

A Scholarly Review of Chinese Studies in North America

北美中国研究综述

Edited by

Haihui Zhang

Zhaohui Xue

Shuyong Jiang

Gary Lance Lugar



Published by the Association for Asian Studies, Inc.
Asia Past & Present: New Research from AAS, Number 11

Literature: Early China

Martin Kern

Definition of the Field

Since the 1970s, the study of early China has experienced impressive growth in North America, especially the United States but to a lesser extent also Canada. Thirty years ago few of the major institutions had specialists for early China, and those in the field were mostly focused on transmitted texts. By now the situation has completely changed. Scholars of early China occupy positions around the country, and few institutions have two or more such specialists on their faculty. Moreover, the field maintains its own journal, *Early China*, which was founded in 1975 as the annual publication of the Society for the Study of Early China. In addition, the Society publishes the Early China Special Monograph Series and maintains the highly informative Early China website.¹

In the development of the early China field, much of the attention has shifted to the study of bronze inscriptions and excavated manuscripts, and here especially to the study of early history, intellectual history, and religion. As is often the case for ancient civilizations, these fields are closely interrelated, and literature is closely connected to all of them; strictly speaking, there is no defined field of “early Chinese literature” that could be separated from the study of Chinese antiquity altogether. It lies in the nature of ancient societies that they require integrated, interdisciplinary research instead of isolated approaches guided by modern categories such as “history,” “religion,” or “literature.” However, in the present survey, I nevertheless attempt to isolate “literature” (in the more narrow sense) from the other subfields in the study of early China (history, philosophy, religion, etc.) that are dealt with in other parts of the present book. In doing so, I am not asking “What is literature?” but instead, “What do we recognize and study as literature?”

Literature in its broadest sense includes all forms of texts. In a first attempt to narrow this definition, we normally focus on all forms of aesthetically shaped writings—what the Chinese tradition calls *wen* 文—that is, texts with significant features that cannot be reduced to the mere expression of information. In this view, a list of bureaucratic titles is not literature, but a Western Zhou bronze inscription, showing (however irregular) use of rhyme and tetrasyllabic meter, is a work of literature and even poetry. Eloquent historical and philosophical writing, for example, in the *Shiji* or *Zhuangzi*, qualifies as literature—and should be studied with close attention to literary form!—and so might a Western Han imperial edict or memorial. By contrast, the most narrow or pure sense of literature in the modern sense of “literary art” does not apply to any text in early China, nor would it to the texts of other ancient civilizations.

Instead of following a particular definition, the following survey will proceed from the actual North American literary scholarship of early China in order to illuminate important accomplishments

and recent trends. In this one can discern two different perspectives of research: specialists of early China study literary texts within their contemporaneous historical, religious, archaeological, and other contexts, while specialists of Chinese literature, often being more engaged with later periods, include particular early texts in their discussions of specific textual genres. For the first group of scholars, the *Shijing* is part of the intellectual world of its time and related to the Western Zhou ancestral ritual or the Warring States discourse on self-cultivation; its study forms an important part in the overall reevaluation of Chinese antiquity in light of our newly excavated sources. For the second group, the *Shijing* is part of the history of Chinese poetry that relates to the later poetic tradition. The two approaches are fundamentally different yet complementary, and some scholars are able to combine them.

The one distinct field that is directly pertinent to the study of literature but is itself a large and highly specialized area of research is Chinese linguistics. This area is further divided into studies of historical phonology, lexicology, paleography, and the origin and early characteristics of the Chinese writing system. Numerous studies have been published on all these topics, yet due to constraints of space, they cannot be accommodated here. Exceptions will be made only on the few occasions where a study specifically addresses a particular literary text under discussion.

To date there exists only a single book devoted to pre-Qin through Han literature, namely, Burton Watson's (Columbia University) 1962 monograph *Early Chinese Literature*.² This work was pioneering in its day but is now considerably dated, although it remains a useful general introduction to the scope of the field. Its first real update will appear in chapters 1 (Shang through Western Han) and 2 (Eastern Han through Jin) of *Cambridge History of Chinese Literature*,³ (2010) written by Martin Kern (Princeton University) and David R. Knechtges (University of Washington), respectively.⁴ Knechtges is also the author of what will soon be the most important reference work for the field: a massive encyclopedic handbook of nearly eight hundred entries to provide reliable guidance on classical Chinese writings from antiquity to the Tang.⁵

Since the early twentieth century, many literary anthologies have been published—first in Europe and then, especially in the second half of the century, also in the United States. These include numerous translations of individual pieces of early Chinese literature that cannot be discussed in the present survey. Finally, not a few of the seminal English-language works that are still required reading in North American sinology were written in Europe and, of course, must be mentioned in this survey. On the other hand, more recent European writings, even in English, cannot be mentioned here.

History of the Field and Current Trends

Shijing

The academic study of Chinese literature began with European translations of the *Shijing*. Of these, the three most influential works of the late nineteenth and then the twentieth century were written in English and created in Europe. The first was James Legge's (Oxford University) study, translation, and philological annotation of the *Shijing*,⁶ published in 1871 as part of his rendering of the *Five Classics*, the *Four Books*, and other philosophical texts from early China. Legge broadly consulted the classical commentaries from the Han through the Qing but was particularly inclined to follow Zhu Xi's readings. The second major translation of the *Shijing*, also created in England, was Arthur

Waley's (School of Oriental Studies, London),⁷ published in 1937.⁸ Waley's translation, influenced by the French sociologist Marcel Granet's study of the *guofeng* 國風, *Fêtes et chansons anciennes de la Chine* (1919), minimized the philological apparatus and presented an eminently readable rendering of the *Shijing* in which the ancient songs appeared fresh and charming, ancient poetry in the best sense of the word. The third influential translation was Bernhard Karlgren's (Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm), published in 1944–45 in the *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* in Sweden, and accompanied by Karlgren's meticulous *Glosses* on the *Shijing* between 1942 and 1946 in the same journal.⁹ To this day, these are the three constantly cited English translations of the *Shijing*; more than half a century after Karlgren's work, no subsequent translations, including Ezra Pound's extremely free poetic rendering in *The Classic Anthology Defined by Confucius*,¹⁰ have ever replaced them. Both Legge and Karlgren still serve as indispensable reference works for the philological study and historical scholarship of the *Shijing*.¹¹ Karlgren and Legge approached the *Shijing* primarily from the perspective of *jingxue* 經學 (Karlgren's translations especially are utterly disinterested in poetic beauty), but Waley, in addition to his unquestioned scholarly competence in philology and anthropology, treated the *Shijing* as ancient poetry that modern readers can not only study but also enjoy.

In addition to these translations, the study of the *Shijing* has been the most important field in early Chinese literature in North America. At the time of Karlgren's translation, James Robert Hightower (Harvard University) published two authoritative studies on the *Hanshi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳 and *San jia shi* 三家詩 that are still unsurpassed.¹² George A. Kennedy (Yale University) wrote two brief yet meticulous analyses of metric features and the use of reduplicatives (*chongdie* 重疊) in the *Shijing*.¹³ In 1968, W. A. C. H. Dobson (University of Toronto) published a linguistic analysis of the *Shijing* where he also attempted to date its different sections;¹⁴ however, its somewhat mechanical discussion has not inspired much further research. The same is true for the rhetorical, to some extent even structuralist, work by William McNaughton on the language and style of the *Shijing*.¹⁵

Over the following two decades, a number of important studies explored the nature of the *Shijing* from comparative perspectives, sometimes reaching quite different conclusions. In 1969, Chen Shih-hsiang's 陳世驥 (University of California, Berkeley) seminal essay "The *Shih Ching*: Its Generic Significance in Chinese Literary History and Poetics" looked at the *Shijing* from the perspective of both comparative literature and anthropology, discussing the origins of the songs in the musical culture of high antiquity.¹⁶ C. H. Wang (University of Washington), in his 1974 book *The Bell and the Drum: Shih Ching as Formulaic Poetry in an Oral Tradition*, attempted to apply the Parry-Lord theory of oral folk composition to the *guofeng*.¹⁷ A similar approach was employed by Hans H. Frankel (Yale University) in his 1969 and 1974 studies of the *yuefu* "Kongque dongnan fei" 孔雀東南飛.¹⁸ While these ideas about formulaic oral poetry were popular around 1970, few scholars since then have followed up on reading Chinese poetry this way; more recently, Charles H. Egan (San Francisco State University) has convincingly rejected the "folk" and "oral" paradigms for early Chinese poetry.¹⁹ C. H. Wang's collection of essays *From Ritual to Allegory: Seven Essays in Early Chinese Poetry* continued the comparative approach through six inspiring studies of the *ya* 雅 and *song* 頌 sections of the *Shijing*,²⁰ proposing, among other original ideas, to read a series of *daya* 大雅 hymns as the "epic" of King Wen, which could be compared to the Homeric epics. By contrast, in her essay published in 1983, "Allegory, Allegoresis, and the *Classic of Poetry*,"²¹ Pauline Yu (president of the American Council of Learned Societies,

formerly of the University of California, Los Angeles) forcefully rejected the direct application of the critical terminology of the classical West—in this case, “allegory”—to poetry of classical China, showing instead how ancient Chinese philosophical and religious thought differed profoundly from its counterpart in the Mediterranean world and hence led to fundamentally different modes of poetry and poetic exegesis. Since then the comparative interpretation of early Chinese poetics in relation to the *Shijing* has led to studies of considerable theoretical and philosophical ambition: Haun Saussy’s (Yale University) 1993 book *The Problem of a Chinese Aesthetic*;²² Ming Dong Gu’s (Rhodes College) 2005 book on hermeneutics, especially with regard to *Shijing* and *Yijing*;²³ Gu’s discussion of the poetic principles of *fu*, *bi*, and *xing*;²⁴ and Wei-qun Dai’s (formerly University of Alberta) article on *Xing*.²⁵ In 2006, Tamara Chin (University of Chicago), wrote a comparative paper on mimesis in the *Shijing*.²⁶

Work devoted to ancient literary thought in relation to the *Shijing* began to become visible especially in the 1970s. Around the time of James J. Y. Liu’s (Stanford University) classic 1975 book *Chinese Theories of Literature*,²⁷ Chow Tse-tung (University of Wisconsin) authored two essays on the relation of early poetry to ancient music and philosophy.²⁸ Donald Holzman, an American teaching in Paris, wrote “Confucius and Ancient Chinese Literary Criticism” in 1978.²⁹ Thereafter, a number of studies on early aesthetic ideas—especially in relation to the “Great Preface”—have focused on the “Record of Music” 樂記 chapter of the *Liji* 禮記 and the “Discussion of Music” 樂論 chapter in *Xunzi* 荀子.³⁰ Stephen Owen’s (Harvard University) *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought* contains a useful chapter on Warring States literary criticism.³¹

