The Opposition of the *Literati* to the Game of *Weiqi* in Ancient China•

Paolo ZANON

mserv17@bib.psico.unipd.it

With the development of Neo-Confucianism during the Song dynasty (960-1279 AD), the orthodoxy of Chinese society was gradually redefined. However, as board games, which have often been considered as of secondary importance, do have their place in social studies, we may now ask ourselves how this redefinition of epistemological values influenced the attitude of cultivated Chinese *élite* towards games.

The game of *weiqi* [1] is examined in this paper, in order to demonstrate the radical change in thinking which occurred with regard to the game in Song times. Although it had been violently attacked by the *literati* before Neo-Confucianism, with the advent of the new orthodoxy - which allowed many Taoist and Buddhist elements to be inserted in a new framework - *weiqi* too gradually became accepted, thanks to the new cultural atmosphere.

Fragments from the Warring States (453 - 222 BC) period criticising the game of *weiqi* are analysed in the first part of this essay.

Then two texts devoted to criticism of *weiqi* are considered and translated. One of these was written by Wei Yao [2] (*fl.*: 252 AD) in the Three Kingdoms (220 - 265 AD) period, the other by Pi Rixiu [3] (834?-883? AD) in Tang times (618 - 906 AD). In the second part of this essay, excerpts from *Qijing Shisanpian* [4] (The Classic of *Weiqi* in Thirteen Chapters) (*circa* 1050 AD) are translated in order to show how former criticisms based on the "amorality" of *weiqi* were overcome.

1

The game of *weiqi* is *par excellence* the game of Chinese *literati*. The first European to report it was the Macerata-born Jesuit Matteo Ricci (1552 - 1610 AD), who wrote:

> "The deepest of all the [Chinese] games is one with more than two hundred pieces, white and black for each side, on a board with more than three hundred squares [...]. The mandarins have become so absorbed in this game that some of them occupy most of the day playing it, each match lasting more than one hour. And those who are good at this game, even if they have no other ability, are appreciated by everybody and invited everywhere, and some are chosen as masters to teach this game".[1]

It therefore seems quite strange to us nowadays that there was a time when *weiqi* was considered disreputable by the cultivated Chinese

élite. The essays that criticise this game and its players and the reasons their authors give will be analysed here. Then we will see how, in the Song (960 - 1279 AD) dynasty, in a Neo-Confucian environment, these motivations were overcome, with the full rehabilitation of *weiqi*.

A negative attitude may be noted already from the first quotations about *weiqi* in Chinese literature. Confucius himself considered it just one step above total passiveness:

> "The Master said: 'To stuff oneself with food all day without worrying about anything, is difficult indeed! But what about *weiqi* players then? It is better to be one of them than to do nothing!".[2]

Mencius (*circa* 372 - 289 BC) later recognised that the game required concentration and attention, but he relegated *weiqi* to the "small arts".[3] He explained his adversion to this game in a passage in his *Mengzi* [11]:

> "The second [of behaviours devoid of filial virtues] consists of indulging in alcoholic drinks and in playing *weiqi*, and therefore omitting to care for one's parents".[4]

For Mencius, the amorality of *weiqi* was therefore linked with wasting time and undermining the family structure of society, the most important concern from a Confucian point of view.

Weiqi was also criticised by the Mohists from a significantly different stance. A passage concerning the game occurs in a late chapter of *Mozi* [13]:

> "Nobody must dare to sound musical instruments or play *weiqi* in the army: otherwise he will be punished with arrows.". [5]

The prohibition against musical instruments can be clearly understood because of the notorious opposition of the Mohists to music, while the cause of the prohibition against *weiqi* was rather obscure. More light can be thrown on the matter thanks to an admonishment contained in *Guanzi* [19] (IV-II century BC):

> "[...] in the third month of autumn, on the day *gengxin* [20], there are five prohibitions. The first is not to play *weiqi*: it is prohibited".[6]

Now, the calendrical characters *gengxin* are Celestial Stems connected with the metal phase, like the "western" season of autumn, considered in the light of the *wuxing* [23] theory. The third month of this season is the peak of this process and therefore the culmination of the metal phase. The explanation is that *weiqi* must have been related to metal too, so that playing it at a moment when this phase was already prevalent was counterproductive. But, if *weiqi* is linked with metal, it must also be connected with war and in general with fighting. So the result of this analysis, if applied to the statement in *Mozi*, indicates "in the army", in a combat phase, that if another fighting factor - *weiqi* - is added, the natural tendency towards *equilibrium* sought by Chinese thinking would be negated. The same reasoning can be found in Han () times when, in case of heavy rains (*Yin*) [24], woman (*Yin*) were forbidden to go to the market,

the northern gates (*Yin*) of towns were closed and southern ones (*Yang*) [25] left open, and officials had to wear red (Fire) clothing.[7]

