From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library, Princeton, NJ

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyrightlaw. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material inour collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff.For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information onthe Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.
https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026 East Asian Studies

2022

The Enchantment of Erudition: Models and Manifestations of Literary Culture in Han-Wei China

Gu, Yixin

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp01j098zf26p

U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf

THE ENCHANTMENT OF ERUDITION: MODELS AND MANIFESTATIONS OF LITERARY CULTURE IN HAN-WEI CHINA

Yixin Gu

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY

OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE BY

THE DEPARTMENT OF

EAST ASIAN STUDIES

Adviser: Martin Kern

May 2022

© Copyright by Yixin Gu, 2022. All rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is an inquiry into the transition of Chinese literary culture from the late first century BCE through the third century CE. The three centuries under review witnessed a spectacular cultural phenomenon—namely, the emergence and proliferation of an individual form of "erudition." Such a model was presented as an integration of manifold values related to learning, writing, and authority, as well a collective *imaginaire* distributed among a variety of personal embodiments and verbal manifestations. With a wealth of data drawn from philosophic, historiographic, biographic, epitaphic, and poetic texts, the research unpacks a dynamic repository of ideas and utterances—from commonplace vocabulary to sophisticated discourses—associated with this model, which was cast into the composite image of individual as the ideal inheritor, container, producer, and transformer with wide-ranging and self-oriented interests in knowledge and texts. These phenomena altogether demonstrate a re-orientation of Chinese literary culture, from a comparatively narrow sphere regulated by the institutional matrix, toward a multi-centered proliferation of materials, repositories, practitioners, and literary products.

The study in general aims at a reconstruction of the complex intellectual labor and communicative practices involved in the process of making individual erudition a shared, emblematic construction of ideology, which exists beyond the boundaries of conventional archives of knowledge formation but dwells in an extended coded system of communication and meaning-production. Therefore, my inquiry challenges a set of conceptual frameworks related to the studies of early and

medieval China, such as the disciplinary division of "canonical studies" and "literature" (in its narrow, modern sense), the orality-versus-writing dichotomy, the essentialized notion of "Self-consciousness," as well as the discourse of material determinism. Meanwhile, the study re-examines the powers of knowledge involved in the imaginary combination of "erudition" and "individuality" not merely as a specific notion of ideological criticism against institutionalization but, simultaneously, as a truth-making and power-generating enchantment supplying the conceptual foundation for an alternative socio-cultural matrix.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 3

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 7

CONVENTIONS 9

LIST OF TABLES 11

INTRODUCTION 12

CHAPTER 1. 42
IN THE NAME OF ANTIQUITY:
The Revision and Invention of Old and New Models
1.1. Antiquity as a Source of Public Authority 42
1.2. Antiquity as a Guide for Literary Culture 48
1.3. "Man-of-Learning in Antiquity" 61
1.4. "Broadly Learned about *Wen*" 76
1.5. Summary 86

CHAPTER 2. 89
BROADNESS AND COMPREHENSIVENESS:
The Cultivation of Erudition on the Individual Basis
2.1. The Syncretic Mode of Studying Classics and Hermeneutics 89
2.2. The Extension of Individual Mastery of Knowledge and Texts 107
2.3. The Making of Exemplary Individuals as a Collective Memory 131
2.4. Summary 148

CHAPTER 3. 151
SELF-ORIENTED INTEREST IN LEARNING:
Disengagement from Power and Power of Disengagement in Intellectual Lives
3.1. Vulgar *Ru*: A Constructed Other versus an Imagined Community 151
3.2. Hypothetical Discourse: An Alternative Ground for Literary Practitioners 160
3.3. Detachment from Official Career and Its Consequences 187
3.4. Centrifugal and Centripetal Movements of Cultural Resources 197
3.5. Summary 207

CHAPTER 4. 210

MANIFESTING ONE'S ERUDITION IN WRITING:
Literary Productivity and Personal Agency
4.1. Terminologies in Their Linguistic and Cultural Contexts 210
4.2. Integration and Innovation: The Dual Mode of Textual Production 229
4.3. Textual Display of Erudition: The Exteriorization of the Interiorized 244
4.4. Credit and Liability: The Mutual Embodiments between Texts and Individuals 266
4.5. Summary 288

CHAPTER 5. 292
LITERARY CULTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF INTERMEDIACY:
Acts, Thoughts, and Traces within the Paradigm of Cross-Media Commensurability
5.1. Concepts and Realities of Writing Media 292
5.2. Beyond the Orality-versus-Writing Dichotomy 310
5.3. Reciprocal Interactions between Orality, Memory, and Literacy 327
5.4. Summary 352

CONCLUSION: 356
Toward a Synopsis of Bibliography, Ideology, and Grammatology

APPENDIXES 366
Appendix 1. Tables 8 and 9 366
Appendix 2. Table 10 368
Appendix 3. Table 13b 370
Appendix 4. A Selected Vocabulary of Disyllabic Terms 377

BIBLIOGRAPHY 383

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this piece of work is deeply in debt to the following names as my teachers, colleagues, and friends. First, my gratitude goes to my adviser, Martin Kern, for his generous guidance and support before and during the writing of this dissertation. I would also like to express my appreciation to the other members of my dissertation committee, Willard Peterson, Anna Shields, and David Schaberg, for every comment and feedback that they kindly offered. Meanwhile, I am grateful to all members of faculty and staff in the Department of East Asian Studies at Princeton University, where I enjoyed a wealth of training, support, and intellectual exchange foundational to my transformation from a student to a young scholar. I would also like to thank the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies (PIIRS) for offering me the 2021–22 Writing Grants Fellowship to support the last year of my doctoral research. Moreover, I owe my appreciation to scholars outside of Princeton, including Wu Chengxue, Luo Yuming, Chen Yinchi, Xiaofei Tian, Matthias Richter, Antje Richter, and Xu Jianwei, for their advice and encouragement over the past few years.

My gratitude also goes to my graduate colleagues and my friends, including Luke Waring, Heng Du, Thomas Mazanec, Zhuming Yao, Yunxiao Xiao, Soojung Han, Yuzhou Bai, Shengyu Yang, Ziyao Ma, Yiyi Luo, Yuanxin Chen, Sinae Kim, Gian Duri Rominger, Kun You, Yalin Du, Yutong Li, and Junnan Chen, to whom I owe the pleasure of every shared moment engaged in the eros for wisdom.

Some parts of the dissertation were presented, published, or accepted for forthcoming publica-

tion before May 2022. Parts of Chapters 2 and 3 can be seen in one of my articles published in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 141.2 (2021), after being first presented at the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society (Western Branch) in October 2019. Parts of Chapter 4 were first presented at the 21st conference of the CU Boulder Asian Studies Graduate Association in February 2020, and then at the 4th Conference of the Early Medieval China Group in March 2021. Parts of Chapter 3 were first presented at the annual meeting of American Oriental Society (Western Branch) in October 2021, and then at the "Chinese Political Thought: A Global Dialogue Beyond 'Orientalism'" International Workshop in January 2022. Parts of Chapter 1 were considered for publication in a special issue of *Oriens Extremus* forthcoming in the same year. I would like to thank all the editors, reviewers, and attendees of the above-mentioned journals and conferences for their generous comments and advice.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, who make all these possible and meaningful.

CONVENTIONS

1. *References*.

References are provided in the footnotes in accord with the Chicago Manual of Style format in the first instance, with subsequent references given in abbreviated form generally as the surname of the author (full name in the case of Chinese authors), followed by the abbreviated title of their work. References to traditional Chinese sources after the first instance present only the title of the text, followed by the volume and page numbers.

2. *Translations*.

I have generally made use of existing English translations of traditional Chinese terms but declared and explained my choices when they are different from specific existing ones in significant respects. When a traditional Chinese source is cited, the translation is normally my own, sometimes with link(s) to existing translation(s) that my version takes as the reference(s). Important Chinese terms in the first instance within the main text are normally followed by a translation that is normally omitted thereafter, unless a new discussion becomes necessary. There are some cases in which the translation of a term is not given in the first instance but saved for later.

3. *Chinese Characters and Romanization*.

Full-form (*fanti* 繁體) Chinese characters and mainland *pinyin* 拼音 romanization are employed throughout my writing. Alternative romanization systems, such as Wade-Giles, are not converted when they appear in the titles and the texts of published works. Chinese characters for specific terms, names, and titles appear in the first instance and are omitted thereafter in the main text and in the footnotes, respectively.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	The Occurrences of *Haogu* in the *Hanshu*	51
Table 2.	The Mastery of All Major Classics Presented in the *Hanshu*	94
Table 3.	The Mastery of All Major Classics Presented in the *Dongguan Hanji*	94
Table 4.	The Mastery of All Major Classics Presented in the *Houhan shu*	94
Table 5.	*Boxue*, *Bowu*, *Bolan*, and *Botong* in the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*	113
Table 6.	*Duowen*, *Qiawen*, and *Duozhi* in the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*	115
Table 7.	*Botong*, *Jiantong*, *Tongru*, and *Tongren* in the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*	123
Table 8.	Lexical Items Related to *Bo* and *Tong* in the *Dongguan Hanji*	366
Table 9.	Lexical Items Related to *Bo* and *Tong* in the *Sanguo zhi*	366
Table 10.	Literary Scholars Gathered by Cao Regime in the Early Third Century CE	368
Table 11.	*Zhuan*, *Ji*, *Zhu*, and *Zuo* in Four Historiographic Compilations	218
Table 12.	*Zhushu*, *Zhuanji*, *Zhuiji, and Zhuwen* in Four Historiographic Compilations	219
Table 13a.	*Wenzhang* in Four Historiographic Compilations	259
Table 13b.	*Wenzhang* in Four Historiographic Compilations (with Contextual Information)	370
Table 14.	*Feng*, *Song*, *Du*, and *Lan* in Four Historiographic Compilations	328

INTRODUCTION

> Cultures create a contract
> between the living, the dead, and the not yet living.
> In recalling, iterating, reading, commenting, criticizing, discussing
> what was deposited in the remote or recent past,
> humans participate in extended horizons of meaning-production.[1]
>
> —Aleida Assmann, "Canon and Archive"

Topics and Questions

To make sense of a cultural phenomenon is to engage in a coded system of communication and meaning-production, a network that undertakes extensive imaginations and presentations of the living, the dead, and the not yet living. From such a point of view, the present study demonstrates the significance of communicative practices that were foundational to a specific coded system undergoing an era of several major changes. In what follows, I will investigate the transition of Chinese literary culture from the first century BCE through the third century CE—roughly, from the last decades of the Western Han (202 BCE–9 CE) to the Eastern Han (25–220 CE) and the Three Kingdoms (220–280 CE) (or the Wei [220–265 CE]). The three centuries under review witnessed a dynamic, spectacular accumulation of acts, thoughts, and traces that were altogether presented as the emergence and proliferation of an individual form of "erudition." With this model, a literary culture was remarkably transformed by manifold values related to learning, writing, and authority, as well as a collective *imaginaire* distributed among a variety of personal embodiments and verbal manifesta-

1 Aleida Assmann, "Canon and Archive," in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 97.

tions. Such a spectacle can be observed and hence interpreted within a wide spectrum of ideas, utterances, and socio-cultural phenomena, which increasingly gave rise to the composite image of individual as the ideal inheritor, container, producer, and transformer with wide-ranging and self-oriented interests in knowledge and texts. These phenomena, meanwhile, indicate a re-orientation of literary activities from a condition regulated by the institutional matrix toward a multi-centered proliferation of materials, repositories, practitioners, and products.

