliest study of the facts of P'u-hsien Wan-nu published in Japan, the present writer would like to recommend *A Study of the Ruins of the Wan-yen*

完顏 *Castle*⁽¹⁾ by Prof. OGAWA, formerly of the Kyôto Imperial University. The purpose of the study, however, consisted chiefly in explaining from an archaeological standpoint the topography of the Chien-tao 間島 district during the Chin and Yuân dynasties; and in his study of Wan-nu 萬奴, Dr. OGAWA, I regret to say, availed himself of rather later materials only, such as the *Yuân-shih-hsin-pien* 元史新編 by WEI Yüan 魏源, and the *Shih-chia-chai-yang-hsin-lu* 十駕齋養新錄 by CH'ÏEN Ta-hsin 錢大昕. For instance, his treatment of the dynastic title which I am to discuss in this paper, is but a faithful uncritical reprint of these materials. His services, however, as a Japanese pioneer in the study of P'u-hsien Wan-nu deserve our profound respect.

The next work on Wan-nu that appeared was an epoch-making paper. I refer to *A Study of the Facts concerning P'u-hsien Wan-nu*⁽²⁾ by the late Dr. YANAI, my former teacher. Later on, this was published, after a careful revision, with the new title *Tôshinkoku Kyôiki Kô* 東眞國疆域考, *A Study of the Dominion of Tung-chên-kuo* 東眞國).⁽³⁾ It is of course needless to say that Professor YANAI was a profound scholar on the history of Mongolia and of the Yuân dynasty, a man with very moderate views, and one of the greatest authorities in the field of Oriental history. These two works and his still later study *Essays on the Raids of Manchuria by Chinggis Khan*⁽⁴⁾ constitute the outstanding monuments which we junior students

(1) Takuji OGAWA, Dr. Sc.: *Studies of Chinese Historical Geography* 理學博士小川琢治著「支那歴史地理研究」, pp. 369-375. *Wan-yen Kojôshi Kô* 完顏古城址考. It was originally an address delivered at the Kyôto Shigaku-kwai (Kyôto Historical Society) on Feb. 11th, 1909, entitled *The Ruins of the Wan-yen Castle*, (*Wan-yen Jô no Koshi* 完顏城の古址) as a report of his investigation of the so-called Wan-yen Castle which, during his survey of the Chien-tao 間島 district, he had chanced to discover in October, 1907. This was printed in the second collection of the addresses delivered before the Society, published Sept., 1909, and also included in this work, published Sept., 1928.

(2) Watari YANAI: *P'u-hsien Wan-nu Jiseki Kô* 文學博士箭内互著「滿鮮萬奴事蹟考」, The Shigaku-zasshi, Vol. XXI, No. 2, Feb., 1910, pp. 180-197; No. 3, Mar., 1910, pp. 314-328; No. 5, May, 1910, pp. 504-520.

(3) W. YANAI, *Tôshin-koku Kyôiki Kô* 箭内博士「東眞國疆域考」, The Manchurian Historical Geography, Vol. II, No. 4, pp. 224-267.

(4) W. YANAI: *Chinggis Khan no Manshû Keiryaku ni Kwânsuru Ni San no Kenkyû* 箭内博士「成吉思汗の滿洲經略に關する二三の研究」, The Tôyô-gakuhô, Vol. IV, No. 2, pp. 197-210, June, 1914. Reprinted in his *Môkoshi Kenkyû* 蒙古史研究 (*Studies of Mongolian History*), pp. 33-52, Oct., 1930.

of Wan-nu should repeatedly refer to and look up to, to gain inspiration for further study.

A third who has undertaken to work on this subject is Dr. IKEYUCHI, my honoured teacher. He is at present looked up to as one of the greatest authorities of the history of Manchuria and Korea. With his profound scholarship and keen historical insight, he made free use of the materials he had found on the Korean side, and gave his judgment on this subject in his two papers—namely, ‘*On the Official Name of P'u-Hsien Wan-nu's Kingdom*’⁽¹⁾ and ‘*Manchuria in the Last Days of the Chin Dynasty*’⁽²⁾. These form valuable literature for a student of Manchuria at the close of the Chin dynasty and the beginning of the Yüan dynasty, or of the history of Korea at the same period, which he should read before anything else.

The present writer was most fortunate in having work under these two eminent professors above-mentioned, as he happened to take interest in the history of thought during the Yüan dynasty, and was a number of times enlightened under their personal guidance. Thus he came to peruse their masterpieces constantly and to be considerably benefited each time he read them; his indebtedness to their views is beyond measure. Therefore, he believes that he is the first to pay whole-hearted respect to them for their elaborate works and to recognize their merit. However, as the chief objective of their study in those days lay in elucidating historical geography, and their research was made when their materials were mostly limited to those connected with historical geography, their treatment of such a subject as a dynastic title—a name assumed for its literary meaning, not a name of the place from which the ruling family came—was not entirely free from inaccuracy in the light of recent research.

(1) Hiroshi IKEYUCHI, B. H.: *Hosen-Bando no Kokugô ni Tsuite*, 文學博士池内宏著「滿鮮萬奴の國號について」, The Tôyô-gakuhô, Vol. XII, No. 4, pp. 495-498, Dec., 1922.

(2) H. IKEYUCHI: *Kin Matsu no Manshû*, 池内博士「金末の滿洲」, 滿鮮地理歴史研究報告 Report of the Geographical and Historical Researches in Manchuria and Korea, No. 10, pp. 1-118.

This would demand much thinking in the light of the development of thought. They carried a controversy between them, and such a junior student as the present writer is fully aware of his inability to criticise their views. However, as this question stands, as it was taken up and left by the two professors, and both the *Tung-chên* 東眞 theory and the *Tung-hsia* 東夏 theory are still regarded as parallel; the Oriental historians in this country remain in the dark, not knowing how to choose between the two theories.⁽¹⁾ It is a great misfortune that Dr. YANAI's *Tung-chên* theory which I must deny now tends to be accepted not only in Japan, but in China also⁽²⁾, simply because he published it before the other, and he was the forerunner in the

(1) Sanjiro ICHIMURA, B. H.: *The Outline of Oriental History*, Revised Edition. (文學博士市村瓚次郎著「補訂東洋史要」) The rise of *Tung-chên-kuo* 東眞國 is discussed, pp. 255-256, July, 1923. Shôgo ODA: *The Mediaeval History of Korea* (小田省吾著「朝鮮中世史」) p. 203. Section 30 entitled "The Relations between Chin 金, Khitai 契丹, *Tung-chên* 東眞, and Mongolia" under Chap. XI entitled "Foreign Relations," discusses P'u-hsien Wan-nu 蒲鮮萬奴 of *Tung-hsia* 東夏. It is strange that the text should give *Tung-hsia* 東夏, while the title gives *Tung-chên* 東眞. Consequently the dynastic title is interchangeably *Tung-chên* 東眞 or *Tung-hsia* 東夏. 朝鮮史講座一般史 (*Lecture on Korean History: the General History: begun January 1923*) p. 206. 瀨野馬熊著「朝鮮中世史」 Umakuma SENO: *The Mediaeval History of Korea*, pp. 168-175. His view is precisely similar to Mr. ODA's, especially in connection with the dynastic title. 「朝鮮史大系」 (*The Outline of Korean History*) p. 170, Aug., 1927. Shôgo ODA: *A Shorter History of Korea* 小田省吾著「朝鮮小史」. Under Section 3 entitled *Kao-li and Mongolia*, the dynastic title of Wan-nu 萬奴 is asserted to be *Tung-chên* 東眞. The same author first follows the *Tung-hsia* theory and now adopts the *Tung-chên* theory. The reader is at a loss which to believe. The date of Wan-nu's independence will be discussed later in full detail. Yoshio MORITA: *Concerning the Locality of Nan-ching the Capital of Tung-chên-kuo and Nan-ching-wan-hu* 東眞國, 森田芳夫著「東眞國都南京及び南京萬戸の位置に就て」, The Keijô Teidai Shigakukwai-hô (Report of the Historical Society of the Keijô Imperial University), July 1, 1931.

(2) *Tz'ü-yüan* 辭源: ch'ên 辰, p. 100: lower column. Under *Tung-chên* 東眞, we find "This is the name of a state, meaning the Eastern Jurchins: in the last period of the Chin dynasty, P'u-hsien Wan-nu occupied Yen-chi-tao in the present Chi-lin Province and Kan-kyô-dô of Korea, and assumed the title of Emperor, adopting for his dynastic title *Tung-chên*. Later he was defeated by the Mongols. 國名, 即東方女眞之意, 金之季世, 蒲鮮萬奴據今吉林延吉道及朝鮮咸鏡道, 稱帝, 國號東眞, 後爲蒙古所滅." Here Dr. YANAI's theory is followed entire. 謝壽昌等著「中國古今地名大辭典」 (HSIEH Shou-chang and others: *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Chinese Place-Names*), p. 487. Under *Tung-chên-kuo* 東眞國, we find "This means the Eastern Jurchins; in the last period of the Chin dynasty, P'u-hsien Wan-nu conquered Yen-chi-tao in the present Chi-lin Province and Kan-kyô-dô in Korea and assumed the title of Emperor, adopting for his dynastic title *Tung-hsia* 東夏 or *Tung-chên* 東眞. Later he was defeated by the Mongols. 即東方女眞之意, 金之季世, 蒲鮮萬奴據今吉林延吉道及朝鮮咸鏡道, 稱帝, 國號東夏, 亦曰東眞, 後爲蒙古所滅." Here the two professors' views are collaterally adopted.

study of Wan-nu. So I deemed it the duty of a former student to correct his erroneous view. With much hard careful thinking, and availing myself of the materials newly secured during the last more than ten years and of my scanty knowledge, I finally came to feel confident that I had found the key with which to solve this difficult problem, and published in the *Tôyô-gakuhô* (March, 1932) a paper entitled *A Study of the Dynastic Title of P'u-hsien Wan-nu*. This present paper, with a few more new materials obtained since, only aims at elucidating the source and meaning of Ta-chên 大眞, giving neither the arguments of the two professors nor my own opinion on them.

II Ta-Chên 大眞, the Dynastic Title of Wan-Nu

Controversy has continually been going on as to the probable dynastic title of Wan-nu 萬奴.

The present writer asserts that neither Tung-chên 東眞 nor Tung-hsia 東夏 was the dynastic title of Wan-nu, he is confident that Wan-nu did not proclaim his dynastic title twice, and contends that the dynastic title of Wan-nu was Ta-chên, and none other. My argument is based on the fundamental materials of those days rendered almost complete by the later discovery of more new materials, and on the perfect agreement of the meaning of the dynastic title with the state policy of Wan-nu, which has been, I am convinced, quite definitely proved by the latest discovery of the biography of Wang Kuei 王澹, Premier to Wan-nu, who was the probable proposer of the title.

The basis of this question is no doubt the account in the Official Annals of T'ai-tsu 太祖 in the *Yüan-shih* 元史 compiled by SUNG Lien 宋濂 and others of the Ming dynasty.

“The 10th year (*i-hai* 乙亥) . . . In October (winter), P'u-hsien Wan-nu the *Hsüan-fu* 宣撫 (Pacification-Commissioner) of the Chin court occupied Liao-tung,

presumed to call himself T'ien-wang 天王 (Heavenly King), assuming Ta-chên 大眞 as his dynastic title and adopting T'ien-t'ai 天泰 as the name of his era."⁽¹⁾ The date corresponds to the 3rd year of Chên-yü 貞祐 under the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 of the Chin 金 dynasty, the 8th year of *Chia-ting* 嘉定 under the reign of the Emperor Ning-tsung 寧宗 of the Southern Sung 南宋 dynasty, the 2nd year of the Emperor Kao-tsung 高宗 of the Kao-li 高麗 dynasty, namely 1215 A.D. The accuracy of this date very fortunately admits of no doubt whatever, and the *Chin-shih* 金史 compiled by T'ò T'ò 脫脫 and others of the Yüan dynasty gives it so definitely that even the month and the day are designated. It is true that the compilers of the *Chin-shih* on purpose or by mistake omit the two all-important characters Ta-chên 大眞; but in view of the fact that they retain "adopting T'ien-t'ai 天泰 as the name of his era," it is absolutely certain that they recorded the same incident.

The Official Annals of the Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 in the *Chin-shih* read:

"On October the day *jên-tz'u* 壬子 (27th), the 3rd year of *Chên-yü* 貞祐, the rebel in Liao-tung named P'u-hsien Wan-nu presumed to proclaim a dynastic title (Ta-chên 大眞), adopting T'ien-t'ai 天泰 as the name of his era."⁽²⁾ I am quite confident that the original text which supplied this material surely contained the two characters 大眞. There are three outside records which powerfully endorse this material found in the histories of the Chin and Yüan dynasties, which I claim as my own latest discovery and which serve as a convenient vehicle in my argumentation.

(1) 明宋濂等撰「元史」卷一，太祖本紀，十九丁表。洪武版本。十年乙亥...冬十月，金宣撫蒲鮮萬奴，據遼東，僭稱天王，國號大眞，改元天泰。Hsüan-fu 宣撫 (pacification-commissioner) is the name of an official dating from the T'ang dynasty. On the occasion of waging a war of a serious nature, a Hsüan-fu was appointed from among the ministers by the Emperor. It was originally a military officer. The Southern Sung dynasty also had some Hsüan-fu who ranked below the Tu-tu 都督 (governor). The Yüan dynasty installed Hsüan-fu-shih 宣撫司 (Pacification Offices) in various districts, which were only local offices in the remote frontiers. The *Wên-hsien-t'ung-kao* 文獻通考 says "The Yüan-shuai 元帥 of the T'ang dynasty, its Tu-tu 都督 and the Hsüan-fu 宣撫 of the Sung dynasty were all the highest in the army and civil administration, who commanded the armies, and carried a conquest. They correspond to the Ta-chiang-chün 大將軍 (the Commander-in-chief) of both Han dynasties.

(2) 元脫脫等撰「金史」卷十四，宣宗本紀，十五丁表。嘉靖八年版本。貞祐三年十月壬子[廿七日]...遼東賊蒲鮮萬奴僭號[大眞]改元天泰。

The first is a record preserved on the side of the Kao-li 高麗 dynasty—an official circular issued from the Tung-ching-tsung-kuan-fu 東京總管府 (Tung-ching General Administration Office) of the Chin court, which is recorded in the *Kao-li-shih* 高麗史 compiled by CHÊNG Lin-chin 鄭麟趾 of Korea. The year following the establishment of a state by Wan-nu, that is, the 3rd year (*ping-tzû* 丙子) of the Emperor Kao-tsung 高宗 of the Kao-li 高麗 dynasty, the 4th year of *Chên-yu* 貞祐 of the Chin dynasty, the 11th year of T'ai-tsu 太祖 of Mongolia, that is, 1216 A.D., in the intercalary month of July (autumn), the Emperor despatched investigation officials to various districts for the purpose of inquiring as to the suffering of the people and also as to their loyalty. It happened on that occasion that on the 5th of the same month the army leader of the northern frontier sent the following report to the court.

“In the month of July (autumn), the 3rd year (*ping-tzû* 丙子) of Kao-tsung . . . On the 5th of the intercalary month (*ping-bsü* 丙戌) the army leader of the northern frontier reported to the court as follows. The Tung-ching General Administration Office of the Chin dynasty sent out an official circular, in accordance with the Imperial message. It read in part: ‘In ancient times the Tartars drove into the capital boasting of their barbarous force; but years ago they concluded peace with our mighty army, and went away. Later on, the Khitans 契丹 rose together, encroaching upon our frontiers, murdered our subjects, burned down our granaries, invited upon themselves the hatred of Heavenly God and the enmity of our people, and went away in a body. Those who had been threatened to obedience rose in reversed arms and those who shared in the plot obeyed with all their troops. By and by, the people desired to return to the former state and all the Liao-tung peninsula became as peaceful as before. Only Wan-nu, the rebel, has flung away his high trust for that region, forgetting the unusual favours of our Empire, and engaging his mind in a wicked purpose; and is bringing upon himself the hatred of Heaven. . . . Hereby this proclamation is issued. See that an official circular be sent out instantly, saying that P’u-hsien Wan-nu 蒲鮮萬奴, *the Hsüan-fu* (Pacification-Commissioner) of the

Chin court has occupied Liao-tung, presuming to call himself T'ien-wang 天王 (Heavenly King) and adopting Ta-chên 大眞 as his dynastic title'.⁽¹⁾ A glance at this quotation will show it as an official report describing the manner of the activities of Wan-nu in Liao-tung during the year before, —namely, the 3rd year of *Cbên-yu* (the 2nd year of Kao-tsung of the Kao-li dynasty). It is shown that he had rebelled against the Chin court, proudly assuming Ta-chên as his dynastic title. It does not refer to the adoption of T'ien-t'ai as a new name for his era; after this account, the *Kao-li-shih* goes on to say:

“Prior to this, the Chin court again sent a message asking us to sell rice to them. Our court having notified the frontier officials refused this request. Since last year the Chin people because of the fighting have been suffering privations; they have competed among themselves in bringing out their rare treasures for disposal.”⁽²⁾ It may be seen from this that since Wan-nu declared his independence the preceding year the Liao-tung region was in utter exhaustion because of his rebellion.

