Utopianism:

A Unique Theme in Western Literature?
– A Short Survey on Chinese Utopianism –

Koon-ki T. Ho

The theme of an ideal commonwealth is no doubt a prominent motif in the Western literary tradition. Some scholars in the West are so proud of this particular literary phenomenon that they believe that utopianism is solely found in the West. Plato's (c. 427–c. 347 B.C.) *Republic* is always cherished as the prototype of utopianism expressed in a literary form in human record. Gerard Dudok even goes to the extreme and proclaims that:

> History provides us with many instances of despotism of oriental monarchs, of a state of deplorable bondage of their subjects of extravagant luxury and fabulous riches, of stringent poverty and dire want, but, although allusions to these evils are made in oriental and Arabic tales, we do not hear of writers who, moved with compassion at the hard fate of their fellowmen, felt called upon to act as social reformers and to embody their ideas on social improvements in a kind of state-romance. Even granted that such works exist at all, they would be of no particular importance for us.[1]

This sort of closing one's eyes to facts may be a result of enthnocentrism or cultural chauvinism, which would only do harm than good to serious scholarship on utopianism, especially under the concept of *Weltliteratur* and the discipline comparative literature. In the same year (1923), Joyce Hertzler, in America, published her *The History of Utopian Thought.* In the very first paragraph, she writes:

> There is a common impression that Plato was the first to picture a perfect future of whom we have record in literature, and that his "Republic"

> was the first Utopia or ideal commonwealth. This is the result of holding to a literary field too narrowly conceived. A broader reading with the search for utopian elements uppermost, will bring a different conclusion.[2]

We totally agree with Hertzler. We are not going to deal with Arabic literature in this essay, but at least in the oriental literature, we find here and there utopianism appeared even earlier than Plato's *Republic.* Hertzler points out that early in the eighth century B.C., in Hebrew literature, there were already records of utopianism.[3] In the fifth century B.C. in China, there was a sage Confucius (551–479 B.C.) who qualified in all respects to be called a utopist. While the Hebrew literature may not have a significant influence on the utopian tradition in the West, Confucius is a very influential figure in the Enlightenment period in the West, which may have something to do with the concepts of utopias in that period of time.[4] It has also been hypothetically suggested that Confucius might have influenced Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826) in his conceptualization and actualization of democracy.[5] It is obvious that utopianism is such a universal motif that a discussion on the East-West basis is useful.

This essay is an attempt to make a short survey on utopianism in Chinese classical literature.[6] We are going to examine some major works which have been labelled "Chinese utopias." In the mean time, we compare them with Thomas More's (1478–1535) *Utopia,* the renowned classic of this literary theme in the West, so as to bring forth especially how the Chinese and western utopists differ in their conceptions of an ideal society. The Chinese works we are going to study are Confucius's "The Society of Grand Union "(大同社會); T'ao Ch'ien's 陶潛(365–427) "The Peach Blossom Spring" (桃花源記), Shih Nai-an's 施耐庵 (1296? –1370?) *Shui-hu chuan* 水滸傳, Ch'en Ch'en's 陳忱 (1590? –1670?) *Shui-hu huo-chuan* 水滸後傳, and finally Li Ju-chen's 李汝珍 (1763? –1830?) *Ching-hua yüan* 鏡花緣.[7] Among these, the societies described by Confucius and T'ao Ch'ien are generally accepted as utopias, whereas it is still controversial for the remaining three to be considered as utopian literature at all.[8]

Before one can proceed to any substantial study of the above works, it is useful to decipher the concepts of utopianism in the Western tradition and their incarnations in any literary forms. In spite of the fact that everyone talks about utopia, just as other literary terms such as Romanticism or novel that everyone talks about, it denotes one thing to someone, and another

thing to another. A. Neusüss proposes three variations in the definition of utopia. "The first conceives the utopia as a particular literary style and seeks the distinguishing characteristic of it in certain literary qualities. The second calls the utopia a 'utopian,' i.e., naive and prescientific, way of thinking about society. The third identifies the utopia with the critical approach to the form man has given to society."[9] Both Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia* fit more in the third than the other two kinds. Lewis Mumford prefers a dichotomous definition for utopia. He says that "the word utopia stands in common usage for the ultimate in human folly or human hope–vain dreams of perfection in a Never-Never Land or rational effort to remake man's environment and his institutions and even his own erring nature, so as to enrich the possibilities of common life."[10] He further elaborates that "almost every utopia is an implicit criticism of the civilization that served as its background; likewise it is an attempt to uncover potentialities that the existing institutions either ignored or buried beneath an ancient crust of custom and habit."[11] Smith, on the contrary, does not take utopias seriously. He puts forth the argument that "utopias are generally regarded as literary curiosities which have been made respectable by illustrious names, rather than a serious contribution to the political problems which troubled the age at which they appeared."[12] These two antithetical interpretations of utopias may have their roots in the etymological meanings of the word "utopia" which refers either to the Greek word "eutopia" meaning the good place, or to "outopia" meaning no place. It is the meaning of the good place which attributes the positive values to the utopias. Likewise, it is the meaning of no place which causes critics like Smith not to take them seriously.

When we come to the classification of those utopias in the West, we encounter complexity again. There is first of all a binary opposite pair of concepts–utopia and dystopia.[13] Since dystopia is just the product of the negative influence of utopia, we are going to omit it for the purpose of this essay. However, within utopias themselves, we can still find variations. Hertzler observes two seemingly negative ideals among the Western utopias. The first ideal concerns the future of the human race in this world. The other concerns the future of the individual in another world hereafter. The former bespeaks a perfecting of humanity in this very mundane life and on this very mundane earth, the latter bespeaks a despairing of that possibility in this world and anticipates it hereafter. Therefore, the first one is more

disinterested and humanitarian, while the second one is essentially egoistic and vaguely transcendental.[14] These observations somewhat conform to the dichotomy of Mumford's two kinds of utopias, the utopia of escape and the utopia of reconstruction. According to Mumford, the utopia of escape carries the function of escape and compensation which is very similar to the second ideal postulated by Hertzler. The main difference is that Mumford's utopia of escape "seeks an immediate release from the difficulties and frustration," whereas Hertzler's second ideal seeks the release in future. The utopia of reconstruction attempts to provide a condition for our release in future on this earth, which is precisely the first ideal discussed by Hertzler.[15] Summing up, there are two kinds of utopias. One leaves the external world as it is, whereas the other seeks to reform the external world. The Christian paradise is obviously one of the first kind, that is, a utopia of escape. More's Utopia and Plato's Republic belong to the second–the utopia of reconstruction.[16] In my opinion, most Chinese utopias belong to the utopia of escape.