At the same time, the field of *Shijing* studies has produced a series of fine studies but no clear trends. In 1989 Joseph R. Allen (University of Minnesota) wrote perceptively on narrative poetry in the *Shijing*.³² Steven Van Zoeren’s (formerly Stanford University) 1991 book *Poetry and Personality: Reading, Exegesis, and Hermeneutics in Traditional China* is a thoughtful study of the reception and interpretation of the *Shijing* from Han through Song times,³³ while William H. Baxter III’s (University of Michigan) *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology* has greatly advanced the understanding of ancient Chinese phonology and the *Shijing* rhyme system,³⁴ finally replacing the framework that Karlgren had erected during the first half of the twentieth century. Both Stephen Owen (Harvard University) and John Timothy Wixted (Arizona State University) have produced insightful discussions of the “Great Preface,”³⁵ Mark Laurent Asselin (formerly University of Washington) has shown how an Eastern Han *fu* reflects the Lu School reading of “Guanju,”³⁶ and essays by Haun Saussy (Yale University), Stephen Owen, and Dore J. Levy (Brown University) have examined the functions of rhyme and repetition in *Shijing* language, as well as the poetic principle of *fu* 賦, respectively.³⁷ David R. Knechtges (University of Washington) has written a short but eye-opening essay on the linguistic difficulties of the *Shijing* that should once and for all disabuse us of the common yet ignorant idea of “naturally reading” a *Shijing* song by choosing selectively whatever traditional or modern glosses one finds convenient.³⁸ Joseph R. Allen (University of Minnesota), in the postface to his 1996 edition of Arthur Waley’s *The Book of Songs*, has published a very useful “literary history” of the *Shijing*;³⁹ likewise, Michael Nylan’s (University of California, Berkeley) 2001 book *The Five “Confucian” Classics* includes a long chapter on the *Shijing* in the history of classical Chinese learning.⁴⁰ Peter Flueckiger (Pomona College), a scholar of Japanese literature, has recently written an insightful article, “The *Shijing* in Tokugawa Ancient Learning,” extending our research on *Shijing* reception history to Japan.⁴¹

If there is any particular trend, it might be that in recent years much (though not all) of *Shijing* studies has shifted to scholars of early China.⁴² The historian Edward L. Shaughnessy (University of Chicago) has proposed to interpret certain linguistic and literary differences in the *ya* and *song* hymns as reflections of the ritual changes during the Western Zhou.⁴³ Jeffrey K. Riegel (formerly University of California, Berkeley; now University of Sydney) has published an influential essay on the interpretation of “Guanju” 閔雎 and “Yanyan” 燕燕 in the Mawangdui “Wuxing” 五行 manuscript.⁴⁴ Mark Edward Lewis (Stanford University), in his 1999 book *Writing and Authority in Early China*, has written an important chapter on the uses of *Shijing* songs during the Eastern Zhou period;⁴⁵ in a way complementary to Lewis, Zhou Yiqun (Stanford University) has published a study on the practice of *fu shi* 賦詩 by women in early historiography.⁴⁶ Paul R. Goldin (University of Pennsylvania) has authored “Imagery of Copulation in Early Chinese Poetry,” largely devoted to the *Shijing*,⁴⁷ as well as “The Reception of the *Odes* in the Warring States Era.”⁴⁸ Finally, Martin Kern (Princeton University) has written a series of studies, published both in English and in Chinese, on the role of the *ya* and *song* in the formation of early Chinese ritual and cultural identity, on the appearance of *Shijing* quotations in excavated manuscripts, and on the early interpretation of the *guofeng*.⁴⁹ In addition to further studies on the *Shijing* in its early cultural context, Kern is preparing a new complete translation of the *Shijing*.

Altogether, *Shijing* studies in North America have left behind most of the more technical methodology that was to some extent important from the 1960s through the 1980s. Instead, the more recent work is often focused on particular problems of hermeneutics, the early reception of the text, and the particular questions that have arisen with the presence of *Shijing* fragments in excavated manuscripts. Later imperial *Shijing* scholarship is often drawn on but not studied as a subject in its own right.

Chuci

Compared to the study of the *Shijing*, work on the *Chuci* has been far more limited. Serious engagement with the text began in 1923 with Arthur Waley’s *The Temple and Other Poems*, which included not only translations but also an introduction on Chinese poetry and an appendix on its metrical forms.⁵⁰ The first essay of considerable influence by a North American sinologist was James Robert Hightower’s “Ch’ü Yüan Studies,” published in 1954, where Hightower critically reviewed early- and mid-twentieth-century Chinese scholarship on Qu Yuan.⁵¹ The next three significant works were all written in England. First came Arthur Waley’s 1955 interpretation of the “Nine Songs” as expressions of shamanistic practices;⁵² next, David Hawkes’s (Oxford University) translation of the *Chuci* anthology in 1959;⁵³ and third, in 1963, Angus C. Graham’s (University of London) study of *sao*-style prosody.⁵⁴ Soon thereafter, in 1967, Hawkes’s influential essay on the themes and language of the “Nine Songs” appeared.⁵⁵ In the 1970s, Chen Shih-hsiang published two studies on formal structures in the “Nine Songs” and on the expression of time in the *Chuci*.⁵⁶ Most importantly, in 1985 Hawkes published an updated second edition of his translation. It included a very substantial introduction where Hawkes discussed the history of the anthology, the Qu Yuan biography, and the linguistic features of the songs.⁵⁷

The only other book-length study of the *Chuci* also focused on the Nine Songs but from a radically different perspective: in 1985, Geoffrey R. Waters (formerly Indiana University) offered an introduction to the traditional political interpretation of the songs as it was first formulated in Eastern

Han times by the Wang Yi commentary.⁵⁸ No other scholar in North America has since pursued this reading, but it has remained an important reminder that the modern focus on “shamanism” was not always the way the ancient songs were interpreted.

To different degrees (with Hawkes’s writings remaining the most influential), these works published between 1955 and 1985 still define our current understanding of the *Chuci*. In addition, scholarship since then includes Stephen Field’s (Trinity University) translation of “Tian wen” 天問,⁵⁹ two comparative essays by C. H. Wang,⁶⁰ Pauline Yu’s reflections on the use of imagery in the *Chuci*,⁶¹ Paul W. Kroll’s (University of Colorado) outstanding translation and analysis of “Yuan you,”⁶² Tim Wai-Keung Chan’s (formerly University of Colorado, now Hong Kong Baptist University) study of the formation of the *Chuci* anthology and the authorship of its individual parts,⁶³ and Gopal Sukhu’s (Queen’s College, New York) account of the *Chuci* in Han times.⁶⁴

Altogether, there is no question that new work on numerous aspects of the *Chuci* is overdue. So far, no study has discussed any part of the text in relation to the newly excavated manuscripts, nor has there been sufficient work to integrate the text more fully with the intellectual and literary contexts of late Warring States and early Han times. Compared to the *Shijing*, as well as the Han *fu*, the *Chuci* is the least-studied corpus of early Chinese poetry in North American sinology today.

Han fu

The study of the Han *fu* in the West can almost entirely be summarized by the single name of David R. Knechtges (University of Washington) whose work stands next to the two or three leading *fu* scholars in Chinese academia over the past three decades. No other scholar anywhere in the West has covered the *fu*, and indeed Han literature in general, more authoritatively than Knechtges.

In the United States, the study of the Han *fu* began with three seminal essays by James Robert Hightower (Harvard University) and Hellmut Wilhelm (University of Washington) that are still required reading for anyone interested in the topic: Hightower’s studies on the *fu* of Jia Yi and Tao Qian (including a discussion of the *fu* by Dong Zhongshu and Sima Qian) and Wilhelm’s essay on the Western Han 士不遇賦 genre.⁶⁵ Like all of Hightower’s and Wilhelm’s works, these essays are masterpieces of historical and philological inquiry that have stood the test of time well; in this respect they are comparable to Legge’s and Karlgren’s work on the *Shijing*. Moreover, they set the tone for Knechtges’s extremely wide-ranging body of study and translation. As a result, the exploration of the Han *fu* has been the most painstakingly philological endeavor in all of North American studies of Chinese literature regardless of genre or period—and, considering the enormous linguistic difficulties of the genre, appropriately so.

The published work of David R. Knechtges in both English and Chinese already spans more than four decades, beginning with *Two Han Dynasty Fu on Ch’ü Yüan: Chia I’s “Tiao Ch’ü Yüan” and Yang Hsiung’s “Fan-sao,”*⁶⁶ in 1968, the year of Knechtges’s dissertation on Yang Xiong and the rhetoric of the Western Han *fu*.⁶⁷ This was followed by a translation of Yang Xiong’s *Hanshu* biography,⁶⁸ as well as two authoritative studies on Mei Sheng’s “Qi fa 七發,”⁶⁹ and on the rhetoric of Yang Xiong’s “Yulie fu” 羽獵賦,⁷⁰ before the publication of what to this day remains the best introduction to the Western Han *fu*, the monograph *The Han Rhapsody: A Study of the Fu of Yang Hsiung (53 B.C.-A.D. 18)*.⁷¹ In the

ensuing more than thirty years, Knechtges has written on virtually every aspect of the Han *fu* and its related topics, including on the pre-Han *fu* in *Xunzi* and on the *fu* in the Six Dynasties and the Tang (not to mention Knechtges's many publications on other topics).⁷² Most notable are the first three (of projected eight) volumes of his magisterial *Wenxuan* translation, which provide meticulously annotated translations of the complete *fu* section in the *Wenxuan* (chapters 1–19).⁷³ In addition, Knechtges is the editor and principal translator of Gong Kechang's *Studies on the Han fu*, which combines Gong Kechang's Chinese volume *Han fu Yanjiu* 漢賦研究 with the lectures he gave during his year as a visiting professor at the University of Washington.⁷⁴