The second is the material preserved on the side of the Southern Sung 南宋 dynasty. There is a book entitled *Hêi-ta-shih-liao* 黑韃事略 written by P'ENG Ta-ya 彭大雅 and annotated by Hsü T'ing 徐霆. After recording the conquest of the whole

(1) 朝鮮鄭麟趾撰「高麗史」卷二十二，高宗世家，三百二十九頁，上下段。高宗三年丙子，秋七月，...閏月丙戌[五日]，北界兵馬使奏，金東京總管府，奉聖旨移牒，略曰。昔有韃靼，恃兇入京，已與大軍，年前講好去訖，而後契丹嘯聚，蠶耗邊方，殺戮我生靈，焚燒我倉廩，致皇天之厭祿，斂衆怨以同歸，脅從者倒戈而攻，同謀者傾軍而服，既人心之戴，奮全遼海以如初，唯叛賊萬奴，棄一方之重委，忘皇國之大恩，用心不貳，爲天不祜，...以此今移牒...使回牒以速到，時金宣撫蒲鮮萬奴，據遼東，僭稱天王，國號大眞。Prof. YANAI says “As this was a time when Wan-nu failed to defeat the various castles in the Liao-tung peninsula, it is impossible to assert that Tung-ching 東京 or the present Liao-yang 遼陽 was not for a period in the hands of the Chin troops; but the existence of a regular Tsung-kuan-fu 總管府 (General Administration Office) is certainly beyond conception.” Besides, he says that this official circular contains falsification and exaggeration. (*Ibid.* p. 224) Can he be right? Even if Tung-ching 東京 was not occupied by the Chin forces, it is evident that the office called Tung-ching-tsung-kuan-fu 東京總管府 existed somewhere in the vicinity to which it had moved. In view of the fact that, on the outbreak of the recent Manchurian incident, the government of Chang Hsüeh-liang 張學良, no sooner than losing its footing at Mukden 奉天, had re-established itself at Chin-chou 錦州, you will see that my inference is well-grounded. The official circular is asserted to contain falsification and exaggeration of facts, but it must be conceded that this circular on the independence of Ta-chên-kuo 大眞國 is not a falsification.

(2) 先是，金再牒，乞糶，國家令邊官，拒而不納，自去年，金人因兵亂資竭，爭賣珍寶。

land by the Mongolians and mentioning the various countries where peace reigned, the book says :

“Of the states which have resisted and have not yet been conquered, one in the east is Kao-li 高麗 and another Wan-nu in Liao-tung 遼東 (namely, Ta-chên-kuo 大真國 of the Jurchins 女真). Wang Hsien-tso 王賢佐, Premier to the latter, is over ninety years old and understands the art of reading the future.”⁽¹⁾ According to this, the states which had not yet been conquered were two in the east;—Kao-li and Wan-nu’s state in Liao-tung. That the state Wan-nu founded in Liao-tung was of the Jurchins 女真 and its dynastic title was Ta-chên 大真, was what P’ENG Ta-ya personally heard at the Mongolian court and personally recorded; therefore, it may be reliably said that the state founded by Wan-nu was then also called Ta-chên-kuo 大真國 by the Mongolians. As has been pointed out by the present writer, P’ENG 彭 was twice sent north to the Mongolian court to be received in audience by T’ai-tsung 太宗,—once in the 5th year of *Shao-ting* 紹定, the 1st year of T’ien-hsing 天興 under the reign of the Emperor Ai-tsung 哀宗 of the Chin dynasty, the 4th year of T’ai-tsung of Mongolia,—namely 1232 A.D., and again in the 4th year of *Chia-hsi* 嘉熙, the 12th year of T’ai-tsung of Mongolia, or 1240 A.D. However, in view of the fact that Hsü T’ing 徐霆, the annotator, also went up to the northern court between the two visits by P’ENG—that is, at the beginning of *Tuan-p’ing* 端平 under the reign of the Emperor Li-tsung 理宗, probably the 7th or 8th year of T’ai-tsung 太宗 of Mongolia, it is evident that this book is the record of P’ENG’s first visit. In the Official Annals of the Emperor Li-tsung in the *Sung-shih* 宋史 compiled by T’o T’o 脫脫 and others of the Yüan dynasty, we come across the following passage :

“On December the day *kuai-mao* 癸卯 (28th), the 5th year (*jen-ch’ên* 壬辰) of *Shao-ting* 紹定, the great Yüan court decided to attack the Chin state again. Shih

(1) 宋彭大雅撰,徐霆注「黑韃事略」,王國維撰「黑韃事略箋證」,王忠愍公遺書內編,觀堂集林卷第十六,史林八,二十七丁表。已爭而未竟者,東曰高麗,曰遼東萬奴,即女真大真國,厥相王賢佐,年餘九十,有知來之明。

Kao-chi 史嵩之 despatched Tsou Shên-chih 鄒伸之 there to express thanks for it.”⁽¹⁾

That P'ÉNG Ta-ya was a member of Tsou Shên-chih's suite in the capacity of secretary is evident in the *Hêi-ta-shih-liao-chien-chêng-po* 黑韃事略箋證跋—an enquiry made by Mr. WANG Kuo-wei 王國維, a passage of which reads:

“P'ÉNG Ta-ya 彭大雅 was appointed secretary to the aforesaid. Therefore, Ta-ya was surely a member of Tsou Shên-chih's party.”⁽²⁾

Should this be accepted, the date at which P'ÉNG was informed of the circumstances in question was the 4th year of T'ai-tsung of Mongolia, the 5th year of *Shao-ting*, or the 18th year of T'ien-t'ai according to the calendar of Ta-chên-kuo 大真國. Seeing that this Ta-chên-kuo of Wan-nu was destined to be overthrown by the Mongols in the 5th year (*Keuei-sü* 癸巳) of T'ai-tsung, or the 19th year of T'ien-t'ai (the 2nd year of T'ien-hsing 天興 of the Chin, the 6th year of *Shao-ting* of the Sung dynasty, the 20th year of the King Kao-tsung 高宗 of the Kao-li dynasty, or 1233 A.D.), it may be ascertained that even as late as when P'ÉNG was informed of the circumstances,—namely the year before its downfall, the phrase Ta-chên-kuo 大真國 or the dynastic title of Wan-nu was current. As regards Wang Hsien-tso 王賢佐, Premier to Wan-nu, it will be more convenient to discuss later. The great stress WANG, as well as the present writer, lays on Mr. P'ÉNG's *Hêi-ta-shih-liao* 黑韃事略 as valuable historical material, may be inferred from his following remarks:

“This work, brief but of wide range in its contents, amply serves to supply the facts for those who study the state. The supplement by Chang-ju 長孺 (Hsü T'ing 徐霆) is also exceedingly informing. In the scarcity of materials on the earlier stages of the Mongolian dynasty, this book contributes no less than the *Yüan-chao*-

(1) 元脫脫撰「宋史」卷四十一，理宗本紀。十三丁裏。萬曆二十七年刊本。紹定五年壬辰十二月癸卯[二十八日]，大元再遣使，議攻金，史嵩之以鄒伸之報謝。

(2) 清王國維撰「黑韃事略箋證」十五——十六丁。彭大雅為前綱書狀官，則大雅當在鄒伸之壬辰一行中。

Pi-shih 元朝祕史 or the *Ch'in-chêng-lu* 親征錄.⁽¹⁾

The third is the following account in the *Sung-yüan-t'ung-chien* 宋元通鑑 compiled by HsIEH Yin-ch'í 薛應旂 of the Ming dynasty and revised and commented upon by CH'ÊN Jên-hsi 陳仁錫.

"The 8th year (*i-bai* 乙亥) of *Chia-ting* 嘉定... On October the day *i-wei* 乙未 (10th)... P'u-hsien Wan-nu, *Hsüan-fu* (Pacification-Commissioner) of the Chin court occupied Liao-tung, presumed to call himself T'ien-wang (Heavenly King), adopting Ta-chên 大真 as his dynastic title, and T'ien-t'ai also as the name of his era."⁽²⁾

This account, though differing from the *Chin-shih* only in the point of the month and the day, completely agrees with the official histories of the Chin and Yüan dynasties in the point of the year. Because this work is accompanied by the compiler's preface dated December 1st, the 45th year (*ping-yin* 丙寅) of *Chia-ching* 嘉靖 of the Ming dynasty, it is presumable that HsIEH Ying-ch'í reprinted this account from both the *Chin-shih* and the *Yüan-shih*; however, seeing that the date differs as much as more than a half month, it may be possible that he adopted it from the material of a source entirely different from them. At any rate, he adopted for the dynastic title neither Tung-hsia 東夏 nor Tung-chên 東真, to the great satisfaction of the present writer.

Now, the *Ta-chin-kuo-chih* 大金國志 compiled by Yü-wên Mou-chao 宇文懋昭 of the Sung dynasty records the following passage under the 4th year (*ping-tzu* 丙子) of *Chên-yü* 貞祐 (the 11th year of T'ai-tsu 太祖 of Mongolia).

(1) 同前。此書敘述簡該，足徵視國之識，長孺[徐靈]所補，亦頗得事實，蒙古開創時史料最少，此書所貢獻，當不在祕史，親征錄之下也。

(2) 明薛應旂編，陳仁錫評閱「宋元通鑑」宋紀，九十九，寧宗八。八丁裏。嘉定八年[乙亥金貞祐三年，蒙古太祖十年]...冬十月乙未[十日]...金宣撫蒲鮮萬奴據遼東，僭稱天王，國號大真，改元天泰。Wu-shih-chih 武事志 in the *Nan-chin-hsiang-tu-chih* 南金鄉土志，a very recent book by Hsü Chih-san 秀芝三，says: "Mu-hu-li 穆呼哩 of Mongolia repeatedly attacked Liao-tung. P'u-hsi Wan-nu 布希萬努，Hsüan-fu (Pacification-Commissioner), of the Chin court, occupying Hsien-p'ing 咸平 and Tung-ching 東京，rebelled, assuming the title of T'ien-wang 天王 and adopting Ta-hêng 大亨 as his dynastic title, and T'ien-t'ai as the name of his era." (蒙古穆呼哩又屢攻遼東，金宣撫布希萬努，取咸平東京以叛，僭稱天王，國號大亨，改元天泰。) Ta-hêng 大亨 is of course a mistranscription of Ta-chên 大真。

“About that time there was a man named Wan Hsiao-nu 萬蕭奴 who was *An-fu-shih* 安撫使 (Pacification-Commissioner) of Liao-tung. He was a Khitanese. Taking advantage of the disturbance of Ta-chin-kuo 大金國, he presumptuously declared himself Emperor; and occupying the seven districts of Liao-tung, he wished to possess all the territories of Yen 燕 (Ho-pei), Tai 代 (Northern Shan-hsi), Wei 魏 (Ho-nan) and Chin 晉 (Southern Shan-hsi) through manoeuvring his troops. Ho-pei and Ho-nan were destroyed; waste land stretched over a thousand 里; human habitation became scarce; as far as the eye could reach there was only devastation.”⁽¹⁾ This Wan Hsiao-nu 萬蕭奴 is certainly a mistranscription and a reversion of Hsiao Wan-nu 蕭萬奴, for according to the *Chin-kuo-yü-chieh* 金國語解⁽²⁾, Hsiao 蕭 being Shih-mo 石抹, it may be presumed that his Jurchin name was Shih-mo Wan-nu 石抹萬奴; but lacking any other material to prove it, I shall simply leave this as a problem for further study. This account completely fails to say that he called his dynasty Ta-chên 大真 or that he called himself Tung-hsia-wang 東夏王 (Tung-hsia-king). It is noteworthy that, despite the glaring fault in attributing Liao 遼 (Khitanese) for his home, and many carelessnesses in its description, this work perfectly coincides with the other materials in stating the fact that he presumptuously declared his independence and became Emperor.

From the above materials, I hope, the reader has realised that Wan-nu adopted Ta-chên 大真 for his dynastic title in the 3rd year of *Chên-yü* 貞祐 of the Chin dynasty, and the 10th year (*i-hai* 乙亥) of T'ai-tsu 太祖 of Mongolia. This raises the next question, what is the meaning of Ta-chên 大真? However, a few remarks must be made on the circumstances under which, on the withdrawal of the troops of Khasar 合撒兒 from Liao-hsi 遼西, Wan-nu again rebelled in the summer of the 2nd year of *Chên-yü* 貞祐 calling himself Tung-hsia-wang 東夏王 (Tung-hsia king) and later still presumed to call himself T'ien-Wang 天王 (Heavenly King), adopting

(1) 宋宇文懋昭撰「大金國志」其時又有遼東安撫使萬蕭奴者，本遼人，乘大金國之亂，自立爲帝，據遼東七路，欲引兵併燕代魏晉而有之，兩河既破，赤地千里，人煙斷絕，滿目蓬蒿。The character 安安 is of course a mistranscription of Hsüan 宣。

(2) 「金史」卷末附錄「金國語解」姓氏，十二丁裏。嘉靖版。

Ta-chên 大真 for his dynastic title.

How is it that Wan-nu who had stood against the Chin court presumptuously calling himself Tung-hsia-wang 東夏王 for some time should have been appointed the *Hsüan-fu-shih* (Pacification-Commissioner) for conquering Liu-ko 留哥? How is it that, such being the case, he actually took part, in September and October, the 2nd year of *Chên-yü* 貞祐, in order to conquer Liu-ko 留哥 with his fellow-generals, in a battle by the Hsi-ho 細河 in the north of Kuei-jên-hsien 歸仁縣 (near the present Tz'u-lu-shu 鷺鷥樹 in K'ai-yüan-hsien 開原縣)? Lest such questions be raised, I had better give my opinion on them. In the preceding year, Wan-nu had killed Wan-yen T'ieh-ko 完顏鐵哥, a fellow-general who had suspected his rebellious intentions. The Chin court had inflicted no punishment whatever for his crime; and he had been left unpunished for his assumption of the title Tung-hsia-wang 東夏王 (Tung-hsia King). (I shall call your attention later to a similar situation in connection with Wang Kuei 王澹 whom the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 of the Chin dynasty certainly knew to have been advising Wan-nu, the rebel, but whom the Emperor rewarded for his services, favoured with an Imperial message, and even promoted in rank.) Now that the influence of the Chin court had waned, the question of Wan-nu's assumption of the title Tung-hsia-wang 東夏王 had to be overlooked; otherwise, the court would have had to suppress him on the one hand, while guarding against Liu-ko 留哥 on the other. It is probable that, suspecting little chance of success on the part of its troops in the field abroad, they adopted the general policy of bringing round Wan-nu after reading a lecture to him, and of fighting exclusively against Liu-ko. Moreover, Wan-nu considered that even though he wished to hold sway over Liao-tung, his ambition would no doubt meet with serious obstacles if Liu-ko occupied one quarter and the Mongols were at his back. Nothing would be better than to let the Chin generals defeat Liu-ko for him. If he encamped facing the enemy and the general situation turned unfavourable for the Chin side, he would retire only to rise again against the Chin court. With both cases calculated in his mind, it seems, Wan-nu took part in the battle of Kuei-jên-

hsien 歸仁縣。 And as the battle developed unfavourable for the Chin side, Wan-nu, in accordance with his original plan, collected the remnants of his troops and retreated to Tung-ching 東京 (Liao-yang 遼陽). This is my opinion on the biography of Yeh-lü Liu-ko 耶律留哥 in the *Yüan-shih*, which is cited below.