Another criticism of *weiqi* may be found in *Fayan* [26] (Exemplary Sayings) (*circa* 5 AD) by Yang Xiong [27], in which the author contests the acritical acceptance of spontaneity of Taoism:

> "Some believe that criminal law corresponds to *Dao* [28] because it too is spontaneous. But I say that criminal law, like *weiqi*, like fencing and magic practices which confuse the eye, although they are all spontaneous (*ziran*) [29], still have a true *Dao* only generally speaking, but in their particulars they have a perverse *Dao*".[8]

Here, the presence of terms like "criminal law" clearly indicates that the object of criticism is also Legalism. This is therefore the first passage which openly associates *weiqi* with Legalist theories.

The silence of Taoist texts on *weiqi* leaves open the possibility that the game may be connected with this philosophical school. The real way of playing *weiqi* recalls *Yin-Yang* theories very closely, so that Confucius's criticism in reality may be due to the fact that this classification system was alien to him. Later, when *Yin-Yang* theories were absorbed by Taoism, Mencius's opposition to the game and his denouncing of its "amorality" became more articulated and was modelled on his condemnation of the Taoist free attitude towards society's obligations. So, whereas for Confucius and Mencius the object of debate was the *Yin-Yang* classification system, for Yang Xiong there was a

different element: the negativity of *weiqi* was similar to that of Legalist government systems, *i.e.*, the criminal law. In *Mozi* and *Guanzi*, the game was associated with war, and thus with Legalism and "Horizontal and Vertical" theories, supporting war as a solution to the political anarchy of the Warring States. Therefore, the latter two authors had a significantly different approach to the condemnation of *weiqi*.

A third reason for criticism may have been due to the early relations between *weiqi* and divination. This point of view is perhaps subtended to all pre-Han writers who mention *weiqi* in their texts; in *Fayan*, it may be seen in the association of the game with "magic practices".

Only after the fall of the Han dynasty did an essay appear totally devoted to criticism of *weiqi* and its players. The author was a strictly orthodox Confucian: Wei Yao [31] (*fl.*: 252 AD). He died in jail because he refused to write in an official history that the father of the founder of the Wu dynasty was himself an emperor.[9] This biographical note helps us to understand better Wei Yao's intransigent point of view, expressed in his *Boyi Lun* [35] (Speech on *weiqi*). Given the importance of this text, its full translation is given below:

> "It has been said of the *literati* that, ashamed of present times and failing their examinations for a place in the imperial administration, they are afraid of reaching the end of their days without being remembered by posterity. Therefore: 'Study as if you could not reach your goal, and even as if you feared losing it'". [10]

If these straits have been reached, it is because nowadays the *literati* are very different from those of the past. The latter feared not to obtain fame with the passing of years, so, conscientiously and with determination, they studied from the first ray of light at dawn, when they awoke, until nightfall, when they lay down to sleep. With no free time or moments of rest, they submitted themselves to this for months and years, accumulating knowledge with daily labours. The examples of Ning Yue's [37] commitment and Dong Sheng's [38][11] sincerity incited them to plunge into virtue's abyss and to live in the citadel of arts and of the *Dao*. Even with Xi Bo's [40] sanctity and Ji Gong's [41][12] ability, constant daily toil is necessary. This attitude allowed the Zhou dynasty (XI century - 255 BC) to be exalted and made it famous for a hundred million years.

So how could ministers and common people stop studying?!

If we recall ancient as well as more modern *literati* who - in the course of history - became renowned, we will find that all of them accumulated remarkable and extraordinary experiences of study. Spending most of the time absorbed in books, they exhausted their spirits and tired their bodies. Even when they did not obtain a

public office they did not desert their duty and, even in poverty and tribulation, their determination did not waver. Such was Bu Shi's [42] iron will when he planted fields and grazed flocks; such was Huang Ba [43][13] when he received the *Dao* in jail. At the end they both reached the renown that made their names imperishable.

With this goal in mind, Shan Fu [45] was engaged from dawn to sunset and Wu Han [46] did not leave the common gate.[14] How could they have travelled for pleasure or have abandoned their responsibilities?

Instead, the members of the present generation do not pay attention to the Five Classics and the art of government, but amuse themselves playing *weiqi*. They are negligent of their tasks, desert their professions, forget to eat and drink, spend the whole day until daylight fails playing, and then go on by the light of oil-lamps.