In the *Book of Poetry* (詩經), the first record of Chinese literature, there are already traces of utopianism. In the poem "Big Rat" (碩鼠), for example, the poet laments that

> Big rat, big rat,
> Do not gobble our millet!
> Three years we have slaved for you,
> Yet you take no notice of us.
> At last we are going to leave you
> And go to that happy land;
> Happy land, happy land,
> Where we shall have our place.

> 碩鼠，碩鼠
> 無食我黍！
> 三歲貫女，
> 莫我肯顧，
> 逝將去女，
> 適彼樂土。
> 樂土，樂土
> 爰得我所。[17]

This short poem which includes an implicit criticism of its contemporary society and an aspiration for a better future may be regarded as the germina-

tion of Chinese utopianism. The big rat is the symbol of all sorts of political and social suppressions. The happy land is of course the utopia. The repeated exclamations of the term happy land, however, suggest a underlying despair of ever reaching this ideal piece of land. Therefore, it is both a good place and no place simultaneously. In this way, this poem may be qualified to be an example of the utopia of escape.

In ancient Chinese philosophy and mythology, utopianism is also one of the most popular themes. The ancient sages, such as Lao Tzu 老子, Confucius, Chuang Tzu 莊子(369–286 B.C.) and Mo Tzu 墨子(479? –403 B.C.), all expressed in their works their own versions of an ideal society.[18] The most influential Chinese utopia is Confucius's concepts of "grand union" or *ta-t'ung* 大同. Once Confucius was invited to a thanksgiving sacrifice in the state of Lu 魯. When it was over, he went out the hall, looking sad and sighed. His disciple Yen Yen 言偃 saw this and asked him the reason. Confucius replied that it was the rites of the sacrifice failed him. The corrupted rites appeared to Confucius a symbol of social disorder. In this incidence, he expressed his famous concepts of the society of "grand union."[19] In this society, everybody has his own place. They make no hereditary princes but men of talent, virtue and ability are chosen. Men love others' parents and cherish others' children as their own, so much so that all the aged, widows, orphans, childless men, disable and diseased are all sufficiently taken care of. Social welfare in More's *Utopia* is no doubt well organized, but we do not find people loving others' parents and treating others' children as their own. Also, in the society of "grand union," people have more freedom to choose their job, and everyone gets his own favorite one at last. In *Utopia,* however, agricultural works are of paramount importance. For every citizen, except the ruling class, it is compulsory to do agricultural works. This reminds us of the utopian philosophy of the Chinese Agrarian School (農家) contemporary to Mencius's 孟子(327–289 B.C.) time. The Agrarian School proposed that in an ideal society, every person including the king should work as a farmer. Mencius, another sage of the Confucian School, pointed out that since the head of the Agrarian School himself had to exchange his crops for clothing and agricultural implements, in a real ideal society, it necessiated different people to do different kinds of jobs, and so it was not a must to have everyone turned into farmers.[20] This more or less helps us to discern the different emphases of the Confucian ideal society and Utopia in terms of jobs allocation. Confucius

will be satisfied with every person doing his own favorite job and every job is taken up by someone. In More's case, it is perhaps a result of the common practice of turning farm-land into sheepfolds at his time,[21] cultivation is upheld as most important and fundamental practice to a utopia. Moreover, the citizens of the society of "grand union" are given more self-initiative in their work performances and other aspects. While there are stywards to see whether everyone is working properly in Utopia, the citizens in the ideal Chinese society would only like to work to their full capacity, but without seeking any private gain from it. Besides, there are laws, no matter how few and how simple they are, to forestall the Utopians, deviating from social norms, but in the society of "grand union," there are no crimes and even no individual ambition ever existed: their doors will always remain open and are not shut at all. In this sense, the Chinese utopia is an even more ideal and perfect human society than More's Utopia, not to mention slavery which exists in the latter. The major difference between them is rooted in the two authors' ultimately optimistic view of human nature. Since Utopia is already too rigid to be changed, it may represent the final version of More's ideal commonwealth. In this final stage of ideal society, precautions are still introduced to prevent corruptions. This implies that More did not trust his Utopians very much. In other words, he had no confidence in human nature. In the Chinese society, people are portrayed not only as passive moral observers but also as active participators in moral norms. That is to say, Confucius had full confidence in his ideal citizens that they are able to discard all sorts of evil from their own inner self and subsist themselves as such. It is, however, important to note also that the society of "grand union" is supposed to have existed in the past. Thus, beneath his optimism, there is embedded also an ironic undertone that corruption is inevitable in any human society.

Confucius's concepts of "grand union" are undoubtedly the most influential utopian thoughts in China, but they are not expressed in a literary genre. The first significant Chinese utopia written in a literary genre may be T'ao Ch'ien's "The Peach Blossom Spring."[22] Like many other utopists in the world, T'ao Ch'ien lived in a very disagreeable period of time. The fourth century China was a time of frequent civil wars and rapid substitutions of dynasties. Intellectuals in this period of time were highly suppressed and easily persecuted by the governments. As a result, a general spirit of escapism permeated in the entire society. Buddhism and Taoism

were very popular in intellectual circles. Both philosophical schools advocated the meaninglessness of the phenomenal world and therefore re-inforced the spirit of escapism. It is sometimes incarnated in literature in the form of fairy tales. A popular formula of these tales consists of one or two persons entering by accident a god's dwelling and experiencing there all sorts of happiness and pleasures and then coming out just to find a few days in the fairy-land meaning a few thousand years in the human world. The isolated islands far in the sea and high mountains became different kinds of gods' dwelling places in these tales. In a sense, all such tales can be ascribed to utopian literature, although they are just very short stories and expose merely a glimpse of the authors' ideal worlds.[23] Perhaps, we may categorize them as utopias of escape for which the inventor of this term finds difficulty in identifying specific examples in Western literature.[24] T'ao Ch'ien's "The Peach Blossom Spring" is quite different from the above utopias, even though the story also begins with an accidental discovery of a hidden ideal place. The length of the description of this utopia including the poem is still short, but it is already enough for us to discern his ideals.