“In the year (*chia-hsü* 甲戌, the 9th year of T'ai-tsu 太祖), the Chin court sent out Ch'ing-kou 青狗 as an envoy and, offering a high stipend, tried to persuade Liu-ko to surrender. But he would not. Moreover, Ch'ing-kou 青狗, scenting danger, became a subject to Liu-ko. The Chin ruler, in a great rage, ordered Wan-nu 萬奴, *Hsüan-fu* (Pacification-Commissioner) to proceed with 400,000 men under him and defeat Liu-ko. Liu-ko counterattacked Wan-nu by the Hsi-ho 細河 in the north of Kuei-jên-hsien 歸仁縣. The Chin troops were utterly worsted. Wan-nu, collecting the remnants of his troops, withdrew to Tung-ching 東京.”⁽¹⁾

My inference above-mentioned is by no means a wild imagination, because I could produce definite evidence showing that the defeat of the Chin troops at the battle of Kuei-jên-hsien was due to the lack of understanding and co-operation among the Chin generals who participated in it. As Dr. YANAI already observed, there is an Imperial message with which the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 honoured the generals concerned, in November, the 2nd year, which reads ;

“The Imperial message to [Ao-Tung] Hsiang [奧屯] 襄, and P'u-hsien Wan-nu, Pacification-Commissioner in the Liao-tung district and P'u-ch'a Wu-chin 蒲察五斤 the Imperial messenger, says ‘Shang-ching 上京 and Liao-tung 遼東 are both very important territories. As you had often proved your loyalty to the throne, we confidently trusted that you would co-operate in rendering services to the state and, in case of emergency, sacrifice yourselves for the good of our state. The detailed report shows that you have done nothing of the kind. Whom else

(1) 「元史」卷百四十九, 列傳第三十六, 耶律留哥傳, 二丁表。洪武版。甲戌[太祖九年], 金遣使青狗, 誘以重祿使降, 不從, 青狗度其勢不可, 反臣之, 金主怒, 復遣宣撫萬奴, 領軍四十餘萬攻之, 留哥逆戰于歸仁縣北[細]河上, 金兵大潰, 萬奴收散卒, 奔東京。The character 細 in the phrase Hsi-ho 細河 has been here supplemented on the basis of the *Hsin-Yüan-shih* 新元史 by Ko Chao-min 柯劭忞。

could we rely upon? Join your hearts and unite your power in everything you may undertake hereafter by way of defense. Once opportunity be lost, regret will be of no avail. Moreover, victory rests with those who perfectly unite and control their men. Since you have learned a lesson from your past failure, you are now expected to strive for future services.”⁽¹⁾

Here we find in the Imperial message an absolute confidence in the generals in the field, an expectation that, Shang-ching and Liao-tung being very important districts, the generals would co-operate in rendering services to the state and save the country from the crisis, the bitter disappointment on the arrival of the detailed report of their complete defeat, a hopeless utterance “Whom else could we rely upon?”, an encouragement “Join your hearts and unite your power” in everything they might undertake by way of defence, an injunction “Victory rests with those who unite and control all their men,” and finally an expectation that they would strive for future services in spite of their past failure. The issuing of such an Imperial message indicates the lack of unity among the generals which resulted in their defeat. The Annals of the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 in the *Chin-shih* records the same affair very simply. It says:

“On November the day *kuei-wei* 癸未 (23rd), the 2nd year of *Chên-yü* 貞祐, the law was perverted for the sake of pardoning the rebels in the Liao-tung district; and the officials arbitrarily appointed by the Hsüan-fu-shih 宣撫司 (Pacification-Office) were all removed from office by an Imperial edict.”⁽²⁾

My humble view that Wan-nu was not completely defeated at Kuei-jên-hsien by Liu-ko, but retreated simply in accordance with his original plan may be confirmed by the following material. In spite of the Imperial message of Hsüan-tsung in

(1) 「金史」卷百三，列傳第四十一，十二丁表。嘉靖八年版。詔諭[奧屯]襄及遼東路宣撫使蒲鮮萬奴，宣差蒲察五斤，曰，上京遼東，國家重地，以卿等累效忠勤，故委腹心，意其協力盡公，以徇國家之急，及詳來奏，乃大不然，朕將何賴，自今每事，同心併力備禦，機會一失，悔之何及，且帥克在和善鈞從衆，尙懲前過，以圖後功。

(2) 「金史」卷十四，宣宗本紀，七丁裏。嘉靖版。「貞祐二年十一月癸未[二十三日]，曲赦遼東路，勅罷宣撫司輒擬官。」

November, it seems that Wan-nu was watching for an opportunity to mobilize the vast troops in his charge. The manner in which he began his operations early in the following year (the 3rd year of *Chên-yu* 貞祐) and carried on battles at various points for almost ten months is fully recorded in the biography of Ch'ih-shih-lieh Huan-tuan 紇石烈桓端, in the *Chin-shih* 金史, which reads:

“The 3rd year of *Chên-yu* 貞祐 (the 10th year or *i-hai* 乙亥 of T'ai-tsu 太祖 or the 2nd year of Kao-tsung 高宗 of the Kao-li dynasty), P'u-hsien Wan-nu took such districts as Hsien-p'ing 咸平 (K'ai-yuan 開原), Tung-ching 東京 (Liao-yang 遼陽), Shên 瀋 (Mukden 奉天), and Ch'êng 澄 (the present Hai-ch'êng 海城 a locality to the southwest of Liao-yang), including even Minggan 猛安 and Mou-ko 謀克. A vast number of men followed him. In March, nine thousand footmen and horsemen under Wan-nu invaded the neighbourhood of P'o-su 婆速; so Huan-tuan 桓端 made Tu-tung 都統, Wên-ti-han P'a-ko-lien 溫迪罕怕哥聳 counterattack Wan-nu and drive him away. In April, he again plundered Shang-ku-ch'êng 上古城 (unlocated, though the *Chin-shih-hsiang-chiao* 金史詳校 says in the latter section of Chap. 8 th) that the character 古 should read 京; Tu-tung 都統 (Governor) Wu-yen Po-hsia 兀顏鉢轄 was sent to counterattack the invaders; Wan-nu ordered another army of five thousand men to attack Wang-yün-i 望雲驛 (unlocated) and Tu-tung met them; Tu-tung 都統 Ao-tun Ma-ho-shang 奧屯馬和尙, and Chiao-ku Ho-ta 夾谷合打 defeated several thousand of Wan-nu's men at San-ch'a-li 三叉里 (unlocated). In May, Tu-tung Wên-ti-han Fu-shou 溫迪罕福壽 assailed Wannu's troops at Ta-ning-chên 大寧鎮 (The *Chin-shih-hsiang-chiao* 金史詳校 ascribes this to Hsiu-yen-hsien 秀巖縣 in Kai-chou 蓋州, which corresponds to the neighbourhood of Hsieu-yen 岫巖 to the southeast of Hai-ch'êng 海城), destroying the fort, annihilated the enemy. In September, nine thousand men under Wan-nu marched to I-fêng 宜風 (a hsien 縣 under Liao-yang-fu 遼陽府, but not definitely located) and I-ch'ih 易池 (I 易 is a mistranscription for t'ang 湯, the present T'ang-ch'ih-pao 湯池堡 in the northeast of Kai-p'ing 蓋平); Huan-tuan 桓端 fought against them with his troops, and the invaders were defeated and

forced to retreat.”⁽¹⁾

Even then the Chin court issued the following message to Wan-nu, wishing him to defend the country against Liu-ko 留哥, or rather against the Mongolians behind Liu-ko. The Annals of the *Chin-shih* reads:

“On March the day *kêng-nu* 庚午 (11th), the 3rd year of *Chên-yü* 貞祐 (the 10th year under the reign of T'ai-tsu 太祖 of Mongolia), P'u-hsien Wan-nu, *Hsüan-fu-shih* for Liao-tung, was instructed to pick up the best of his troops, to station them at Shên-chou 瀋州 (the present Mukden 奉天) and Kuang-ning 廣寧 (the present Pei-chên 北鎮) until further notice for further movement.”⁽²⁾

As is given in detail in the biography of Huan-tuan 桓端 cited above, Wan-nu who had been active since the adoption of a new era in the 3rd year of *Chên-yü* 貞祐, defying the Imperial message of the Chin court, opposed the Chin troops in March, May, and September. Though fighting seems to have ended always unfavourably for him, he persistently and courageously kept on attacking various forts. And in October, the same year, being now confident of his success in controlling the Liao-tung peninsula, he founded Ta-chên-kuo 大真國, adopting the new era *T'ien-t'ai* and assuming the title T'ien-wang 天王 (Heavenly King).

Prof. YANAI, on the ground that the 3rd year of *Chên-yü* in the above-quoted biography of Huan-tuan fails to agree with the record in the *Yüan-shih* 元史 and the Annals of the *Chin-shih* 金史, corrected it to read the 4th year⁽³⁾, which is only a natural outcome of his ascribing Wan-nu's assumption of

(1) 「金史」卷百三,列傳第四十一,紇石烈桓端傳,十四丁裏——十五丁表。嘉靖八年版。貞祐三年[太祖十年乙亥,高麗高宗二年],蒲鮮萬奴取咸平[開原],東京[遼陽],瀋[奉天],澄[遼陽西南海城]諸州,及猛安謀克人亦多從之者。三月,萬奴步騎九千,侵婆速近境,桓端遣都統溫迪罕怕哥,擊却之。四月,復掠上古城[上京城],遣都統兀顏鉢轄拒戰,萬奴別遣五千人攻望雲驛,都統奧屯馬和尙擊之,都統夾谷合打破其衆數千于三叉里。五月,都統溫迪罕福壽攻萬奴之衆于大率鎮[蓋州],拔其壘,其衆殲焉。九月,萬奴衆九千人,出宜風及易池,桓端率兵與戰,其衆潰去。

(2) 「金史」卷十四,宣宗本紀。七丁裏。嘉靖八年版。貞祐三年[蒙古太祖十年乙亥]三月庚午[十一日],諭遼東宣撫使蒲鮮萬奴,選精銳,屯瀋州[奉天]廣寧[北鎮],以候進止。

(3) Dr. YANAI: *The Dominions of Tung-chên-kuo*, 箭內博士著「東真國の疆域」,Od. cit. in 滿洲歷史地理(The Manchurian Historical Geography), Vol. II, pp. 231-232.

the dynastic title of Tung-hsia 東夏 in the *Yüan-shih* to the 11th year (*ping-tzũ* 丙子) of T'ai-tsu 太祖 (the 4th year of *Chên-yu* 貞祐). In the opinion of the present writer who takes the attitude of emending the *Yüan-shih* in the light of the *Pi-shih* 秘史 and the *Ch'in-chêng-lu* 親征錄, this question may be answered without correcting the materials like this or without causing incompatibility among the materials. Moreover, T'u Chi 屠寄 in his *Mêng-wu-êrb-shih-chi* 蒙兀兒史記 asserts Wan-nu's independence and assumption of the dynastic title of Ta-chên 大真 to have been in the month of January, the 3rd year of *Chên-yu* and his fighting at various points in March, April, May, and September to have been a campaign after his assumption of sovereignty. Dr. YANAI, it seems, agrees with Mr. T'u⁽¹⁾, giving up his previous view of correcting the chronology, but I hold that Wan-nu, having attacked the various points one after another, ascended the throne in October, proudly declaring his suzerainty. He seems to have occupied Hsien-p'ing 咸平 at the beginning of the year, but very probably Liu-ko 留哥 still was at Hsien-p'ing at that time; and the troops under Mu-khu-li 木華黎 and Shih-mo Yeh-hsien 石抹也先 still were in Tung-ching 東京⁽²⁾ and Pei-ching 北京 from October, the 9th year (*chia-hsü* 甲戌) to February, this year, as previously stated. So it follows that Mr. T'u's supposition that Wan-nu's founding of the state in January has no ground; and it is most unfortunate that Prof. YANAI rather blindly followed his view. Therefore, this account in the biography of Huan-tuan is open to question.

I believe that the biography of T'a-ssü 塔思, grandson of Mu-khu-li serves to prove that Wan-nu's founding his state took place in the 10th

(1) Dr. YANAI says: "The independence of Wan-nu took place in the spring of the 3rd year of *Chên-yu* 貞祐." Op. cit., *The Tôyô-gakuhô*, pp. 197-ff.

(2) In the year *chia-hsü* 甲戌, the Chin Emperor wishing peace, (Mu-khu-li) went back to the north, organized all the troops and ordered a conquest of Liao-tung. In the year *i-hai* 乙亥, Hsiao Yeh-hsien 蕭也先, his adjutant, defeated Tung-ching 東京 with a strategy and proceeded to attack Pei-ching 北京. (「元史」卷百十九, 木華黎傳...「甲戌金主講和, 北還, 命統諸軍征遼東」). The Annals of T'ai-tsu 太祖 says 甲戌冬十月, 木華黎征遼東 (In October (winter), the year *chia-hsü* 甲戌, Mu-khu-li conquered Liao-tung... In February, the year *i-hai* 乙亥, Mu-khu-li attacked Pei-ching). The biography of Shih-mo Yeh-hsien 石抹也先在 the *Yüan-shih*, Chap. 150, though giving no date, mentions the use of a strategy in taking Tung-ching and gives a detailed description of the circumstances under which Pei-ching 北京 was taken.

year (*i-hai* 乙亥) of T'ai-tsu 太祖, not in the 11th year (*ping-tz'u* 丙子) as Dr. YANAI asserted; or in the 12th year (*ting-ch'ou* 丁丑) as Dr. IKEUCHI holds. This work where it records the fall of Wan-nu's Ta-chên-kuo 大真國 in the 5th year (*kuai-ssü* 癸巳) of T'ai-tsung 太宗 reads:

"In September (autumn) T'a-ssü 塔思, following the Crown Prince who later became the Emperor Ting-tsung 定宗, carried a campaign to the east, and captured at Liao-tung Wan-yen Wan-nu 完顏萬奴, the Hsien-p'ing *Hsüan-fu* 宣撫 (Pacification-Commissioner) of the Chin court. With his troops, Wan-nu had held Tung-hai 東海 since the year *i-hai* 乙亥. At this time he was completely conquered."⁽¹⁾

Tung-hai here mentioned is of course the basin of the Tou-man-chiang 豆滿江 as the two professors pointed out. Whether the year *i-hai* 乙亥 be regarded as the time at which Wan-nu moved eastward or the time at which he founded his state may be a matter of opinion. When the usual manner of describing the fall of various dynasties is investigated, may it not be more natural to regard this date, not as the time at which Wan-nu moved his capital, but as the time at which Wan-nu had founded Ta-chên-kuo 大真國 which was now completely conquered in this year? The phrase 率衆保東海 (With his troops, Wan-nu had held Tung-hai 東海) shows a misconception, on the part of the careless compiler, that Wan-nu had always been in Tung-hai 東海 since founding his state.

III The Source and Meaning of Ta-Chên 大真

A glance at the circumstances under which the previous dynastic titles in China were chosen, will show that they were all related to the places from which the ruling families originated. Is then Ta-chên 大真, Wan-nu's title, also a geographical term? No, I have never seen it mentioned as a place-name. Leaving 大 (great) out of the question for the time being, because it is only an adjective, we may look up

(1) 「元史」卷百十九，木華黎傳附塔思傳。十一丁亥。洪武版。秋九月，從定宗于潛邸東征，擒金威平宣撫完顏萬奴于遼東，萬奴自乙亥，率衆保東海，至是平定之。

chên 眞 among geographical terms. There is a place called Chên-chou 眞州, but it has nothing to do with the home of Wan-nu. Then Ta-chên 大眞 must be a title adopted on account of its literary meaning.