Fighting on game-boards, when it is still unclear who is stronger and who will be defeated, players concentrate all their attention and are completely enraptured by the game. Their spirits are exhausted and their bodies are fatigued, social relations are neglected, the duties of hospitality are omitted, so that the host no longer welcomes his guests. Even when there is the meat

of the sacrificial ox, and even Shao [49] and Xia [50] music, it seems that nobody has time to care about them.

Limits are so exceeded that some even bet their clothes and personal objects. Following the evolution of the game, hand after hand, tempers change, honesty and correctness are abandoned and expressions became not only choleric but even violent.

In such circumstances, the object of players' desires never transcends the game-board and their attention never goes beyond its squares. But if the adversary is beaten there is no official place assigned to the winner, "territories" are "conquered", but in reality no plot of land is gained, ability in this game is not included among the Six Arts,[15] and playing it is not comparable to administering state affairs. Even those who exercise their bodies to reach longevity never dare to consider their activity among the Arts!

Furthermore, the imperial examiners chosen to select candidates for places in the state administration do not accept *weiqi* as a discriminating choice.

If we search for the principles of *weiqi* in armies drawn up in fighting order, we do not find them in the rules of Sunzi [52] or Wu Qi [53]. Looking for those principles in the Arts or in *Dao* is not in the tradition of Confucius's school. Adopting inconstancy and fraud as

methods of play is a demonstration of the use of incorrect and disloyal principles, employing technical terms like “invasion”, *jie* [54], and “killing”, *sha* [55], means being devoid of Humanity, *ren* [56]. Lastly, spending the day deserting one’s occupations brings no advantages, and so we may wonder if there is any difference between placing pieces on a game-board and simply throwing stones.

In the house of a cultivated man, if he is still outside the public administration he must exercise himself so as to enhance longevity; if he does have a place in the administration he must act so as to serve with loyalty, postponing private business until dinner time, but, even so, wherever is the advantage of playing *weiqi*?

Conforming oneself to the above, filial conduct and the respect due to friends will be correct and pure, and well-deserved fame will be manifested.

The glorious Wu [57] dynasty (220 - 265 AD) has now received from Heaven the mandate to rule; but, because inside the Four Seas peace is still not achieved, the dynasty is constantly engaged in the duty of selecting military officers brave enough to impose order and ready to bear responsibilities like bears and tigers, and choosing *literati* like dragons and phoenixes to undertake official duties. Thus, the one hundred

behaviours will all be fixed, those with public duties will obtain a universal goal, in order to be rewarded with gold and even higher positions. This will improve society for one thousand years and one hundred generations will gain virtue.

In this way, the *literati* of the present generation will be encouraged to direct their attention in the right way and, loving merit and appreciating power, thanks to the present brilliant period, they will have their names inscribed in the official chronicles and will receive government positions. These are the most important duties of the *junzi* [58] and of the utmost urgency.

Let us now consider the *weiqi* board: where can we find on it any relation with a prefecture? And the three hundred pieces with an army of ten thousand soldiers? Imperial robes, bells and musical stones are much more important than pieces and game-boards: who would exchange one for the other?

In the event of scholars willingly turning the diligence they now squander in *weiqi* towards poetical texts, they will obtain a strength like that of Yan [59] and Min [60][16] and, by employing it in wisdom they will have the capacity of Liang [61] and Ping [62], by bestowing it in goods they will be rich like Yi Dun [63],

> using it in archery and driving war-chariots, they will be generals. [17]
>
> When circumstances correspond to what I have said, then fame will be gained and no-one will be inept any longer."[18]

Wei Yao's criticism against *weiqi* is very detailed and may be considered as a *summa* of all the preceding arguments. He condemns the amorality of *weiqi*, like Mencius, but adds a vivid description of unrespected guests and depicts the players as furious gamblers, ready to lose their shirts for a game, thus extending the Mencian accusation of unfiliality. Wei Yao also used to criticise the game because of its close link with war, but he denied that this aspect may somehow be ennobled by the contiguity with Sunzi's theories. What is definitely new in his accusations is his analysis of the intrinsic amorality even of the technical terms, like "killing", used by the players. Instead, he follows Confucius when he states that playing *weiqi* is meaningless, like "throwing stones", recalling the words "without worrying about anything" of the Master. Another aspect is WeiYao's refusal to consider *weiqi* among the "arts". The reason for this may have been the players' appropriation of Mencius's statement, which denigrates *weiqi* by placing it among the "small arts" turning it into official recognition. Therefore Wei Yao correctly restores the original meaning by blaming the players.