While Knechtges's studies of the Han *fu* are focused on detailed historical and philological inquiry, translation, and extensive annotation, several other scholars have occasionally contributed to the field in their own ways. A valuable dissertation was written by Franklin N. Doeringer (1971).⁷⁵ In 1971 Burton Watson produced a very readable anthology of *fu* poetry;⁷⁶ in 1979 William T. Graham Jr. (formerly Ohio State University) published his study of Mi Heng's 禰衡 "Rhapsody on a Parrot" 鸚鵡賦;⁷⁷ in the mid-1980s, W. South Coblin (University of Iowa) wrote several linguistic studies related to the Han *fu*;⁷⁸ in 1986 Dore J. Levy discussed the poetic principle of *fu* as "enumeration";⁷⁹ in 1987, Donald Harper (University of Chicago), following his interest in the occult arts of ancient China, interpreted certain *fu* as religious spells in the southern religious tradition of Chu;⁸⁰ and in 1990, David W. Pankenier (Lehigh University) once again discussed the genre of the "frustrated scholar *fu*" (Shi buyu fu 士不遇賦).⁸¹ In 1993 Zhang Cangshou (Anqing Teachers College, Anhui) and Jonathan Pease (Portland State University) coauthored a study titled "Roots of the Han Rhapsody in Philosophical Prose," tracing the Han *fu* to Confucian and Daoist expository writing, and in addition to the rhetoricians (zonghengjia 縱橫家) from the Warring States.⁸² In 1997, an important dissertation on a series of late Eastern Han *fu* was completed by Mark Laurent Asselin at the University of Washington.⁸³ More recent contributions to Han *fu* studies, beyond David Knechtges' work, are more limited. Martin Kern (Princeton University) has discussed the aesthetics of moral persuasion in the Western Han *fu*, analyzed the authenticity of the Sima Xiangru biography in the *Shiji*, and argued that the Yauloe 要略 chapter of *Huainanzi* 淮南子 should be read as a Western Han *fu*.⁸⁴ Fusheng Wu (University of Utah) has reaffirmed the—already well-known—relation of the Han *fu* in Han epideictic rhetoric and imperial patronage.⁸⁵ Altogether, far more work has been done on Yang Xiong than on any other *fu* author.

Qin-Han Poetry and Literary Court Culture

The present survey includes the poetry of the Qin and Han dynasties, but it does not include the so-called "anonymous Han *yuefu*" and "Nineteen Old Poems" and also stops before the works of the Jian'an period (196–220). The reason for not including the "anonymous Han *yuefu*" is that few North American scholars who in recent years accept the bulk of anonymous *yuefu* collected as authentic Han works; instead, these texts, known to us only from Six Dynasties are usually—and also in the present volume—discussed in the context of Six Dynasties literature. The reason for stopping before the Jian'an period is that the poetry of that time, while nominally still belonging to the Han dynasty, marks a new departure, especially with the 建安七子, who flourished at the court of Cao Cao, *Seven Masters*

of *Jian'an* Period.

Much of Qin and Han poetry is closely related to the imperial court. An important essay in this context is Hellmut Wilhelm's (University of Washington) "The Bureau of Music of Western Han," published in 1978.⁸⁶ From the Qin, the only surviving poetic works are the stele inscriptions created during the reign of the Qin First Emperor; they have been the subject of a monograph by Martin Kern (Princeton University),⁸⁷ who is also the author of a book on the Western Han "Anshi fangzhong ge" and "Jiaosi ge" from the reigns of Han Gaozu and Han Wudi, respectively.⁸⁸ In addition, Kern wrote on the use of poetry in *Shiji* and *Hanshu*.⁸⁹ David R. Knechtges (University of Washington) has published several articles on Han poetry and court literature: on the literary production at the court of Han Wudi,⁹⁰ on court criticism in Han literature,⁹¹ and on the poetry of Ban Jieyu 班婕妤.⁹² Donald Holzman, an American working in Paris, studied the beginnings of pentasyllabic poetry in the Han.⁹³ Finally, Kenneth E. Brashier (Reed College) has contributed several careful literary and historical studies on Eastern Han stele inscriptions, which were often composed in the tradition of the *Shijing*.⁹⁴ All these studies are primarily defined by their strictly philological and historical approach. In addition, Brashier's work is thoroughly informed by the theory of memory, an important new subfield in Western cultural studies.

Altogether, research on Qin-Han poetry before the *Jian'an* period and excluding so-called anonymous Han *yuefu* and old-style poetry is limited partly because of the fairly small amount of short poetry that can be safely dated to the Han. However, there is still much more work to be done.

Philosophical and Historical Prose

Prose writing from early China can be roughly divided into several categories: historical and pseudo-historical texts, expository ("philosophical") writings, and accounts of technical knowledge. Many works from the first two categories have survived through the tradition, while most technical writing (on medicine, divination, calendarics, astrology, etc.) has not been preserved but has now begun to surface through archaeological excavations (and, sadly, the looting of tombs). While the technical writings have attracted much interest not only in China but also in the West, especially North America, they mostly lack particular literary form and have hence not inspired much literary analysis. Unfortunately, the literary features of excavated philosophical texts have also been neglected, and this despite the fact that they often display complex patterns of argumentation largely unknown in the received textual tradition.⁹⁵ By and large, the same situation extends to the transmitted philosophical writings of early China. Very few texts have attracted the kind of literary analysis that takes seriously the poetic modes and registers of language that pervade so much of early Chinese writing. The reason for this is that historians and intellectual historians of early China are not trained in the literary analysis of texts, with the unfortunate result that the aesthetic features of philosophical writings tend to be ignored. More often than not, poetic or otherwise aesthetically sophisticated language is considered an obstacle to the understanding of the argument—when in fact, as is obvious in works like *Zhuangzi* or *Huainanzi*, the philosophical argument can be fully understood only when taking its particular form of expression into consideration. To date, just a handful of recent studies can be noted: Lisa A. Raphals's (University of California, Riverside) studies on *Zhuangzi*, Harold D. Roth's (Brown University) book

on the “Neiye 内業” chapter in *Guanzi*, Sarah A. Queen’s (Connecticut College) and Martin Kern’s essays on *Huainanzi*, and David R. Knechtges’ study of the “Fu” chapter in *Xunzi*.⁹⁶ The fact that all these works are fairly recent gives hope that more are to follow in the future.

By contrast, the historical and pseudo-historical works of early China have been studied quite intensely from a literary perspective. In the process, the distinctions between “history” and “fiction” have been questioned consistently; this is not only true for the *Zhanguo ce* but also for *Zuo zhuan*, *Shiji*, *Guoyu*, and other texts that are traditionally read as historical. Thus, in the 1970s and 1980s, a series of studies by Hellmut Wilhelm (University of Washington), William H. Nienhauser Jr., (University of Wisconsin), David Johnson (University of California, Berkeley), and Anthony C. Yu (University of Chicago) traced the origins of Chinese fiction to the art of persuasion, as well as to narrative techniques amply on display across all early philosophical and historical writing,⁹⁷ so much so that no new account of early historiography, for example, in On-cho Ng (Pennsylvania State University) and Q. Edward Wang’s (Rowan University) 2005 book *Mirroring the Past: The Writing and Use of History in Imperial China*,⁹⁸ can ignore the commonalities between history and fiction in early China. As a result, however, an uneasy and unresolved tension now exists between what we know about the literary constructions of early historical works and the trust we still wish to put in texts such as *Zuo zhuan* and *Guoyu* simply because of a lack of other sources. Recent essays such as those by David Schaberg (University of California, Los Angeles) and Wai-ye Li (Harvard University) eloquently testify to this ongoing tension.⁹⁹

The one text that even those who read the *Zuo zhuan* as factual history accept as a collection of historically unreliable anecdotes is the *Zhanguo ce*. This is due largely to the work, over four decades, by James I. Crump Jr. (University of Michigan) who has shown the *Zhanguo ce* anecdotes to be examples of rhetorical persuasion. Following his critical studies, Crump published his revised translation of the entire text in 1996.¹⁰⁰ In 1989, Yumiko Fukushima Blanford wrote a massive dissertation on the *Zhanguo ce* fragments and related rhetorical texts in the Mawangdui silk manuscripts.¹⁰¹

The literary and rhetorical analysis of the *Zuo zhuan* began with two influential essays by Ronald C. Egan (University of California, Santa Barbara) and John C. Y. Wang (Stanford University), both published in 1977.¹⁰² In 1999 Eric Henry (University of North Carolina) analyzed the “Junzi yue 君子曰” and “Zhongni yue 仲尼曰” comments in the text.¹⁰³ However, the scholar who has done most for the analysis of the *Zuo zhuan* since the late 1990s is David Schaberg, who has published an outstanding book, *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography*,¹⁰⁴ and a series of essays on various aspects of the text.¹⁰⁵ To this, Wai-ye Li has now added another impressive book on the construction and readability of meaning in the *Zuo zhuan*, titled *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography*.¹⁰⁶ Schaberg, Li, and Stephen W. Durrant (University of Oregon) have also, in a joint effort, completed a new translation of the *Zuo zhuan*.¹⁰⁷

Even more attention has been given to the *Shiji* than to the *Zuo zhuan*. Here studies are devoted to the authenticity and textual problems of individual chapters, to the interpretation of Sima Qian’s intentions, to the structure of the text, and, perhaps most importantly, to the reading of the *Shiji* as a reflection of Sima Qian’s fate and thought. The serious study of the *Shiji* in North America began with Burton Watson’s (Columbia University) 1957 *Ssu-ma Ch’ien: Grand Historian of China*.¹⁰⁸ At the

same time, Watson, drawing much on Japanese scholarship, prepared translations of some eighty-five chapters of the text, which were published in 1961 and 1969.¹⁰⁹ Since then numerous studies have appeared on the *Shiji*, with two scholars leading the field: William H. Nienhauser Jr. (University of Wisconsin) and Stephen W. Durrant (University of Oregon). Nienhauser, in addition to his many articles on the text, including reviews of its study in both China and the West,¹¹⁰ has assembled a team of translators to finally, for the first time, produce a complete translation of the *Shiji* in English. So far, six of nine projected volumes have been published.¹¹¹ Moreover, while other scholars have sometimes questioned the authenticity of certain *Shiji* chapters,¹¹² Nienhauser has been a strong defender of Sima Qian's authorship. While most of Nienhauser's detailed work is focused on the *Shiji*, Durrant has largely concentrated on the persona of Sima Qian, giving perceptive interpretations of Sima's worldview and motivations.¹¹³ The culmination of Durrant's efforts is his 1995 book *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian*.¹¹⁴

Besides Watson, Nienhauser, and Durrant, a number of scholars have contributed further studies on Sima Qian,¹¹⁵ the narrative structure of the *Shiji*,¹¹⁶ and the historian's moral authority and judgment in the text.¹¹⁷ In addition, Grant Hardy (University of North Carolina at Asheville) has recently authored a book, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo*, contending that Sima Qian, driven by moral purposes, created the *Shiji* as a textual microcosm of multiple meanings.¹¹⁸

In contrast to the *Shiji*, the *Hanshu* has received far less attention. Following Homer H. Dubs's (Columbia University, etc.; later Oxford University) translation of the first twelve chapters plus the Wang Mang biography,¹¹⁹ Burton Watson (Columbia University) published a volume with further translations of selected chapters.¹²⁰ The only literary discussion of a chapter is Stephen Owen's (Harvard University) reading of the "Biography of Lady Li" (Li furen zhuan) as a critique of Emperor Wu's erotic passion.¹²¹ In addition, Martin Kern (Princeton University) has analyzed the rhetorical use of song in the *Hanshu* (and, to a lesser extent, the *Shiji*).¹²² Most recently, Anthony E. Clark (University of Alabama) published *Ban Gu's History of Early China*, offering his hypotheses about Ban Gu's political views and the motivation behind the *Hanshu*.¹²³

Other genres of Han dynasty prose have been largely neglected, save for two studies: a brief monograph on the literary structure of Wang Fu's *Qianfu lun*, by Anne Behnke Kinney (University of Virginia),¹²⁴ and a substantial dissertation on Han letters by Eva Yuen-wah Chung (formerly University of Washington).¹²⁵ Obviously, far more work needs to be done.