For clarity, "literary culture," in my terms, refers to an ever-renewing social and intellectual matrix that involves a constellation of ideas, practices, and expressions related to literary materials and technologized by literary skills. Within the frame of this matrix, the study aims at offering an interdisciplinary inquiry that, to be precise, entails not merely an examination of a selected range of concepts and notions which serve the main interest of the history of ideas; nor does it exclusively focus on a series of preeminent writers whose names and works are familiarized in any major archive of intellectual or literary history. Instead, the inquiry will start from the ever-changing foundation of linguistic, material, and socio-cultural contexts out of which any individual manifestation of a given concept gains its meaning and position. This, methodologically, requires a dual approach to be followed throughout the present study. On the one hand, the study will unpack a growing, dynamic repository of ideas and utterances—from commonplace vocabulary to sophisticated discourses—which sustained the values of a specific range of crucial concepts being individually realized in various verbal structures. On the other hand, it will focus on the context and the textuality of a given utterance itself, with regards to its appropriation, revision, and sometimes

innovation of a given concept within specific literary forms and collective frameworks.

The model central to my investigation, to be precise, was a projection of the cultivation and exhibition of "erudition" on the individual basis in dealing with literary objects and literary productions commonly generalized as *wen* 文.[2] During the era under review, the concept *wen*—with a wide range of meanings and context-dependent flexibility—was increasingly recognized and performed as the exterior manifestation of human-and-world in the forms of verbalizations and literary products. "Erudition," in my terms, is not a mere translation of any specific Chinese word or term but a notion that crystallizes a constellation of ideas and utterances, among which two of the most arresting ones appear to be *bo* 博 ("broadness") and *tong* 通 ("to penetrate," "to comprehend," "to learn thoroughly," "comprehensiveness/thoroughness," and so on). These ideas and utterances altogether constructed a mental picture of receiving, integrating, synthesizing, and performing various sources within a recycling and transforming process in conformity to an "inside-outside" paradigm.[3] This paradigm, on a conceptual and imaginary level, connected reception and production, interiorization and exteriorization, as well as the cultivation and expression of in-

2 Throughout the "Introduction," I will save my detailed analyses (and sometimes translations as well, as in the case of *wen* 文) of crucial Chinese terms and concepts for the respective sections in following chapters where they recur.

3 In terms of "inside-outside," for clarity, I do not intend to prescribe them as two ontologically separated realms of reality, nor do I intend to conflate them with a set of hierarchized dichotomies in accord with specific philosophical, metaphysical, and linguistic traditions, especially the inside-outside division applied in Western linguistics and grammatology that is rooted in a biased notion of logocentrism. Instead, I take "inside" and "outside" as a pair of imaginary and descriptive concepts from a constellation of Han-Wei utterances and discourses, which presented the reception, production, and verbalization of knowledge and texts as a recycling and transforming process only via nuanced acts, thoughts, and traces on the individual basis. For more discussions of the applicability of the inside-outside paradigm, see Chapters 4 and 5. About "paradigm," I adopt this concept in a broad sense corresponding to Thomas Kuhn's 1969 revision of his definition of this term (see Kuhn, *Postscript-1969*, in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd Ed. [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996], 175), yet with no attempt to engage in the debates on the applicability of his theory for the history of science. For further discussions, see Notes 470 and 677.

dividual erudition. Meanwhile, it worked in concert with another prominent notion of cross-media commensurability, a paradigm in which a variety of human traces—from speeches and writings to gestures and appearances—actualized in different media and forms were mutually compatible and commensurable within a shared conceptual frame.[4] These two notions or paradigms were crucial and indispensable not merely to the present study but also an even larger range of ideas and practices in early and early medieval China.

While the pursuit for individual erudition was extensively presented as a desirable and productive mode of intellectual life, it was not a mere representation or outcome of specific utilitarian, political, or even philosophical necessity and impulsiveness. Instead, the process by which it gained prominence can be properly generalized as an "enchantment," with regards to the imaginary nature involved in the meaning-construction, knowledge formation, and socio-cultural remembrance that empowered and instantiated this model, as well as the transformative effects on the views of human and world of those whose minds were permeated or occupied by this model. In terms of "enchantment," the inquiry aims to demonstrate that the conceptual foundation sustaining the ethos of erudition was alternative to—if not more profound than—the articulation of specific socio-political agendas, movements, and campaigns. Instead, such a foundation was formulated by the collective commitments to a constellation of ideas, values, methods, and cultural codes applicable to a wide variety of intellectual and literary practices. Meanwhile, the study holds a promise to re-examine the powers of knowledge involved in the imaginary combination of "erudition" and

4 See Chapter 5 for my discussions of the applicability of the notion of cross-media commensurability.

"individuality" not merely as a specific notion of ideological criticism against institutionalization but, simultaneously, as a truth-making and power-generating source supplying the conceptual foundation for an alternative socio-cultural matrix.

To approach this conceptual foundation is to achieve a meaningful reconstruction of the complex, interactive intellectual labor performed in a wide spectrum of acts, thoughts, and traces. Therefore, the study takes three lines of inquiry that are indispensable to each other—

First, on a conceptual level, the cultivation of individual erudition was presented as an outside-toward-inside process through multiple ways of interiorization of various external sources into a repository under individual mastery and controls. This process was performed by a syncretic, integrative, and encompassing mode of literary learning, a mode most often expressed in terms of *bo* and *tong* within a growing repository of utterances that ranged from commonplace vocabulary to a series of more sophisticated expressions. The phenomena under review involved a foundational re-orientation of individual practice to transcend the boundaries between different texts and different traditions, as well as a liberation of scholarly labor and individuality from the imposition of personal affiliation to the matrix of institutes, schools, tutors, and authorities. The cultivation of individual erudition was, on the one hand, a cultural product of the different modes of formation, transmission, and reception of knowledge and texts in general. On the other hand, it greatly enriched and expanded the imaginary archive of personal possessions of knowledge and texts—one's own "bibliography," in a metaphorical sense—toward a broadened realm with open-ended possibilities of proliferation and integration.

Such a self-oriented scholarly stance leads to the second line of my inquiry—namely, an examination of the re-orientation itself as both a practice of ideological criticism and a construction of power and authority in its own right. To be precise, I will investigate the rhetorics and politics involved in the process of empowering individual erudition as a source for a sharable identity and hence an imagined community, both of which at once involved the production of specific otherness as the opposite, the different, or the inferior. Such a process was tightly associated with a gesture of disengagement—performed in a variety of nominal, practical, and literary forms—that detached scholarly individuals and their literary business from the pursuits of official powers and ranks. The disengagement from the institutional matrix provided an alternative ground for the cultivation of erudition, as actualized with the increasingly multi-centered deployment of labor, material, and sources across time and space. Reciprocally, literary business fulfilled the desire for an alternative mode of elitism that offered new access to acquire authorities, reputations, and public recognitions.

Third, on a conceptual level again, the exhibition of individual erudition was presented as an inside-toward-outside process, through which one's interiorized erudition was exteriorized, actualized, and performed in a variety of media and forms, especially by means of "writing." In terms of "writing," I refer specifically to the composition of a verbal structure with an integrated body of contents-and-forms to be actualized in a written form, instead of a physically written text or the gesture of write-something-down. Such an investigation of grammatology, therefore, does not aim at a comprehensive science of "writing" as a practical skill or a physical object, but the notions of

"writing" that were inscribed, reflected, and actualized in a variety of cultural productions. Over the period under focus, a writing as an individual product was arguably presented as a "textual display of erudition," which speaks well to the extended foundation of knowledge underlying the proliferation of individual literary productivity, as well as the shifting configurations of the concept *wenzhang* 文章 that was increasingly associated with an imaginary connection between a text and a person as a pair of properties embodying and manifesting each other.

Taking literary culture as a coded system of communication and meaning-production, the study reconstructs a collective process by which individual erudition was made a sharable emblem beyond the boundaries of conventional archives and disciplines of knowledge formation. My approach is, therefore, violating a compulsive assumption that the best way to acquire a justifiable concept is always localized within a particular archive with its enclosed—and often anachronistically constructed—historical specificity, limited to the incommensurability of its objects, terminologies, and methodologies. More specifically, the inquiry will explore new ways of interpretation beyond an artificial point of view divided by existing disciplinary boundaries and categories. It challenges, correspondingly, a set of theoretical frameworks employed by traditional and modern scholars that are conceptually based on these differentiations. Namely, I tend to negotiate with the overall disciplinary division between "canonical studies" (*jingxue* 經學) and "literature" (*wenxue* 文學 in its narrow, modern sense[5]) as two areas of intellectual activities, the dichotomy of *jinwen* 今

5 For the traditional meanings of *wenxue* 文學 and its relation to other concepts such as *wenzhang* 文章 in early Chinese contexts, see Martin Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon: Historical Transitions of 'Wen' in Early China," *T'oung Pao* 87 (2001): 43–91. For my discussions, see Chapter 4. For the translingual practices by which the narrow, modern meaning of *wenxue* in the specific sense of "literature" was translated from English to

文-versus-*guwen* 古文 as two camps of canonical studies,[6] as well as the orality-versus-writing dichotomy underlying the studies of numerous literary phenomena in China and beyond. Instead, by unpacking a richer repository of acts, traces, and expressions, it becomes possible to invite critical reflections on the effectiveness of cultural periodization of early and medieval China that are based upon essentializing divisions, categorizations, and teleology.