Another author who wrote an esay against *weiqi* was Pi Rixiu (834?-883? AD). He was born in Xiangyang [66] in modern Hubei [67],

became a *jinshi* [68] in 867, and is famous for his poetic anthologies and for an edition of *Chajing* [69] (The Classic of Tea).[19]

His text on *weiqi*, entitled *Yuanyi* [70] (The Origin of *Weiqi*) is part of his work *Shiyuan Jimi* [71] (The Interconnected Mysteries of the Ten Origins). *Yuanyi* exists in two versions: one is in *Wenyuan Yinghua* [72] (Anthology of the Garden of Literature)[20] and criticises *weiqi*; the other is in *Xuanxuan Qijing* [74] (The Very Mysterious Classic of *Weiqi*)[21] and is in favour of the game. This second version is clearly a forgery, because it quotes the book *Qijing Shisanpian* (The Classic of *Weiqi* in Thirteen Chapters), which was written much later during the Song dynasty. The following is therefore a translation of the first version:

> "If somebody is asked about the origin of *weiqi*, he will surely answer: 'Yao [78] taught Dan Zhu [79] how to fight, and Dan Zhu invented this [game], so that is its origin'.
>
> But I maintain that even if *weiqi* is an art, its practice is the following: if I take the initiative my adversary is the loser, but if my rational capacity is impaired and my adversary exploits this, then I am at a disvantage. If I want an inner gain, first I have to invade the outer; if what I want to obtain is far away, first I have to occupy what is near, and this means being false.
>
> The unmodified method of placing pieces that leads to victory is an elastic defence, the way that leads to defeat is not to fight when necessary and to run away.

Conflict occurs every time the winner does not accept a [local] defeat and the loser does not want it either. Defending one territory and abandoning another one, occupying one territory and leaving another one: this is like He Zong [80] and Su Qin's [81][22] methods and to Chen Zhen's [82][23] speeches and is deceitful.

In such a situation, if you do not pay attention to what is important, if you are not deceitful, if you do not fight you lose. In *weiqi*, if you do not cheat, you fall into chaos. Even if you are a good player like Yi Qiu [83] you must use such methods.

My opinion is the following: Yao had a nature gifted with humanity, rectitude, formal courtesy, wisdom and honesty [just as] man needs to use his hands, feet, ears and eyes. But is not it typical of inferior people to apply their poor plans and scarce intelligence to strategies to fight until they win or lose?

In Yao's times, the numerous tribes of Miao [84] were not yet subjugated to him and, in spite of Yao's humanity, they did not behave towards him with due respect. Therefore Yao's army could have been [justified in] invading them, to civilise them. [Such an action would have been like] a hunter trying to trap an owl in a net or a fisherman trying to cook the fish Kun [85]. So Yao did not want to employ the army and instead

> ordered Shun [86] [to solve the problem]. But even Shun, not tolerating [the idea of using violence] to subjugate the Miao, proclaimed the civic virtues, so that social structures could develop even among Miao's tribes. He did not employ the army either, even when the Miao did not respect him. Consequently, how could Yao ever have employed a deceitful attitude which damages others, or false and warlike wisdom as fighting methods, and even teach them to his son with the aim of conquering other states?!
>
> Hence, the origin of *weiqi* must go back to the Warring States period, because its harmful, false, warlike and cheating *Dao* is typical of those who promoted "Horizontal and Vertical" theories.
>
> How can it be ascribed to Yao?! Who dares say that?!".[24]

Pi Rixiu bases his approach to *weiqi* on the assumption that, according to the legend, the game was developed by Dan Zhu after receving instruction in combat from his father, the mythological emperor Yao. The story is actually slightly different. In the Warring States period, this legend is reported in *Shi Ben* [87] (The Origin of History) and simply states that Yao invented *weiqi* and taught it to his son. One explanation of this legend is that *weiqi* was originally connected with divination, traditionally given to man by Yao. Later, Zhang Hua [88] (*fl.* 280 AD) wrote in his *Bo Wu Zhi* [89] (Records of Investigation of Things) (270-290

AD) that the real object of inventing this game was to improve the mentally retarded Dan Zhu.[25] Here, Pi Rixiu seems to follow a different tradition, which ascribes the real origin of the game to Dan Zhu, following Yao's principles.

In any case, Pi Rixiu denies this possibility, refuting any connection between Yao, sanctified by Confucians in the light of their values, and the very practice of *weiqi*. He suggests instead Su Qing and He Zong, political theoreticians of the Warring States period, who proposed two different and antithetic systems of alliance but who were considered in Han times as members of the "Horizontal and Vertical" school, as inspirers of the values on which *weiqi* is based. Here we have the same criticism already present in *Guanzi*, *Mozi* and *Fayan*, which states that the *Dao* of *weiqi* is "perverse".