Finally, scholarship on early mythology has only gradually moved from anthropological to literary approaches. Important anthropological works on early myth are K. C. Chang's (Harvard University) classic study *Art, Myth, and Ritual: The Path to Political Authority in Ancient China*,¹²⁶ as well as Sarah Allan's (Dartmouth College) 1991 book *The Shape of the Turtle: Myth, Art, and Cosmos in Early China*.¹²⁷ Given the workings of euhemerism (and reverse euhemerism) in antiquity, many studies of early Chinese myths deal in one way or another with the legendary rulers at the dawn of civilization; excellent examples may be found in Allan's 1981 monograph *The Heir and the Sage: Dynastic Legend in Early China*,¹²⁸ and, most recently, Mark Edward Lewis's (Stanford University) 2002 book *The Flood Myths of Early China*.¹²⁹

Deborah Lynn Porter (University of Utah), in her essay on *Mu Tianzhi zhuan*,¹³⁰ and her 1996 book *From Deluge to Discourse: Myth, History, and the Genesis of Chinese Fiction*,¹³¹ has taken a somewhat more

literary (but especially psychoanalytical) approach to early mythology. In 2002, Richard E. Strassberg (University of California, Los Angeles) published his thorough study and partial translation of the *Shanbai jing*.¹³² Whalen Lai (University of California, Davis) has compiled a useful account of Chinese scholarship on myths,¹³³ and Paul R. Goldin (University of Pennsylvania) has written “The Myth That China Has No Creation Myth.”¹³⁴ Many more articles on individual myths have been published over the years,¹³⁵ although the boundaries of the study of early Chinese religion—another large field of research—are fluid. Remarkably, however, the myth-and-ritual (including myth-and-sacrifice) theory, which has been extremely influential in the study of ancient Greece, has never been adopted in any significant way by Western sinologists.

Conclusion

While there is no simple way to summarize the study of early Chinese literature in North America, several characteristics certainly stand out. To begin with, compared to the fields of late imperial and modern literature, and even to recent developments in the study of medieval literature, research on early Chinese literature may still be called conservative in the sense that most of it has remained closely focused on the reading and analysis of specific texts (as opposed to work in which texts are selectively used to illustrate the modern scholar’s own ideas). Next, in retrospect it appears that some of the comparatist and structuralist impulses of the 1960s through the 1980s reflected the desire to discuss Chinese literature in the terms of Western models and intellectual paradigms: texts were sometimes analyzed according to preconceived patterns, arguments were exchanged about the adequacy or inadequacy of using the language of traditional European literary thought to capture the nature of Chinese literature, and the songs of the *Shijing* were compared to the literature of the ancient Mediterranean world. The appeal of these approaches has faded, and not all of their results have aged well.

By contrast, the sinological study of Chinese literature, marked by a close focus on philological and historical analysis, has remained the most powerful approach in the field. Even when scholars are well trained in ancient Greek (or any other European) literature and have from there developed fine sensitivities to matters of literary form and rhetoric, they usually do not move their comparative interests into the foreground. Likewise, the field of early Chinese literature has remained largely immune to the latest trends in Western literary theory. Perhaps because of the sheer linguistic challenge or its archaic nature, this literature has not lent itself to the kind of intellectual acrobatics that are, more often than not, performed according to an entirely Western choreography. Even the limited number of studies driven by ambitious theoretical approaches are usually grounded in original texts. The postmodern (and other) jargon that over the past decades has marred so much of Western literary scholarship (and is now rapidly retreating) has never gained much ground in the study of early Chinese literature.

At the same time, the field has moved decidedly beyond the sometimes naïve and anachronistic ideas inherited from traditional beliefs and certain uncritical scholarship of the past. Simple assumptions about the purported folk origins of the *guofeng*, about early Western Zhou dates for any part of the *Shijing*, or about Qu Yuan’s authorship of much of the *Chuci* are no longer tenable, nor are the unquestioned acceptance of the *Zuo zhuan* as a factual account of Chunqiu period history, the pious idea that the

songs recorded in early historiography were indeed composed by heroes at the very moment of their demise, or the belief that the early anonymous *yuefu* can be faithfully dated to Han times.

One characteristic of the field of early Chinese literature is the fact that it is not situated in any particular academic institution. Outstanding work is being produced at numerous universities from small liberal arts colleges to large state universities. Some of the major programs in later Chinese literature, including some of the most prestigious institutions in North America, have no early Chinese literature program at all; at other places, research on Chinese literature is almost completely in the early period. A second characteristic of the field is that much of its research is centered on specific texts; moreover, some individual scholars have spent years and sometimes decades working primarily on a particular genre or even a single text. Thus, senior scholars like David R. Knechtges (University of Washington) or William H. Nienhauser Jr. (University of Wisconsin) have largely defined the study of the Han *fu* and the *Shiji*, respectively; one simply cannot imagine the field without their massive contributions. Likewise, a small number of midcareer scholars such as David Schaberg (University of California, Los Angeles) or Martin Kern (Princeton University) have similarly written entire series of studies on specific texts, in this case, the *Zuo zhuan* and the *Shijing*, respectively. While all these scholars have also worked on many other questions and hence cannot be regarded as limited by narrow specialization, it is easy to see that the study of these texts would look much different without their sustained efforts over many years. In this way, the field, also because of its relative smallness, is highly personalized and—especially considering that North American scholars occasionally move from one university to another—not primarily bound to particular institutional traditions. (In reverse, one can also see what happens when a text does not attract anyone's sustained attention, like, e.g., the *Chuci*; no coherent body of scholarship, or even set of questions, has emerged for it.)

Meanwhile, in addition to painstaking research on individual texts, scholars occasionally engage in rigorous discussions over fundamental questions. Recently, a controversy has emerged over the very nature of early Chinese textuality, specifically regarding the presence of and interplay between writing and orality in texts from Zhou through Han times. (This discussion is not to be confused with the 1970s interest in oral folk composition of poetry!) To some extent, this debate follows the one in the study of Western antiquity, where it has been alive for several decades already. The case of early China, however, has become complicated—in a very fruitful and productive way—by recent manuscript finds. Shall we think of Zhou and even Han China as a culture where writing and reading were the highest and also most natural forms of cultural expression and learning?¹³⁶ Or shall we emphasize the notion of performance culture in which literary texts were internalized in memorization and externalized in performance even when the technology of writing was readily at hand?¹³⁷ These questions go to the compositional process and very nature of early texts and to the core of our historical imagination of ancient Chinese culture. The study of literature is the field where they can be pursued most effectively.

Notes

Martin Kern, received his PhD in sinology in 1996 from Cologne University. After teaching at the University of Washington (1997–98) and Columbia University (1998–2000), he moved to Princeton University (2000) where he is now Professor of Chinese Literature in the Department of East Asian Studies. A specialist in ancient Chinese literature (Zhou through Han), his interdisciplinary work cuts across the fields of literature, literary theory, philology, history, religion, and art in ancient and medieval China, with a primary focus on poetry. He has written or edited five books, including *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shib-huang: Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Imperial Representation* (2000) and the edited volumes *Text and Ritual in Early China* (2005) and *Statecraft and Classical Learning: The Rituals of Zhou in East Asian History* (2009, with Benjamin A. Elman). In addition, he has written more than fifty articles and book chapters, including chapter 1 in *Cambridge History of Chinese Literature* (2010). A collection of his essays translated into Chinese is titled *Zaoqi Zhongguo de shuxie, shige he wenhua jiyi* 早期中國的書寫、詩歌和文化記憶 and is forthcoming from Sanlian Publishers, Beijing. For further information, see his website, <http://www.princeton.edu/~mkern/>.

This review article was written in July 2009.

¹ <http://lucian.uchicago.edu/blogs/earlychina/>. Another highly valuable website for Western scholarship in all fields of early China studies is maintained by Paul R. Goldin at the University of Pennsylvania: <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/ealc/paul-r-goldin>. In preparing the present essay, I have greatly benefited from Professor Goldin's massive and detailed bibliography.

² Burton Watson, *Early Chinese Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962).

³ *Cambridge History of Chinese Literature*, ed. Stephen Owen and Kang-I Sun Chang (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

⁴ Kern has published a similar chapter in German: "Die Anfänge der chinesischen Literatur" [The beginnings of Chinese literature], in *Chinesische Literaturgeschichte* [History of Chinese literature], ed. Reinhard Emmerich (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2004), 1–87. Both Knechtges and Kern are preparing to expand their Cambridge chapters into book-length monographs, to be published by Brill in Leiden.

⁵ David R Knechtges and Taiping Chang. *Ancient and Early Medieval Chinese Literature: a Reference Guide* (Leiden: Brill, 2010-)

⁶ James Legge, *The She King or the Book of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1871). Numerous reprints followed.

⁷ The school was renamed the School of Oriental and African Studies in 1938.

⁸ Arthur Waley, *The Book of Songs* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1937; repr., New York: Grove Press, 1960). Waley had originally rearranged the sequence of the *Shijing* songs into seventeen categories of contents. The original sequence of the *Mao shi* was restored by Joseph R. Allen (University of Minnesota), who republished Waley's translation in 1996 (New York: Grove Press), adding the small number of songs that Waley had left untranslated.

⁹ Karlgren, Bernhard. 1964. Index to glosses on the book of odes [*Shih ching*]; Glosses on the book of documents. Stockholm: [s.n.]. The translation was reprinted in one volume in 1950 (Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities); the glosses were reprinted in one volume in 1964 (Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities).

¹⁰ Ezra Pound, *The Classic Anthology Defined by Confucius* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954).