A fisherman, one day, rowing upstream, comes to a unknown peach forest. At the end of the forest, he finds the spring of the stream and a mountain cave. The fisherman enters the cave and comes out of it to a broad and level plain. There he finds a group of people living happily together. The utopia here is bascially an anarchic society, which contrasts sharply the rigid governmental control in More's Utopia. Similar to the Utopians, the people in the Chinese ideal world are all farmers. Both of these farmers are empiricists in the sense that they can tell the natural signs of change in weather by their long experiences but they cannot explain them in theory. In the Chinese utopia, people even have no calendar. There is another similarity shared by the two utopias–the people's attitudes towards clothing. The main use of clothing is to keep the body warm. Therefore, after five hundred years of time, the people in the Peach Blossom Spring have not bothered to change the style. In Utopia, plainness is the characteristic of their clothes. The society in "The Peach Blossom Spring" is a static one as Utopia.[25] Not only do their clothes remain unaltered for so many years, no social advancement is observed at all. The paramount difference between the two societies is still that of freedom versus authoritarianism. The habitants in the Peach Blossom Spring are subjected to very little, if any exists at all, social constraints and therefore live in a more natural manner; whereas the

Utopians are under a number of strict controls and the society as a whole is more artificial. The difference has something to do with the two authors' philosophical background. T'ao Ch'ien, being greatly influenced by the Taoist philosophy, believed that the most ideal state of existence is a complete integration into nature's harmony. The less human intervention there is in a society, the better result obtained. So, there is even no education for the children in his ideal society. More, who is a pious Christian and believed in human free will, would not allow his ideal citizens to live freely, lest some may choose to be evil. So, strict rules to guide the people to follow the right way are indispensible to Utopia.

The second significant difference is the relations of the two utopian societies with the outside world. The society in the Peach Blossom Spring is a product of war. The founders came to settle there to avoid a war five hundred years ago, and the habitants there prefer to remain in their place peaceful and isolated from the outside world. Although Utopia is deliberately cut physically away from the outside world, there are still many connections between them. Once Utopia is still attached to the corruptive human world, it is inevitably involved in political problems and never immune to wars. In fact, the Utopians would actively declare war to foreign countries in order to maintain justice. Here, we may also derive the very vital difference between utopias of escape and utopias of reconstruction. The Peach Blossom Spring, a utopia of escape, is merely an ideal pastoral society isolated from the actual world. T'ao Ch'ien did not bother himself what the actual world was and would be, because his work was just a dream of some kind in which he could indulge himself. The whole business is a passive escape from reality.[26] *Utopia,* which consists of a detail description of how the country is operated and its various relationships with the outside world, betrays its author's conscientious desire to reform the actual world according to his ideal model. The ultimate aim is an active reconstruction of the corruptive reality.

Besides the above similarities and differences, interestingly, both utopias have been argued by critics as not purely imaginary products of the respective authors but some kind of historical records of actual human societies. Arthur Morgan has devoted a few chapters in his book *From Nowhere to Somewhere* to prove that More's *Utopia* is actually a true representative accounts of the empire of Incas in Peru, and Hythlodaeus is not an imaginary figure but a real person of flesh and blood who had been in

Incas.[27] Ch'en Yin-k'e 陳寅恪 (1890–1969) has written an essay "Collateral Evidences of The Peach Blossom Spring" (桃花源記旁證) in which he argues that T'ao Ch'ien's work is in fact a reflection of some actual societies in his times.[28] If both critics were right, then all of the above comparisons and discussions of these two works could also been put under the title "A Comparative Studies of Chinese and Peruvian Historical Utopias," and could also be an essay of comparative sociology aside from comparative literature.

If "The Peach Blossom Spring" has some sort of historical origin, *Shui-hu Chuan* (also known as *Water Margin, All Men Are Bothers* and *Outlaws of the Marsh*)[29] is more obviously indebted to historical facts. The novel is a long story of 108 outlaws from their very beginning of formation as a gang to the final disorganization of them. The story is based upon the anecdotes of a famous gang of robbers, smaller in number; active towards the end of the Northern Sung Dynasty (c. 1101–1125).[30] A very unique feature of this utopian novel is that the ideal society is not located in an exotic piece of land hidden from the outside world, nor is it a well established society. The novel narrates the process of how the group of heroes come together to build an ideal society against their corruptive contemporary world. The social background at the time the story happened is completely chaotic. The government is usurped by a corruptive bureaucracy, so that there is practically no justice in the entire society. Most of the 108 heroes are victims of this social injustice and they are forced to become outlaws–to go out the constraints of laws to ask for justice. In order to assert their justice, the heroes give up their positions in society and go to Liang-shan 梁山 to actualize their ideals. In the end of the novel, we see the heroes trying to integrate themselves back into society with their ideals in mind. They help the government to defeat a barbarian country in the north and calm down three serious internal riots. A great many heroes lose their lives during these campaigns and the remained few are maltreated by the corruptive government. So, it may be a despair of the author that any attempt to bring an ideal society to the real world is doomed to fail.

Their ideology is to "carry heaven's will" (替天行道) and they end up with building such an ideal society:

> People from everywhere come to the same place. People from different families become one single family. . . . They have one heart and one soul

> and ready to live and die together. Although their faces and dialects may be different, as a result of their diverse native places, their hearts, their spirit, their mutual loyalty, mutual trust and altruistic love are the same. This society consists of descendents from imperial families, rich people, generals, government officials as well as people from some other different social background, hunters, fishermen, butchers and executioners, but all address each other "brother" without discrimination. Besides, there are brothers by blood, husbands and wives, uncles and nephews, masters and servants, even enemies (before joining the gang), they all share the same happiness and same banquets together. Even though some are smart, some are rude, some are rustic and some are refined, there is no conflict among them. . . .
>
> 八方共域，萬姓一家。…一寸心生死可同。相貌語言，南北東西雖各別。心情肝膽，忠誠信義並無差。其人則有帝子神孫，富豪將吏，并三教九流，乃至獵戶漁人，屠兒劊子，都一般兒哥弟稱呼，不分貴賤；且又有同胞手足，捉對夫妻，與叔姪郎舅，以及跟隨主僕，爭鬪冤讎，皆一樣酒筵歡樂，無問親疎。或精靈，或粗鹵，或村樸，或風流，何嘗相凝…[31]

In this society, everyone is equal. There is no class distinction and there is no law as in the civilized world. The only solidary force is their sworn brotherhood, *i* 義. *I* is a mere abstract concept which the heroes perceive intuitively.[32] In order to uphold this *i*, the heroes will be ready to shed blood, to give up their lives, and even to the extent of killing innocent. As Timothy Wong puts it:

> *Yi* [is] the virtue of righteous and the only common attribute and spirit of the band. . . . Under *yi,* however all of these men (the seemingly immoral figures among the heroes) become "noble" and pure." Under *yi,* justice and vengeance fall into personal hand and private judgement . . . . All of these actions, seemingly so atrocious in themselves, are not only justified; they are ennobled and sanctified under the same strange and encompassing virtue.[33]

Of course, all these are only true on Liang-shan. Once outside it, there are laws to keep everything under control.