It becomes possible, then, to further challenge any over-simplified notion of determinism that gives priority to a specific form of material or spiritual dominance. On the one hand, in dealing with a risk of material determinism that takes the changes of material media—especially the spread of paper during and after the Eastern Han—as the single most fundamental motivation, the study argues for an integrative point of view concerning the mutual interactions between the conceptual world and the ever-changing realities of material and technology. To the same degree, by unpacking a continuous, transformative, and encompassing process of enchantment, it is particularly within my intention to negotiate with another discourse that remains influential and prevailing in the field. Central to this discourse is an essentialized notion in the name of "Self-consciousness" (*zijue* 自覺) or so, which is applied to diverse areas of arts and humanities—intellectual history, philosophy,

---

Japanese as *bungaku* 文學 and then transferred to modern Chinese, see Lydia Liu, *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China: 1900–1937* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 35.

6 For some reference guides for the traditional framework of the *jinwen-guwen* dichotomy, see Zhou Yutong 周予同, *Jing jinguwen xue* 經今古文學 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1926); Shigezawa Toshiro 重沢俊郎, "Kinko bungaku no honshitsu" 今古文學的本質, *Shinagaku* 支那學 9-4 (1939): 669–97; Tjan Tjor Som 曾珠森 trans., *Po Hu T'ung: The Comprehensive Discussions in the White Hall* (Leiden: Brill, 1949), vol. 1, "Introduction," 137–41. For two of the most influential opinions contesting this dichotomy, see Qian Mu 錢穆, "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao" 兩漢博士家法考, in *Liang Han jingxue jinguwen pingyi* 兩漢經學今古文平議 (Taipei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1998), 231–40; Michael Nylan, "The Chin Wen/Ku Wen Controversy in Han Times," *T'oung Pao* 80 (1994): 83–145. For my own reflection on this issue, see Chapter 2.

aesthetics, and the narrow-sensed "literature," and so on—vaguely from the mid-and-late Eastern Han through early medieval times.[7] Within the discourse, the period presumably witnessed an overall revolutionary breakthrough of human consciousness toward the awakening or self-discovery of individual value, reason, or aesthetics released from a condition of ignorance, silence, and repression. Such a discourse, at the risks of reinforcing the lineal mode of the evolution of human mentality and the validity of dichotomous construction of oppositional values, involves also a tendency—not always explicitly—of conflation with specific conventional notions concerning the European Renaissance and Enlightenment. As the discourse settles the periodization of Chinese philosophy, literature, and intellectual history in terms of "breakthroughs" or "revolutionary" changes, it underrates, simultaneously, the connectivity and transformability between the manifold old and the manifold new, and it overlooks the imaginary other than rational nature involved in a great deal of intellectual expressions and performances across a longer time span. No less than an inquiry into a culture in terms of its "changes," my study aims to approach the various traces of transformation from a perspective that is more thoughtful of the revisionary rather than the revolutionary, the continuity rather than the breakthrough, and the elements internal to a process of "enchantment" rather than that attributed to a movement of "enlightenment."

7 For some opinions with the most far-reaching influences, see Suzuki Torao 鈴木虎雄, *Shina shilon shi* 支那詩論史 (Tokyo: Kōbundō Shobo, 1927), 40–43; Lu Xun 魯迅, "Wei Jin fengdu ji wenzhang yu yao ji jiu zhi guanxi" 魏晉風度及文章與葯及酒之關係, in *Lu Xun quanji* 魯迅全集 (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 2005), vol. 3, 523–53; Wang Yao 王瑤, *Zhonggu wenxue shilun* 中古文學史論 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1998); Yu Yingshi 余英時, "Han Jin zhi ji shi zhi xin zijue yu xin sichao" 漢晉之際士之新自覺與新思潮, in *Shi yu Zhongguo wenhua* 士與中國文化 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1987), 287–400; Li Zehou 李澤厚, *Mei de licheng* 美的歷程 (Shanghai: Sanlian shudian, 2009), 88–104. See also Note 398 for a more fruitful series of references including the critical reflections on the common use of this concept (especially the discourse that the Jian'an 建安 period was an era of *zijue* 自覺 for literature and literary theory). For more reflections on this issue, see Chapters 3 and 4.

Sources and Methodologies

The effects of such a process of enchantment can be observed and hence interpreted in a broad spectrum of literary materials across a wide time span covering narrative, commemorative, argumentative, and sometimes poetic texts. What is gained from these materials is a dynamic repository of utterances with diverse sources, contents, and forms. Such a complexity of textuality, consequently, invites critical reflections from the prisms of both textual and literary criticisms, both of which involve a series of problems and methodological choices.

To begin with, a large proportion of textual data will be drawn from narrative accounts that were accretionally formulated, preserved, and transformed in historiographic, biographic, and epitaphic sources during and after the Han. The sources under review altogether present a rich repository of themes, patterns, tropes, and narrative elements that constituted an expansive network of image-making and meaning-production. These elements are distributed among a variety of forms of textual presentation, from the most formulaic, commonplace characterizations and descriptions of individual personas to the most spectacular, charismatic scenarios in which the images of exemplary figures were theatrically foregrounded and displayed. Most of these accounts should be properly considered as the crystallization of comparatively later narrations of the past. This crystallization was entangled with the dynamics of the production, transmission, and re-fabrication of the materials themselves, a process filled with variability and instability, as well as diverse motifs, approaches, and writing styles of different narrators, compilers, and story-tellers who made selective

appropriations of available sources.[8] The narrative accounts under review, in Hayden White's terms, are best regarded as the verbalizations of the imaginary nature of narrativity in general, as well as the *poetics*—namely, the arts of emplotment and meaning-production—of historiography in particular.[9] In this regard, I avoid an assumption that takes every single narrative account as—or just meant to be taken as—a faithful, straightforward representation of "how it actually was" (*wie es eigentlich gewesen*). Instead, they are rich in evidence as they are saved from the dichotomous division between the "real/unfunctional" and the "fictional," but recognized as the verbal manifestations of a dynamic repository of ideas, values, and beliefs that, within a larger socio-cultural framework, were presented as true and embedded with truth-making power.[10]

Such a repository consists of a constellation of utterances and expressions with comparatively stable forms and meanings, especially a series of descriptive terms that characterize individual features and daily practices to a degree to be considered as the "lexical indicators" throughout the following chapters. Widespread in various sources such as historiographic compilations, biographic writings, tombstone inscriptions, and so on, the distributional patterns of these lexical indicators are indicative of several diachronically changing visions and realities about literary culture across

8 For more discussions on these issues in Han and early medieval historiographies and biographies, see Chapter 2, esp. Notes 180 and 181.

9 See Hayden White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," in *The Content of the Form* (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 1–25, esp. 4 and 24; "Introduction: The Poetics of History," in *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 1–42; "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," in *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 81–100.

10 For some previous reflections on this issue, see, for example, Lü Simian 呂思勉, *Lü Simian du shi zhaji* 呂思勉讀史札記 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2005), 855–56; Patricia Ebrey, "Toward a Better Understanding of the Later Han Upper Class," in *State and Society in Early Medieval China*, ed. Albert E. Dien (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 69; Stephen Owen, "Postface: 'Believe It or Not,'" in *Idle Talk: Gossip and Anecdote in Traditional China*, ed. Jack Chen and David C. Schaberg (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014), 217–23.

three centuries. Through my investigation, exemplary figures will be recognized not merely considering their privileged positions held in the pantheon of Chinese cultural history, but more importantly, from the underlying process of making them a collective memory[11] and *imaginaire* for a growing popularity of the literate community, a community gradually surrounding the shared model of individual erudition. For most literary scholars and practitioners who constituted a part of this picture, their achievements and productions were scarcely preserved and rarely transmitted. Their images, nevertheless, had altogether flowed into a broader living flux of verbal manifestations.

Toward a larger picture beyond these narrative accounts, the whole range of lexical indicators under review fall into a wider spectrum of items, which include a group of comparatively old and monosyllabic terms (such as *wen*, *yan* 言, *xue* 學, *ru* 儒, *bo*, *tong*, *shu* 述, and *zuo* 作) and a group of comparatively new and normally disyllabic compound words with more than one explicit semantic element (such as *wenzhang*, *boxue* 博學, *tongru* 通儒, and *zhushu* 著述[12]). A considerable number of these terms under review had a wide semantic range and an etymological foundation prior to the Han. Manifested in the manifold traces within the living flux of languages, these lexical indicators constituted a dynamic reflection of literary culture and intellectual lives that changed

11 My use of "collective memory" throughout is inspired by Maurice Halbwachs' definition and interpretation of this concept that inclusively explain both individual and social practices of remembrance. See Halbwachs, *The Social Frameworks of Memory*, in *On Collective Memory*, trans. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). I also compare the collective memory under focus with some other theorizations of socially shared and constructed memories. For discussions of my choice, see Chapter 2.

12 In addition to a series of detailed analyses of some of the most arresting compound words, see also a selected vocabulary in Appendix 4, where I incorporate a wider range of relevant disyllabic terms with translations, samples, and contextual information.

over time, and to the same degree they themselves constituted the linguistic and conceptual network as the locus where those changes took places. New terms were often brought into the flux with their meanings gaining from the old semantic roots, and old terms were constantly invoked, revised, and re-contextualized in a manner of appropriation reciprocally connected to other linguistic and non-linguistic factors as well.