I should like to call attention to the fact that Premier Wang Kuei 王澹 (Hsien-tso 賢佐) who advised Wan-nu in choosing the dynastic title was a Taoist (隱士 anchorite) as is discussed later, and quote the following passage from the *Ta-kuan-chêng-lei-pên-t'sao* 大觀證類本草:

“Gold dust tastes peppery and smooth, and contains a poison. It is chiefly used in soothing the mind, hardening the marrow, keeping the body in order, and removing the essence of foul poisons. If a man swallows it, he will become immortal. It is produced in I-chou 益州, and may be collected in all seasons.”⁽¹⁾ And it goes on to say:

“T'AO Yin-chü 陶隱居 (Recluse T'ao) says... ‘According to the *Hsien-fang* 仙方, gold is called *ta-chên* 大眞.’”⁽²⁾

T'ao Yin-chü or Recluse T'ao, here mentioned, refers to T'ao Hung-ching 陶弘景 of the Liang 梁 dynasty, who as court scholar served the Emperor Kao-ti 高帝 of the Ch'i 齊 dynasty during the South and North Dynastic period, but later hid himself in Mt. Chü-ch'ü 句曲 at Chü-jung 句容, calling himself Hua-yang Yin-chü 華陽隱居 (Recluse Hua-yang 華陽). In his last days, he came to be known by the name Hua-yang-chên-i 華陽眞逸; it is said that he indulged in the study of Shên-hsien 神仙 (immortality); and being skilled in the hermit's art, died at eighty-five years of age, suffering from no disease.⁽³⁾ He is well-known as an important charac-

(1) 「大觀證類本草」四,經史本草卷四,玉石部中品。十八丁裏,十九丁表。元大德版,日本翻刻,安永四年刊。明李時珍撰「本草綱目」卷之八,三丁表。萬曆庚寅[十八年]版。金屑味辛平,有毒,主鎮精神,堅骨髓,通利五藏,除邪毒氣,服之神仙,生益州,採無時。

(2) 陶隱居云...仙方名金爲大眞。

(3) 唐姚思廉撰,梁書卷五十一,列傳四十五,陶弘景傳。五丁裏,六丁表。「有時獨遊泉石,望見者以爲仙人,性好著述,尙奇異...尤明陰陽五行,風角星筭,山川地理,方圖產物,醫術本草」YAO Ssü-lien of the T'ang dynasty: The *Liang-shu* (He sometimes took a walk along the pond and rocks in his garden. Those who saw him from a distance took him for a hermit. He was naturally fond of writing and took interest in curious phenomena... He was especially versed in the Yin-yang-wu-

ter with Kou Ch'ien-chih 寇謙之 in the history of Taoism. The *Hsien-fang* 仙方 referred to by T'ao Hung-ching is a Taoist book of medical recipes, which is found among the Confucian works, histories, and recipe-books mentioned in the revised edition of *Chêng-ho-chêng-lei-pên-t'sao* 重修政和證類本草 published by Hui-ming-hsien 晦明軒 in the year *chia-tzû* 甲子 (the 4th year) of T'ai-ho 泰和 of the Chin dynasty. The fact that *chin* 金 (gold) was also called *t'ai-chên* 太眞 may be definitely proved by the reference in the *Pên-t'sao-kang-mu* 本草綱目 by Li Shih-chên 李時珍 of the Ming dynasty, which traces this fact to an ancient book entitled *Tan-fang-ching-yüan* 丹房鏡源. It is a very common custom in China to use *t'ai* 太 and *ta* 大 interchangeably.

It is hoped that the reader will keep in mind the literature in which *chin* 金 is also called *ta-chên* 大眞. Our attention is now turned to Wan-nu again. His calling himself a member of the Imperial Chin family has much bearing upon this question; and it is also evident from various documents⁽¹⁾ that he, on this account, called himself Wan-yen Wan-nu 完顏萬奴. Wan-nu who had for some time during the preceding year called himself Tung-hsia-wang 東夏王, was now to declare his independence and to deliberate upon the dynastic title. His wish was no doubt to style his the Chin dynasty established by Wan-yen A-ku-ta 完顏阿骨打. However, that could not be. So long as the Chin court formally existed, though driven away into Pien-ching 汴京 (K'ai-fêng 開封) under the pressure of the Mongols, with its influence fast waning, the same title Chin 金 could not be adopted. It is quite conceivable that Wan-nu desired his dynastic title to be one with a sublime meaning and represented by noble characters, which should, on the one hand, ex-

hang 陰陽五行 theory, fortune-telling by means of winds, astrology, geography, products of neighbouring countries, medicine, and botany.)

(1) 元史卷百十九, 塔思傳. 「咸平宣撫完顏萬奴」(*Hsüan-fu* (Pacification-Commissioner) at Hsien-p'ing, Wan-yen Wan-nu. 劉祁撰「歸潛志」卷五. 六丁裏. 梁詢諠傳「宣宗南渡, 宗室萬奴叛據上京」. (Liu Ch'i: *Kuei Ch'ien-chih*) (The Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 moved his capital southward. Wan-nu 萬奴 of the main family rebelled and occupied Shang-ching 上京.) The Annals of the King Tung-p'ing 東平王 says 完顏萬奴金內族也. (Wan-yen Wan-nu is of the direct branch of the Chin family.)

press the pride and dignity of the Chin family and, on the other, inspire the respect of the people he ruled. Probably he consulted his premier and other members of his staff, asking for their suggestions; and, advised by Wang Kuei 王澹 and others, Wan-nu decided upon his dynastic title. Now, the two characters 大真 Ta-chên meaning Chin 金 satisfied his wish. In other words, it could be said that Ta-chên was synonymous with Chin. We might even imagine that Wan-nu intended to assume the name Wan-yen 完顏 as a member of the Chin family and had an ambition to replace Ta-chin-kuo 大金國 in order to revive it. As an evidence of the fact that at that time Ta-chên-kuo 大真國 in written form practically meant the Chin dynasty, I should like to present the following passage in the *Hêi-ta-shih-liao* 黑韃事略, previously quoted, which reads "Namely, Ta-chên-kuo of the Jurchins" 即女真大真國 in three different editions: one by Prof. YANAI, another by Dr. KÔDA, and the one in the Mên-ying-lou 問影樓 series.⁽¹⁾ The aspiration of the Jurchins to found a state under the title of Chin was not limited to Wan-nu. The fact that when the Ch'ing 清 dynasty arose in later days, T'ai-tsu the first Emperor of Ch'ing in order to distinguish it from the former Chin 金 dynasty called it the Hou-Chin 後金 or Later Chin dynasty is so well-known as the result of an elaborate study of Prof. ICHIMURA, my honoured teacher.⁽²⁾ It is also definitely observed in the *Man-chou-lao-tang-pi-lu* 滿洲老檔祕錄⁽³⁾ by Mr. CHIN Liang 金梁 and in the Introduction to the same by Mr. Hsü 徐.⁽⁴⁾

(1) 箭內博士校定本 (Edition revised by Dr. YANAI) 十七枚裏。幸田(露伴)本 (Edition by Roban KÔDA) p. 33. 問影樓本 (Mên-ying-lou series) 十二丁裏。

(2) (Dr. Sanjiro ICHIMURA: *A Study of the Dynastic Title of Ch'ing* 文學博士市村瓊次郎著「清朝國號考」), the Tôyôkyôkwai-Chôsabû-Gakujutsu-hôkoku, Vol. I, pp. 129-158, July, 1909. Iwaki-chi INABA: *The Complete History of the Ch'ing Dynasty* 稻葉岩吉著「清朝全史」, Section 18, pp. 300-310, April, 1914. Hsiao I-shan: *Ch'ing-tai-tung-shih* 蕭一山著「清代通史」, p. 46, 民國十六年九月。

(3) The Great Emperor of Hou-chin-kuo 後金國 sent a message to the Korean King, saying that all the officials and common people of Liao-tung cut their hair, as a sign of pledging allegiance.) 金梁譯「滿洲老檔祕錄」十八丁裏,「後金國大皇帝,遺朝鮮國王書,今遼東官民,皆已薙髮歸順」。

(4) The writer makes many omissions, especially in the point of dynastic titles. Chin 金 is mentioned in this book for the first time. 徐世昌滿洲老檔序,金梁著「瓜圃叢刊續編」民國十七年刊民國十八年刊單行本收載,「秉筆者,芟落過多,甚於國名,其初稱金見檔册」。

In this study thus far you have seen that Ta-chên 大眞, the dynastic title of Wan-nu meant Chin,—a phrase suggested by Wang Kuei 王澹 and others, and adopted because of its literary meaning derived from Taoist classics. The keen insight of CHAO I 趙翼 of the Ch'ing dynasty did not overlook this. In his *E'rb-shih-êrb-shih-tsa-chi* 二十二史劄記, he says:

“In the last stage of the Chin dynasty, P'u-hsien Wan-nu 蒲鮮萬奴, *Hsüan-fu* (Pacification-Commissioner) occupying Liao-tung, assumed the title of T'ien-wang 天王 (Heavenly King), and adopted Ta-chên 大眞 as his dynastic title. This is the first dynastic title adopted on account of its literary meaning. T'ai-tsu 太祖 of the Yüan dynasty had no title at first, calling it simply Mên-ku 蒙古 (Mongolian) as in the case of Liao 遼 which called itself Khitan 契丹. In the 8th year of *Chih-yüan* 至元 under the reign of the Emperor Shih-tsu 世祖, the dynastic title was first adopted on the proposal of Liu Ping-chung 劉秉忠. It was *Ta-yüan* 大元, derived from the phrase 大哉乾元 (Great is the firmament). Adoption of a dynastic title on account of its literary meaning dates from this.”⁽¹⁾

As CHAO I 趙翼 points out, the scholars in the past used to insist that of all the dynastic titles of China the first that was adopted for its literary meaning was Yüan which, arising from the northern side of the great desert, dominated the central regions of China. It goes without saying that Yüan was derived from the phrase *Ch'ien-yüan* 乾元 (the firmament) in the *I* 易, after this, the Ming dynasty and the Ching dynasty followed suit. Now that Ta-chên 大眞, the dynastic title of Wan-nu has been proved to be one adopted for its literary meaning, this should cause a serious change in our accepted attitude. It is true that, even prior to this, *Chên-kuo* 振國 the earlier title of the P'o-hai 渤海 during the T'ang period is said to have been derived from the word *chên* 震 in the *I* 易 and to mean the east, and Ting-an-kuo 定安國 founded by the remnants of the same dynasty is also alleged not to

(1) 清趙翼著「二十二史劄記」卷二十九，元史二十四丁。表裏。金末，宣撫蒲鮮萬奴據遼東，僭稱天王，國號大眞，始有以文義爲號者。元太祖本無國號，但稱蒙古，如遼之稱契丹也，世祖至元八年，劉秉忠奏始建國號，曰大元，取大哉乾元之義，國號取文義自此始。

be a title other than a geographical term ; if so, we should admit priority in these. It is true that these only represent the Tung-i 東夷 (eastern savages) of the far frontier viewed from the standpoint of the central regions. Should Wan-nu's Ta-chên-kuo 大真國 as well as Chên-kuo 振國 and Ting-an-kuo 定安國 be omitted on the ground that they were not among the major states which dominated China proper, but were only presumed states on the eastern frontier, this new system of choosing a dynastic title might be said to begin with the Yüan dynasty. Leaving Chên 振 and Ting-an 定安 out of the question for the time being, the adoption of the title Ta-chên 大真, not long after the establishment of the title of the Mongolian dynasty, on the suggestion of Premier Wang Kuei 王澹 who had risen from a Taoist anchorite, may be compared with the exercise of the grand ceremony of adopting a dynastic title by Shih-tsu 世祖 at the Yüan court on the recommendation of Liu Ping-chung 劉秉忠, a high official who had returned to secular life, renouncing the Buddhist priesthood of the Dhyâna sect 禪宗 where he was known as Tzŭ-ts'ung 子聰.⁽¹⁾ This comparison would prove exceedingly interesting in the study of cultural development as reflecting the Taoism and Buddhism of the time. In this sense, Ta-chên 大真, the dynastic title assumed by Wan-nu, though the presumption of a minor state, should not be overlooked, because it certainly takes a most important position in the history of the dynastic titles in China.

Should the title of Wan-nu be Ta-chên and its meaning be as explained here, we find it our duty to offer the reason why the *Kao-li-shih* 高麗史 calls Wan-nu's state, not Ta-chên, but always Tung-chên 東真. The Jurchins 女真 who occupied the northeastern frontier of Kao-li 高麗 and the Chin territory of the Ho-lan 曷懶 district were called Tung-nü-chen 東女真 (the Eastern Jurchins), as Professors YANAI and IKEUCHI emphatically pointed out. I do not hesitate to accept their view. However, I sincerely regret that I can agree with neither Prof. YANAI who

(1) Hirosato IWAI: *Relations of the Early Mongol Emperors with the Buddhist Priest of the Dhyâna Sect*, 岩井大巖「元の帝室と禪僧との關係に就いて」, (*Gen no Tei-shitsu to Zen-sô tonô Kwan-kei ni tsuite*) The Tôyo-gakuhô, Vol. XII, No. 1, p. 117, March, 1922.

asserts that Tung-chên 東眞 is an abbreviation of Tung-nü-chen 東女眞 and that, on the strength of this fact alone, it is the dynastic title of Wan-nu, nor with Prof. IKEUCHI who asserts Tung-chên 東眞 to be only a sub-title of Tung-hsia-kuo 東夏國 employed on the Korean side. I insist that Tung-chên 東眞 is the title of Ta-chên 大眞 after it moved to the east,—that is, the title of Ta-chên which had established its state at Tung-ching 東京 (Liao-yang 遼陽) in the Liao-tung peninsula, but afterwards moved its capital to the basin of the Tou-man-chiang 豆滿江 in the summer, the 12th year (*ting-ch'ou* 丁丑) of T'ai-tsu (the 1st year of *Hsing-ting* 興定 of the Chin dynasty, or the 4th year of Kao-tsung 高宗 of the Kao-li dynasty). Whether it called itself Tung-chên or was so called by the Koreans only is doubtful, because no material on this subject is available. As to the time and route of the eastward migration, Prof. IKEUCHI's exhaustive study⁽¹⁾ serves so perfectly that I have nothing to say on it. What is my ground for connecting the eastern migration of Ta-chên with Tung-chên? The following passage is my answer. The Annals of the Emperor Kao-tsung 高宗 in the *Kao-li-shih* 高麗史 says:

“On December the day *chi-hai* 己亥 (1st), the 5th year (*mou-yin* 戊寅), (the 13th year of T'ai-tsu of Mongolia, and the 2nd year of *Hsing-ting* of the Chin dynasty), Marshals Ha-chên 哈眞 and Cha-la 札剌 commanding 10,000 men, and also the 20,000 men under Wan-yen Tzū-yüan 完顏子淵 sent out by Wan-nu of Tung-chên declared “We shall attack and take the four castles of Ho 和, Mêng 猛, Shun 順, and Tê 德 which are occupied by the Khitan rebels, and immediately proceed to the Chiang-tung-ch'êng 江東城.”⁽²⁾

Your attention is called to the fact that this is the first occasion on which the characters Tung-chên appear in the *Kao-li-shih*,—that is, Ta-chên-kuo 大眞國 by

(1) Dr. IKEUCHI: *Manchuria in the Last Days of the Chin Dynasty*, Op. cit. 池內博士「金末の滿洲」「滿鮮地理歴史研究報告」(Report of a Geographical and Historical Research in Manchuria and Korea), No. 10, pp. 57-59.