Under the veil of those ideal elements, the Liang-shan society is full of problems. It is not a self-productive society. Robbery is the only way to sustain their living. While the citizens of Utopia, irrespective of sex, are doing farming, the Liang-shan inhabitants, irrespective of sex, would join any action of robbery if he or she is required. However, the Liang-shan people do not

just rob indiscriminately. Their targets are always the exploiters of common people and members of the corruptive bureaucracy.[34] They value money, and love wine and meat a great contrast to the Utopians, especially the Buthrescae, even though both are abstinent from sex. In fact the Liang-shan heroes not only keep away from sexual life, but also show abhorrence of sex, lest sexual affairs will be harmful to their militant prowess.[35]

Being outlaws in a lawful society, they are subjected to many outside attacks by the government soldiers. Sometimes, they have to wage wars to save their friends out from all kinds of social oppressions as well as to rob for a living. Military force is therefore extremely essential to their struggle for survival. In the whole story, they have never lost any decisive battle both in the wars of defence and attack. Partly because Liang-shan is naturally a good place for defence and partly because their manifestation of *i* always moves the generals of the enemy armies to join their band. Another determining factor is that they would conceive strategies before each battle and take every precaution to avoid any possible great loss on their side. Their attitudes and ways of dealing with wars are therefore very similar to those of the Utopians. Utopia, another ideal world situated in the corruptive human earth, is made safe from outside attacks as Liang-shan by its founder. However, being self-sufficient in food, the Utopians would only wage war for self-defence, for repelling invaders from friendly territories, or for liberating victims of dictatorship. In other words, except for self-defence, they would only go to war for maintaining justice and their ideals. The Liang-shan heroes are bascially doing the same things in addition to robbery which is in this case a means to survive. Another similar feature is their preference to adopt strategies in wars. They share analogous strategies too. Laying ambush in the battle fields is their common favorite strategy. One particular strategy is strikingly similar. The Utopians would send people to distribute posters in the enemy territory, spreading the news of awards for the lives of the king or other important figures so as to sow discord among the enemy.[36] In a major battle of the Liang-shan band, a comparable strategy is used. Posters are spread in the enemy's city to incite internal conflicts among the enemy.[37]

Moreover, the Utopians would ask for compensation from the defeated enemy after victories. The Liang-shan heroes would also rob the treasury houses and food storages after they have won the battles. The Utopians never devastate the enemy territories after their victories, whereas the Liang-

shan band, except a few cases, would not disturb the innocent but distribute their booty to the poor, and as a result, the common people in the cities under attack would bid them welcome and show gratitude to them when they retreat.[38] The above similarities show that these two ideal states would never wage war for no reason or for the purpose of invasion. They value every life of their soldiers and would let their enemies pay the prices of wars, but would not harm the innocent.

Indeed, the Liang-shan society may be called a utopia. It is a utopia of the 108 heroes and their followers who are in one way or another expelled from society. Liang-shan is a place where they are able to find refuge from all sorts of social injustices and oppressions. One may question the propriety of calling this society which is built up by so many blood thirsty and gluttonous outlaws a utopia. As long as, however, some people find their ideals there, it is a utopia for these people.[39] In fact, one person's utopia may be a hell for another. Plato's *Republic,* for example, is considered a profascist state by some modern critics regardless of the author's original intention.[40]

At the end of *Shui-hu chuan,* only thirty-two heroes remained alive. These heroes were picked up again by a latter novelist Ch'en Ch'en to build his version of utopia. The novel is entitled *Shui-hu hou-chuan* or *Sequel to Shui-hu chuan.* Ch'en Ch'en lived between the late Ming to early Ch'ing period (c. 1590–c. 1670). He had experienced the invasion of the Manchus from the north who established the Ch'ing Dynasty. The Manchu government wanted to forestall the riots by the adherents of the former dynasty, and therefore adopted a highly suppressive policy. Literary inquisition was used to prevent any propaganda nimical to the Manchu government. In order to pass the literary inquisition, the Chinese men of letters expressed their thoughts in an oblique manner. A common way was to pick up a recurring motif or a historical event as camouflage. *Shui-hu huo-chuan* belongs to this kind of literature. Ch'en Ch'en borrowed the story from *Shui-hu chuan* to express his wish to build another society far away from the control of the Ch'ing government. It follows that his utopia is again a utopia of escape. The story of this novel begins with how the remaining Liang-shan heroes, after integrating themselves back to the mundane world, are forced to become outlaws again because of the discrepancies between their ideals and what the actual world is. At the same time, Chin 金, a barbarian country from the north (the latter Manchu), invades China and destroys the Northern Sung Dynasty, a situation strikingly similar to Ch'en Ch'en's

own experiences. Some heroes join the government armies to fight against the Chins, but, again, because of the corruptive bureacracy, there is no way to restore the falling of the Sung empire. At last, the heroes go into the sea and found a kingdom in today's Thailand. Thailand is described as a utopia by the author. The first island that the heroes land on is like this:

> **Surrounded by mountains and hills, there are rich forests. In the middle there are many large fields. The habitants live in huts scattered around. There are different kinds of domestic animals: cows, sheep, chicken and dogs, and different kinds of plants: peach, pear, mulberry and hemp. It is really a world of its own.**
>
> 山巒環繞，林木暢茂，中間廣有田地，居民都是草房，零星散住，牛羊雞犬，桃李桑麻，別成世界。

The inhabitants on this island are either farmers or fishermen. They live separately and do not belong to any government. They have settled there for generations. They sew their own clothes and farm their own lands, and every family has enough food to sustain their living. They do not have to pay tax either. The descriptions of this island and the inhabitants are very similar to the descriptions of the Peach Blossom Spring. The island is a sort of happy land for hermits. The heroes, however, do not settle on this island. At that time, the central government of Thailand is usurped by a unscrupulous prime minister who later assassinates the king and comes to the throne himself. The Liang-shan heroes help the royal family to defeat this dictator and set the entire country free again. Because of this reason, the former queen who has no son to succeed the throne just leaves the country to the heroes' hands. All the heroes become high officials. The country under the ruling of the heroes becomes a real paradise on earth.