The elegance of an inquiry into the occurrences and appropriative variations of these terms, according to Coleridge, rests in cases in which "more knowledge of value may be conveyed by the history of a *word* than by the history of a campaign."[13] Specifically, the accumulation of both old and new terms (and their old and new meanings) altogether constituted a vocabulary that, to quote Quentin Skinner, offers "the clearest sign that a society has entered into the self-conscious possession of a new concept,"[14] in *terms* of which the intellectual codes related to individual erudition was encoded and decoded. In the past one century, it has been common for scholars to map a small proportion of these key words as indicative of the cultural, intellectual, and literary history in early and early medieval China. Nevertheless, there has not been sufficient intellectual labor spent on an inclusive examination of a large repository of lexical and conceptual items related to Han-Wei literary culture. In debt to a fruitful series of studies with focuses on a selective range of words and concepts,[15] it becomes possible to achieve a more coherent understanding of a more extensive

13 Samuel T. Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, ed. John Beer (London: Routledge, 1994), 17.

14 Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, vol. 1: The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), x.

15 For a series of exemplary works in recent decades with critical examinations of crucial terms and concepts relevant to the present dissertation, see Fukui Shigemasa 福井重雅, "Rikukei rikugei to gokei: Kandai ni okeru gokei no seiritsu" 六経六藝と五經：漢代における五經の成立, *Chūgoku shigaku* 中國史學 4 (1994): 139–64;

range of key words with regards to their semantic roots, distributional patterns, context-dependent appropriations, and mutual connections—taking them, in general, as the verbal manifestations of the changing concepts and realities involved in the foundation of a literary culture as a coded system.

Out of the matrix of normative vocabulary and commonplace utterances, the key concepts under review were encoded and inscribed by specific writers or speakers into a variety of elaborated verbal structures. Within their literary bodies composed by specific arts of allusions, revisions, metaphors, analogies, repetitions, and so on—namely, the rhetorics and the poetics that constituted their own textuality, such texts undertook a rich range of possibilities of expression, communication, and meaning-production. To quote Skinner again, the question one confronts in studying a given text as such is what its author "could in practice have been intending to communicate by the utterance of this given utterance," and hence, "the appropriate methodology for the history of ideas must be concerned, first of all, to delineate the whole range of communications which could have been conventionally performed on the given occasion by the utterance of the given utterance, and, next, to trace the relations between the given utterance and this wider *linguistic* context as a means of decoding the actual intention of the given writer."[16] This approach suggests making as

---

Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon"; Michael Puett, *The Ambivalence of Creation: Debates Concerning Innovation and Artifice in Early China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002); Nicolas Zufferey, *To the Origins of Confucianism: The Ru in Pre-Qin Times and during the Early Han Dynasty* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2003); Mark Csikszentmihalyi and Michael Nylan, "Constructing Lineages and Inventing Traditions through Exemplary Figures in Early China," *T'oung Pao* 90 (2003): 59–99. All these works will be mentioned and revisited throughout the following chapters.

16 Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8 (1969): 48. See also Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, vol. 1: The Renaissance*, xi, for a further elaboration on his methodology.

extensive as possible use of literary utterances from a broader flux of verbal expressions, and, to identify the thematic, semantic, and conceptual correspondences between one utterance and another. The approach further encourages tentatively taking a given utterance and its effects as the basic data of meaning experience of an informed reader[17] who would presumably develop his or her responses and understandings with acknowledgments of the linguistic and cultural contexts of that utterance. An understanding acquired in this fashion is particularly in conformity to, in Bakhtin's words, "a correlation of a given text with other texts."[18]

Such correlations can be observed particularly in cases where specific topoi and tropes were repeatedly employed by different thinkers and writers, who hence situated their expressive utterances as the echoes, revisions, and often violations of previous and contemporary voices. The inventions and expositions of new ideas were constantly made with a gesture to invoke from the past and, more precisely, by means of a revisionary approach of meaning-production. Oftentimes, new ideas were rhetorically performed through revisionary appropriations of old notions and utterances (especially those associated with Kongzi 孔子 [551–479 BCE]) with their meanings and forms innovatively transformed in conformity to the purposes of the present speakers or writers. A recurring theme, utterance, or authoritative model, in this regard, can be viewed as a rhetorical trope and apparatus, as well as a constructive element that supplied ever-proliferating discourses and expressions. Equally important to this revisionary approach is the way in which specific concepts re-

17 Here I use the term "informed reader" in conformity to Stanley Fish. See Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 21–67, esp. 48.

18 Mikhail Bakhtin, "Toward a Methodology for the Human Science," in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, trans. Vern W. McGee, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 161.

lated to literary learning and practicing were woven into a wider network of meanings correlated with the phenomena in other media and forms. Such a structure of semantic correlation is manifested, just for a handful of the most arresting instances, in the metaphorization of "learning" as "plowing," the configuration of "writing" as "weaving," the shifting and ever-expanding conceptualization of *wenzhang* as the patterned display of the world and the individuals, as well as the cross-media commensurability between the spoken, the written, and a broader spectrum of exteriorized human traces (all to be discussed in the respective chapters). With regards to all these correspondences, it becomes possible to integrate a diverse range of utterances across nearly three centuries into a conceptual world that was, by its nature, an imaginary one, in which the imagined essence of *wen* was continuously passed on and carried forward through its ever-growing and ever-renewing instantiations in varying forms.

This verbally manifested world of interrelated concepts also involved a great deal of significant changes of material, technology, and intermediacy. In this regard, the single most influential factor over Han-Wei period was the improvement and later the spread of paper since the second century CE. As widely accepted, the spread of paper brought about a remarkably growing supply of reading and writing media, an expanded foundation of the literate community, as well as the overall proliferation of textual productions.[19] With acknowledgment of all fundamental facts in-

19 For the up-to-now most comprehensive studies on papermaking and its subsequent influences, see Tsien Tsuen-hsuin 錢存訓, *Written on Bamboo and Silk: The Beginnings of Chinese Books and Inscriptions*, 2nd Ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 145–74; "Paper and Printing," in *Science and Civilisation in China*, ed. Joseph Needham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), vol. 5, part I, 1–123. For references on the impacts of paper (before or after 105 CE) particularly on the Eastern Han and early medieval intellectual world and literary culture, see, for example, Shimizu Shigeru 清水茂, "Kami no hatsumei to Gokan no gakukaze" 紙の發

volved in these discourses, the present study aims to make a gesture that avoids the risk of material determinism but lays focus on the mutual impacts between material, technology, and intellectual and socio-cultural ethos. The model of individual erudition was actualized, not merely through text-based practices such as reading and writing but also via a diverse range of activities that carried forward the significance of memorization and oral presentation. Orality and memory constantly played important roles in Chinese intellectual lives before, during, and after the spread of paper, a condition of existence with ever-renewing forms and functionalities. Moreover, the ideas, forms, and core values of individual erudition had permeated a variety of areas of intellectual lives through a long-term transition that started prior to the growing supply of paper. From a comparative point of view, as Michael Clanchy informs, medieval England society witnessed a remarkable growth of written documents and the developments of literary skills across nearly three centuries prior to the spread of printing technology.[20] This phenomenon is indicative of the elegance of an integrative point of view concerning the reciprocal interactions between material, technology, and a more diverse range of socio-cultural changes. Therefore, the spread of paper is better viewed as a participating catalyst—instead of the primary motivation—for an already ongoing progress that had changed, and would continue to change, the landscape of Chinese literary culture with both material and conceptual impacts.

明と後漢の學風, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 79 (1990): 1–13; Michael Nylan, "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han," *Early China* 25 (2000): 252–53. For a wider range of references, see Note 592. For my own reflection on this issue, see Chapter 5.

20 See Michael T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*, 3rd Ed (Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).

Outline of Chapters

The remaining part of the introduction will briefly summarize the contents of the remaining chapters, but I will save my detailed discussions and references for the respective sections—

The opening chapter focuses on an array of phenomena and discourses from the late Western Han through the first century of the Eastern Han related to the concept *gu* 古 ("antiquity"). The chapter investigates how such a retrospective notion was associated with a constellation of new elements that constituted the conceptual foundation for the growing prominence of individual erudition. The chapter begins with a general introduction of the nostalgic atmosphere around the mid-and-late Western Han to revive and cherish cultural legacies of the past, in which "antiquity" was performed at the heart of a diverse array of public communications. The chapter then revisits the fashion of *haogu* 好古 around the same period, a fashion that specifically represented a growing enthusiasm for recycling the values of "antiquity" through literary practices on ancient legacies, especially those embodied in textual objects. The *haogu* atmosphere was tightly associated with the late Western Han library project in Chang'an as a breeding ground from which a social and textual network of "admirers of antiquity" was gradually developed through a few generations by sharing knowledge, texts, and ideas. The "Yiwen zhi" 藝文志 ("Treatise on Classics and Writings"), as the final conceptual crystallization of this project, performed a recurring theme that the highly diffused and dispersed textual traditions could be ideally traced back to a state of completeness, unity, and coherence in ancient times. This theme expressed essentially a late Western Han (and early Eastern

Han) intellectual aspiration to reach a comprehensive understanding of the ever-growing and ever-changing cultural traditions.

The latter half of the chapter provides a detailed analysis of a series of intellectual discourses out of this cultural nostalgia. Based on two interrelated passages in the *Fayan* 法言 and the "Yi-wen zhi," Yang Xiong 揚雄 (53 BCE–18 CE) and Liu Xin 劉歆 (50 BCE–23 CE)—whose ideas were probably in debt to Liu Xiang 劉向 (77–6 BCE)—proposed an ideal model of learning in the name of *gu*—in terms of *gu zhe zhi xue* 古者之學 or *gu zhi xuezhe* 古之學者—that was, essentially, a revisionary invention of a new model of literary praxis toward the self-dependent and self-oriented cultivation of individual erudition. Their ideas and practices were later echoed by early Eastern Han scholars such as Ban Gu 班固 (32–92 CE) and Wang Chong 王充 (27–97 CE). The core message encoded in these Han discourses was an aspiration for comprehensive and self-oriented mastery of a broader range of knowledge and textual traditions that, correspondingly, entailed a critical stance against the Han official academic system, as well as its imposition of personal affiliation and sectarianism attached to institutional authorities. In addition, my reading lays a specific emphasis on the revisionary approaches at the heart of these scholars' rhetorical strategies. Namely, the Han thinkers innovatively revised and appropriated a series of old ideas and utterances associated with Kongzi and previous masters, such as that one ought to be "broadly learned about *wen*" 博學於文 and that "a man-of-learning in antiquity [did it] for the sake of himself" 古之學者爲己, transforming them into practical values applicable to the material and intellectual contexts of their own times. These scholars' discourses and practices altogether left behind a legacy of ex-

emplary ideas, concepts, and models that eventually opened a new chapter of Chinese literary culture in the following centuries.