(2) 「高麗史」卷二十二, 高宗五年, 三三三頁, 下段。五年戊寅[蒙古太祖十三年, 金興定二年]十二月己亥[朔日], 蒙古元帥哈眞及札剌率兵一萬, 與東眞萬奴所遣完顏子淵兵二萬, 聲言, 討丹賊和·猛·順·德·四城, 破之, 直指江東城。

Wan-nu which moved eastward during June or July of the preceding year (*ting-ch'ou* 丁丑) is here for the first time represented with the characters 東眞 Tung-chên. Despite the fact that Wan-nu assumed the dynastic title Ta-chên 大眞 in October (winter), the 10th year of T'ai-tsu of Mongolia (the 2nd year of *Chên-yu* 貞祐, or the 2nd year of Kao-tsung 高宗 of the Kao-li dynasty) and the Kao-li court should have known this event, as it had received the announcement in July (autumn), the following year,—that is, the 11th year (*ping-tzŭ* 丙子) through the Tung-ching-tsung-kuan-fu 東京總管府 of the Chin dynasty, the *Kao-li-shih* never uses the characters 大眞, but persistently uses for them the phrases Wan-nu-ping 萬奴兵 (Wan-nu's soldiers) and Huang-ch'í-tsŭ-chün 黃旗子軍 (Yellow-flag-men-army). This being the case, the first appearance of the name Tung-chên-kuo in the *Kao-li-shih* in December, the 5th year of Kao-tsung 高宗 accounts for the knowledge, on the side of the Koreans, of the eastern migration of Wan-nu. If so, it seems to me that this change of the title Ta-chên-kuo to Tung-chên-kuo with the eastern transfer of its capital is only a parallel case with the change of the title of the Chou 周 dynasty to the Tung-chou 東周 dynasty with the eastern transfer of its capital. Such examples of the same kind are plenty in the field of Chinese history. Therefore, the title Tung-chên should be taken, not as the Tung-nü-chên, but as Tung-chên after its eastern transfer of its capital; and Ta-chên-kuo 大眞國 being synonymous with Ta-chin-kuo 大金國, Tung-chên-kuo 東眞國 (Eastern Chên State) must mean Tung-chin-kuo 東金國 (Eastern Gold State). One might ask, How is it, then, that the phrase Tung-chên appears in the *Kao-li-shih*, long after Wan-nu was overthrown? Indeed, Prof. IKEUCHI and Mr. WANG Kuo-wei⁽¹⁾

(1) WANG Kuo-wei in his *Héi-ta-shih-liao-chien-chéng* says "Mr. P'êng 彭 mentions Wan-nu of Liao-tung among the states which have resisted and have not yet been conquered. According to the Annals of the Emperor T'ai-tsung in the *Yüan-shih*, the capture of Wan-nu 萬奴 took place as early as the 5th year (*kuai-ssu* 癸巳), exactly the same year that Mr. P'êng was sent to the northern court. Mr. P'êng evidently had not been informed of the fact. However, the *Kao-li-shih* by CHÉNG Lin-shih 鄭麟趾, usually writes Tung-chên. The phrase appears about twenty times in connection with the intercourse between Ta-chên and Kao-li from the year (*kuai-ssu* 癸巳) under the reign of T'ai-tsung to the end of *Chih-yüan* 至元 under the reign of Shih-tsu. It is conceivable that even after the capture of Wan-nu,

seem to avail themselves of this as a strong support for their view of taking Tung-chên as an abbreviation of Tung-nü-chên. This I would explain as a matter of custom established on the side of the Koreans. The phrase having been used so long by them, they continued to use it for several decades even after Tung-chên was overthrown. Such instances are often found in history. Here is an instance which, though but negatively, supports my argument. The theory that the Jurchins occupying the northeastern frontier of Korea were called Tung-chên (Eastern Jurchins) may be accepted; the Jurchins occupying the region near the Ya-lu-chiang 鴨綠江 or the northwestern region, the *Kao-li-shih* calls *Hsi-nü-chên* 西女眞 (Western Jurchins); but the book never writes *Hsi-chên* 西眞 (Western Chên) for it. If there were a custom to abbreviate Tung-nü-chên to Tung-chên, there might be another to abbreviate Hsi-nü-chên, to Hsi-chên (Western Chên). But no such phrase have I come across in the *Kao-li-shih*. One might reply that the fact that the northwestern Jurchins never formed a strong state accounts for the absence of such a phrase in the *Kao-li-shih*. This sounds rather plausible, but it is not strong enough to upset my argument. Prof. YANAI in defending this first appearance under December, the 4th year of Kao-tsung, says "Although that this is for the first time used under December seems suspicious at first sight, it may be explained by the fact that the Koreans, in June, did not know the new title Tung-chên adopted for Wan-nu's state, but came to know it afterward. It would be too hasty to regard the date of the first appearance of the title in the *Kao-li-shih* as the time at which the dynastic title was adopted and doubt the record in the *Yüan-shih*." Thus⁽¹⁾ he criticises the

the Mongolians used the phrase, as they continually dominated the region; the descendants inherited it as if it were one of the territories; the title of Tung-chên was retained as before. What this book says may be nearer the truth after all." 王國維撰「黑韃事略箋證」二十九丁表「彭氏，於己爭未竟諸部中，列遼東萬奴，案元史太宗紀，萬奴之禽在五年癸巳，正彭氏北使之歲，蓋彭氏尙未知此事實也，然鄭麟趾高麗史多紀東眞，即大眞與高麗交涉事，自太宗癸巳以後，至世祖至元之末，凡二十見，意萬奴既擒之後，蒙古仍用之，以鎮撫其地，其後子孫承襲如藩國，然故尙有東眞之稱，此書所云，或反得其實也」。 Mr. P'ENG's visit to the Mongolian court, as I have already proved, took place before the fall of Ta-chên-kuo 大眞國. Mr. WANG's view reproduced here sounds strange.

(1) Dr. YANAI: *The Dominion of Tung-chên-kuo* 箭內博士「東眞國の疆域」, Op. cit., 滿洲歷史地理 (Manchurian Historical Geography), No. 2, pp. 240-241.

compiler of the *Kao-li-shih*. But were the Koreans really uninformed of the affair? It is regrettable that he was too severe to the compiler of the *Kao-li-shih* in order to defend his own view. One would rather feel moved to say something in support of CHÊNG Lin-chi. It is noteworthy that another writing of the period, other than the *Kao-li-shih*, also contains the phrase Tung-chên. The *Chin-chiu-li-hang-chün-chi* 金就礪行軍記 by LI Ch'í-hsien 李齊賢 says:

“Ha-chên 哈眞 sent his interpreter Chao Chung-hsiang 趙仲祥 telling the general (Chin Chiu-li 金就礪) ‘If you wish to conclude peace with us, you should, from a distance, make obeisance to the Mongolian Emperor first and then to the Emperor Wan-nu.’ Wan-nu is the head of Tung-chên. The general answered, ‘As there are not two suns in the heaven, no people have two rulers. How can the world have two emperors?’ Thereupon, he made obeisance to the Sacred One, but not to Wan-nu.”⁽¹⁾

Ha-chên was the Mongolian general who, on December 1st, the 5th year (*mou-yin* 戊寅) of Kao-tsung, attacked the Chiang-tung-ch'êng 江東城 with Wan-yen Tzŭ-yüan 完顏子淵, the general of the Wan-nu troops. Chin Chiu-li 金就礪 was the head of the defending army on the Kao-li side. The incident here given took place in January, the following year,—namely, the 6th year (*chi-mas* 己卯). The presence of the phrase Tung-chên in this *Hang-chün-chi* 行軍記, exactly at the same time that the *Kao-li-shih* uses the phrase Tung-chên may also serve to justify my theory of explaining Tung-chên as Ta-chên after its eastward migration.

IV The Relation between Wang Kuei 王澹 and Wan-Nu 萬奴

In the preceding sections I have often referred to Wang Kuei 王澹 or Wang Hsien-tso 王賢佐 and promised to discuss him in full detail. The *Chin-shih* gives

(1) 李齊賢著「金就礪行軍記」哈眞使通事趙仲祥，語公〔金就礪〕曰，果與我結好，當先遙禮蒙古皇帝，次則禮萬奴皇帝，萬奴蓋東眞之主也，公曰，天無二日，民無二王，天下安有二帝耶，於是只拜聖武，不拜萬奴，quoted in Dr. IKEYUCHI's *Manchuria in the Last Days of the Chin Dynasty*, p. 72.

the following fragmentary accounts of Wang Kuei, but no separate biography. It was formerly impossible to know much of this man. Moreover, there was only one item regarding him in his connection with Wan-nu. The first appearance of the name Wang Kuei in the *Chin-shih* occurs under the 2nd year of *Chên-yu* 貞祐 in the reign of the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 of the Chin dynasty. It reads:

“On January (spring) the day *i-yu* 乙酉 (19th), the 2nd year, . . . the court summoned Wang Kuei 王澹, a *chü-shih* 處士 (a recluse); but he did not come.”⁽¹⁾ Under the following year, it says:

“On September the day *ting-mao* 丁卯 (11th), the 3rd year . . . The Emperor awarded Wang Kuei 王澹, a *yin-shih* 隱士 (a Taoist anchorite), the positions of *Ta'i-chung-ta-fu* 太中大夫 and *Yu-chien-i-ta-fu* 右諫議大夫, and also appointed him staff officer at the Liao-tung *Hsüan-fu-shih* 宣撫司 (Pacification-Office).”⁽²⁾

Again, under the following year, it says:

“On March the day *ping-tz'u* 丙子 (23rd), the Emperor pardoned prisoners in the Liao-tung district. On the day *chi-mao* 己卯 (26th), Wang Kuei 王澹, a *chü-shih* in the position of *Yu-chien-i-ta-fu* 右諫議大夫 was now transferred to *Chung-fêng-ta-fu* 中奉大夫 and *Han-lin-bsüeb-shih* 翰林學士 (a member of the Academy). Thereupon, the Emperor honoured him with a message of recognition.”⁽³⁾

The Official Annals in the *Chin-shih* only offer these fragmentary accounts. As to the name Wang Hsien-tso 王賢佐, it appears in an entirely different source. A passage in the *Hêi-ta-shih-liao* 黑韃事略 by P'ENG Ta-ya 彭大雅 of the Sung dynasty says:

“Of the states which have resisted and have not yet been conquered, one in the east is Kao-li and another Wan-nu in Liao-tung (namely, Ta-chên-kuo of the Jurchins 女真). Wang Hsien-tso 王賢佐, Premier to the latter is over ninety

(1) 「金史」卷十四,宣宗本紀,貞祐二年,三丁表。嘉靖版。二年春正月 . . . 乙酉[十九日],徵處士王澹,不至。

(2) 「金史」卷十四,宣宗本紀,貞祐三年,十二丁裏。嘉靖版。三年九月 . . . 丁卯[十一日],詔授隱士王澹太中大夫右諫議大夫,充遼東宣撫司參謀官。

(3) 「金史」卷十四,宣宗本紀,貞祐四年,十八丁裏。嘉靖版。四年三月 . . . 丙子[二十三日],由遼東路,己卯[二十六日],處士王澹以右諫議大夫,復遷中奉大夫翰林學士,仍賜詔褒諭。

years old and knows the art of reading the future."⁽¹⁾

Now the question is whether Wang Kuei 王澹 in the *Chin-shih* is identical with Wang Hsien-tso 王賢佐 in the *Hêi-ta-shih-liao*. The pioneer on this subject was T'ü Chi 屠寄 of the Ch'ing 清 dynasty. In his *Mêng-wu-êrb-shih-chi* 蒙兀兒史記, he published an original biography of Wang Kuei, which he attached as an appendix to the biography of P'ü-hsien Wan-nu. In it he says :

“Wang Kuei, it may be supposed, is identical with Wang Hsien-tso. Kuei 澹 is probably his personal name and Hsien-tso 賢佐 his alias.”⁽²⁾

Leaving some doubt as to the identity, he succeeded in composing a brief life of the man, cleverly combining the accounts in the *Chin-shih* and the *Hêi-ta-shih-liao*. This certainly does credit to his unusual insight. Some time ago I published an outline of my study on the dynastic title of P'ü-hsien Wan-nu⁽³⁾, in which, from the fact that such words as Ta-chên 大眞, T'ien-t'ai 天泰, and T'ien-wang 天王 in the *Yüan-shih* overwhelmingly smack of Taoism, I suspected the man a Taoist priest or some one connected with Taoism, and, from the fact that the *Chin-shih* describes him as a *yin-shih* 隱士 and a *chü-shih* 處士 and the *Hêi-ta-shih-liao* says ‘He is over ninety years old and knows the art of reading the future’ 年餘九十, 有知來之明, I imagined that he knew also the art of longevity and hygiene, was versed in Taoism and skilled in astrology. Therefore, I declared that Wang Kuei was no doubt Wang Hsien-tso. As I later on saw the new edition of the *Hêi-ta-shih-liao-chien-chêng* 黑韃事略箋證 by WANG Kuo-wei, I felt deeply satisfied to find that I had guessed right. Mr. WANG summarized the life of Wang Kuei from the *Chung-chou-chi-lo-fu* 中州集樂府 by YÜAN Hao-wên 元好問 of the Chin dynasty, and concluded by saying :

(1) 宋彭大雅撰徐霆注[黑韃事略], 王國維箋證本, 二十一丁表。已爭而未竟者, 東曰高麗, 曰遼東萬奴, 即女眞大眞國, 厥相王賢佐, 年餘九十, 有知來之明。

(2) 清屠寄撰「蒙兀兒史記」列傳第十五, 蒲鮮萬奴附傳王澹傳六丁表。王澹疑即王賢佐, 澹其名, 賢佐其字也。

(3) Hirotsato IWAI: The Shigaku-zasshi, Vol. XLII, No. 7, p. 811, July 1931; Address at Oriental History Section, the 23rd Conference of the Shigaku-kwai (Historical Society); the Shigaku-zasshi, Vol. XLIII, No. 3, p. 420, July, 1932; Report of the 129th Meeting of the Tôyôshi-danwa-kwai (Oriental History Symposium Society).

“T'u Ching-shan 屠敬山 wrote a life of P'u-hsien Wan-nu, in which he declares the identity of Wang Hsien-tso of this book with Wang Kuei in the *Chin-shih*. This question is now settled on the ground of the *Chung-chou-chi* 中州集.”⁽¹⁾ Mr. WANG answered the question asked by Mr. T'u and incidentally provided my surmise with definite evidence. Moreover, perhaps as a result of the suggestion by T'u Chi 屠寄 in his *Mêng-wu-êrb-shih-chi* 蒙兀兒史記, Ko Chao-min 柯劭忞, in compiling the *Hsin-yüan-shih* 新元史, assigns a section for the life of P'u-shien Wan-nu in the last paragraph of which, he discusses the relation of Wan-nu to Wang Kuei.

“It was nineteen years since Wan-nu assumed the dynastic title in the year *i-hai* 乙亥 when he was defeated. The premier to Wan-nu was called Wang Kuei. The Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 of the Chin dynasty awarded him positions of *Yu-chien-i-ta-fu* 右諫議大夫 and appointed him staff officer at the *Liao-tung-An-fu-shih* 遼東安撫司 (Pacification-Office). Later he became premier to Wan-nu, and died at over ninety years of age. He was said to know the art of reading the future.”⁽²⁾ Dr. KO 柯, like a Chinese scholar, makes no research or criticism, but simply selects his materials from among the various documents. However, his general attitude is much to my satisfaction. Since no complete life of Wang Kuei has yet been presented to our academic circles, as has been previously referred to, I consider it not entirely useless to introduce the life. The *Chung-chou-chi-lo-fu* has an article entitled “Wang Hsüan-tso 王玄佐”⁽³⁾, before a selection of poems by him entitled *Tung-hsien-ko* 洞仙歌 occurs.

(1) 清王國維撰「黑韃事略箋證」二十三丁裏。屠敬山[寄]作蒲鮮萬奴傳，已疑此書之王賢佐即金史之王澹，今據中州集，乃得定之。

(2) 清柯劭忞編「新元史」卷一百三十四，列傳第三十一，蒲鮮萬奴傳，七丁表。萬奴自乙亥歲僭號，至是九十有九年而亡。萬奴之相曰王澹，金宣宗授右諫議大夫，充遼東安撫司參謀官，後遂為萬奴宰相，年九十餘卒，世謂有知來之術云。A mistake already seen in the case of *Yü-wen Mou-chao*, editor of the *Ta-Chin-kuo-chih*, is repeated here again by Dr. Ko Chao-min, that is to say, he transcribes *Hsüan-fu-shih* 宣撫使 incorrectly as *An-fu-shih* 安撫使, (vid. p. 122).