In the above description, we can discern that this novel can be ascribed to utopian literature. The author, nevertheless, does not go into detail about how the government rules the people and how the country becomes a real paradise. Instead, he emphasizes the part the heroes play in the fight against the dictator. Therefore, even though the story is about a construction of a utopia, it is still more a utopia of escape than a utopia of reconstruction. Again, the real paradise is just a vague hope of the author. He does not care what it actually looks like or how to achieve it.

Another novel which has the touch of utopianism is *Ching-hua yüan*

or *Flowers in the Mirror* by Li Ju-chen in the eighteenth century. It is the most problematic work among those we have discussed up till now. It starts out with an allegorical outlook, a satire on his contemporary society and in the mean time, the author insinuates the ideal picture of what a society should be like. "Before the novel is half over, Li Ju-chen has long abandoned his role as satirist to engage in a full-scale celebration of the ideals and delights of Chinese culture."[42] Even in the first half, we are not certain whether he aimed at a utopian or dystopian dimension, owing partly to the fact that the first half of the novel consists of a long sea voyage. We see through the experiences of the protagonists, T'ang Ao 唐敖 and To Chiu-kung 多九公, more than thirty exotic and imaginary countries, some of which possess utopian attributes, and some of which should be more appropriately described by the term dystopia. We have also T'ang Ao in the first half and his daughter in the second half becoming immortals on an island. This may suggest that after all the genuine utopia is not anywhere on earth but in the fairy-land. Before such medley of content, we hesitate to draw any definite conclusion as to how we should evaluate this novel in the context of utopian literature.

If we are to discuss the utopian elements in this novel, there are at least two countries that our protagonists visited which may be called utopias. They are the Country of Gentlemen (君子國) and the Country of Great Men (大人國). The Country of Gentlemen is famous for its altruistic spirit. The author describes three bargains in a market place in which the buyers try to raise the prices of goods while the sellers try to reduce the prices. It is obviously a utopian view of human trade. We are also told that even the vulgar people behave as gentlemen. But, the story of this country soon becomes a criticism of the customs of the Chinese society at that time. T'ang Ao and To Chiu-kung meet two brothers on their way who invite the two Chinese guests to their house. These two brothers who behave just as any common people in the country and live in a very common place are later found to be the prime ministers of the country. They ask the two guests about the customs prevailing in China, by which the author presents a profound criticism of the inhuman and meaningless customs practised at his time. One particular criticism may be compared to one that More makes in Utopia against his fellow country men. It is the criticism of the Chinese attitudes towards the edible swallow's nest. In the Country of Gentlemen, one *sheng* 升 or Chinese liter[43] of grains can exchange one hundred catties

of the swallow's nest, because it is not at all tasty by itself or substantial as grains. Only the poor would accumulate it for possible future famine. On the contrary, in China, the swallow's nest is considered the best dish in a banquet and it is extremely expensive. A host would be proud of serving his guests the swallow's nest. The attitudes of the citizens of the Country of Gentlemen towards edible swallow's nest can be compared to the Utopians' attitudes towards gold and silver. By themselves, gold as metals, like the swallow's nest as food, should not be so valuable from the pragmatic point of view. In Utopia, gold and silver are only used to produce the humblest items of domestic equipment, and even to make chains for slaves. Outside Utopia, such as the country of Flatulentine, gold is endorsed as the symbol of glory and reverence. In this way, both the citizens of the Country of Gentlemen and Utopia are more pragmatically oriented and they can see through the genuine values of things and treat them as such. They are not blinded by vainglory. In the Chinese story, there is an ironic touch of the swallow's nest. While the Chinese visitors are going to depart, the two prime ministers give these visitors numberous presents. The sailors are given the swallow's nest which they have never tasted before, for its high value in China. The sailors are soon in despair of its tastelessness and do not believe that the swallow's nest really tastes like that. They think that the two prime ministers have cheated them. A similar humourous irony is found in More's *Utopia*. The Flatulentine diplomats want to impress the Utopians by wearing all kinds of gold ornaments, but they only find themselves being treated as slaves. In such a way, Li Ju-chen and More satirize their fellow countrymen's value judgements. Only in a utopia will the true values of things be fully revealed and recognized.

The second utopia in *Ching-hua yüan,* the Country of Great Men is not a dwelling place of giants. The term "great man" is actually an opposite to the Chinese term "little man" or *hsiao-jen* 小人 which means immoral men or bad guys. The author has just given his readers a short account on this country. The citizens in this country are all born with a piece of cloud under their feet. The color of the cloud changes in accord with the morality of an individual. If he has done something wrong, the cloud will turn grey. If he still indulges himself, it will turn black. In that case, everyone would treat him with contempt. On the other hand, a man of morals would have a piece of colorful cloud. Because of this reason, the people would try their best to behave themselves. The piece of cloud actually

represents their own conscience. Under a mythological veil, Li Ju-chen suggests that man is born with a conscience, even though it is only seen by his own inward eyes. If a man can be responsible to his own conscience, he will be a citizen of the Country of Great Men, that is, a man of morals. It is really interesting to see how in the West in the eighteenth century, some of the enlightened *philosophes* speculated and proposed that man is not born deprived and should be able to reach a prosperous future just by himself, whereas in China Li Ju-chen incarnated a similar concept in his novel in more or less the same period of time.

As mentioned, there are numberous dystopias functioning as satirical mirror images to the real world in the novel. Thus, it is not strange to find some Chinese critics comparing this novel with Swift's (1667–1745) *Guilliver's Travel.*[44] Just like *Gulliver's Travel* which is a mixture of dystopias and utopias, "we may wonder whether the utopian spirit or the spirit of satire for its own sake is dominant" in *Ching-hua yüan.*[45] Another problem is as C. T. Hsia pointed out, the second half of the novel becomes "a full scale celebration of the ideals and delights of the Chinese culture."[46]

When it comes to the twentieth century, both the tradition of utopias of escape in literature and utopias of reconstruction in philosophy do not cease.[47] Liang Chi-ch'ao's 梁啓超(1873–1929) *The Future of New China* (新中國未來記), and Lao She's 老舍(Shu Ch'ing-ch'un 舒慶春 1898–1966) *Cat Country* (貓城記) are some famous works of the literary tradition. K'ang Yu-wei's 康有爲(1858–1927) *The One-World Philosophy* or *Ta-t'ung shu* 大同書, and Chu Chung-pen's 朱中本 *Peace, Spring and Autumn* or *T'ai-p'ing ch'un-ch'iu* 太平春秋 belong to the latter tradition.[48] Since our purpose is to focus on classical literature, we will not go deep into these modern works.