Chapter 2 investigates a constellation of concepts, utterances, and practices as indicative of the growing prominence of individual erudition, a phenomenon in which *bo* ("broadness") and *tong* ("comprehensiveness") stood out as a pair of core values embedded in a wide variety of expressive forms. The chapter discusses how the two values gained currency from the late Western Han onward and, in general, presented the extension of individual mastery of knowledge and texts that transcended the division of different scholarly interests in particular objects and institutes. It is also my intention to investigate the rhetorical forms and the pragmatic, performative, and commemorative natures embedded in the sources under review, considering how they sustained the two core values and the exemplary figures who embodied them, making them altogether recognized and presented as a significant part of collective memory over the Eastern Han and beyond.

The first section of the chapter is devoted to a couple of phenomena associated with the studies and receptions of the five (or six) major objects of classical learning (most often in terms of "Five Classics" [*wujing* 五經] since the late Western Han), as well as the hermeneutic traditions surrounding them. My survey indicates that the Eastern Han witnessed a much larger proportion of literary scholars known for studying all these classics compared to the Western Han, especially its early and middle periods. Similarly, the period under review witnessed the rise of a syncretic and integrative mode of mastering manifold hermeneutic traditions associated with one specific canon. This is shown, in the reception and production of old and new interpretations from the late West-

ern Han through the third century CE by a growing number of erudite classicists.

The second section offers a rounded survey of intellectual activities and utterances that exemplified the values *bo* and *tong* in a larger context beyond the "classics." I collect and analyze a diverse range of Eastern Han and early medieval materials drawn from historiographies, biographies, philosophic writings, and epitaphs, for their increasing employment of a constellation of descriptive terms—such as *boxue* ("broadly learned"), *bolan* 博覽 ("broadly reading/viewing"), *bowu* 博物 ("broadly learned about things"), *botong* 博通 ("broadly comprehending"), *duowen* 多聞 ("extensively informed"), *qiawen* 洽聞 ("richly informed"), *tongren* 通人 ("comprehensive man"), and *tongru* ("comprehensive *ru*")—that characterized and commemorated erudite individuals from the Western Han through the third century CE. The distributional patterns of these lexical items show that the Eastern Han witnessed a remarkably growing prominence—not merely in terms of the quantity of relevant indicators but also their diversity and intensity—of *bo*-or-*tong*-related utterances and practices. On a more theoretical level, this section also offers a series of analyses of scholarly discussions and debates on these two notions in relation to a handful of other significant concepts. These examinations altogether reveal *bo* and *tong* as a pair of core values that stood for an intellectual desire for the extension of individual mastery of knowledge and texts, as well as an aspiration for more comprehensive understandings of available sources with conceptual coherence.

Within the growing repository of utterances and expressions surrounding the ideal model of erudition, the final section investigates, more specifically, the formation and the remembrance of exemplary models who achieved their status as a significant part of collective memory during the

Eastern Han and beyond. Mostly found in historiographic and biographic contexts, the making of such images involved a series of recurring patterns, tropes, and procedures of meaning-production, all of which progressively constructed a sharable body of expressions applicable to the idols being remembered that included also some of the remembers themselves. This collective nature of commemoration is shown, especially in the clustered presentation of a relatively small number of prominent exemplars, the recuring tropes and elements found in the reusable textual models and their iterations and variations, as well as a constellation of other intellectual features conceptually interrelated with *bo* and *tong* distributed among a wider range of sources.

Chapter 3 concerns the conceptual and practical relationships between the scholarly stance of individual erudition and the institutional matrix of power, regarding the former itself as an ideological criticism and an agenda seeking alternative power and authority. Around the Eastern Han, the self-oriented interest in literary learning and practicing was widely performed along with a resistant gesture of political disengagement from academic and bureaucratic institutionalization, a gesture that at once involved the production of specific others vis-à-vis the imagined community of individuals-of-erudition in its own right. The investigation begins with a scholarly resistance against "vulgar *ru*" (*suru* 俗儒), an attitude shared by a series of Eastern Han scholars with both academic and ethical concerns. The voices against *suru* called into questions the sectarian mode of knowledge transmission and knowledge production, especially the imposed affiliation to particular texts and authorities. Such a resistant stance, as well as the self-oriented principle it involved, worked in concert with a larger picture of political disengagement and individual exemption from

the career-minded interest in official rank and power.

The condition of disengagement, which took places in a variety of rhetorical and practical forms, provided an alternative ground for the engagement in literary business, supplying the needs of power and authority in both private and public intellectual lives. This is shown, for instance, in a series of hypothetical discourses composed by Yang Xiong, Ban Gu, Cui Yin 崔駰 (d. 92 CE), Zhang Heng 張衡 (78–139 CE), and Cai Yong 蔡邕 (133–192 CE). The self-referential master voices against their career-minded interlocutors within the texts performed both a gesture of detachment from the institutional matrix and a self-oriented interest in literary practices, each of which reciprocally supported and justified the other as a desirable intellectual choice. On a more practical level, the detachment from official career was enacted and performed by a large number of practitioners of reclusion—to name the single most preeminent exemplar, Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200 CE)—who achieved this status normally by means of refusing official offers and withdrawing from the present positions. Their practices at once involved a more active and liberated condition of the transmission and production of knowledge, texts, and materials, a phenomenon that gained prominence especially during the latter half of the Eastern Han.

In the latter half of the Eastern Han, the alternative ground vis-à-vis a centralized system of imperial institutionalization worked in concert with the overall proliferation of regional academic communities around specific central figures and, hence, a multi-centered condition of deployment of knowledge, texts, and authorities. This condition was later entangled with a large-scale socio-political resistant movement against the empire. The social turmoil in the last decades of the

Eastern Han caused a more violent dispersal of cultural resources, a condition that was painstakingly re-oriented toward a new center of authority by the Cao regime in the early third century CE. Despite the great loss and dispersal of knowledge, materials, and cultural resources over the time of turmoil, the overall experience from the Han intellectual world left behind a legacy of far-reaching influence that would continue to mediate the contingency of physical damages in the near future. In general, the private and public foundations for a literary culture were remarkably extended, which potentially formulated a notion of scholarly individuality detachable from any single form of centripetal force navigated by an embodied authority, as well as empowering that literary culture with a more flexible mode of transmission, transformation, and proliferation.

Chapter 4 undertakes an analytical investigation of the conceptual foundation and actualization of "writing"—used as a synecdoche for the composition and production of text that is essentially newly articulated as a verbal structure with an integrative body of contents and forms. The period under focus witnessed not merely the proliferation of writings in general, but also the growing prominence of writings as individual products. Instead of privileging "writing" with centrality vis-à-vis other literary or verbal skills, it is appropriate to consider the practices of composing texts with new contents-and-forms within an inside-toward-outside process from reception toward production, a process by which the cultivation of one's erudition via various accesses of interiorization was encoded and performed in various ends of exteriorization. Such a process also involved the growing consciousness of personal agency and property associated with writings, as manifested in the claims of one's role as the principal of textual productions by undertaking both

credit and liability.

To start with, the chapter invites critical reflection on the theoretical problems of "author"/"authorship" and their usages in the studies of early and medieval Chinese literature, and hence explores a more fruitful way of understanding the overall surplus of literary productivity by examining a constellation of lexical items and expressions that represent several types of practices of composing new texts. Through a rounded survey of terms such as *zhuan* 撰, *ji* 集, *zhu* 著, *zuo*, *zhushu*, and *zhuwen* 屬文 within their linguistic and cultural contexts, with reference also to a series of exemplary cases and intellectual discourses, my observations demonstrate that the nearly three centuries around the Eastern Han witnessed an overall proliferation—in terms of quantity, diversity, and intensity—of both praxes and representations of private literary productions, a phenomenon corresponding to the extension of individual mastery of knowledge and texts over this period.

Furthermore, I suggest that the various forms of literary productivity in Han-Wei China fall into a spectrum between a pair of interrelated conceptions—namely, an integrative mode of collecting, connecting, synthesizing, and revising existing sources and an innovative mode of constructing an essentially new unity of contents-and-forms. The proficiency in producing new literary compositions, in this context, was considered and performed as fundamentally based on one's innovative utilization and the appropriation of pre-existing texts and knowledge. In terms of these, I argue for a conception of a condensed, integrative, and deeply engaged intellectual labor that controls the formation of one text in relation to many others, a labor that is neither to be conflated with a simple notion of "authorship" nor to be downplayed by the recent paradigm of studying

early and medieval Chinese texts that emphasizes modularity, variability, composite nature, collaborative labor, and so on. More specifically, such a concept of labor opens a window toward an alternative mode of explaining the polymorphous textual appearance found within a given literary artifact, other than reducing it into an overall model of composite patchwork of modular materials in either highly fluid or relatively circumscribed way.

This leads to the next section of the chapter, which conceptualizes the practice of writing as potentially a "textual display of erudition" through which the individually interiorized materials and sources were exteriorized and transformed into an integrated verbal structure with new contents-and-forms. On a conceptual level, this section examines the production of new texts as presented as a recycling and transforming process from inside toward outside, a process tightly entangled with values such as *bo* and *tong* that constituted the substance of one's erudition being interiorized and hence displayed. Based on this, the study aims at a deeper interpretation of *wenzhang* (in one of its narrow senses as "literary production") in terms of its connections with *wenxue* (in one of its traditional senses as "literary learning"). And generally, my investigations also invite a more comprehensive understanding of *wen* and its lexical derivations such as *wenzhang* as, on a deep level, the exterior, perceivable, and decipherable manifestations of human and world to be realized in a variety of mutually commensurable forms.