¹¹ Remarkably, Marcel Granet's *Fêtes et chansons anciennes de la Chine* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1919), though translated by into English E. D. Edwards in 1932 as *Festivals and Songs of Ancient China* (London: Routledge; New York: Dutton), was never able to exert the kind of influence in North America that it has enjoyed to this day in Europe and even in parts of East Asia. Its emphasis on the folk origin of the *guofeng* influenced Arthur Waley's translation and is still shared by other scholars (including C. H. Wang) but has failed to become universally accepted.

¹² James Robert Hightower, Han Shih Wai Chuan: Han Ying's Illustrations of the Didactic Application of the Classic of Songs (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1952); James Robert Hightower, "The Han shih wai chuan and the San chia shih," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 11 (1948): 241–310.

¹³ These are George A. Kennedy, "Metrical 'Irregularity' in the *Shih Ching*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 4 (1939): 284–96, reprinted in *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Li Tien-yi (New Haven: Far Eastern Publications, Yale University, 1964), 10–26; and "A Note on Ode 220," in *Studia Serica Bernhard Karlgren Dedicata: Sinological Studies Dedicated to Bernhard Karlgren on his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Søren Egerod and Else Glahn (Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1959), 190–98.

¹⁴ W. A. C. H. Dobson, *The Language of the Book of Songs* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968). Dobson also published "The Origin and Development of Prosody in Early Chinese Poetry," *T'oung Pao* 54 (1968): 231–50.

¹⁵ William McNaughton, *The Book of Songs* (New York: Twayne, 1971); "The Composite Image: Shy Jing Poetics," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 83 (1963): 92–106; "Shi ching Rhetoric: Schemes of Words," PhD diss., Yale University, 1965.

¹⁶ Chen Shih-hsiang, "The Shih Ching: Its Generic Significance in Chinese Literary History and Poetics," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 39 (1969): 371–413; reprinted in *Studies in Chinese Literary Genres*, ed. Cyril Birch (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 8–41.

¹⁷ C. H. Wang, *The Bell and the Drum: Shih Ching as Formulaic Poetry in an Oral Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974). For the Lord-Parry theory on the composition of the Homeric epics, see Albert Bates Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960).

¹⁸ Hans H. Frankel, "The Formulaic Language of the Chinese Ballad 'Southeast Fly the Peacocks,'" *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academic Sinica* 39 (1969): 219–44; "The Chinese Ballad 'Southeast Fly the Peacocks,'" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 34 (1974): 248–71.

¹⁹ Charles H. Egan, "Were *Yüeh-fu* Ever Folk Songs? Reconsidering the Relevance of Oral Theory and Balladry Analogies," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 22 (2000): 31–66; "Reconsidering the Role of Folk Songs in Pre-T'ang *Yüeh-fu* Development," *T'oung Pao* 86 (2000): 47–99.

²⁰ C. H. Wang, *From Ritual to Allegory: Seven Essays in Early Chinese Poetry* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1988).

- ²¹ Pauline Yu, "Allegory, Allegoresis, and the Classic of Poetry," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 43 (1983): 377–412, in a later version published anew in Yu's *The Reading of Imagery in the Chinese Poetic Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).
- ²² Haun Saussy, *The Problem of a Chinese Aesthetic* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993).
- ²³ Ming Dong Gu, *Chinese Theories of Reading and Writing: A Route to Hermeneutics and Open Poetics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005).
- ²⁴ Ming Dong Gu, "Fu-Bi-Xing: A Metatheory of Poetry-Making," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 19 (1997): 1–22.
- ²⁵ Wei-qun Dai, "Xing Again: A Formal Re-Investigation," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 13 (1991): 1–14.
- ²⁶ Wei-qun Dai, "Orienting Mimesis: Marriage and the *Book of Songs*," *Representations* 94 (2006): 53–79.
- ²⁷ J. Y. Liu, *Chinese Theories of Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).
- ²⁸ Chow Tse-tsung, "The Early History of the Chinese Word *Shih* (Poetry)," in *Wen-lin: Studies in the Chinese Humanities*, ed. Chow Tse-tsung (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), 151–209; "Ancient Chinese Views of Literature, the Tao, and Their Relationship," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 1 (1979): 3–29.
- ²⁹ Donald Holzman, "Confucius and Ancient Chinese Literary Criticism," in *Chinese Approaches to Literature: From Confucius to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao*, ed. Adele Austin Rickett (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), 21–41.
- ³⁰ Kenneth J. DeWoskin, *A Song for One or Two: Music and the Concept of Art in Early China* (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1982); Kenneth J. DeWoskin, "Early Chinese Music and the Origins of Aesthetic Terminology," in *Theories of the Arts in China*, ed. Susan Bush and Christian Murck (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 187–214; Scott Cook (Grinnell College), "Yue Ji—Record of Music: Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Commentary," *Asian Music* 26.2 (1995): 1–96; Scott Cook, "Xun Zi on Ritual and Music," *Monumenta Serica* 45 (1997): 1–38; Erica F. Brindley (Pennsylvania State University), "Music and 'Seeking One's Heart-Mind' in the 'Xing Zi Ming Chu,'" *Dao* 5 (2006): 247–55; Erica F. Brindley, "Music, Cosmos, and the Development of Psychology in Early China," *T'oung Pao* 92 (2006): 1–49; Erica F. Brindley, "The Cosmic Power of Sound in the Late Warring States and Han Periods," *Journal of Chinese Religions* 35 (2007): 1–35; Haun Saussy, "'Ritual Separates, Music Unites': Why Musical Hermeneutics Matters," in *Recarving the Dragon: Understanding Chinese Poetics*, ed. Olga Lomová (Prague: Charles University, Karolinum Press, 2003), 9–25. See also Saussy, *The Problem of a Chinese Aesthetic*. In addition, Scott Cook has published a study on early aesthetic theory in the excavated "Wu xing" 五行 essays from Mawangdui and Guodian; see his "Consummate Artistry and Moral Virtuosity: The 'Wu xing' 五行 Essay and Its Aesthetic Implications," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Reviews, Articles* 22 (2000): 113–46. Paula M. Varsano (University of California, Berkeley) has written two more broadly framed studies on the theme of space and subjectivity in early poetry; see her "Getting There from Here: Locating the Subject in Early Chinese Poetics," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 56 (1996): 375–403; and "Une vue de mille Li: L'espace réflexif et l'évolution de la subjectivité lyrique en Chine," *Cahiers du Centre Marcel Granet* 2 (2004): 91–111.
- ³¹ Stephen Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 19–36.

- ³² Joseph R. Allen, "The End and the Beginning of Narrative Poetry in China," *Asia Major*, 3rd ser., 2 (1989): 1–24.
- ³³ Steven Van Zoeren, *Poetry and Personality: Reading, Exegesis, and Hermeneutics in Traditional China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991).
- ³⁴ William H. Baxter III, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992). See also Baxter's important study "Zhou and Han Phonology in the *Shijing*," in *Studies in the Historical Phonology of Asian Languages*, ed. William G. Boltz and Michael C. Shapiro (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 1991), 1–34.
- ³⁵ Stephen Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 37–56; John Timothy Wixted, "The *Kokinshū* Prefaces: Another Perspective," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 43 (1983): 215–38.
- ³⁶ Mark Laurent Asselin, "The Lu-School Reading of 'Guanju' As Preserved in an Eastern Han *Fu*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117 (1997): 427–43.
- ³⁷ Haun Saussy, "Repetition, Rhyme, and Exchange in the *Book of Odes*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57 (1997): 519–42; Stephen Owen, "Reproduction in the *Shijing* (Classic of Poetry)," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 61 (2001): 287–315; Dore J. Levy, "Constructing Sequences: Another Look at the Principle of *Fu* 'Enumeration,'" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 46 (1986): 471–93.
- ³⁸ David R. Knechtges, "Questions about the Language of *Sheng min*," in *Ways with Words: Writing about Reading Texts from Early China*, ed. Pauline Yu et al. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 14–24.
- ³⁹ Joseph R. Allen, "Postface: A Literary History of the *Shijing*," in Arthur Waley, *The Book of Songs* (New York: Grove, 1996), 336–83.
- ⁴⁰ Michael Nylan, *The Five "Confucian" Classics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 72–120.
- ⁴¹ Peter Flueckiger, "The *Shijing* in Tokugawa Ancient Learning," *Monumenta Serica* 55 (2007): 195–225.
- ⁴² This would also include the monograph by Gilbert L. Mattos, *The Stone Drums of Ch'in* (Nettetal: Steyler, 1988). The "stone drums" include fragments of Warring States poetry similar to that of the *Shijing*; Mattos's study, however, is more historical than literary.
- ⁴³ Edward L. Shaughnessy, "From Ritual to Literature: The Ritual Contexts of the Earliest Poems in the *Book of Poetry*," *漢學研究* 13 (1995): 133–64, reprinted in Edward L. Shaughnessy, *Before Confucius: Studies in the Creation of the Chinese Classics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997).
- ⁴⁴ Jeffrey K. Riegel, "Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings in *Shijing* Commentary," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57.1 (1997): 143–77. A decade earlier, Riegel published an article, "Poetry and the Legend of Confucius's Exile," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 106 (1986): 13–22, in which he studied three songs from the 衛風 section and their possible relation to the story of Confucius's travels.
- ⁴⁵ Mark Edward Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 147–94.
- ⁴⁶ Zhou Yiqun, "Virtue and Talent: Women and *fushi* in Early China," *Nannü* 5 (2003): 1–42.