It is clear now that utopianism is also a very prominent tradition in Chinese culture. The utopias in Chinese literature are more utopias of escape, while the utopias in Chinese philosophy are utopias of reconstruction. The five works we have discussed in this essay represent five different types of utopias too. Confucius's society of "grand union," like others in the philosophical tradition, is a political utopia and a utopia of reconstruction.[49] T'ao Ch'ien's one is a pastoral utopia, under the strong influence of Taoism. Shih Nai-an's Liang-shan is a utopia of the members of lower levels of society, an ideal world where they can take revenge for and protest against the oppressions from the upper class. Ch'en Ch'en's work is a utopia of the adherents

of the Ming Dynasty under the governance of the Manchu empire, an ideal place where these adherents can be free from the interference of the barbarians. All T'ao Ch'ien, Shih Nai-an and Ch'en Ch'en aim only at utopias of escape. Li Ju-chen has a specific utopia for women, aside from the two utopias discussed, in his novel,[50] but since his ultimate purpose of writing this novel is still obscure, we are not going to draw any definite conclusion. More's *Utopia* is obvious a utopia of reconstruction, the ideal society is but his own England reversed.[51] No matter whether they are utopias of escape or utopias of reconstruction, or Chinese or Western ones, they are products of a disagreeable social reality and implicit criticisms of that social reality. Finally, behind the authors' optimism, there always a strong underlying pessimism and even despair that utopias are at any rate nowhere to be found. It follows that a utopia is rather a state of mind than a social state down to earth, and there is actually no inherent difference between the so-called the utopia of escape and the utopia of reconstruction.

Notes

1. Gerard Dudok, *Sir Thomas More And His Utopia* (Amsterdam: Firma A. H. Kruyt, 1923), p. 19.
2. Joyce O. Hertzler, *The History of Utopian Thought* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1923), p. 7.
3. Ibid., pp. 7–8. See also Glenn Negley & J. Max Patrick, *The Quest for Utopia* (New York: Henry Schuman, 1952), p. 257.
4. For details, see David W. Y. Dai, "Confucius and Confucianism in The European Enlightenment," Diss., University of Illinois, 1979. See also H. G. Creel, *Confucius: The Man And The Myth* (New York: The John Day Company, 1949), pp. 254–72.
5. See Creel, pp. 273–78. Liao Ching-ts'un 廖競存 in his *Shih-chung yu ta-t'ung* 時中與大同 (The Middle Way And The Grand Union) records the debates of the American "Declaration of Independence." He quotes a passage from Thomas Jefferson's speech in which Jefferson confessed that parts of his ideas of the Declaration came from Confucius's thoughts. (Taipei: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan 商務印書館, 1966), p. 5. Unfortunately, he has not given the source of this quotation. I have consulted a number of Thomas Jefferson's biographies including his autobiography and a few American History books. I found only records of the existence of these debates but no details of the debates are given in the works I consulted. So, I reserve my comment here on the possibility of any direct influence from Confucius to Jefferson until I find some more

evidences. The works that I have consulted are the followings: Thomas Jefferson, *Autobiography*, ed. Andrew A. Lipscomb, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington D. C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1903). *Thomas Jefferon (A Biography in His Own Words)*, ed. The Editors of Newsweek Books (New York: Newsweek, 1974). George Tucker, *The Life of Thomas Jefferson* (London: Charles Knight & Co., 1837). Henry S. Radal, *The Life of Thomas Jefferson* (New York: Derby & Jackson, 1858). Francis W. Hirst, *Life And Letters of Thomas Jefferson* (London: The Macmillan Company, 1926). George Bancroft, *History of United States* (Boston: Charles C. Little And James Brown, 1839). Edward Channing, *A History of The United States* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907). *Harper's Encyclopaedia of United States History* (New York & London: Harber & Brother Publishers, 1912).

6. The term classical literature is just arbitarily used to denote literary works before the twentieth century, which have very little, if any exists at all, contact with Western literature. Our purpose is to show that the utopian motif is indigenous to Chinese literature.

7. Since the theme of utopianism is so rich in Chinese history of thoughts, we cannot but limit our focus to its incarnation in literature. The five works, except Confucius's "The Society of Grand Union," belong one way or another to a literary genre. The reason we put Confucius's work in our discussion is its very great influence on Chinese utopianism.

8. In the book *Chung-kuo ta-t'ung si-hsiang tzŭ-liao*中國大同思想資料 (Material of Chinese Utopianism), by History of Chinese Philosophy Department (of The Faculty of Philosophy, The Chinese Institute of Science) (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü,中華書局 , 1959), all the five except Ch'en Ch'en's *Shui-hu huo-chuan* are listed as representative works of Chinese utopianism. *Shui-hu chuan* is also considered as a piece of Chinese utopian literature by other modern critics. Man 蠻 (Huang Jen 黃人), in his *Hsiao-shuo hsiao-hua* 小說小話 (Short Talks on Fiction), comments that *Shui-hu chuan* is a book of socialism which is also very close to utopianism. See K'ung Ling-ching孔另境 ed., *Chung-kuo hsiao-shuo shih-liao* 中國小說史料 (Historical Material of Chinese Fiction) (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1959), p. 37. Yueh Heng-chün 樂衡軍 also argues that the Liang-shan society is a utopia of some kind. See her "The Creation and (Destruction of Liang-shan-po—A Discussion of The Tragic Irony in *Shui-hu chuan*" (梁山泊的締造與幻滅——論水滸傳的悲劇嘲弄), *Chinese Classical Fiction Studies* (中國古典小說研究) (Taipei: Chung-hua-wen-hua fu-hsing yüeh-k'an-she 中華文化復興月刊社, 1977), pp. 159—90. *Shui-hu hou-chuan* is laballed as an example of Chinese utopia by Chang Chien 張健 . See "A Reading of *Shui-hu huo-chuan*—A Chinese Utopia" (讀水滸後傳——中國的烏托邦), *A Symposium of Chinese Classical Fiction* (中國古典小說論集) (Taipei: *You-shih-wen-hua ch'u-pan-kung-si ch'i-k'an-pu* 幼獅文化出版公司期刊部, 1975), pp. 245—54. For a more substantial investigation on *Shui-hu huo-chuan* as utopian literature, see D. N. Voskresensky, "Utopian Motifs in Chinese Fiction of the Seventeenth Century: The Theme of the