The final section focused on several individual presentations of the growing consciousness of personal agency and property related to literary productions. It begins with a critical examination of the long-standing dichotomy between *shu* ("to transmit") and *zuo* ("to create/to innovate"), out

of which the Han scholars felt urged to defend their innovative writing practices and to justify their anxiety for honoring themselves as the owners and the producers of their works. The ideas and utterances regarding this issue changed over time, as especially shown in a series of intellectual discourses made by Sima Qian 司馬遷 (ca. 145–90 BCE), Yang Xiong, and later Wang Chong. Wang Chong, as one of the strongest cases, articulated his claim for the superiority of individuals with literary productivity in terms of a hierarchical division between *wenru* 文儒 ("literary *ru*") and *shiru* 世儒 ("worldly *ru*"). These discourses altogether prepared an intellectual ground for a fruitful surplus of literary culture from the late Eastern Han through the Wei dynasty, as echoed and enacted in the voices and practices of Cao Pi 曹丕 (187–226 CE), Cao Zhi 曹植 (192–232 CE), and their contemporaries. Meanwhile, the aspiration of becoming the principal of credit and liability of one's writings was also associated with a motif of competition with previous and contemporary works, as well as an imaginary notion of "text" as a closed, stabilized entity beyond variance.

In the final chapter, I aim to contextualize some of the main arguments made in previous chapters within the circumstances of material and intermediacy over the period under focus. Literary practices took places in both tangible and intangible forms that involved a great deal of mutual dependence and interactions between orality, memory, and literacy. Therefore, this chapter concerns the following questions: To what degree did the development of writing media—especially the spread of paper—exert an influence on literary culture during and after the Eastern Han? How did oral, aural, and memorial practices play their roles along with the growing prominence of text-based experience technologized by reading and writing? Toward a more comprehensive vision,

how can the connectivity between ideas and technologies, that between models and instantiations, and that between a world of ever-changing concepts and a world filled with ever-changing material realities be properly described?

To begin with, this chapter undertakes an examination of the changes of writing media underlying manuscript production and circulation, with a specific focus on the spread and utilization of paper from the early second century CE onward. Not limited to an economic or utilitarian point of view, my investigation shows that the use of paper itself, in the long-term collaboration with bamboo, wood, and silk, was often embedded with specific symbolic functionalities and aesthetic values. Also, in contrast to a conventional opinion that takes the spread of paper as a fundamental turning point of Chinese literary culture, I suggest regarding paper as a catalyst (instead of the primary motivation) that did not initiate but accelerated an ongoing progress that began before the first century CE, a progress manifested in the proliferation of public and private repositories and collections of texts, along with the reciprocal networks of circulating and producing texts between official institutes and private owners. These observations altogether demonstrate a surplus of texts and knowledge being made available to an expanding literate community, a condition that prepared the material foundation for the growing prominence of the models and the manifestations of individual erudition in intellectual lives.

The remaining part of the chapter deals with the relationships between orality, memory, and literacy. Beyond an over-simplified orality-versus-writing dichotomy, I aim at demonstrating their mutual dependence and reciprocal interactions on both conceptual and material levels. As present-

ed in a wealth of discourses and utterances during Han-Wei period, the spoken and the written words were both configured as the verbal exteriorization of an imagined inside of individual and, meanwhile, interpreted along with the assumed notion of cross-media commensurability. This, nevertheless, is not to disregard that oral-memorial and text-based practices practically underwent considerable changes during the Han-Wei period. According to the distributional patterns of lexical indicators such as *feng* 諷 ("to recite"), *song* 誦 ("to chant [in a form of recitation]"), *du* 讀 ("to read [aloud]"), and *lan* 覽 ("to view") in relevant sources, the practice of visual reading was more frequently and intensely recorded or presented in the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms contexts than in previous ages.

On the one hand, this phenomenon corresponds to the growing availability of written texts, as well as the increasing dependence of literary learning on text-based practices. On the other hand, although the increased accessibility of physically written texts had weakened the necessity of individual dependence on orality and memory, the two elements were by no means removable from the heart of literary culture but only presented in new forms accustomed to a variety of changing circumstances of intellectual lives. The talents of oral performance and memorization played a series of roles different from what they served in previous ages, becoming more interactively associated with the visual embodiments of literary culture that were either written on manuscripts or inscribed on stones. Moreover, in this new milieu, oral performance was situated in a more individualized manner of self-presentation of one's competitive intelligence and erudition, a case that was, precisely, akin to what happened to and via writing. These observations altogether lead to a

cross-media point of view in which the elements of orality, memory, and literacy were mutually interiorized, represented, and recycled within an ever-broadening realm of verbal instantiations and cultural productions.

- CHAPTER 1 -

In the Name of Antiquity: The Revision and Invention of Old and New Models

1.1. Antiquity as a Source of Public Authority

Toward an inquiry into Chinese literary culture across three centuries, the opening chapter is nevertheless devoted to a comparatively short time span—namely, the era from the late Western Han through the early Eastern Han. In what follows, I will examine the knowledge, power, and logic involved in the formation of an intellectual model during this era, a model of literary learning and literary practicing that gained prominence and became foundational to the transition of Chinese literary culture from the first century BCE onward. The emergence of such a model was presented, not merely as an articulation of particular motifs, values, and elements newly invented from its own time, but also as a discourse equipped with the power of the past—to be specific, a discourse in the name of *gu* ("antiquity") per se. During the last half-century of the Western Han, the nostalgia for antiquity was widely performed as a theme distributed among various communications and activities in political and intellectual lives. It was within such a context that a series of scholarly voices—in their different communicative practices and expressive forms—actualized a specific rhetorical use of "antiquity," one that constituted a piece of the core elements of a model of literary learning that was essentially new.

It was not a Han invention to invoke "antiquity" as a source of authority. Textual evidence, as early as in bronze inscriptions and in the oldest stratum of the *Shi* 詩 and the *Shu* 書, had collec-

tively presented a rich repository of expressive utterances that addressed *gu*—along with a series of other references to the past—as an essential element that constituted the rituals and memories of the Zhou aristocratic society.[21] The period from Warring States through early imperial times, then, witnessed a further proliferation of discourses that carried the notion of "antiquity" into a more diverse range of socio-cultural communications. On the one hand, *gu*, as either a single term per se or a concept expressed in various forms, was commonly employed in texts conventionally attributed to different communities, "schools," or "-isms" (as often conflated with the term *jia* 家), a pattern that transcends any over-simplified division of early Chinese intellectual world in such terms.[22] On the other hand, such a sharable nature of "antiquity" and the divergence between different ideologies could have indeed reinforced each other. What make this particularly clear are two discourses found in the *Hanfeizi* 韓非子 and the *Huainanzi* 淮南子, that the common affiliations to the authority of ancient models intensified the incompatibility and hostility between certain groups of thinkers, who held onto different opinions and beliefs that developed over time.[23]

---

21 For a comprehensive study on textual sources and their commemorative natures in Zhou aristocratic society, see Martin Kern, "Bronze Inscriptions, the *Shijing* and the *Shangshu*: The Evolution of the Ancestral Sacrifice during the Western Zhou," in *Early Chinese Religion, vol. 1*, ed. John Lagerwey and Mark Kalinowski (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 143–200, esp. 170–72, for a specific discussion of the Zhou utterances that addressed and invoked the past.

22 The term *jia* 家—in the specific sense of "school" or "scholastic lineage" characterized by continuous and traceable filiation—gained significance not until China's imperial era and was then anachronistically mapped onto pre-imperial intellectual world. For references, see Csikszentmihalyi and Nylan, "Constructing Lineages and Inventing Traditions," 61; Yuri Pines, *Envisioning Eternal Empire: Chinese Political Thought of the Warring States Era* (Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), 4–6. For a general query of the mapping of various "-isms" to early Chinese thought, see Willard J. Peterson, "Squares and Circles: Mapping the History of Chinese Thought," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49 (1988): 47–60, esp. 47–48.

23 The *Hanfeizi* 韓非子 contested the two intellectual traditions *ru* 儒 and *mo* 墨, as well as the many branches deriving from them after the demise of their first masters presumably Kongzi 孔子 and Mozi 墨子. All those differentiated traditions—according to the *Hanfeizi*—claimed for their own authorities by invoking the ancient sages Yao 堯 and Shun 舜 as their models. See Wang Xianshen 王先慎 annot., *Hanfeizi jijie* 韓非子集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998), 456–57. The *Huainanzi* 淮南子 passage likewise described a fashion critically

The power of "antiquity" (*gu*), therefore, did not rest with the specificity and historicity enclosed in a given time-and-space, but its open-ended meanings and rhetorical effects. The authority invoked in terms of *gu* was situated in an imaginary realm that was both beyond and connected with the living. Oftentimes, the gesture of invoking that authority involved a motif of ideological criticism against the "modern/present," which was conventionally expressed in term of *jin* 今. In early China, such a specific usage of "antiquity" transcended the boundaries between different intellectual traditions and permeated diverse areas of activities in public lives. Speaking in terms of socio-political ideology, such a conceptual dichotomy between *gu* and *jin* shows conformity to what Mark Edward Lewis defines as the "oppositional stance" against state powers from the Warring States through early imperial times.[24] The motif of taking antiquity as a source of authority engendered a tradition that was famously summarized as "undervaluing the present by invoking antiquity" (*yi gu fei jin* 以古非今) or, in a slightly different way, "valuing antiquity and undervaluing the present" (*shi gu fei jin* 是古非今). Both utterances were first noted as the quotations of the representatives who spoke on behalf of specific "present" imperial authorities. The phrase *yi gu fei jin* was first seen in Li Si's 李斯 (284–208 BCE) proposal to the First Emperor of Qin 秦始皇 (r. 246–210 BCE) at the founding moment of the imperial Qin dynasty (221–206 BCE). In his pro-

---

that "the majority of mundane people praise antiquity but belittle the present day. Consequently, those who practice *dao* 道 certainly would attribute their ideas to Shennong and Hungdi and then put them into their own discourses." 世俗之人，多尊古而賤今，故爲道者必托之于神農、黃帝而後能入說。See Liu Wendian 劉文典 annot., *Huainan honglie jijie* 淮南鴻烈集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 653–54. For citations with discussion of these two sources, see also Yu Yingshi, "Gudai zhishi jieceng de xingqi yu fazhan" 古代知識階層的興起與發展, in *Shi yu Zhongguo wenhua*, 46–47.