The reason for this change of attitude among *weiqi* opposers may be related to the peculiar atmosphere of those times. Due to Buddhist and Taoist predominance in the Chinese world of thought during the Tang dynasty, Mencian criticism lost a good deal of its strength. Moreover, any opposition to the *Yin-Yang* had been forgotten ever since the syncretism of Han times, so that these arguments to denigrate the game could no longer be used.

Hence, the opposition of the *literati* changed weapons to attack *weiqi*, emphasizing its close coincidence with the political theories of the Warring States which had been completely rejected by Chinese intellectuals since those times. The players themselves have claimed a certain connection between *weiqi* and *Sunzi*'s war wiles, as seen in Wei

Yao's essay. But *Sunzi*'s positions overlap those upheld by Legalists and Su Qing and He Zong, to the point at which all of them accept war as a useful solution to controversies among states - a solution which may became excellent if used in an unscrupulous and Machiavellian way, with no concern for morality or rituals.

By attacking *weiqi*, the Chinese *literati* were attacking a philosophical attitude which was not only contrary to official ideology, but also opposed to the most deeply rooted values of social harmony, outside which they could only see the predominance of violence over honesty. This does not mean that the *literati* were not fascinated by *weiqi*: as many as thirty-five poems about the game have come down to us since Tang times,[26] showing how much the Tang cultivated *élite* enjoyed spending time playing *weiqi*. It is significant that there are no prose essays in praise of *weiqi* from this period. This suggests a possible dichotomy between public official condemnation and private enjoyment of the "*weiqi* vice". Aesthetic thoughts embodied in poems, going beyond rational argument, became the only way to express the subtle pleasure of being absorbed in one's thoughts in front of the *weiqi* board. But this dichotomy was about to be solved, thanks to Song Neo-Confucianism.

2

Song Neo-Confucianism has its roots in the political reforms proposed by Fan Zhongyan [94] (989-1052 AD). His aim was to increase the number of public administrators among the *literati* by means of

examinations and to restrict the possibility of nobles entering such a career. During the period of his influence at court (1043-1044), he proposed that the *literati* should express their ideas and criticisms in prose essays instead of being examined in the composition of meaningless poems, at that time mandatory. His political point of view was summed up in a sentence from *Yijing* [95] (The Classic of Changes): anything which causes problems must be changed, since only after change can there be constancy.[27]

His views were also later held by Ouyang Xiu [97] (1007-1072 AD) who wrote in his *Benlun* [98] (On Bases) that only the *literati* have the right to administer the empire. This right derives from their understanding of the "bases" of good governments of the past. Only cultivated people were able to distinguish between empty formalism and the profound meaning of ritual.[28] Thanks to these views, it became possible to re-interpret all preceding historical periods and ideological systems. This obviusly also influenced the debate about *weiqi* and made possible its complete rehabilitation through analysis of its "bases".

The work in which this new perspective appeared is entitled *Qijing Shisanpian* (The Classic of *Weiqi* in Thirteen Chapters) by Zhang Jing [102] (*fl.*: *circa* 1050 AD), otherwise unknown. Chapter seven includes the quotation of *Yijing* that was the motto of Fan Zhongyan, so that the link with his position is explicit.

In *Qijing Shisanpian*, Taoism and Sunzi's theories are accepted as ways of interpreting the game and as useful in playing it, but they are subordinate to a wider ethic horizon. The references to Sunzi are given in

the same structure of *Qijing Shisanpian*, divided into thirteen chapters as *Sunzi Bingfa* [103] (The Art of War of Sunzi) and in many quotations taken from it. Quotations from *Laozi* [104] provide clearly explain the relations of *weiqi* with Taoism. But the main achievement was the setting up of a moral standard for *weiqi* players, so that preceding criticisms were overcome. This is openly stated in chapter nine:

> "It has been said: '*Weiqi* provides deceits and tricks as necessary; invasion and killings as technical terms: is not it false *Dao*?!' But I answer: absolutely not! As a matter of fact, in *Yijing* it is written: 'when an army goes into battle it needs fixed rules, otherwise there is danger'.[29] The army must not be deceived: cheating speeches and betrayal are typical of the 'Horizontal and Vertical' doctrine of the Warring States."[30]

The chapter continues with an explanation of what players must not do:

> "Although the *Dao* of *weiqi* is small, it is identical to that of fighting. So there are many levels of play and not all the players are the same. At the lowest level, there are those who play without thinking or reflecting; then there are those who use their fingers to point to the positions on the board; others even speak and reveal their plans.
>
> But those who have reached a high standard of play do not behave like this at all. On the contrary, they think