Search for a Blissful Land," trans. Jeanne Kelly, *Tamkang Review*, 8 (1977), 142–45. *Ching-hua yüan* as utopian literature seems to have aroused more interests of the Western scholars. Arthur Morgan calls it "the Chinese collection of utopian sketches." *Nowhere was Somewhere* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1946), p. 143. Jean Chesneaux believes that the utopian tradition in the eighteenth century China is represented by it. "Egalitarian and Utopian Traditions in the East," *Diogenes*, 62 (Summer 1968), 84. (He translates the title of the novel as *The Mirror of the Flowers.*) In the discussion of the individual works, the problem of whether these works qualified to be called utopian literature will be picked up again.

9. A. Neusüss, *Utopie, Begriff und Phenomen des Utopischen* (Neuwied, 1968), p. 18. The ideas are paraphrased in English by Martin G. Plattel, *Utopian and Critical Thinking* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1972), p. 41.
10. Lewis Mumford, *The Story of Utopias* (New York: The Viking Press, 1966), p. 1.
11. Ibid., p. 2.
12. Smith, "Harrington and His *Oceana*," quoted in Hertzler, p. 2, footnote 1, but she has not given further information about Smith's work.
13. For the origin and history of dystopia, see Chad Walsh, *From Utopia to Nightmare* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962). See also Pohl, Frederik, Martin Harry Greenberg & Joseph Olander, "Utopias and Dystopias," in *Science Fiction: Contemporary Mythology*, ed. Warrick, Patricia, Martin Harry Greenberg & Goseph Olander (New York: Harper, 1978), pp. 393–400.
14. Hertzler, p. 262.
15. Mumford, pp. 15–23.
16. Unfortunately, Mumford has not given us specific examples of these two kinds of utopias in his discussion of these concepts. Later in another chapter, he labels the Christian paradise as a utopia of escape, p. 59. We only call More's *Utopia* and Plato's *Republic* utopias of reconstruction by inference.
17. *Mao-shih Cheng-chien* 毛詩鄭箋, *Ssu-pu pei-yao* 四部備要 edition (Taipei: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1966), *chüan* 5, pp. 11b–12a. The translation is by Arthur Waley, *The Book of Songs* (Boston & New York: Hughton Mifflin Company, 1937), p. 309.
18. For details and the original materials of these ancient sages' concepts of utopia, see *Chung-kuo ta-t'ung si-hsiang tzŭ-liao*, pp. 2–9. See also Hou Wai-lu 侯外廬 ed., *Chung-kuo li-tai ta-t'ung li-hsiang* 中國歷代大同理想 (The Chinese Utopian Ideals Through Ages) (Peking: K'e-hsüeh ch'u-pan-she 科學出版社, 1959), pp. 1–13. The utopian thoughts of these ancient sages are also political or social philosophy which they meant to be practical and wished to have them put into practice. Therefore, in this sense, their utopian thoughts can be ascribed to the utopia of reconstruction. Chesneaux bases on a book of the title *Chung-kuo ta-t'ung si-hsiang tzŭ-liao* which is edited by Hou Wai-lu and makes a short discussion of Chinese utopianism, pp. 79–88. But, as we have cited above, Hou Wai-lu's book

is *Chung-kuo li-tai ta-t'ung li-hsiang.* Chesneaux seems to have mixed the two up. The problem becomes more complicated when I find Chesneaux made a reference in p. 98 of his "version." Hou's book has only 54 pages. The other one has exactly 98 pages, but Chesneaux's reference is not found in p. 98. It is really doubtful which book Chesneaux was really using when he wrote that essay. (Here, I would like to express my gratitude to Mr. Wood-yan Lai, Lecturer, Department of Chinese, University of Hong Kong and Prof. Takeshi Hamashita of Hitotsubashi University who kindly helped me to get hold of a xerox-copy of Hou's book which I failed to find in either Hong Kong or the U. S. A.) For the concepts of utopias in Chinese ancient mythology, see Masakazu Chubachi, "Paradise in Ancient Myths–Particularly on *Huang-chuan*–," *Iōnōgaku,* 58 (July 1979), 1–55. See also Tamaki Ogawa, "Paradise Motifs in China," in *The Other World Motifs in Literature – A Co-operated Research,* ed. Yoshifumi Ueda, Tamaki Ogawa, Ryotaro Kato & Tadashi Sasaki (Tokyo: Chuokoron-sha 中央公論社 , Inc., 1959), pp. 201–340. An abridged version of this essay is later collected in Ogawa's *Studies of History of Chinese Fiction* (中國小說史の研究) (Tyoko: Iwanami Sho-ten 岩波書店 , 1968), pp. 227–73.

19. Confucius's concept of "grand union" is found in *Li-chi Cheng-chu* 禮記鄭注 , *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition (Taipei: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1966), *chüan* 7, pp. 1a–1b. English translation of this text is found in James Legge trans., *Li Chi* (Book of Rites) (New York: New Hyde Park, 1967), vol. 1, pp. 364–66. It is most probably that the concepts of "grand union" recorded in this book are not really Confucius's own ideas but that of the author(s) of *Li-chi.* We attritube the concepts to Confucius just for the sake of convenience.

20. For the whole argument, see *Meng Tzu cheng-i* 孟子正義 , *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, *chüan* 5, pp. 1a–5a. For English translation, see James Legge trans., *The Chinese Classics,* vol. 2, *The Book of Mencius* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895), pp. 246–57.

21. This is a criticism made by Hytholdaeus, the one who has been in Utopia. See Thomas More, *Utopia,* trans. Paul Turner (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1965), pp. 46–47.

22. According to Hu Shih 胡適 (1891–1962), "The Peach Blossom Spring" is probably the only example of utopian writing in medievel China. See Morgan, p. 104, but he has not cited the reference of this argument. We do not agree to Hu's argument. See for example Ogawa, "Paradise Motifs in China," pp. 249–340. In these pages, Ogawa quotes many utopian tales from the third century to about the tenth century.