24 Mark Edward Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), esp. 63–97.

posal, Li Si accused those who sought authority from "antiquity" (*gu*) instead of the modern imperial codes as the ideological enemies of the new empire.[25] The tension between a unified empire and "antiquity" as an alternative authority was then manifested in the mid-Western Han. What makes this particularly clear is that declared by Emperor Xuan 宣帝 (r. 74–48 BCE), who specifically criticized the group that he disparaged as "vulgar *ru*" (*suru*) in terms of *shi gu fei jin*, for their practices in the name of "antiquity" to intervene in the institutional system of the Han empire.[26]

The Western Han witnessed a diverse range of communications on state affairs and public issues, which altogether involved a conflict between "antiquity" and "modernity." One of the most influential opinions regarding this tension was that proposed by Michael Loewe, who defines a longstanding political conflict between "reformists" and "modernists" over the dynasty.[27] Though Loewe's mapping of this dichotomy has not gone unchallenged,[28] it is hardly a matter of dispute

25 Sima Qian 司馬遷, *Shiji* 史記, annot. Pei Yin 裴駰, Sima Zhen 司馬貞, and Zhang Shoujie 張守節 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982), 6.254–55, where Li Si 李斯, in his proposal to the First Emperor (ca. 213 BCE), accused those who "did not learn after the modern codes but those of antiquity" 不師今而學古 and *yi gu fei jin* 以古非今, and then suggested taking a series of administrative measures to censor texts and knowledge all over the empire and put them under the control of imperial institutes (see also *Shiji* 87.2546, for another record of this event). In traditional narrations, these measures of imperial censorship were manifested in two brutal misconducts—namely, "burning the texts" (*fenshu* 焚書 or *fanshu* 燔書) and "burying alive" (*keng* 阬/坑) the *ru* or the *shushi* 術士 ("technicians"), both of which were accused for millenniums as a cause of the great damage and loss of ancient culture and textual legacies in pre-imperial China. These notions have been however contested by pre-modern and modern scholarships in different aspects. For example, see Wang Chong 王充, *Lunheng* 論衡 (Huang Hui 黃暉 and Liu Pansui 劉盼遂 annots., *Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990], 354–56); Cui Shi 崔適, *Shiji tanyuan* 史記探源 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), 57; Jens Østergård Petersen, "Which Books Did the First Emperor of Ch'in Burn? On the Meaning of *Pai Chia* in Early Chinese Sources." *Monumenta Serica* 43 (1995): 1–52. For a discussion that prompts new insight into this issue and its implications, see Martin Kern, *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih-huang: Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Imperial Representation* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2000), esp. 183–96.

26 Ban Gu 班固, *Hanshu* 漢書, annot. Yan Shigu 顏師古 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 9.277. See also Chapter 3, for a detailed investigation of the different usages of the term *suru* 俗儒.

27 Michael Loewe, *Crisis and Conflict in Han China* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1974), esp. 11–12.

28 For example, see Hans van Ess, "The Apocryphal Texts of the Han Dynasty and the Old Text/New Text Controversy," *T'oung Pao* 85 (1999): 46, for his critique on Loewe's assignment of the so-called *guwen* 古文 and *jinwen* 今文 schools of canonical studies into his dualistic framework; and Chen Qiyun 陳啟雲, *Ruxue yu Handai lishi*

that "antiquity" was frequently invoked as a source of public authority by statesmen and scholars—many of whom were identified as the members of the *ru*[29] according to the Han criteria—to bring up multiple changes to public affairs. This phenomenon was particularly preeminent during the mid-and-late Western Han that opened a new page of Chinese political culture and ideology. Over this period, scholars and officials identified as *ru*, along with the old traditions they mastered and drew upon, reached a higher status of political significance and cultural popularity.[30] These changes were accentuated by their aggressive participations in a set of institutional reforms and cultural projects in the name of the revival of the past, which was oftentimes referred to as *gu*. The effects of such a transition can be viewed, especially during the reigns of Emperor Yuan 元帝 (r. 48–33 BCE) and the following rulers Emperor Cheng 成帝 (r. 33–7 BCE), Ai 哀帝 (r. 7–1 BCE), and Ping 平帝 (r. 1 BCE–6 CE), with albeit frequent frustrations caused by political opponents and the unsteadiness of imperial supports. The proposals for the revival of antiquity, for a brief summary, covered the reforms of the system of sacrificing "Heaven" (*tian* 天) and "Earth" (*di* 地), the worships to imperial ancestors and former rulers, the institutions of ritual and music,

---

wenhua 儒學與漢代歷史文化 (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 2007), 30, for a particular critique on Loewe's terms "modernist" and "reformist."

29 The concept *ru* in early China was a complex one that has raised numerous discussions and debates for centuries. For a comprehensive review with also some reconciling solutions, see Zufferey, *To the Origins of Confucianism*. I save my further discussion of this issue for Chapter 3.

30 See *Hanshu* 9.298–99, for Ban Gu's brief remark on the transition during the reign of Emperor Yuan 元帝; see also Homer Dubs, *The History of the Former Han Dynasty, vol. 2* (Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1941), 285–98; Qian Mu, *Qin Han shi* 秦漢史 (Taipei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1998), 201–57; Loewe, *Crisis and Conflict in Han China*, 154–92; Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon"; Zeb Raft, "The Beginning of Literati Poetry: Four Poems from First Century BCE China," *T'oung Pao* 96 (2010): 74–124, esp. 79; Chen Suzhen 陳蘇鎮, *Chunqiu yu handao: liang Han zhengzhi yu zhengzhi wenhua yanjiu* 春秋與漢道：兩漢政治與政治文化研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2011), 307–77, esp. 330–38; Yan Buke 閻步克, *Shidafu zhengzhi yansheng shi gao* 士大夫政治演生史稿 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2015), 319–64.

the distribution of political powers and entitlements inside and outside of the court, and so on.

Within this socio-political atmosphere, the growing prominence of "antiquity" was expressed in a series of recurring utterances and rhetorical tropes related to formulas like *gu zhi* 古之 ("… of/in antiquity") and *gu zhe* 古者 ("as in the case of antiquity"), as well as normative nouns like *guzhi* 古制 ("ancient code," or, "ancient institution") and *guwen* ("ancient text," or, "ancient writing/script"). The two formulas *gu zhi* and *gu zhe*, for instance, are extensively found in Western Han materials such as relevant quotations in the *Yantie lun* 鹽鐵論[31] and the words cited in the *Hanshu* 漢書, where the two formulas achieved their status as the common ways to invoke "antiquity" as a source of authority. The two terms *guzhi* and *guwen* show more clearly a diachronic pattern of distribution. In the *Hanshu*, for instance, the term *guzhi* appears eighteen times in total, in which thirteen samples are presented—presumably by Ban Gu—as the citations from state ministers or imperial rulers during the late Western Han.[32] The term *guwen* in the *Hanshu* referred to either the "ancient texts" in general or the "ancient-script" as a graphic form of writing vis-a-vis *jinwen* ("new-script"), in which the term *wen*[33] undertook two different—but both narrow, compared to

31 See Wang Liqi 王利器 annot., *Yantie lun jiaozhu* 鹽鐵論校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1992), passim. For a recent study of the different stances and rhetorical strategies of the three groups represented in the text, see Anatoly Polnarov, "Looking Beyond Dichotomies: Hidden Diversity of Voices in the *Yantielun*," *T'oung Pao* 104 (2018): 465–95, where the author differentiates their foundations of arguments and their gestures to seek particular authorities.

32 Eleven of the thirteen late Western Han references to *guzhi* 古制 recorded by the *Hanshu* are from state ministers like Xiao Wangzhi 蕭望之 (*Hanshu* 93.3727), Kuang Heng 匡衡 (Ibid., 25B.1254, 1255), Zhen Tan 甄譚 (Ibid., 25B.1254, 1255), Yi Feng 翼奉 (Ibid., 27A.1347, 75.3175), Zhu Bo 朱博 (Ibid., 83.3406), Zhai Fangjin 翟方進 (Ibid., 83.3406), Gong Sui 龔遂 (Ibid., 89.3638), and Wang Mang 王莽 (Ibid., 25B.1265), and two from imperial edicts issued by Emperor Ping 平帝 (Ibid., 12.351) and Empress Dowager Wang 王太后 (Ibid., 99A.4086). Among the other five of the overall eighteen references, two are attributed to Jia Yi's 賈誼 refutation against the early Western Han enfeoffment (Ibid., 27A.1331, 27B.1457).

33 The term *wen*, which consists of a broad spectrum of mutually correlative and context-dependent meanings such as "pattern," "ornament," "culture," "text," and "writing," was placed at the very heart of Chinese literary cul-

its wide semantic range—meanings. The second usage of *guwen* as "ancient-script," to be specific, is mostly found in the "Yiwen zhi" of the *Hanshu*, which reflects Liu Xiang and Liu Xin's intellectual labor in the bibliographic project that they led in the last decades of the Western Han, as well as in Liu Xin's proposal to elevate the status of a specific range of "ancient-script" texts that he recognized as the embodiments of specific values of *gu*.[34]

Within such linguistic and socio-cultural contexts, the concept *gu* distinguished itself from a general notion referring to the past, but participated into a communication based upon the imaginary connections between the past and the living. None of the above-mentioned *gu*-related notions should be prioritized as one above the others. Instead, it was the overall proliferation of expressions in the name of *gu* that constituted a sharable foundation of rhetoric, from which a variety of discourses and activities could seek their sources of authority. This, then, leads to my investigation of the logics and the effects of a specific scholarly nostalgia pivotal to the present chapter: a nostalgia in which "antiquity" was invoked as a guide for literary culture.

1.2. Antiquity as a Guide for Literary Culture

Along with other phenomena of cultural nostalgia in the late Western Han, the growing significance of *gu* was particularly manifested by scholarly interests in textual materials regarded as a piece of "ancient" legacy. Such interests were actualized with the formation of a new system of texts and

---

ture before, during, and after the historical period under focus. I will save my discussions of this concept and other *wen*-related terms for each time they occur or recur throughout the entire dissertation.