> very deeply and ponder on the consequences of their moves. They use the possibilities given by the positions of the pieces and direct their thoughts towards the board before they lay down a piece. They calculate winning moves before they are manifest in play, and prevent the adversary from placing a piece where he would like. Do *they* base their play on speaking too much or on frantic gestures?!
>
> *Zuozhuan* [105] states: 'Be honest, not dishonest!'.[31] Are not we speaking precisely about this?".[32]

Other chapters of *Qijing Shisanpian* contain more details about the moral standards which that must be maintained when playing *weiqi*:

> "Do not pride yourself on victory, do not complain about defeat. A *junzi* is modest and generous; it is typical of vulgar persons to give way to irascible and furious expressions. It is good for the best players not to exalt themselves and for beginners to have no fear. Be calm and breathe regularly. If you do this, your battle is already half won, while if your face reveals your disturbance, you are already losing. No shame is worse than that due to change of feelings, no action is more base than to cheat others.

> [...] When the pieces are counted [at the end of the game], do not worry about knowing the real extent of [your] victory".[33]

Once it was clear that *weiqi* was acceptable because of its high moral standard, *Qijing Shisanpian* could go on to explain that war and combat may occur on the board but that this is only a possibility, not a goal or a necessary condition. Avoiding the open direct fighting also was recommended also by Sunzi's theories. "The winner is he who by not fighting, subdues his adversary".[34] This quotation is similar to Sunzi's: "The winner is he who knows when to fight and when to avoid fighting".[35]

Qijing Shisanpian also stated that " the winner is he who knows his own weak points".[36] This is close to self-knowledge, and later in the text in fact the words of Laozi are quoted: "He who knows himself is enlightened". Victory is therefore sought more over oneself than over one's adversary.

So it cannot be denied that, although *weiqi* is a game in which a player who cheats can beat his honest adversary, it is clear that the true player is principled, because he has understood the ethics of the game. The way of playing thus becomes a reflection of the human nature of the players, just as calligraphy and painting show the integrity of an artist's values.

In his *Homo Ludens* Huizinga wrote that games are outside the moral sphere, being neither good nor evil. But, he added, in the case of an action which is admitted by the rules but which contrasts with moral conscience, the latter must always prevail.[37]

In ancient China, as we have seen, games were not outside the moral sphere, because of the Confucian position about the predominance of ethics above all other considerations. It was therefore much more important to determine whether *weiqi* could be considered as enhancing players' principled conduct or whether it was harmful to them. The negative attitude prevailed, for different reasons, from the Warring States period until the Tang dynasty, so that there was no possible answer to criticisms of *weiqi*. The reasons were due to the various interpretations of *weiqi*: a game of *Yin-Yang*, war, amoral or shamanistic.

When *Qijing Shisanpian* was written the situation changed completely, thanks to formalisation of standard behaviour which allowed rule-abiding players to be recognised. And these were the players who "even if they have no other ability, they are appreciatedby everybody and invited everywhere"[38] described by Matteo Ricci: people accepted by the upper classes only because of their ability at *weiqi*, a clear sign of their morality. *Weiqi* had become a part of Neo-Confucianism and all former opposition was forgotten.

Very ironically, this integration into the world of the Chinese *literati* was so perfect that, during the Cultural Revolution, *weiqi* was persecuted precisely because it promoted "feudal ideas".[39]