(3) 金元好問編「中州集」附樂府。翰苑英華中州集，十六丁表裏，四部叢刊本。

王玄佐

賢佐一字玄佐，名澹，咸平人，為人沈默寡欲，遂於易學，若有神授之，又通星曆緯識之學，明昌初，德行才能，召至京師，命以官，不拜。朝廷重其人，授信州教授，未幾，自免去，再授博州教授，郡守以下皆師尊之，一日守澹客，適中使至，中使漠然少年，重賢佐名，強之酒，守從旁救之，曰王先生不茹葷

Wang Hsüan-tso

Another alias of Hsien-tso 賢佐 was Hsüan-tso 玄佐; his personal name was Kuei 澹. He was a man of Hsien-p'ing 咸平. He was naturally taciturn and disinterested, and was such a great expert in the *I* 易 study that people thought that God was helping him; he was also a profound student of astrology and fortune-telling. At the beginning of *Ming-chang* 明昌 (1190 A.D.), he was known for his virtue and talent, and was summoned to the capital, and ordered to accept an official position, but he refused it. The court, respecting his personality, appointed him Professor of Hsin-chou 信州 (Huai-yüan-fu 懷遠府 in the region of P'o-hai 渤海 to the north-east of T'ieh-ling 鐵嶺), but before long he ran away from the post. He was again

酒,勿苦之也,中使乃止,是夕賢佐棄官,遁歸鄉里。宣宗即位,聞其名,議譏召之,以道梗不果。車駕南渡。人有自咸平來者說,賢佐年六十餘,起居如少壯人。宣宗重其人,常以字呼,遣王曼卿,授遼東宣撫使,不拜。又詔宰相,以書招之,‘云,阻奉仙標,渴思道論,敬佇下風,瞻系何極,先生嘉遯林嶽,脫屣浮榮,究大易之盈虛,洞玄象之終始,道尊德重,名動天朝,推其緒餘,足利天下,然君子之道,出處語默,何常之有,或拂衣而長往,或濡跡以挾時,故當其無事,則采薇山阿,餌木岩岫,固其宜矣,及多難之際,社稷傾危而不顧,蒼生倒懸而不解,其自爲謀則善矣,仁人之心固如是乎,某等猥以不才謬膺重任,四郊多壘,各將誰執,徒積慙汗,坐視何益,日夜以思,庶幾得明利害而外僭祿者,在天子左右,同濟太平。今聖上明發,不寐軫念元元,屈己下賢,尊師重道,歎先生之絕識,仰先生之高風,雖黃帝尊廣成之道,唐虞重顓陽之節,不是過也,先生懷寶遺世,如某輩之不肖,固在所棄,獨不念累世祖宗之基業,億兆生靈之性命,忍忘之耶,昔商岩四老定儲嗣而暨來,東山謝安爲蒼生而一起,今安危大計,非特定儲之勢也,強敵侵逼,又非東晉之時也,生民塗炭亦已極矣,豈先生建策於明昌之初,獨無一言於貞祐之日乎。想先生幡然而改,愾然而來,審定大計,轉危爲安,然後,披憲幌,拂雲霓,未爲晚耳,敬聽車音,某雖不肖,請擁轡而先之。’書達,竟不至,遼東破時,年九十餘矣。[信州渤海懷遠府鐵嶺東北;博州元東昌路,山東省聊城縣西北]

In this connection, I should like to tell you about the two aliases of Wang Kuei. The character hsüan 玄 in Hsüan-tso 玄佐, the alias of Wang Kuei 王澹, is also one fondly and frequently employed by Taoists. It is very probable that, because Wang was respected as a Taoist anchorite by the common people of that period and was really a personage of rare intelligence and talent, he gradually came to be called Hsien-tso 賢佐 (the Intelligent Tso). I should think that hsüan 玄 and hsien 賢 being pronounced almost similarly by the Chinese, the two aliases (Hsüan-tso 玄佐 and Hsien-tso 賢佐) have been handed down to this day. Incidentally, this fact will serve to prove that Wang was a Taoist anchorite profoundly respected by the general public as well as the court of P'u-hsien Wan-nu. Yüan Hao-wên 元好問 whose alias was Yü-chih 裕之 and whose pen-name I-shan 遺山 was a noted man of letters of the Chin-Yüan period. This (中州集) is a collection of the poems of the whole Chin dynasty, with a brief biography for each composer. His aim was probably in recording historical matters in verse; some episodes are given; hence a book the student of the Chin and Yüan dynasties cannot afford to overlook. He left other works such as the *I-shan-chi* 遺山集 in forty volumes, the *Hsü-i-chien-chih* 續夷堅志, and the *T'ang-shih-chien-chu* 唐詩箋注. The parentheses in this biography mark Mr. Wang's omission.

appointed Professor of Po-chou 博州 (The Yüan dynasty re-named it Tung-chang-lu 東昌路—a district to the northeast of Liao-chêng-hsien 聊城縣 in Shan-tung 山東). (There he was looked up to as master by everybody, including the district head. One day the district head invited Kuei as an honoured guest to his house, where a court messenger called unexpectedly. The messenger, only an innocent youth, intending to pay homage to the great reputation of Hsien-tso, pressed wine upon him. The district head intervened and saved him, saying “Don’t worry Professor Wang. He doesn’t drink.” This stopped the messenger. However, in the course of the evening, the scholar) resigned his post and went back to his native place. The Emperor Hsüan-tsung on his accession to the throne, heard of his great reputation, and after a consultation, summoned him to a post-station. He failed to come, on the pretext that the road was blocked. As the Imperial carriage moved southward, a man who had come from Hsien-p’ing told him that Hsien-tso, now over sixty years old lived, working like a young man. The Emperor always affectionately spoke of Hsien-tso using his alias. The Emperor sending Wang Man-ching 王曼卿 as his envoy appointed him *Hsüan-fu-shih* 宣撫使 of Liao-tung, but he did not accept it. The Emperor ordered his premier to write and summon Hsien-tso. (The letter reads: To live up to the high standard of the hermit, to ponder on the principles of Taoism, placing ourselves under your leadership and looking up to you,—it would be the greatest honour to us. My dear professor, you prefer to lead a retired life, keeping aloof from worldly glory, studying the waxing and waning of the great *I* 易 theory, penetrating into the cause and effect of heavenly phenomena. The depth of your moral teachings and the eminence of your virtue inspire even the Imperial court. Even the small remnants of your ability will be enough to benefit the world. However, the way of the true gentleman should be so varied in movement and speech. He should make a long journey, swinging his clothes, or should stay behind in order to save the people. In times of peace, it is very well for him to hunt for the osmund royal in a mountain corner and eat plants in a rock cave. In times of emergency, it is also very well

for him, not to care if an empire should decline, and not to relieve the people if they should be hung upside down, but to carry on his own studies. However, a benign person cannot remain unfeeling like this. We (the premier and others) are by mistake placed in important positions to manage grave situations; we are blocked in every direction. Whom should we go to? Why should we keep on perspiring and standing idle? Day and night we earnestly wish to find some one who can tell advantages from disadvantages, and yet does not care for earthly honours or wealth, and to make such a man wait upon the Emperor, and to endeavour with him to bring about a peaceful reign. The present Emperor who is brilliant and sagacious is sleeplessly solicitous for the welfare of his people, humbles himself before the wise, respects the teachers, and upholds moral principles. He admires your supreme wisdom and looks up to your lofty character. His certainly exceeds the respect which Huang-ti 黃帝 showed for the teachings of Kuang-ch'êng 廣成 or T'ang Yü 唐虞 (Yao-ti 堯帝 and Shun-ti 舜帝) for the fidelity of Ying-yang 潁陽. You who are gifted with such rare talent have left the world behind. Ill-advised men like us well deserve desertion. How could you remain indifferent to the mighty task our successive emperors have achieved and the destiny of our nation? How could you dare to forget them? In the Han period, the four old anchorites of Shang-yen 商岩 were persuaded to leave their refuges to decide on their imperial heir; and in the Tung-Chin 東晉 dynasty, Hsieh An-shih 謝安石 of Tung-shan 東山 was also invited to the imperial court to save the people, and won a decisive battle. The present crisis is far more pressing than the necessity to decide upon an heir in the Han dynasty. The powerful enemy presses upon us far harder than in the Tung-Chin 東晉 period; and the privations and suffering of the people have never been more intense. If you drew up a policy at the beginning of *Ming-chang*, how could you keep silent in this era of *Chên-yu*? We trust you will at once tear yourself away from your present state, join us willingly, draw up a supreme policy, and convert the present crisis into a peaceful reign. It would not be too late yet even after that to further your study of Taoism, pulling aside the fragrant curtain and

pushing apart the screen of cloud. Should we be so honoured as to be allowed to hear the rolling of your carriage, we shall humbly go on with brooms in hands and act as your forerunners.) The letter reached him, but he did not come. And Liao-tung was lost, when he was over ninety years old.”

As KU Yen-wu 顧炎武 and CH'ÏEN Ta-hsin 錢大昕 have pointed out⁽¹⁾, Yüan Hao-wên 元好問 with Liu-ch'i 劉祁, was one of the actual writers of the *Chin-shih*. So it cannot be denied that the biography of Wang Kuei by YÜAN I-shan 元遺山 is quite valuable as historical material. I am convinced that it may be relied upon.

There is another collection of poems entitled *Ku-yin* 谷音⁽²⁾ compiled by Tu-Pên 杜本 of the Yüan dynasty. A brief life of Wang Kuei is included. Since the book does not aim to be a biography, this life is quite simple; but the six poems included would be helpful for those who wish to know his sentiment in those days.

Wang Kuei Hsüan-tso 王澹玄佐 of Liao-tung.

Kuei was a great scholar and personality. He was invited by the *tz'u-shih* 刺史 (governor) of Po-chou 博州, and became a teacher there. He taught more

(1) (The *Chin-shih* is mostly written by the two men Liu Ch'i 劉祁 and Yüan Hao-wên 元好問 and is very readable. 清顧炎武著「日知錄」卷二十六, 二十七丁裏——二十八丁表。『金史大抵出劉祁, 元好問二君之筆, 亦頗可觀。』) An inserted note reads (Mr. Ch'ien 錢 says “The affairs after the southern transfer of the capital in *Chên-yu* 貞祐 are mostly borrowed from the two writers YÜAN 元 and LIU 劉. Up to Chang-tsung 章宗, the accounts in full detail are found in the *Shih-lu* 實錄 (Actual Record), and not taken from the two men.” 錢氏曰「貞祐南遷以後, 事迹多取元劉兩家, 章宗以前則實錄真在, 非出二人事也。」)

(2) 元杜本編「谷音」上卷, 一丁表, 四部叢刊本。This contains, like the *Chung-chou-chi* 中州集 previously mentioned, poems and brief biographies of their composers; in two volumes; 100 pieces altogether, by 23 known poets and 4 anonymous ones. These represent poems of lamentation by true loyalists and poems of refined sentiment by exiles, in the last days of the Sung and Chin dynasties. The characters hsüan 玄 and chên 貞 are employed only with a studied omission in their strokes.

Tu Pên 杜本 was a man of the last period of the Yüan dynasty; his alias was Pai-yüan 伯原. He came from Ch'ing-chiang 清江 and was a profound scholar and writer, a poet, and a calligrapher of the *chuan-shu* 篆書 and *li-shu* 隸書 types. He came up to the capital, summoned by the Emperor Wu-tsung 武宗, but before long went home for retirement. He was again offered by the Emperor Shun-ti 順帝 the position of *Han-lin-tai-chih* 翰林待制, but he firmly refused it. Besides this book, he wrote *Ching-chiang-pi-chang-chi* 清江碧嶂集. He was called Professor Ch'ing-pi 清碧先生.

Lately I have come across the *Liao-tung-wên-hsien-chêng-liao* 遼東文獻徵略 in six volumes by CHIN Yu-fu 金毓紱 published in 1925. This also gives a biography of Wang Kuei, but it is nothing but a reprint of the *Chung-chou-chi* 中州集 and the *Ku-yin* 谷音 with some notes by him. It contains no new material.

than a hundred disciples. During the era of *Chên-yu* 貞祐, the premier repeatedly sent messages to Kuei, offering the post of *Hsüan-fu* (Pacification-Commissioner) of Liao-tung and asking him to leave for his post in the region. Kuei refused and departed by means of a boat."⁽¹⁾

The time has now come, with the discovery of these two new materials, to revise the accepted life of Wang Kuei solely based on the meagre materials scattered in the *Chin-shih*. The *Chin-shih* only says 不至 "He did not come" when summoned by the Emperor Hsüan-tsung, utterly failing to indicate where he did not come from. Now we definitely know that he stayed at Hsien-p'ing, his native place, and did not leave it when his service was desired by the Emperor. Moreover, about a month before Wan-nu, assuming the dynastic title Ta-chên (大眞), rebelled against the Chin dynasty, the court, wishing to win over Wang Kuei whose influence and reputation were unrivalled in Liao-tung and planning to subjugate Liao-tung through his efforts, awarded him the positions of *T'ai-chung-ta-fu* 太中大夫 and *Yu-chien-i-ta-fu* 右諫議大夫, and appointed him staff officer at the *Liao-tung Hsüan-fu-shih* 遼東宣撫司 (Pacification-Office). This was formerly understood to mean that he accepted the offer at the capital and proceeded to his post in Liao-tung, but we now know that one of the two materials says "The court appointed him *Liao-tung Hsüan-fu-shih* 宣撫使 (Pacification-Commissioner), but he refused 授遼東宣撫使不拜"; and the other says "The premier asked him to leave for his post in the region. Kuei refused. 請澮之鎮澮不應." Thus it is clear that he did not obey the order of the Chin court. Besides, the passages "He was naturally taciturn and disinterested and such a great expert of the *I* 易 study that people thought that God was helping him 爲人沈默寡欲. 遂於易學. 若有神授之" and "Also a profound student of astrology and fortune-telling 又通星曆緯識之學" completely coincide with "He knows the art of reading the future 有知來之明" recorded by P'ENG Ta-ya 彭大雅. Again, according to this biography, a man who came from Hsien-p'ing soon after

(1) 元杜本編「谷音」上卷,一丁表——二丁表,四部叢刊本。澮博學醇行,博州刺史迎爲師,教授弟子百餘,貞祐中,就拜宣撫遼東,宰相累書請澮之鎮,澮不應,浮海逝去。

the Emperor Hsüan-tsung moved southward described Wang by “Hsien-tso 賢佐 now over sixty years old 賢佐年六十餘”, which was in the 2nd year of *Chên-yü* 貞祐; and when Wan-nu was defeated about twenty years later in the 2nd year of *T'ien-hsing* 天興 of the Chin dynasty (the 5th or the year *kuai-sü* 癸巳 of the Emperor T'ai-tsung of Mongolia), the biography says “Liao-tung was defeated when he was over ninety years old. 遼東破時,年九十餘矣.” When Mr. P'êng heard of this man at the Mongolian court a year before the fall of Wan-nu, he writes “Wang Hsien-tso 王賢佐, Premier to Wan-nu, is over ninety years old. 厥相王賢佐年餘九十.” The two materials are found to coincide perfectly. As the *Chin-shih* describes him as a *yin-shih*⁽¹⁾, I took him to be a Taoist anchorite or some one connected with Taoism, as I have previously mentioned. Now, in the passage *Yüan Hao-wên* 元好問 writes in connection with his selecting *Tung-hsien-ko* 洞仙歌 from the numerous poems by Wang Kuei to include it in the *Chung-chou-chi* 中州集 and also in the letter which the Chin premier wrote to Wang Kuei, imploring him to render service to the court, it is to be noted that he was a man distinctly connected with Taoism. As given in detail in the *Cho-kêng-lu* 輟耕錄⁽²⁾ by T'AO Tsung-i 陶宗儀 and in the

(1) In August, the year *jên-wu* 壬午, a star was visible in the day-time. Yin-shih Ch'iao Ching-chên 隱士喬靜真 said “My study of the heavenly phenomenon tells me that we should not advance our troops.” 「元史」卷百十九, 木華黎傳, 二丁表, 「壬午八月有星晝見, 隱士喬靜真曰, 今觀天象未可征進。」 Disregarding this warning, Mu-khu-li 木華黎 advanced his troops; yet it seems that *yin-shih* 隱士 (a recluse) does not mean a common man. The *Tzū-wei-kuan-chi* 紫微觀記 by YÜAN Hao-wên 元好問 says: The *yin-chün-tzu* 隱君子 (recluse gentleman) of old and students of Taoism, usually lived in mountains or woods, eating plants and drinking from a rivulet. He had a slender neck and a yellow face. He placed himself outside the common run of man like a follower of the school of Pe'i wêng and Ho-chang-chang-jên. Later men classify the school with the Huang-ti Lao-tzu school and look up to them as the group of the greatest recluses. Since the days of T'ao Yin-chü 陶隱居 and K'ou Ch'ien-chi 寇謙之, this custom has been in existence. 古之隱君子學道之士, 爲多居山林, 木食澗飲, 稿項黃誠, 自放于方之外, 若涪翁河上丈人之流, 後世或附之黃老家, 數以爲列僊, 陶隱居, 寇謙之以來此風故在也). The meaning of *yin-shih* 隱士 must be clear now. *The I-shan-wen-chi* 「遺山文集」第三十五, 十七丁表, 四部叢刊本。

(2) The *Ch'üan-chên-chi-shih* 全真紀實 reads “In the first year of *Chên-yüan* 貞元 in the reign of Emperor Liang 亮 of the Chin dynasty, a government clerk from Hsien-yang 咸陽, named Wang Chung-fu 王中孚 introduced the religion *Ch'üan-chên-chiao* 全真教. As T'an 談, Ma 馬, Ch'iu 丘, and Liu 劉 joined him, the movement began to flourish. 陶宗儀著「南村輟耕錄」卷二十九, 陶氏景元本刊, 八丁裏, 「全真紀實云, 金主亮, 貞元元年有吏員, 咸陽人王中孚者, 倡全真教, 談, 馬, 丘, 劉和之, 其教盛焉。」

Tzū-wei-kuan-chi 紫微觀記⁽¹⁾ by YÜAN Hao-wên 元好問, it was a time when Ch'üan-chên-chiao 全真教 swayed the whole of North China and was taking the world by storm. It is small wonder if Wang Kuei should have been among those who swam with the current of the times. Moreover, in his poem entitled *Ho-chib-fang* 河之坊, though included with some omission in this selection, he dreads the invasion of the Yüan troops from without, criticises the conservative cowardly policy of the Chin court, the gradual decrease of the dominion, the absence of a far-sighted premier who should assist the Emperor, the ever corrupting politics, and moans: "A doomed nation! Look, you blind men!" 國覆矣,視爾膏膏. In the four poems entitled *Kan-yü* 感遇, he also bemoans the folly of the Sung people uniting with the Yüan forces in attacking the Chin people, comments upon the daily growth of the Mongols and the daily decline of the Chin court, and in mentioning that in the weakening of the two states the Yüan people gain, doing nothing on their part, he laments "Two tigers fight in the middle of the field; gain rests with the hunters" 兩虎鬥中野,利乃歸循虞; and as he witnesses Chin officials won over by the Mongols, he satirizes: "Chicks fly; with them dogs run. Who cares whether I live or not?" 鷄飛與狗走,妾命獨奈何. Thus all his poems⁽²⁾ would reflect his character as a perverse recluse.