- ⁴⁷ Paul R. Goldin, "Imagery of Copulation in Early Chinese Poetry," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 21 (1999): 35–66. A revised and expanded version of this essay was published as chapter 1 of Goldin's *The Culture of Sex in Ancient China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001), 8–47.
- ⁴⁸ Paul R. Goldin, "The Reception of the Odes in the Warring States Era," in *After Confucius: Studies in Early Chinese Philosophy* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005), 19–35.
- ⁴⁹ Martin Kern, "Bronze Inscriptions, the *Shangshu*, and the *Shijing*: The Evolution of the Ancestral Sacrifice during the Western Zhou," in *Early Chinese Religion*, pt. 1: *Shang through Han (1250 BC to 220 AD)*, ed. John Lagerwey and Marc Kalinowski (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 143–200; "Quotation and the Confucian Canon in Early Chinese Manuscripts: The Case of 'Zi Yi' (Black Robes)," *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 59.1 (2005): 293–332; "引據與中國古代寫本文獻中的儒家經典：《緇衣》研究," 簡帛研究 2005: 7–29; "從出土文獻談《國風》的詮釋問題：以《關雎》為例," 中華文史論叢 2008.1: 253–271; "Beyond the *Mao Odes*: *Shijing* Reception in Early Medieval China," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 127 (2007): 131–42; "Excavated Manuscripts and Their Socratic Pleasures: Newly Discovered Challenges in Reading the 'Airs of the States,'" *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 61 (2007): 775–93; "作為記憶的詩：《詩》及其早期詮釋," 國學研究 16 (2005): 329–41; "The *Odes* in Excavated Manuscripts," in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, ed. Martin Kern (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 149–93; "出土文獻與文化記憶：詩經早期歷史研究," 中國哲學 25 (2004): 111–58; "Early Chinese Poetics in the Light of Recently Excavated Manuscripts," in *Recarving the Dragon: Understanding Chinese Poetics*, ed. Olga Lomová (Prague: Charles University, Karolinum Press, 2003), 27–72; "Methodological Reflections on the Analysis of Textual Variants and the Modes of Manuscript Production in Early China," *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 4 (2002): 143–81; "*Shi jing* Songs as Performance Texts: A Case Study of 'Chu ci' ('Thorny Caltrop')," *Early China* 25 (2000): 49–111.
- ⁵⁰ Arthur Waley, *The Temple and Other Poems* (London: Allen and Unwin; New York: Knopf).
- ⁵¹ James Robert Hightower, "Ch'ü Yüan Studies," in *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun-Kagaku-Kenkyusyo* (Kyoto: Kyoto University, 1954), 192–223.
- ⁵² Arthur Waley, *The Nine Songs: A Study of Shamanism in Ancient China* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1955). The theme of shamanism was further pursued by Chan Ping-leung in "*Ch'u Tz'u* Shamanism in Ancient China" (PhD diss., Ohio State University, 1972).
- ⁵³ David Hawkes, *Ch'u Tz'u: The Songs of the South* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959).
- ⁵⁴ Angus C. Graham, "The Prosody of the *Sao* Poems in the *Ch'u Tz'u*," *Asia Major*, n.s., 10 (1963): 119–51. In 1982 Galal LeRoy Walker completed his dissertation on rhymes and other formal features in the *Chuci* under the title "Toward a Formal History of the *Chuci*" (PhD diss., Cornell University).
- ⁵⁵ David Hawkes, "The Quest of the Goddess," *Asia Major*, n.s., 13 (1967): 71–94; reprinted in *Studies in Chinese Literary Genres*, ed. Cyril Birch (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 42–68. Another essay on the "Nine Songs" is Chen Shih-hsiang's "On Structural Analysis of the *Ch'u Tz'u* Nine Songs," *Tamkang Review* 2 (1971): 3–14.
- ⁵⁶ Chen Shih-hsiang, "On Structural Analysis of the *Ch'u Tz'u* Nine Songs," *Tamkang Review* 2 (1971): 3–14; "The Genesis of Poetic Time: The Greatness of Ch'ü Yuan," *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, n.s., 10 (June 1973): 1–44.

- ⁵⁷ David Hawkes, *The Songs of the South: An Anthology of Ancient Chinese Poems by Qu Yuan and Other Poets* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1985).
- ⁵⁸ Geoffrey R. Waters, *Three Elegies of Ch'u: An Introduction to the Traditional Interpretation of the Ch'u Tz'u* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).
- ⁵⁹ Stephen Field, *A Chinese Book of Origins* (New York: New Directions, 1986). Back in the early 1940s, a controversy about the nature of the "Tian wen" was triggered by the highly speculative work of the German scholar Eduard Erkes, who was then strongly rebutted by Achilles Fang and others.
- ⁶⁰ C. H. Wang, *From Ritual to Allegory: Seven Essays in Early Chinese Poetry* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1988), chaps. 6 and 7.
- ⁶¹ Pauline Yu, *The Reading of Imagery in the Chinese Poetic Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), chap. 3.
- ⁶² Paul W. Kroll, "On 'Far Roaming,'" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116.4 (1996): 653–69.
- ⁶³ Paul W. Kroll, "The *jing/zhuan* Structure of the *Chuci* Anthology: A New Approach to the Authorship of Some of the Poems," *T'oung Pao* 84 (1998): 293–327.
- ⁶⁴ Gopal Sukhu, "Monkeys, Shamans, Emperors, and Poets: The *Chuci* and Images of Chu during the Han Dynasty," in *Defining Chu: Image and Reality in Ancient China*, ed. Constance A. Cook and John S. Major (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), 145–65.
- ⁶⁵ James Robert Hightower, "The *Fu* of T'ao Ch'ien," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 17 (1954): 169–230, reprinted in *Studies in Chinese Literature*, ed. John L. Bishop (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 45–106; James Robert Hightower, "Chia I's Owl *Fu*," *Asia Major* 7 (1959): 125–30; Hellmut Wilhelm, "The Scholar's Frustration: Notes on a Type of *Fu*," in *Chinese Thought and Institutions*, ed. John K. Fairbank (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 310–19, 398–403.
- ⁶⁶ David R. Knechtges, *Parerga* 1 (Seattle: Far Eastern and Russian Institute, University of Washington, 1968).
- ⁶⁷ David R. Knechtges, "Yang Shyong, the *Fub*, and Hann Rhetoric" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1968).
- ⁶⁸ David R. Knechtges, *The Han shu Biography of Yang Xiong (53 B.C.–A.D. 18)* (Tempe: Center for Asian Studies, Arizona State University, 1982).
- ⁶⁹ David R. Knechtges, with Jerry Swanson, "The Stimuli for the Prince: Mei Cheng's *Ch'i-fa*," *Monumenta Serica* 29 (1970–71): 99–116. This study is particularly important for locating the origins of the *fu* in Warring States rhetoric.
- ⁷⁰ David R. Knechtges, "Narration, Description, and Rhetoric in Yang Shyong's *Yeu-lieh fub*: An Essay in Form and Function in the Hann *Fub*," in *Transition and Permanence: Chinese History and Culture*, ed. David Buxbaum and Frederick W. Mote (Hong Kong: Cathay Press, 1972), 359–77.
- ⁷¹ David R. Knechtges, *The Han Rhapsody: A Study of the Fu of Yang Hsiung (53 B.C.–A.D. 18)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

⁷² David R. Knechtges, "The Liu Hsin/Yang Hsiung Correspondence on the *Fang yen*," *Monumenta Serica* 33 (1977–78): 309–25; "Uncovering the Sauce Jar: A Literary Interpretation of Yang Hsiung's *Chü Ch'in mei Hsin*," in *Ancient China: Studies in Early Civilization*, ed. David T. Roy and Tsuen-Hsiun Tsien (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1978), 229–52; "A Journey to Morality: Chang Heng's *The Rhapsody on Pondering the Mystery*," in *Essays in Commemoration of the Golden Jubilee of the Fung Ping Shan Library* (Hong Kong: Fung Ping Shan Library, 1982), 162–82; "Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju's 'Tall Gate Palace Rhapsody,'" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 41 (1981): 47–64; "Problems of Translating Descriptive Binomes in the *Fu*," *Tamkang Review* (1984–85): 329–47; "論賦題的源流," *Wen shi zhe* 文史哲 184 (1988): 40–45; "論韓愈的古賦," in 韓愈研究論文集 (Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, 1988); "文選賦的評議," in 昭明文選研究論文集 (Changchun: Jilin wenshi chubanshe, 1988), 74–80; "Riddles as Poetry: The *Fu* Chapter of the *Hsun-tzu*," in *Wen-lin*, ed. Chow Tse tsung, vol. 2 (Madison: Department of East Asian Languages and Literature, University of Wisconsin, 1989; Hong Kong: NIT Chinese Language Research Centre, Institute of Chinese Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1989), 1–32; "Poetic Travelogue in the Han *Fu*," in *Transactions of the Second International Conference on Sinology* (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1989), 1–23; "In Praise of the Han: The Eastern Capital *Fu* by Pan Ku and His Contemporaries," in *Thought and Law in Qin and Han China*, ed. Wilt L. Idema and Erik Zürcher (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 118–39; "述行賦," in 中國文學名篇鑒賞辭典 (Jinan: Shandong daxue chubanshe, 1992), 1736–40; "The Poetry of an Imperial Concubine: The Favorite Beauty Ban," *Oriens Extremus* 36 (1993): 127–44; "Bao Zhao's 'Rhapsody on the Ruined City': Date and Circumstances of Composition," in *A Festschrift in Honour of Professor Jao Tsung-i on the Occasion of His Seventy-fifth Anniversary* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1993), 319–29; "The *Fu* in the *Xijing zaji*," in "Proceedings of the Second International Fu Conference," special issue of, *New Asia Academic Bulletin* 13 (1994): 433–52; "西京雜記中的賦," *Shehui kexue zhanxian* (1994): 213–17; "The Old Style *Fu* of Han Yu," *Tang Studies* 13 (1995): 53–82; "漢武帝的賦," in 第三屆國際辭賦學學術討論會論文集 (Taipei: Guoli Zhengzhi daxue wenxueyuan 1996), 1–14; "班婕妤詩和賦的考辨," in ms (Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, 1997), 260–78; "賦中描寫複性音詞的翻譯問題," in 中外學者文選學論集 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998), 1131–50; "班昭辭賦考," in 辭賦文學論集 (Nanjing: Jiangsu jiaoyu chubanshe, 1999), 186–95; "Early Chinese Rhapsodies on Poverty and Pasta," *Chinese Literature* (1999): 103–13.

⁷³ David R. Knechtges, *Wen xuan or Selections of Refined Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982, 1987, 1996).

⁷⁴ Gong Kechang, *Studies of the Han fu* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1997).

⁷⁵ Franklin N. Doeringer, "Yang Hsiung and His Formulation of a Classicism" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1971). Another dissertation is by Elma E. Kopetsky, "A Study of Some Han *Fu* of Praise: The *fu* on Hunts, Sacrifices, and Capitals" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1969). On this basis, Kopetsky further published "Two *Fu* on Sacrifices by Yang Hsiung," *Journal of Oriental Studies* 10 (1972): 104–14.

⁷⁶ Burton Watson, *Chinese Rhyme-Prose: Poems in the fu Form from the Han and Six Dynasties Periods* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1971).

⁷⁷ William T. Graham Jr., "Mi Heng's 'Rhapsody on a Parrot,'" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 39 (1979): 39–54.

⁷⁸ W. South Coblin, "The Finals of Yang Xiong's Language," *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 12 (1984): 1–53; "Some Sound Changes in the Western Han Dialect of Shu," *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 14 (1986): 184–226; "The Rimes of Chang'an in Middle Han Times," *Acta Orientalia* 47 (1986): 93–131, and 48 (1987): 89–110.