List of Chinese Characters

1]: ≥∫ ×∇ 2]: ↑≥ ℜ ¯3]: ∞√ƒ ∞ 4]: ×∇ ÷γ⁄Θ⁄T ⎪γ 5]: ∂♣ ≥ϕ 6]: ♦↵⁄÷ 7]:⁄Θ⁄T ÷γ ♠ ˝♦ 8]: ∞_ ♦⊇ 9]:⁄⁄∝¬ →∇ ♣⎪ 10]: ♣ι⁄ʎ⁄Ω 11]: ♥σ⁄ʎ 12]: ℜ⎪°⎪13]: —∞⁄ʎ 14]: ÷≠ ∞O 15]: ⎪˝ ♥⎪↔™ 16]: ⎪∇⁄ʎ ∂° ƒ♦ 17]:⁄Ω →⎤ 18]:⁄Ω →⎤ →∇ ♣⎪ 19]: ≡⇒⁄ʎ 20]: ♥° ♦↓ 21]: ≡⇒⁄ʎ →∏ ∞↵ 22]: ∞⎪ →⊃ 23]: ⁄↑ ƒ⎛ 24]: ≥± 25]: ∂♣ 26]: ♠κ ♦∞ 27]: ×↑ ∂↓ 28]: ≠Δ 29]: ƒ⇔ ∝M 30]: °⇑ ≠Δ 31]: ↑≥ ℜ ¯32]: ≈N ℵψ ∤≢ 33]: ⁄⁄°⎥ ⁄H ƒΩ⁄φ ∝⎤ ♦∑ 34]: ♥⎪ °∪ ƒΛ →∇ ♥ξ 35]: ≥∏ ↔∧ ⎪· 36]: →⌡ ♣B 37]: ≠⎥ ∂ς 38]: ÷≥ ∞⊆ 39]:÷≥ ∞∫ →∇ 40]: ƒ⎝ ♣B 41]: →ς⁄⎪ 42]:⁄P ƒϒ 43]: ∂ℵ ⊕Θ 44]: ƒI ∞≤ 45]:⁄σ ♦φ 46]: ♣δ ≡~ 47]: —⎥ ⊗⎡⁄⎪ 48]:⁄≤ ℜ ∣⁄⎪ ♠⎤ 49]: ≈◊ 50]: →Λ 51]:⁄≈ ℘ℵ 52]: →]⁄ʎ 53]: ♣δ °_ 54]: ♣T 55]: ±⌋ 56]:⁄↓ 57]: ♣δ 58]: ♣γ⁄ʎ 59]: ℘X 60]: ∂{ 61]: ♦} 62]: ∞↑ 63]: ↑⊇ ≠ψ 64]:⁄T °⎥ ♣© 65]: ♣δ →∇ 66]: ℑ÷ ∂♣ 67]: ×∫ ∞_ 68]: ∂ι⁄η 69]: ↓⎤÷γ 70]: ↑⎡ ↔∧ 71]:⁄Θ ↑⎡ ⊗~ ±K 72]:⁄∑ ↑β ↑⊥ ∝¬ 73]: ♣⌡ ♠∏ 74]: ∞∪ ∞∪ ×∇ ÷γ 75]:⁄⎩ ƒ… ↔ν 76]: ∞∪ ∞∪ ×∇ ÷γ •σ ÷∇ 77]: ⁄H ∞ℑ ⊕⎡ ♦⎪ ♠⎡ ♠♥ ♠ℵ 78]: ≥⎛ 79]:⁄ƒ ƒ∂ 80]: ƒΞ ±θ 81]:

⊗← ↓≥ 82]: ≥↓ ⇐H 83]: ↔∧←⌊ 84]: ↑] 85]: ⌈⊄ 86]: ∝∉ 87]:

∞ϖ ∞≈ 88]: ±ι ∝¬ 89]: ≥∏ ♠↔ ♣© 90]: …B ∝⏐↑… 91]:

⫽°⏐ ≥∫ ×∇ 92]: *f* ♦ ≥≤ 93]: ∞|⁄τ ←⌈—∩ ♣⇒ ≥N ♠⌈ ♠♥ ♠ℵ 94]:

↑Σ ∞∫ ″T 95]: ♥⟩÷γ 96]: ℘× ℘©⁄Y 97]: …∨ ∂♣ ↑· 98]: ∞≈ ⏐· 99]:

→ϖ ↓υ 100]: ∂H 101]:⫽102]: ±ι ≠τ 103]: →]⁄λ ♣Λ ♠κ 104]:

f∇⁄λ 105]: ∞♠ ∂∩ 106]: *f*© ♦™ ♦© 107]: →]⁄λ ♣Λ ♠κ

≡⌊ ÷θ 108]: …σ …⏐ ≠θ ∝⌡♠⌈ ♠♥ ♠ℵ

---

[1] MATTEO RICCI, 1942, *Storia dell'introduzione del Cristianesimo in Cina*, Roma, La libreria dello Stato, vol. I, p. 146.

[2] *Lunyu* (Confucian Analects), 17th Chapter "Yanghuo" [5], passage 22, in RUAN YUAN [6] (ed.), 1991, *Shisanjing Zhushu* [7], Beijing [8], Zhonghua Shuju [9], vol. II, p. 2526.

[3] *Mengzi* (Mencius), 11th chapter, "Gaozi shang" [10], passage 9, in RUAN YUAN (ed.), 1991, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 2751.

[4] *Mengzi* (Mencius), 8th chapter "Lilou" [12], passage 30, in RUAN YUAN (ed.), 1991, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 2731.

[5] This reference probably indicates some kind of punishment like that meted out to St. Sebastian. *Mozi*, book 15, *ju.*: 70 "Haoling" [14], in: CAI SHANGSI [15] (ed.), 1991, *Zhuzi Jicheng* [16], Shanghai [17], Shanghai Shuju [18], vol. IV, p. 364.

[6] *Guanzi Jiaozheng* [21], *ju*.: 40, ch. “Sishi” [22], in: CAI SHANGSI (ed.), 1991, *op. cit.*, vol. V, p. 240.