It may be imagined that, because Wang Kuei knew Taoism thoroughly as has been referred to, he was versed in the classics quoted by T'ao Yin-chü 陶隱居;

(1) 金元好問著「紫微觀記」 in the *I-shan-wen-chi* 遺山文集,第三十五,十七丁表,四部叢刊本. Since *Chên-yüan* 貞元 and *Chêng lung* 正隆, the religion called Ch'üan-chên-chiao 全真教 has been in vogue. It was introduced by Wang Fu-chung 王孚中, a man from Hsien-yang 咸陽 and T'an 譚, Ma 馬, Ch'iu 丘, and Liu 劉 joined the movement... The lazy degraded classes of people rushed on to it. It spread to the Wei 淮 river on the south, to the Desert on the north, to Ch'in 秦 on the west, and to the sea on the east. Mountains, woods, cities, and huts all looked up to it. Tens and hundreds of men were made into groups. They taught and were taught. The movement became too strong to be suppressed... After the destruction of the state in *Chên-yü* 貞祐, the people quickly turned lawless. The illiterate folks did not know what to think. Therefore, they were taught only by these men. (貞元·正隆以來,又有全真家之教,咸陽人王孚中倡之,譚·馬·丘·劉和之,...故墮窳之人翕然從之,南際淮,北至朔漠,西向秦,東向海,山林城市,廛舍相望,什百爲偶,甲乙授受,牢不可破...貞祐喪亂之後,蕩然無紀綱文章,蚩蚩之民,靡所趣向,爲之教者,獨是家而已).

(2) (Tu Pen: *Ku-yin*) Op. cit., 杜本「谷音」一,二丁表裏.

and I do not hesitate in attributing to his profound scholarship *T'ien-t'ai* the name of the era, *T'ien-wang* the title of the ruler, and *Kai-yüan* the name of the capital. We now readily see that such a recluse as this man could have refused the invitation of the Chin court.

Finally, a word may be necessary on the account in the *Chin-shih* under the date March 26th, the 4th year of *Chên-yü*. I have already referred to the fact that, while the *Chin-shih* records his appointment in September, the preceding year, as staff officer at the Liao-tung *Hsüan-fu-shih* (Pacification Office), the biography insists on his refusal of the proposal. The account under March, the 4th year of the same era reads: Wang Kuei a *ch'u-shih* in the position of *Yu-chien-i-ta-fu* 右諫議大夫 was now transferred to *Chung-fêng-ta-fu* 中奉大夫 and *Han-lin-hsüeh-shih* 翰林學士 (a member of the Academy). Therefore, an Imperial message of recognition and encouragement was awarded him. It seems extremely strange that Wang Kuei who had become Premier to Wan-nu, the rebel, who founded Ta-chên-kuo 大真國,—the man who had refused to accept the position of staff officer at the *Hsüan-fu-shih* seems to have been awarded the position of *Yu-chien-i-ta-fu* and now seems to have been transferred to *Chung-fêng-ta-fu* and *Han-lin-hsüeh-shih* and in addition to that, to have been awarded an Imperial message of recognition. Therefore, T'u Chi 屠寄 offered the following explanation:

“The reason why, in March, the 4th year, the rank of Wang Kuei was promoted and awarded an Imperial message of recognition, was because the Chin court had been informed of the probable fact that when Wan-nu was to rebel, Wang Kuei advised him to reconsider it. Hence this Imperial message of recognition. It is also considered that, through Wang's good efforts, Wan-nu would have changed his mind.”⁽¹⁾ What a happy plausible surmise for Mr. T'u 屠 who had nothing to go by except the scattered materials in the *Chin-shih*! However, in view of his attitude to the Chin court and his satire on the times as shown in his poems, it is evident that Wang was by no means a man who would accept the official positions

(1) 屠寄撰「蒙古兒史記」列傳第十五，蒲鮮萬奴傳，附傳王澹傳，六丁表。而四年三月，尙進王澹官階，且賜褒諭者，意萬奴叛時，王澹必有勸阻之言，朝廷傳聞，故有此諭，猶思借澹力以回萬奴之心也。

and honours. Therefore, as in the previous case when he was offered the position of staff officer at the *Hsüan-fu-shih* the new honours were also awarded him in his absence by the Chin court, and only word was sent to him in Wan-nu's Ta-chên-kuo; it is probable that he did not admit that he accepted them. But this serves to show his extraordinary scholarship and personality. As the Chin court heard of his resourcefulness and wisdom, it tried its best to win him over by offering official positions, by awarding an Imperial message of recognition, and by appointing him *Han-lin-hsüeb-shih*. Thus I interpret the incompatibility between the record in the *Chin-shih* and the new materials.

To summarize the foregoing, Wan-nu was first despatched by the court to Hsien-p'ing as *Chao-t'ao-shih* 招討使 (subjigator), and was promoted to the position of *Hsüan-fu* (Pacification-Commissioner) during the rebellion of Liu-ko 留哥. In the meanwhile, he came to strike up a staunch friendship with Wang Kuei who was at Hsien-p'ing. He unbosomed his innermost idea of declaring independence eventually against the Chin court; and Wang Kuei being impressed by Wan-nu's confidence in his pledged allegiance to Wan-nu, did not accept the repeated summons of the Chin court, repeatedly refused the offer of official positions, decorations, and the Imperial message of recognition, worked with Wan-nu to the very end of Ta-chên-kuo, until he was over ninety years of age, as adviser and premier to Wan-nu. Thus much has been elucidated by the newly acquired materials.

V Conclusions

It is hoped that the reader has now seen that the dynastic title of Wan-nu was Ta-chên, that Wang Kuei, one of the advisers to Wan-nu was a scholar versed in Taoism, that the title Ta-chên was derived from one of the Taoist classics, and that Wang Kuei did remain with Wan-nu until the very end. When viewed in this light, it would not be wrong to suppose that the name of the new era, the title of the ruler, and the name of the capital—all these came from a source similar to that of the dynastic title,—from the brains of Wang Kuei and others who participated

in founding Ta-chên-kuo. I shall first take up the name of the era, *T'ien-t'ai*. The two characters 天泰 as a phrase cannot be found in Confucianism or Buddhism as far as my limited study has gone. So I attempted to trace it to Taoist scriptures or literature, and found some material which might be regarded as its origin. This is a book entitled *Huang-ti-t'ai-i-pa-mên-ju-shib-pi-chüeh* 黃帝太一八門入式祕訣⁽¹⁾, a passage of which reads:

“Incantation for Entering the Heavenly Gate.

Heavenly gate, widely open! Liu-chia 六甲 (Taoist gods) support me! Gold chains and jade keys, fail not to appear! Off with the evils and the devils! Hie, as the laws demand!”

Is it not possible that the two characters *t'ien-t'ai* were taken from the phrase *T'ien-mên-t'ai-k'ai* 天門泰開? As Dr. S. ICHIMURA, my honoured teacher, once pointed out⁽²⁾, the names of the Chinese eras are often derived from Buddhism, Taoism, and the Wu-hang 五行 theory. Is not this one solved in the same light? Moreover, the same book contains the phrase *T'ien-mên-k'ai-t'ai* 天門開泰, which may be the source of *K'ai-t'ai* 開泰, the name of Shen-tsung 聖宗 of the Liao 遼 dynasty. Likewise, *T'ien-t'ai* adopted by Wan-nu may be traced to the same book. One may reply, “Since the Confucian classics already have the phrase *T'ien-bsia-t'ai-p'ing* 天下泰平, you could just as well explain *T'ien-t'ai* as originating from that.” Perhaps I could. According to my memory, however, the *Li-chi* 禮記⁽³⁾ and the *Lü-shib-ch'un-ch'iu* 呂氏春秋⁽⁴⁾ always say 天下太平, but never 天下

(1) 道藏 (Tao-tsang) 洞玄部, 衆術類, 三百二十四册, 五下, 四丁裏。入天門呪。天門泰開, 六甲扶持, 金鎖玉鑰, 速在莫遲, 掃蕩邪穢, 惡鬼祛之, 急急如律令。Liu-chia 六甲 is the name of a diety. *T'ien-mên-k'ai-t'ai* 天門開泰 (Heavenly gate, open widely) and *Ssü-tao-k'ai-t'ai* 四道開泰 (Four ways, open widely) are also found in the same book.

(2) Sanjiro ICHIMURA, *Nengó ni arawaretaru jidai-shi-só*, 文學博士市村瓊次郎著「年號に現はれたる時代思想」(*Ideas of the Times Reflected in the Names of Various Eras*), The Shigaku-zasshi, Vol. XXXIX, No. 4, pp. 319-337, April, 1928.

(3) 禮記 (Li-chi) 仲尼燕居, 第二十八, 「言而履之, 禮也, 行而樂之, 樂也, 君子力此二者, 以南面而立, 夫是以天下太平也。」(To talk and practise what you talk is li 禮 (good manners). To practise and enjoy what you practice is lo 樂 (joy). The chün-tzū 君子 (true gentleman) is one who aspires to do these two. He stands upright facing the south, for peace reigns over the land. 「纂圖互註禮記」四部叢刊本, 四册, 九丁表。

泰平. The practice of writing 天下泰平 for 天下太平 because of the similarity of pronunciation of 太 and 泰, seems to date from a much later time. This I offer only as an opinion, and I am certainly open to conviction.

There is another point I must comment upon. Both the *Yüan-shih* and the *Chin-shih* give the phrase *Kai-yüan T'ien-t'ai* 改元天泰 "He re-named the era *T'ien-t'ai*" and not the phrase *Chien-yüan T'ien-t'ai* 建元天泰 "He established a new era *T'ien-t'ai*." On this account, one may suspect the existence of a previous name for the era, which was adopted when Wan-nu assumed the title *Tung-hsia-wang* 東夏王, but which has been lost through the disappearance of the materials. Is not this the reason why, when the state Ta-chên was established, it is recorded *kai-yüan* "He re-named the era", and not *chien-yüan* "He established a new era." No, this cannot be. Wan-nu's assumption of the title *Tung-hsia-wang* perfectly corresponds to the case in which Chu Yüan-chang 朱元璋 of the Ming dynasty assumed the title *Wu-wang* 吳王, prior to his founding the Ming dynasty. As he had no name adopted for the period when he called himself *Wu-wang* 吳王, so Wan-nu had none for his *Tung-hsia-wang* period. Besides, *Ya-ssü-pu* 耶廝不 and *Chin-shan* 金山, who at about the same time as Wan-nu, founded new states in Liao-tung and assumed the title *wang* 王 (King), adopted new names for their eras⁽¹⁾, but both the *Yüan-shih* and the *Chin-shih* say *kai-yüan* 改元 "He re-named the era" and not *chien-yüan* 建元 "He established a new era." I am of the opinion that what the writers mean by re-naming is re-naming the Chin era, which had been used up to that time.

The next question is *T'ien-wang* 天王. The phrase, in ancient times, had been so much used in the writings by Confucianists, Buddhists, and astrologists, that it is not mentioned from what literature Wang Kuei, in this case, adopted it. A man

P. 151 (4) 呂氏春秋卷之第五, 仲夏紀第五, 大樂, 「先王定樂, 由此而生, 天下太平, 萬物安寧, 皆其其上」四部叢刊本, 一册, 三丁裏. The late Emperor established *yüeh* 樂 (music); through this came the supreme peace over the whole land; everything peaceful is the outcome of this.

(1) 元史卷百四十九, 列傳第三十六, 耶律留哥傳「耶廝不僭帝號於澄州, 國號遼, 改元天威. *Ya-ssü-pü* 耶廝不 assumed the title of Emperor at Ch'êng-chou 澄州, adopting *Liao* 遼 as his dynastic title and re-naming the era *T'ien-wei* 天威; and also *Chin-shan* 金山 also assumed the title *Kuo-wang* 國王 (King) and re-named the era *T'ien-tê* 天德. 「金山又自稱國王改元天德」.

of profound learning versed in antiquities like him certainly had good reason for choosing T'ien-wang 天王, not merely Wang 王 for his lord. It may not be entirely vain to make an enquiry into it.

To begin with, every one who has read the *Sbang-shu* 尙書 remembers that, in China, not T'ien-wang, but simply Wang 王 was used. The reader also knows that the phrase T'ien-wang for the first time appears in the *Ch'un-ch'iu* 春秋. A passage in the *Ch'un-ch'iu-tso-shih-chuan* 春秋左氏傳 reads :

“In July (autumn), the 1st year of the Duke Yin-kung 隱公, the T'ien-wang 天王 summoned Premier Huan 桓 and sent him to the duke with obituary gifts for Hui-kung 惠公 and Chung-tzū 仲子 his parents. [Note] The T'ien-wang here means King P'ing-wang 平王.”⁽¹⁾

And another reads :

“In the winter, the 28th year of the Duke Hsi-kung 僖公, the T'ien-wang fled to Ho-yang 河陽.”⁽²⁾ These instances were followed by the *Shih-chi* 史記, the *Han-shu* 漢書, and other documents, which have handed down the usage to modern times. What does this mean? I think it most convenient to answer the question by quoting the view taken by Ku Yen-wu 顧炎武. In his *Ji-chih-lu* 日知錄, he says :

“The passage in the *Sbang-shu* gives merely Wang 王, but the *Ch'un-ch'iu* 春秋 gives T'ien-wang. At that time, all the rulers of Ch'u 楚, Wu 吳, Hsü 徐, and Yüeh 越 assumed the title Wang 王, so it was necessary to distinguish the particular one by prefixing T'ien to it. Chao-tzū 趙子 says ‘The reason why T'ien-wang is preferred is because the writer wishes to indicate that there were not two Sacred Ones.’”⁽³⁾

In the face of the circumstances of the Chan-kuo 戰國 period when the *Ch'un-*

(1) 春秋左氏傳隱公元年,「春秋經傳集解隱公第一」四部叢刊本,一册,一丁表裏。隱公元年,秋七月天王使宰咺來,歸惠公仲子之賵。[疏]天王平王也。

(2) 僖公二十八年,冬,天王守于河陽。Ho-yang 河陽 is the present Méng-hsien 孟縣 in the Honan 河南 province. 僖公二十八年,同書僖下第七,同刊本,二册,三丁表,八丁裏。

(3) 清顧炎武著「日知錄」卷之四,天王,十二丁表。尙書之文但稱王,春秋則曰天王,以當時楚吳徐越皆僭稱王,故加天以別之也,趙子曰稱天王,以表無二尊是也。

ch'iu 春秋 was written,—if we accept the view of Dr. K. SHIRATORI, my honoured teacher, and Dr. S. TSUDA, who ascribe the writing of the book to a date as late as this—and the princes of the various provinces all assumed the title *Wang*, it was certainly necessary for the writer, for the purpose of distinguishing the Chou family from the rest, to prefix *T'ien* to the ordinary form *Wang* 王. However, KU Yen-wu 顧炎武, following the then accepted view of assigning the writing of the *Ch'un-ch'iu* to a very remote antiquity, reasoned from a different ground. In the Ch'i-nei 畿內 region, the Chou 周 family alone was regarded as *Wang*; the other rulers were known by various titles, such as Kung 公 (Duke), Hou 侯 (Marquis), Pai 伯 (Count), and Tzū 子 (Viscount). With the development of the south, however, some provincial princes began to assume the title *Wang*, and thus it became necessary to prefix *T'ien* to *Wang* in order to distinguish the regal family from the rest. It was the purpose of the compilers of the *Ch'un-ch'iu* to define the true relations of sovereign and subjects. Such is KU Yen-wu's argument.