23. See Ogawa, pp. 249–59. These pages consist of an introductory summary of the utopian tales from the third century onward. The whole thing is translated into Chinese by Chang T'ung-sheng 張桐生 and collected in *A Symposium of Classical Chinese Fiction,* vol. 1, pp. 85–96. But, Chang's translation is based on the version in *Studies of Chinese Classical Fiction,* pp. 264–73.

24. See note 16.

25. Mumford argues that "each utopia was a closed society for the prevention of human growth" and disallowed "any change that would disturb the pattern or meet the new experiences of life," p. 4. More's Utopia is obvious in this tradition. T'ao Ch'ien's ideal society seems to conform to this tradition too.

26. In this sense, "The Peach Blossom Spring" belongs to the category of the fairy tales of its contemporary times except the fact that this ideal society is a human world.

27. Morgan, pp. 17–61.

28. Ch'en Yin-k'e, "Collateral Evidences of 'The Peach Blossom Spring,'" *Ch'ing-hua hsüeh-pao* 清華學報, 11, No. 1 (January 1936), 79–88.

29. *Shui-hu chuan* is translated into English under the title *All Men Are Brothers* by Pearl Buck, (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1957). This translation covers only the first 70 chapters of the novel, a version published by Chin Sheng-t'an 金聖嘆 (?–1661) in about 1641. J. H. Jackson also based on this version and translated in an abridged form of the novel under the title *Water Margin* (Shanghai: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1937). See R. G. Irwin's comments on the merits and demerits of these two versions of translation. *The Evolution of a Chinese Novel: Shui-hu chuan* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Havard University Press, 1966), pp. 95–97. Recently, a 100 chapters version of the novel translated by Sidney Shapiro under the title *Outlaws of The Marsh* has been published. (Peking & Bloomington: Foreign Languages Press Peking & Indiana University Press, 1981). The translator only tells us that the first 70 chapters are based on Chin's edition, but he does not specify which edition he is using for the last 30 chapters. See "Translator's Note," p. 2.

30. See Yü Chia-hsi 余嘉錫 "The Historical Identification of Thirty-six People in *Shui-hu chuan*" (水滸傳三十六人考實), in *Characters in Shui-hu chuan and Shui-hu chuan* (水滸人物與水滸傳) ed. by Taiwan Hsüeh-sheng Book Store Editorial Board (台灣學生書局編輯部) (Taipei: Hsüeh-sheng shu-chü, 1971), pp. 5–120.

31. This passage is only found in the 120 chapters edition published by Yang Ting-chien 楊定見 in about 1620. This edition is published nowadays under the title *The 120 Chapters Edition of Shui-hu chuan* (一百二十回的水滸傳) (Peking: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1959), pp. 1155–56.

32. The term *i* has many meanings in Chinese. For details, see Philip S. Y. Sun, "The *I-ch'i* of the Liang-shan Heroes" (梁山英雄的義氣) *Ming-pao Monthly*, 13, No. 10 (October 1978), 17–23.

33. Timonthy C. Wong, "The Virtue of *Yi* in *Water Margin*," *Journal of Oriental Literature*, 7 (May 1966), 50.

34. For example, see *Shui-hu chuan*, chapters 50 and 67. Shih Nai-an & Lo Kuan-chung, *Shui-hu ch'uan-chuan* (水滸全傳) (Peking: Jen-min wen-hsüeh ch'u-pan-she 人民文學出版社, 1954), pp. 830 & 1135. Hereafter, this edition of *Shui-hu chuan* is referred to by SHCC.

35. C. T. Hsia sums up the heroic code of the Liang-shan heroes by the following characteristics: their sense of brotherhood and comaraderie (*i*), their love of the

gymnastic arts (militant prowess), their generosity, their sexual puritanism and their heartily appetite for wine and meat. See *The Classical Chinese Novel: A Criticial Introduction* (New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1968), pp. 86–92.

36. See More, *Utopia,* p. 111.
37. SHCC, p. 1121.
38. Same as note 34.
39. Philip Sun argues that *Shui-hu chuan* is a propaganda literature of the outlaws. Because of this reason, the members of the Liang-shan are all described as ideal images and the life of outlaws is described as something ideal too. In that case, *Shui-hu chuan* is the utopia of reconstruction of outlaws. For details of Sun's argument, see "*Shui-hu chuan:* The Story of Outlaws Speaking to Outlaws? (水滸傳：强人說給强人聽的故事？)" *Ming-pao Monthly*, 13, No. 8 (August 1978), 2–7, and "*Shui-hu chuan:* The Propaganda Literature of Outlaws' (水滸傳：法外强徒的宣傳文學)," in *Chinese Classical Fiction Studies,* pp. 123–44.
40. R. H. Crossman's argument, quoted in Mumford, p. 4. But Mumford has not cited the reference.
41. Ch'en Ch'en, *Shui-hu huo-chuan* (Taipei: Shi-chie shu-chü 世界書局, 1976), p. 99.
42. C. T. Hsia, "The Scholar-Novelist and Chinese Culture: A Reappraisal of *Ching-hua Yüan,*" in *Chinese Narrative,* ed. Andrew Plaks (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977), p. 267.
43. The Chinese liter or *sheng* equals to 1.0355 liter.
44. See for example Hu Shih, "A Chinese 'Gulliver' on Women's Right (the *Ching-hua yüan*)," *People's Tribute,* New Series 7 (1934), 121–27, also in *Chinese Review*, 4, No. 1 (1935), 31–33.
45. Morgan, p. 153.
46. Same as note 42.
47. See note 19.
48. The works cited here are only some examples of each tradition. They are by no means exhaustive or most important.
49. Confucius's (or the author[s] of *Li-chi*) ultimate aim is to convert his contemporary society back to the society of "grand union." Therefore, I call it a utopia of reconstruction.
50. In *Ching-hua yüan,* there is a Women's Country (女兒國) in which all the social roles of male and female are reversed. It is obvious a utopia of women at Li's times (and even nowadays). In fact, there is a deep concern of women's right in this novel. For this issue, see Hu Shih, "A Chinese Declaration of The Rights of Women (the *Ching-hua yüan* of Li Ju-chen)," *Chinese Social and Political Science Review,* 8, No. 2 (1924), 100–9. See also note 44 and Lin Yu-t'ang 林語堂, "Feminist Thought in Ancient China," *T'ien Hsia* 天下, 1, No. 2 (1935). All these three works are written in English.
51. Hertzler, p. 133.