[7] MICHEL LOEWE, 1994, *Divination, mythology and monarchy in Han China*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P., p. 156.

[8] *Fayan* , *ju*.: 5, “Wendao” [30], in: : CAI SHANGSI (ed.), 1991, *op. cit.*, vol. VII, p.12.

[9] HERBERT A. GILES, 1898, *A Chinese Biographical Dictionary*, Taipei, Literature House, n° 2297; ZANG LIHE [32], 1940, *Zhongguo Renming Dacidian* [33], Shanghai, Shangwu Yinshuguan [34].

[10] *Lunyu* (*Confucian Analects*), ch. ‘Tai Bo’ [36], 8.17, in RUAN YUAN (ed.), 1991, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 2487.

[11] The first is unknown, the second is a Han witer, author of *Dongzhongshu* [39] (Dong’s Book of Loyalty).

[12] Ji Gong is better known as King Wu, founder of the Zhou dynasty. Xi Bo, “The Lord of the West”, was the title of Ji Gong’s father during the Shang dynasty.

[13] Bu Shi lived in the times of Han Wudi (140-86 BC). He was a landowner famous for having provided the Chinese army with supplies in its expedition against Xiongnu [44]. Huang Ba (?-51 BC) was a governor, unjustly imprisoned. Once in jail, he spent his time studying poetry. Thanks to his attitude, when he was released from prison, he was promoted to minister.

[14] Shan Fu, second son of Xiang Gong ruler of Lu [47], was famous for his good administration of state affairs. Wu Han (?-44 BC) was a horse dealer who

became a general in the Han army. The phrase “he did not leave the common gate”, *bu li gong men* [48], means that he held public office.

[15] The “Six Arts”, *liuyi* [51], were: rituals, music, mathematics, writing, archery and chariot driving.

[16] Both were disciples of Confucius.

[17] The above quoted persons are unknown.

[18] CHEN SHOU [64], 1963, *Sanguo Zhi* [65], Shanghai, Zhonghua Shuju, “Wushu”[66], biography of Wei Yao, *ju*. 65.

[19] HERBERT A. GILES, *op. cit.*, n° 1648.

[20] LI FANG [73], 1966, *Wenyuan Yinghua*, Beijing, Zhonghua Shuju, vol. III, pp. 1877, 1878.

[21] WANG RUNAN [75] (ed.), 1988, *‘Xuanxuan Qijing’ Xinjie* [76], Beijing, Renmin Tiyu Chubanshe [77], pp. 30ff.

[22] Founders of the “Horizontal and Vertical” political school of thought in the late Warring States period.

[23] Chen Zhen is otherwise unknown.

[24] LI FANG, *op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 1877, 1878.

[25] LIU SHANCHENG [90] (ed.), 1988, *Zhongguo Weiqi* [91], Chengdu [92], Sichuan Kexue Jishu Chubanshe [93], p. 256.

[26] All this poems are published in: LIU SHANCHENG (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 407 - 425.

[27] *Yijing*, ch. ‘Xici Xia’ [96], in RUAN YUAN (ed.), *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 89.

[28] KIDDER SMITH JR. (*et al*.), 1990, *Sung Dynasty Uses of the I Ching*, Princeton, Princeton U.P., pp. 26 - 32.

[29] *Yijing, ju*. 2, hexagram n°7 shizhen [99], xiang [100] commentary to the first line, in RUAN YUAN, *op. cit*., vol. I, p. 25 zhong [101].

[30] *Qijing Shisanpian*, ch. 9, in WANG RUNAN (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 14.

[31] This quotation is not in *Zuozhuan* but in *Lunyu*. See: *Lunyu*, *ju*.14, in RUAN YUAN (ed.), *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 2511 zhong.

[32] *Qijing Shisanpian*, ch. 9, in WANG RUNAN (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 14.

[33] *Qijing Shisanpian*, ch. 13, in WANG RUNAN (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[34] *Qijing Shisanpian*, ch. 6, in WANG RUNAN (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[35] *Sunzi Bingfa*, ch. 3, in AI QILAI [106], 1991, *Sunzi Bingfa Jingyi* [107], Beijing, Guangbo Dianshi Chubanshe [108], p. 75.

[36] *Qijing Shisanpian*, ch.6, in WANG RUNAN (ed.), *op. cit*., p. 11.

[37] JOHAN HUIZINGA, 1946, *Homo Ludens*, Torino, Einaudi, p. 251.

[38] MATTEO RICCI, 1942, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 146.

[39] From August 1966 until July 1978 no magazines devoted to *weiqi* appeared, and from 1966 to 1974 no national championships were held in mainland China. See: LIU SHANCHENG, *op.cit*., pp. 837ff., p. 1184.