Keeping this point in mind, I should like to treat Wan-nu's case. The Liao-tung region, towards the end of the Chin dynasty, witnessed several lords assuming the title *Wang*, among whom Yeh-lü Liu-ko 耶律留哥 was chief. In Wan-nu's thinking, he differed from the rest in that he came from the Imperial Chin family originating from A-ku-ta 阿骨打; he was no ordinary *Wang*; he must distinguish himself from the others assuming the title *Wang*. Therefore, he consulted Wang Kuei. The scholar hit upon this title *T'ien-wang* in his investigation of the classics. It would not be an empty theory, if one surmised that Wang Kuei's view was exactly similar to Mr. KU's. When viewed in this light, the material which proves Wan-nu's pride in calling himself a member of the great Chin family and Wan-yen Wan-nu 完顏萬奴 would become more and more vital.

A few remarks may be made on *Huang-ch'i-tzū-chün* 黃旗子軍. That Wan-nu's army actually held up a yellow flag may be surmised from the phrase recorded in the *Kao-li-shih* 高麗史.

The *Kao-li-shih*, as has been referred to, under April (summer), the 4th year

ting-ch'ou 丁丑 in the Annals of the Emperor 高宗 (the 1st year of *Hsing-ting* 興定 of the Chin dynasty, or the 12th year of T'ai-tsu 太祖 of Mongolia), describes Wan-nu's leaving the island and landing in the Korean peninsula, plundering the north-western frontier and making a night attack on Marshal Yü-ko-hsia 于哥下 who was stationed near by, and putting him to flight. It goes on to say:

“On the day *chi-wei* 己未 (13th), Wan-nu of the Chin state defeated Ta-fu-ying 大夫營... On the day *moü-ch'ên* 戊辰 (22nd), more than ninety Chin soldiers, crossing the Ya-lu-chiang 鴨綠江, invaded I-chou 義州. As Ting Kung-shou 丁公壽, commander of the provincial army, defended against them with his men, an officer with a golden *pai* 牌 (tablet) capped with the tiger's head, threw down his arms and, kneeling, said ‘I am Marshal Yü-ko-hsia. In a battle last night with the Huang-ch'i-tzü-chün 黃旗子軍, I was beaten, and I have fled here. Pray save my life, my dear general.’”(1)

According to the biography of A-li-pu-sun 阿里不孫 in the *Chin-shih*, he was *Ch'üan-ts'an-chih-chêng-shih* 權參知政事 (Vice-minister) in charge of the Liao-tung district; and in April (summer), the 1st year of *Hsing-ting* 興定 (the 12th year of T'ai-tsu of Mongolia, or the 4th year of Kao-tsung of the Kao-li), namely, the 3rd year of T'ien-t'ai of Ta-chên-kuo 大真國, he was newly appointed *Ts'an-chih-chêng-shih* 參知政事 (Minister), and placed in charge of the Shang-shu-shêng 尙書省 and the Yüan-shuai-fu 元帥府 of the P'o-su 婆速 region. The circumstances there are recorded as follows:

“At the time P'u-hsien Wan-nu occupied Liao-tung and plundered the frontier of the Po-su region, the Kao-li court, dreading his power, donated 80,000 *kokü* 石 of rice to him.”(2)

Thus the *Chin-shih* and the *Kao-li-shih* both agree completely on this point, and it is

(1) 高麗史卷二十二, 高宗世家, 三三一頁上——下段, 己未[十三日]金萬奴來破大夫營... 戊辰[二十二日]金兵九十餘人渡鴨綠江入義州, 分遣將軍丁公壽出兵禦之, 有虎頭金牌官人, 棄兵跪曰, 我元帥于哥下也, 夜與黃旗子軍戰, 不克來奔, 願將軍活我。

(2) 金史卷百三, 列傳第四十一, 完顏阿里不孫傳。十七丁表。嘉靖版。是時蒲鮮萬奴據遼東, 侵掠婆速之境, 高麗畏其強, 助糧八萬石。

evident that the Huang-ch'i-tzŭ-chün 黃旗子軍 was Wan-nu's army. This was so called, as Dr. YANAI and Dr. IKEUCHI pointed out, because of the colour of the flag of the army. Because yellow was most highly valued of all the five colours; and also because it had been used since ancient times as the Imperial colour on account of the associations of its being assigned to the five virtues of the Wu-hang 五行 theory, and because even the *Sung-shu* 宋書 has a statement to the effect that the yellow flag and the purple hat represent the dignity of the Emperor, it may be more natural to explain in that light the yellow colour in this instance. However, in view of the relation between Wan-nu and Wang Kuei, as has been already described, and Wang Kuei's environments and daily life, and also his Taoist tone of discussing Huang-ti 黃帝 and Huang-lao 黃老, I could not help feeling something suggestive.

It is with great pleasure that I can add here some new material which proves that Wan-nu was always in the habit of using a yellow flag, and that this had some connection with Huang-ti, and above all, with *Ta-chên*, the dynastic title of Wan-nu, and that all this was due to Wang Kuei's contrivance.

There is a passage in the biography of Chang Hang-hsin 張行信 in the *Chin-shih*, which reads :

"In February, the 4th year of *Chên-yu* 貞祐... the Shang-shu-shêng 尙書省 reported to the court : Wan-yen Hai-nu 完顏海奴, Assistant *Hsüan-fu* of Liao-tung, says that Wang Kuei, his councillor has once given him the following discourse. The present dynasty is the successor of Kao-hsin 高辛 and Huang-ti 黃帝. In olden times, the Han dynasty had T'ao-t'ang 陶唐 as its ancestor, and the T'ang dynasty in turn had Lao-tzŭ 老子, as its ancestor. So they all built mausolea for their ancestors. Our dynasty has not built a mausoleum for Huang-ti in the course of a hundred years of its existence. Should we not feel ashamed in the face of the Han and T'ang dynasties? Wang Kuei also has said this. When our dynasty first gained power, it chose red for a flag colour, obviously because of the virtue of fire. To have no place of worshipping the five virtues

means a lack of the spirit of observing the sacred rites and religious ceremonies. He has heard as much from Wang Kuei. He wishes that the court would deliberate this matter. Thereupon, at the request of the Emperor, the high officials consulted. [Chang] Hang-hsin [張] 行信 answered to the throne as follows. "In my opinion, the *Shih-lu* 實錄 (Actual record) of our ancestors only says that they did come from Kao-li. As far as we know, they did not come from Kao-hsin. This desire to build a mausoleum for Huang-ti is due to the fact that Huang-ti is the ancestor of Kao-hsin. If we were his successors, we should advocate the virtue of wood. What does the man mean by advocating the virtue of fire instead? Besides, T'ai-tsu, on founding the dynasty, remarked that, because Wan-yen 完顏 as a rule preferred white among colours and because gold (chin) is constant, Ta-chin 大金 (Great gold) was adopted as his dynastic title. This subject of choosing a different virtue had never been discussed; only in the recent years of the reign of the Emperor Chang-tsung 章宗, all high officials were gathered to discuss the matter. As the declining Sung 宋 family had adopted the virtue of fire, they decided upon the virtue of earth. This was announced to the ancestral mausoleum and to the people. It is my opinion that what Kuei says borders upon insanity." The Emperor approved of this.⁽¹⁾

As you see, this is a petition to the Chin court for building a Huang-ti temple presented in February, the 4th year of *Chên-yu*, by Wang Kuei 王澹 at Hsien-p'ing 咸平 in Liao-tung.

Although this petition for the privilege of building a Huang-ti temple was refused by Chang Hang-hsin who was then *T'ai-tzu-shao-pao* 太子少保, *Li-pu*

(1) 元脫脫等撰金史卷百七,列傳第四十五,張行信傳十七表·十八表,嘉靖板,貞祐四年二月, (中略)時尙書省奏,遼東直撫副使完顏海奴言,參議官王澹嘗言,本朝紹高辛黃帝之後也,昔漢祖陶唐,唐祖老子,皆爲立廟,我朝迄今百年,不爲黃帝立廟,無乃愧於漢唐乎,又云本朝初興,旗幟尙赤,其爲火德明矣,五德之祀,闕而不講,亦非禮經重祭祀之意,臣聞於澹者如此,乞朝廷議其事,詔問有司,行信奏曰,按始祖實錄止稱自高麗而來,未聞出於高辛,今所據欲立黃帝廟,黃帝高辛之祖,借曰紹之,當爲木德,今乃言火德,亦何謂也,況國初,太祖有訓,因完顏多尙白,又取金之不變,乃以大金爲國號,未嘗議及德運,近章宗朝,始集百僚議之,而以繼亡宋火行之絕,定爲土德,以告宗廟,而詔天下焉,願澹所言特狂妄者耳,上是之。

shang-shu 禮部尚書, and *hsiu-kuo-shih* 修國史, and Wang Kuei's argument was refuted by him,—the plan itself ended in failure, the date of this petition,—February, the 4th year of *Chên-yu*, the year after the declaration of the dynastic title *Ta-chên*, the second year of *T'ien-t'ai* of Wan-nu, or 1216 A.D., would deserve serious consideration. This petition tells that the Chin army always carried red flags. The use of yellow flags by the army of Wan-nu who claimed to be a descendant of the Chin family and to have originated from Wan-yen, is also extremely interesting. In his refutation, Chang Hang-hsin says, "Besides, *T'ai-tsu—A-ku-ta* (阿骨打), on founding the dynasty, remarked that, because Wan-yen as a rule preferred white among colours and because gold (*chin*) is invariable, *Ta-chin* (Great gold) was adopted as his dynastic title." How could gold be white? Is it not more natural to describe it as yellow? If so, it is very natural that Wang Kuei who had chosen for the dynastic title *Ta-chên* a synonymous phrase as a means of claiming Chin, should have adopted as the flag colour yellow 黃 from the phrase the yellow-gold-colour. Besides, the reason why *T'ai-tsu* adopted *Chin* (gold) as his title was because of the abundance of gold produced in his home province —the present *Ping-chiang-Shêng* 濱江省, *Manchukuo* 滿洲國. This is a view generally accepted by Orientalists of the East and West. Unfortunately this petition by Wang Kuei was not granted. It is conceivable that Chang Hang-hsin a Confucian official opposed Wang Kuei a Taoist *yin-shih* 隱士 because of a difference in their fundamental ideas. Apart from the result of this petition, we must admit that this material eloquently speaks of Wang Kuei's aspirations.

Finally, a word may be said in connection with the name adopted by Wan-nu for his castle-city. The *Yüan-shih* under *Ti-li-chih* 地理志 has the following passage:

"Towards the end of the Chin dynasty, *P'u-hsien* Wan-nu, one of its generals, occupied *Liao-tung*. At the beginning of the *Yüan* dynasty,—namely, in the year *kuei-ssü* 癸巳, the *Yüan* army attacked him and captured Wan-nu alive. The army advanced as far as *K'ai-yüan* 開元 and *Hsü-p'in* 恤品. The eastern region was conquered completely. This is the first occasion that the name *K'ai-yüan* 開元 appears

in history.”⁽¹⁾

Again, the biography of Wang-jung-tsu 王榮祖 in the *Yüan-shih* has a passage which reads as follows :

“It happened that Ko-pu-ko 葛不哥, *Ping-chang-chêng-shih* 平章政事 (Civil Administration Officer) represented his office in Liao-tung. P’u-hsien Wan-nu, *Hsüan-fu-shih* for the Hsien-p’ing 咸平 district, assumed the title at K’ai-yüan 開元; thereupon, the court ordered Jung-tsu 榮祖, as an adjutant under Sa-li-tai 撒里台, to go and conquer him. He took more than ten castles, including Kai-chou 蓋州 and Hsüan-ch’êng 宣城. Ko-pu-ko 葛不哥 fled and was killed.”⁽²⁾

The fact is that the place where Wan-nu assumed the title was, not K’ai-yüan, but Tung-ching 東京. This account is of course untrue. However, because K’ai-yüan is the name of a city for the first time recorded in history in connection with the independence of Wan-nu, as *Ti-li-chih* 地理志 definitely says “This is the first occasion that the name K’ai-yüan 開元 appears in history. 開元之名始見於此”, it admits no doubt as to the participation of Wang Kuei and others in choosing the name for it.

The controversy as regards its locality among Professors YANAI, IKEUCHI, and WADA⁽³⁾ has not yet been settled. I have not the slightest intention to attempt an answer in this paper. I only think that, if the characters K’ai-yüan should be investigated in the light of the other elements I have presented in this paper and

(1) 元史卷五十九, 志卷十一, 地理志開元路。五丁裏。洪武版。金末, 其將蒲鮮萬奴據遼東, 元初癸巳歲, 出師伐之, 生禽萬奴, 師至開元, 恤品, 東土悉平, 開元之名始見於此。

(2) 元史卷百四十九, 列傳第三十六, 王榮祖傳。二十七丁表。洪武版。會金平章政事葛不哥, 行省於遼東, 咸平路宣撫使蒲鮮萬奴僭號於開元, 遂命榮祖還副撒里台進討之, 拔蓋州·宣城等, 十餘城, 葛不哥走死。

(3) Dr. W. YANAI: *Yüan Dominion in Manchuria*, 箭內博士著「滿洲に於ける元の疆域」滿洲歴史地理 Manchurian Historical Geography, Vol. II, pp. 274-432, May, 1913. Dr. H. IKEUCHI: *On the District Name K'aiyüan 開元 during the Yüan Dynasty*, 池内博士著「元代の地名開元の沿革」. The Tôyô-gakuhô, Vol. XII, No. 3, pp. 318-339, Oct., 1922. Dr. W. YANAI: *On Dr. IKEUCHI's Article "On the District Name K'ai-yüan 開元 during the Yüan Dynasty"* 箭内博士著「池内博士の元代の地名開元の沿革を讀む」. The Tôyô-gakuhô, Vol. XIII, No. 1, pp. 70-103, May, 1923. Dr. S. WADA: *A Study On K'ai-yüan-lu (開元路), Manchurian Province of the Yüan Dynasty*, 和田清著「元代の開元路に就いて」. The Tôyô-gakuhô, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, pp. 412-443, Dec., 1928.

also if these elements be proved to have been derived from Taoism, this phrase *K'ai-yüan* would suggest rather a strong Taoist flavour.

To summarize my investigation and argument in the preceding pages and designate the main points of difference from the accepted views.

(1) Two parallel views were accepted as to the dynastic title of Wan-nu: one holding *Tung-bsia* 東夏 and the other *Tung-chên* 東眞. I have determined *Ta-chên* to be the only one. It was commonly accepted that Wan-nu adopted a dynastic title twice. I have emphasized, however, that he only once adopted a dynastic title in the true sense of the term, and that was *Ta-chên* 大眞.

(2) I have attributed the origin of the title *Ta-chên* to one of the Taoist classics, and have stated that its meaning is Gold (*Chin* 金) and that it was the appropriate term as the dynastic title of Wan-nu who called himself a member of the Imperial Chin family. Prior to that time, it was customary to use for a dynastic title the name of the locality from which the ruling family came. This adoption of a phrase as a dynastic title for its literary meaning makes an epoch in the development of culture. The accepted view that held *Tung-chên* to be an abbreviation of *Tung-nü-chin* 東女眞 (Eastern Jurchin) has been refuted, and *Tung-chên* has been explained as a term used for *Ta-chên-kuo* after it moved eastward. This has been proved on the ground that the *Kao-li-shih* begins to use the phrase *Tung-chên* only after its eastward migration.

(3) The biography of Wang Kuei, Premier to Wan-nu, has been newly introduced to the academic world and has been made much use of in supplementing the *Chin-shih* and the *Yüan-shih*, which were found to be quite insufficient. Wang Hsien-tso 王賢佐 recorded in the *Hei-ta-shih-liao* 黑韃事略 and Wang Kuei given in the *Chin-shih* have been proved to be an identical character; and his unusual achievement as an adviser to Wan-nu has been dwelt upon. And it has been concluded that the dynastic title *Ta-chên* was also suggested by him and his friends. Besides, in connection with the dynastic title, I have stressed that *T'ien-t'ai* 天泰 the name of the era, *K'ai-yüan* the name of the castle-town, and *T'ien-wang* 天王 the

title of Wan-nu were all proposed by Wang Kuei and all related to Taoism.

It is my most sincere wish that this brief paper may serve in elucidating the facts involved and in settling the long standing controversy among our senior scholars. Finally, I also desire to extend my highest esteem to my honoured teachers for their eminent views, and beg their pardon for my frank criticism of them.