⁷⁹ Dore J. Levy, "Constructing Sequences: Another Look at the Principle of *Fu* 'Enumeration,'" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 46 (1986): 471–93.

- ⁸⁰ Donald Harper, “Wang Yen-shou’s Nightmare Poem,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 47 (1987): 239–83. Another essay by Harper is “Poets and Primates: Wang Yanshou’s Poem on the Macaque,” *Asia Major*, 3rd ser., 14 (2001): 1–25.
- ⁸¹ David W. Pankenier, “The ‘Scholar’s Frustration’ Revisited: Melancholia or Credo,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110 (1990): 434–59.
- ⁸² Zhang Cangshou and Jonathan Pease, “Roots of the Han Rhapsody in Philosophical Prose,” *Monumenta Serica* 41 (1993): 1–27.
- ⁸³ Mark Laurent Asselin, “‘A Significant Season’: Literature in a Time of Endings—Cai Yong and a Few Contemporaries.” See also Asselin’s “The Lu-School Reading of ‘Guanju’ As Preserved in an Eastern Han *Fu*,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117 (1997): 427–43.
- ⁸⁴ Martin Kern, “Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the *Fu*,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 63 (2003): 383–437; “The ‘Biography of Sima Xiangru’ and the Question of the *Fu* in Sima Qian’s *Shiji*,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123 (2003): 303–16; “Creating a Book and Performing It: The ‘Yaolüe’ Chapter of *Huainanzi* as a Western Han *Fu*,” forthcoming in a volume of essays on the *Huainanzi* edited by Michael Puett and Sarah A. Queen; Martin Kern, “《淮南子》的成書與奏書：論《要略》篇之為賦,” forthcoming in 2013 from Brill in Leiden edited by Wu Guowu 吳國武.
- ⁸⁵ Fusheng Wu, “Han Epideictic Rhapsody: A Product and Critique of Imperial Patronage,” *Monumenta Serica* 55 (2007): 23–59; reprinted as chapter 1 of his *Written at Imperial Command: Panegyric Poetry in Early Medieval China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008).
- ⁸⁶ Hellmut Wilhelm, “The Bureau of Music of Western Han,” in *Society and History: Essays in Honor of Karl August Wittvogel*, ed. Gary L. Ulmen (The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1978), 123–35. More work specifically on the Western Han “Office of Music” has been produced in Europe, notably by Jean-Pierre Diény, Michael Loewe, and Anne Birrell.
- ⁸⁷ Martin Kern, *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch’in Shib-huang: Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Imperial Representation* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2000). By the same author, see also “Announcements from the Mountains: The Stele Inscriptions of the Qin First Emperor,” in *Conceiving the Empire: China and Rome Compared*, ed. Fritz-Heiner Mutschler and Achim Mittag (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 217–40.
- ⁸⁸ This book was written in German and published in Germany: Martin Kern, *Die Hymnen der chinesischen Staatsopfer: Literatur und Ritual in der politischen Repräsentation von der Han-Zeit bis zu den Sechs Dynastien* [The hymns of the Chinese state sacrifices: Literature and ritual in political representation from Han times to the Six Dynasties] (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997). By the same author, see also “In Praise of Political Legitimacy: The *miao* and *jiao* Hymns of the Western Han,” *Oriens Extremus* 39 (1996): 29–67.
- ⁸⁹ Martin Kern, “The Poetry of Han Historiography,” *Early Medieval China* 10–11 (2004): 23–65; “漢史之詩：《史記》、《漢書》敘事中的詩歌含義,” in 中國典籍與文化 2007.3: 4–12.
- ⁹⁰ David R. Knechtges, “The Emperor and Literature: Emperor Wu of the Han,” in *Imperial Rulership and Cultural Change in Traditional China*, ed. Frederick P. Brandauer and Huang Chun-chieh (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994), 51–76.
- ⁹¹ David R. Knechtges “Criticism of the Court in Han Dynasty Literature,” in *Selected Essays on Court Culture in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 1999), 51–77.

- ⁹² David R. Knechtges “The Poetry of an Imperial Concubine: The Favorite Beauty Ban,” *Oriens Extremus* 36 (1993): 127–144; “班婕妤詩和賦的考辨,” in 文選學新論 (Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, 1997), 260–78.
- ⁹³ Donald Holzman, “Les premiers vers pentasyllabiques datés dans la poésie chinoise,” in *Mélanges de Sinologie offerts à Monsieur Paul Demiéville* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1974), 77–115.
- ⁹⁴ Kenneth E. Brashier, “The Spirit Lord of Baishi Mountain: Feeding the Deities or Heeding the *yinyang*?” *Early China* 26–27 (2001–2): 159–231; “Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Stelae,” in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, ed. Martin Kern (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 249–84; “Eastern Han Commemorative Stelae: Laying the Cornerstones of Public Memory,” in *Early Chinese Religion*, Pt. 1: *Shang through Han (1250 BC to 220 AD)*, ed. John Lagerwey and Marc Kalinowski (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1027–59. Brashier’s book on Eastern Han stelae is forthcoming soon.
- ⁹⁵ By contrast, several younger European scholars—especially Dirk Meyer (Oxford University) and Paul van Els (Leiden University)—have paid much closer attention to the literary features of these excavated texts. An attempt to examine the literary structure of the two “Ziyi” manuscripts from Guodian and in the Shanghai Museum corpus can be found in Martin Kern, “Quotation and the Confucian Canon in Early Chinese Manuscripts: The Case of ‘Zi Yi’ (Black Robes),” *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 59.1 (2005): 293–332; and “引據與中國古代寫本文獻中的儒家經典：《緇衣》研究,” 簡帛研究 2005:7–29.
- ⁹⁶ Lisa A. Raphals, “Poetry and Argument in the *Zhuangzi*,” *Journal of Chinese Religions* 22 (1994): 103–16; Lisa A. Raphals, “Skeptical Strategies in the *Zhuangzi* and *Theaetetus*,” *Philosophy East and West* 44 (1994), 501–26; Harold D. Roth, *Original Tao: Inward Training and the Foundations of Mysticism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Sarah A. Queen, “The Creation and Domestication of the Techniques of Lao-Zhuang: Anecdotal Narrative and Philosophical Argumentation in *Huainanzi* 12,” *Asia Major*, 3rd ser., 21 (2008): 201–47; Martin Kern, “Creating a Book and Performing It: The ‘Yaolüe’ Chapter of *Huainanzi* as a Western Han *Fu*,” forthcoming in a volume of essays on the *Huainanzi* edited by Michael Puett and Sarah A. Queen, “《淮南子》的成書與奏書：論《要略》篇之為賦,” forthcoming in 2013 from Brill in Leiden edited by Wu Guowu 吳國武; David R. Knechtges, “Riddles as Poetry: The *Fu* Chapter of the *Hsun-tzu*,” in *Wen-lin*, ed. Chow Tse tsung, vol. 2 (Madison: Department of East Asian Languages and Literature, University of Wisconsin, 1989; Hong Kong: NIT Chinese Language Research Centre, Institute of Chinese Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1989), 1–32.
- ⁹⁷ Hellmut Wilhelm, “Notes on Chou Fiction,” in *Transition and Permanence: Chinese History and Culture: A Festschrift in Honor of Dr. Hsiao Kung-ch’üan*, ed. David C. Buxbaum and Frederick W. Mote (Hong Kong: Cathay, 1972), 251–68; William H. Nienhauser Jr., “The Origins of Chinese Fiction,” *Monumenta Serica* 38 (1988–89): 191–219; David Johnson, “Epic and History in Early China: The Matter of Wu Tzu-hsü,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 40.2 (1981): 255–71; Anthony C. Yu, “History, Fiction, and the Reading of Chinese History,” *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 10.1–2 (1988): 1–19.
- ⁹⁸ Q. Edward Wang, *Mirroring the Past: The Writing and Use of History in Imperial China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2005), 1–79.
- ⁹⁹ David Schaberg, “The Logic of Signs in Early Chinese Rhetoric,” in *Early China/Ancient Greece*, ed. Steven Shangman and Stephen W. Durrant (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 155–86; Wai-ye Li, “Knowledge and Skepticism in Ancient Chinese Historiography,” in *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, ed. Christina Shuttleworth Kraus (Leiden: Brill 1999), 27–54.

¹⁰⁰ His critical studies include James I. Crump Jr., “The *Chan-kuo Ts’è* and Its Fiction,” *T’oung Pao* 47 (1960): 305–75; *Intrigues: Studies of the Chan-kuo Ts’è* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1964); and “A Summary of Recent Articles on the *Chan-kuo ts’è*,” *Early China* 1 (1975): 15–16. His translation of the text, titled *Chan-kuo ts’è*, was first published by Oxford University Press in 1970; a revised edition was published by the Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan in 1996. A selection from the text is *Legends of the Warring States: Persuasions, Romances, and Stories from the Chan-kuo Ts’è* (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1999).

¹⁰¹ Yumiko Fukushima Blanford, “Studies of the ‘Zhanguo zonghengjia shu’ silk manuscript” (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1989).

¹⁰² Ronald C. Egan, “Narratives in *Tso Chuan*,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 37 (1977): 323–52; John C. Y. Wang, “Early Chinese Narrative: The *Tso-chuan* as Example,” in *Chinese Narrative: Critical and Theoretical Essays*, ed. Andrew H. Plaks (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 3–20.

¹⁰³ Eric Henry, “‘Junzi yue’ versus ‘Zhongni yue’ in *Zuo zhuan*,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59 (1999): 125–61.

¹⁰⁴ David Schaberg, *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, MA: Asia Center, Harvard University, 2001).

¹⁰⁵ David Schaberg, “Remonstrance in Eastern Zhou Historiography,” *Early China* 22 (1997): 133–79; “Social Pleasures in Early Chinese Historiography and Philosophy,” in *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, ed. Christina Shuttleworth Kraus (Leiden: Brill 1999), 1–26; “Song and the Historical Imagination in Early China,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59 (1999): 305–61; “Travel, Geography, and the Imperial Imagination in Fifth-Century Athens and Han China,” *Comparative Literature* 51 (1999): 152–91; “Platitude and Persona: *Junzi* Comments in *Zuo zhuan* and Beyond,” in *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture from a New Comparative Perspective*, eds. Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, Achim Mittag, and Jörn Rüsen. (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 177–96; “Playing at Critique: Indirect Remonstrance and the Formation of *Shi* Identity,” in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, ed. Martin Kern (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 193–225.

¹⁰⁶ Wai-ye Li, *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, MA: Asia Center, Harvard University, 2007).

¹⁰⁷ The volume is forthcoming from University of Washington Press.

¹⁰⁸ Burton Watson, *Ssu-ma Ch’ien: Grand Historian of China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957).

¹⁰⁹ Burton Watson, *Records of the Grand Historian of China Translated from the *Shih chi* of Ssu-ma Ch’ien*, 2 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961); *Records of the Historian: The *Shih Chi* of Ssu-ma Ch’ien* (New York: Columbia University Press). These translations were reprinted in three volumes as *Records of the Grand Historian* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993). For Watson’s engagement with the text, see also his “The *Shih Chi* and I,” *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 17 (1995): 199–206.

¹¹⁰ William H. Nienhauser Jr., “A Reexamination of ‘The Biographies of the Reasonable Officials’ in the *Records of the Grand Historian*,” *Early China* 16 (1991): 209–33; “Historians of China,” *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 17 (1995): 207–16; “The Study of the *Shih-chi* (The Grand Scribe’s Records) in the People’s Republic of China,” in *Das andere China: Festschrift für Wolfgang Bauer zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer

(Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), 381–403; “A Century (1895–1995) of *Shih chi* 史記 Studies in the West,” *Asian Culture Quarterly* 24 (1996): 1–51; “A Note on a Textual Problem in the *Shih chi* and Some Speculations concerning the Compilation of the Hereditary Houses,” *T'oung Pao* 89 (2003): 39–58; “Tales of the Chancellor(s): The Grand Scribe’s Unfinished Business,” *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 25 (2003): 99–117; “A Note on Ren An: The Residence, the Hunt, and the Textual History of the *Shiji*,” in *Han-Zeit: Festschrift für Hans Stumpfeldt aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*, ed. Michael Friedrich with the collaboration of Reinhard Emmerich and Hans van Ess. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 275–282; “For Want of a Hand: A Note on the ‘Hereditary House of Jin’ and Sima Qian’s ‘*Chunqiu*,’” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 127 (2007): 229–47.

¹¹¹ William H. Nienhauser Jr., ed., *The Grand Scribe’s Records* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994–).

¹¹² In the West the debate over the authenticity of individual *Shiji* chapters has involved many scholars from North America, Europe, and Japan, often responding to one another. Fundamental differences of opinion remain. Recent essays by scholars in North America include David B. Honey, “The *Han-shu*, Manuscript Evidence, and the Textual Criticism of the *Shih-chi*: The Case of the ‘Hsiung-nu *lieb-chuan*,’” *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 21 (1999): 67–97; Martin Kern, “A Note on the Authenticity and Ideology of *Shih-chi* 24, ‘The Book on Music,’” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119 (1999): 673–77; and Martin Kern, “The ‘Biography of Sima Xiangru’ and the Question of the *Fu* in Sima Qian’s *Shiji*,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123 (2003): 303–16.

¹¹³ Stephen W. Durrant, “Self as the Intersection of Traditions: The Autobiographical Writings of Sima Qian,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 106.1 (1986): 33–40; “Takigawa Kametarō’s Commentary on Chapter 47 of *Shih-chi*,” in *Proceedings of the Second Annual International Conference on Chinese Language Works Outside of China* (Taipei: Lien-ching, 1989), 995–1007, *Proceedings* was published in Chinese and edited by the Cultural Foundation of the United Daily News Group; “Ssu-ma Ch’ien’s Conception of *Tso chuan*,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 112 (1992): 295–301; “Ssu-ma Ch’ien’s Portrayal of the First Ch’in Emperor,” in *Imperial Rulership and Cultural Change in Traditional China*, ed. Frederick P. Brandauer and Huang Chun-chieh (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994), 28–50; “Redeeming Sima Qian,” *China Review International* 4 (1997): 307–13; “Creating Tradition: Sima Qian Agonistes?,” in *Early China/Ancient Greece*, ed. Steven Shangman and Stephen W. Durrant (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 283–98; “Truth Claims in *Shiji*,” in *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture from a New Comparative Perspective*, eds. Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, Achim Mittag, and Jorn Rusen, (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 93–113.

¹¹⁴ Stephen W. Durrant, *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995).

¹¹⁵ Michael Nylan, “Sima Qian: A True Historian?,” *Early China* 23–24 (1998–99): 203–46; Willard J. Peterson, “Ssu-ma Ch’ien as Cultural Historian,” in *The Power of Culture: Studies in Chinese Cultural History*, eds. Willard J. Peterson, Andrew Plaks, and Ying-shih Yü. (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1994), 70–79; Paula Varsano, “Les mots vides de Sima Qian,” in *Tradition et innovation en Chine et au Japon: Regards sur l’histoire intellectuelle*, ed. Charles Le Blanc and Alain Rocher (Montreal: Les presses de l’Université de Montréal; Paris: Publications orientalistes de France, 1996), 93–111.

¹¹⁶ Joseph R. Allen, “An Introductory Study of Narrative Structure in *Shiji*,” *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 3 (1981): 31–66; William G. Boltz, “Myth and Structure of the *Shih-chi*,” *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 56 (2002): 573–85.

¹¹⁷ Li Wai-ye, “The Idea of Authority in the *Shi ji* (Records of the Historian),” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54 (1994): 345–405; Alvin P. Cohen, “Avenging Ghosts and Moral Judgement in Ancient Chinese Historiography:

Three Examples from *Shih-chi*,” in *Legend, Lore, and Religions in China: Essays in Honor of Wolfram Eberhard on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Alvin P. Cohen and Sarah Allan (San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1979), 97–108.

¹¹⁸ Grant Hardy, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999). An important part of Hardy’s work is his study of the tables in the *Shiji*; see also his article “The Interpretive Function of *Shih chi* 14, ‘The Table by Years of the Twelve Feudal Lords,’” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 113 (1993): 14–24.

¹¹⁹ Homer H. Dubs, *The History of the Former Han Dynasty*, 3 vols. (Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1938–55).

¹²⁰ Burton Watson, *Courtier and Commoner in Ancient China: Selections from the History of the Former Han by Pan Ku* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974).

¹²¹ Stephen Owen, “One Sight: The *Han shu* Biography of Lady Li,” in *Rhetoric and the Discourses of Power in Court Culture: China, Europe, and Japan*, ed. David R. Knechtges and Eugene Vance (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 239–59.

¹²² Martin Kern, “The Poetry of Han Historiography,” *Early Medieval China* 10–11 (2004): 23–65; “漢史之詩：《史記》、《漢書》敘事中的詩歌含義,” in *中國典籍與文化* 2007.3: 4–12.

¹²³ Anthony E. Clark, *Ban Gu’s History of Early China* (Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2009).

¹²⁴ Anne Behnke Kinney, *The Art of the Han Essay: Wang Fu’s Ch’ien-fu lun* (Tempe: Center for Asian Studies, Arizona State University, 1992).

¹²⁵ Eva Yuen-wah Chung, “A Study of the *Shu* (Letters) of the Han Dynasty (206 B.C.–A.D. 220) (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1982).

¹²⁶ K. C. Chang, *Art, Myth, and Ritual: The Path to Political Authority in Ancient China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983).

¹²⁷ Sarah Allan, *The Shape of the Turtle: Myth, Art, and Cosmos in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).

¹²⁸ Sarah Allan, *The Heir and the Sage: Dynastic Legend in Early China* (San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1981).

¹²⁹ Mark Edward Lewis, *The Flood Myths of Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002).

¹³⁰ Deborah Lynn Porter, “The Literary Function of K’un-lun Mountain in the *Mu T’ien-tzu chuan*,” *Early China* 18 (1993): 73–106.

¹³¹ Deborah Lynn Porter, *From Deluge to Discourse: Myth, History, and the Genesis of Chinese Fiction* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996).

¹³² Richard E. Strassberg, *A Chinese Bestiary: Strange Creatures from the Guideways through Mountains and Seas* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

¹³³ Whalen Lai, “Recent PRC Scholarship on Chinese Myths,” *Asian Folklore Studies* 53 (1994): 151–63.

¹³⁴ Paul R. Goldin, “The Myth That China Has No Creation Myth,” *Monumenta Serica* 56 (2008): 1–22.

¹³⁵ Sarah Allan, “The Identities of Taigong Wang in Zhou and Han Literature,” *Monumenta Serica* 30 (1972–73): 57–99; Sarah Allan, “Shang Foundations of Modern Chinese Folk Religion,” in *Legend, Lore, and Religions in China: Essays in Honor of Wolfram Eberhard on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Sarah Allan and Alvin P. Cohen (San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1979), 1–21; Sarah Allan, “Sons of Suns: Myth and Totemism in Early China,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 44 (1981): 290–326; William G. Boltz, “Kung Kung and the Flood: Reverse Euhemerism in the *Yao tien*,” *T’oung Pao* 67 (1981): 141–53; Jeffrey K. Riegel (University of California, Berkeley, now University of Sydney), “Kou-mang and Ju-shou,” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 5 (1989–90): 55–83; Stephen F. Teiser, “Engulfing the Bounds of Order: The Myth of the Great Flood in *Mencius*,” *Journal of Chinese Religions* 13–14 (1985–86): 15–43; Whalen Lai, “Symbolism of Evil in China: The K’ung-chia Myth Analyzed,” *History of Religions* 23 (1984): 316–43; Whalen Lai, “Looking for Mr. Ho Po: Unmasking the River God of Ancient China,” *History of Religions* 29 (1990): 335–50; Charles Le Blanc (University of Montreal), “A Re-examination of the Myth of Huang-ti,” *Journal of Chinese Religions* 13–14 (1985–86): 45–63. Michael Puett’s (Harvard University) studies, which are more anthropological than literary, are listed in Paul R. Goldin’s essay in the present volume.

¹³⁶ This appears to be the core assumption of historians such as Edward L. Shaughnessy (University of Chicago) and Mark Edward Lewis (Stanford University). See Shaughnessy’s *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006); and Lewis’s *Writing and Authority in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999).

¹³⁷ As has been argued by Michael Nylan, David Schaberg, and Martin Kern, see Nylan’s “Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han,” *Early China* 25 (2000): 205–58; Schaberg’s *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, MA: Asia Center, Harvard University, 2001); and Kern’s “Feature: *Writing and Authority in Early China*, by Mark Edward Lewis,” *China Review International* 7 (2000): 336–76, and “Ritual, Text, and the Formation of the Canon: Historical Transitions of *Wen* in Early China,” *T’oung Pao* 87 (2001): 43–91, as well as Kern’s studies on the *Shijing* and the Han *fu* noted above.