34 For further references and investigations of Liu Xiang 劉向, Liu Xin 劉歆, and the "Yiwen zhi" 藝文志, see sections 2 and 3 of the present chapter.

knowledge, as accompanied by an ambition to advance individual literary proficiency in dealing with those objects. In her study of this scholarly orientation and its impacts on Western Han literary culture, Michael Nylan defines a *haogu* ("love of antiquity," to use her rendering) movement over the late Western Han in a specific sense of "fashioning parts of pre-existing arguments into a distinctively new mix" through learning and reading ancient textual materials, especially the classics.[35] Her use of *haogu*, as declared, is borrowed for convenience from the famous quote in the *Lunyu* 論語, "believing in and loving antiquity" (*xin er hao gu* 信而好古).[36] Though Nylan does not offer a comprehensive account for the use and the reception of this concept over the period under review, it is appropriate to tentatively examine the *Hanshu* as a database in which this term occurs oftentimes, either from the quotations of Western Han figures or in Ban Gu's retrospective narrations and comments.

Two of the overall nine instances of *haogu* in the *Hanshu*[37] occur in the phrase *xin er hao gu*. One of them was invoked by the late Western Han official Ping Dang 平當 (d. 4 BCE), who praised Emperor Cheng for his investment in "old cultural legacies" (*jiuwen* 舊文) in a context related to music. The other was invoked by Ban Gu in retrospect to Kongzi's accomplishment in organizing and transmitting classical traditions in general.[38] All the other seven occurrences of *haogu*

35 Michael Nylan, *Yang Xiong and the Pleasures of Reading and Classical Learning in China* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2011), 2–3, 40–47, 99–129; see also Nylan, "Manuscript Culture in Late Western Han, and the Implications for Authors and Authority," *Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture* 1 (2014): 155–85.

36 *Lunyu* 論語 7.1 (Cheng Shude 程樹德 annot., *Lunyu jishi* 論語集釋 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990], 431); Nylan, *Yang Xiong and the Pleasures of Reading,* 2.

37 Excluding the two accounts for Zhang Chang 張敞, who "was fond of ancient scripts" 好古文字, and Han Yanshou 韓延壽, who "was fond of the ancient ways of teaching and transforming people" 好古教化, for the sequence *hao gu* in both of them does not stand for a self-contained word.

38 *Hanshu* 22.1072, 88.3589.

are found as Ban Gu's narration of specific figures from the Warring States through the early Eastern Han. The term was used twice as a remark on Marquis Wen of Wei 魏文侯 (r. 445–396 BCE), who were "the most fond of antiquity" 最爲好古 compared to other Warring States lords in a context specifically related to music.[39] Liu De 劉德 (d. 129 BCE), famously known as the Prince of Hejian 河間, was the first Han figure that Ban recognized as *haogu*, in terms of "restoring learning and loving antiquity" 修學好古 in a context where the phrase is accompanied by his well-known collection and sponsorship of a series of old texts in terms of *guwen* (in this case, "ancient text" in general) and *jiushu* 舊書.[40] *Haogu* was then used to remark several renowned or anonymous figures over the last half-century of the Western Han. These figures include Liu Xiang and Liu Xin, who "were both fond of antiquity" 俱好古 in a context where the phrase is accompanied by their capabilities of being "broad in information and great at memorization" 博見彊志,[41] and Yang Xiong, who was "fond of antiquity and took pleasure from *dao*" 好古而樂道 in a context where the phrase is accompanied by his ambition to make his literary writings (*wenzhang*) manifested to later ages.[42] Ban's account then incorporated a group of anonymous "admirers of antiquity" 好古之士 (*haogu zhi shi*) in the late Western Han—among which Yang Xiong was mentioned as a leading figure—who traveled long ways to visit the Ban family and hence approached their collection of texts.[43] The latest account of *haogu* was related to Du Lin 杜林 (d. 47 CE) who

39 *Hanshu* 22.1042, 30.1712.

40 *Hanshu* 53.2410.

41 *Hanshu* 36.1967.

42 *Hanshu* 87B.3583. I save my detailed investigation of the term *wenzhang* and the references to relevant scholarship for Chapter 4.

43 *Hanshu* 100A.4205 (to be further discussed later).

lived from the late Western Han through the early Eastern Han. As a younger scholar, Du was recorded as "pure and tranquil in mind and fond of antiquity" 清靜好古 in a context where the phrase is accompanied by his proficiency in ancient writing.[44]

Table 1
The Occurrences of *Haogu* in the *Hanshu*

Subjects	Phrases	Eras	Objects
Kongzi	"信而好古"	Spring and Autumn	cultural legacy
Marquis Wen of Wei	"最爲好古"	Warring States	music
Marquis Wen of Wei	"最爲好古"	Warring States	music
Liu De	"修學好古"	Early Western Han	textual objects
Emperor Cheng	"信而好古"	Late Western Han	music
Liu Xiang and Liu Xin	"俱好古"	Late Western Han	textual objects
Yang Xiong	"好古而樂道"	Late Western Han	textual objects
"Admirers of Antiquity"	"好古之士"	Late Western Han	textual objects
Du Lin	"清靜好古"	Late Western Han	textual objects

What can be speculated from the distributional pattern of this term in the *Hanshu*, a text complied around half-century after the Western Han? What was recognized and identified as *gu*? What specific media embodied it? Who were fond of it, for what purposes, and accompanied by what kinds of personal and social practices? To begin with, the first pattern of distribution is a diachronic one: more than half of these accounts were related to the last half-century of the Western Han only. The second pattern, then, is related to media. All the three accounts attributed to pre-Han figures were associated with the legacy of ancient culture in general or, more specifically, the ancient music.

44 *Hanshu* 85.3479.

Yet the accounts for Han figures were normally associated with specific literary practices—namely, the activities in dealing with textual objects and technologized by literary skills. These patterns reflect at least Ban Gu's diachronic overview of the changing deployment of scholarly labor and cultural materials, a view in which the values of *gu* were increasingly instantiated by textual objects and literary practices, which reciprocally became the arresting emblems and manifestations of the enchanting power of the past. Moreover, such a vision was unlikely an Eastern Han invention only but, more plausibly, a crystallization of the conceptual and material impacts left behind by the late Western Han precursors, whose admiration of antiquity was actualized in a growing enthusiasm in dealing with texts that constituted a legacy that Ban Gu himself received.

The foregoing patterns were entangled with a transition that Nylan describes as "from archives to libraries," as well as "a major conceptual turn by which the once disparate items in palace archives came to be seen as part of integrated library collections."[45] Central to this transition was the imperial library project beginning from 26 BCE (during the reign of Emperor Cheng) and lasting until the end of the dynasty, a project headed by Liu Xiang and later Liu Xin[46] with also the involvements of an unknown number of scholars among whom a later participant was Yang Xiong.[47] The four late Western Han figures marked by Ban Gu as *haogu* had all played active roles in this

45 Nylan, *Yang Xiong and the Pleasures of Reading*, 40.

46 For Ban Gu's brief accounts for this project, see *Hanshu* 10.310, 30.1701. See also Yao Zhenzong 姚振宗 comp., *Qilüe bielu yiwen · Qilüe yiwen* 七略別錄佚文·七略佚文 (Macao: University of Macao, 2007), 1–4; Yao Mingda 姚名達, *Zhongguo muluxue shi* 中國目錄學史 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002), 29–46. For two accounts in English, see Piet van der Loon, "On the Transmission of Kuan-tzŭ," *T'oung Pao* 41 (1952): 357–93; Michael Loewe, "Liu Xiang and Liu Xin," in *Chang'an 26 BCE: An Augustan Age in China*, ed. Michael Nylan and Griet Vankeerberghen (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2015), 376–79.

47 See *Hanshu* 87.3583.

project as its patron (Emperor Cheng), leaders (Liu Xiang and Liu Xin), and a less important participant (Yang Xiong). Moreover, and also according to the *Hanshu*, there occurred a group of anonymous "admirers of antiquity" (tagged as *haogu zhi shi*) who visited the Ban family in favor of an unknown number of copies of imperial collection they owned, a treasure that Ban You 班斿 (fl. ca. 26 BCE)—Ban Gu's uncle—received from the emperor as a reward for his participation in the library project.[48]

To be precise, the record of those "admirers of antiquity" appears in a recounting of Ban Biao's 班彪 (3–54 CE) experience at his youth with his elder cousin Ban Si 班嗣 (fl. ca. 8 CE), the son of Ban You—

> （班彪）幼与從兄嗣共遊學。家有賜書，內足於財，好古之士自遠方至，父黨揚子雲以下莫不造門。[49]
> (Ban Biao) at his youth learned around with his elder cousin (Ban) Si. (Ban Si's) family owned the texts awarded [by the court] and was in good supply of wealth. The admirers of antiquity traveled from afar to pay their visits. His father's (Ban You) partners, from Yang Ziyun (Yang Xiong) downward, all came as guests.

Little is known about these anonymous "admirers of antiquity" in terms of who they were and what they did. The narrative logic involved in the present passage, however, shows conformity to Ban Gu's overall presentation of *haogu* as a cultural phenomenon. In the *Hanshu* context, the passage presents a group tagged as *haogu* that, at the same time, was socially connected with an exem-

48 *Hanshu* 100A.4203.

49 *Hanshu* 100A.4205. See also Gu Yacheng 谷亞成 and Zhang Fangmei 張芳梅, "Qin Han sijia cangshu lüeshu" 秦漢私家藏書略述, *Xibei daxue xuebao* 西北大學學報 22 (1992): 116. For a further discussion on this issue, see Chapter 5.

plary *haogu* figure (Yang Xiong), favoring a collection of texts that directly derived from a *haogu* activity (the library project), and finally, gathering around the family of Ban Gu who placed *haogu* at the heart of the whole picture of his narration of the late Western Han literary culture. Ban You's participation in this project was not mentioned elsewhere but the last chapter of the *Hanshu*, the arrayed biographies for the Ban family. Considering Ban You's assistant role, those who made greater contributions to the library project, like Liu Xiang and Liu Xin, could have enjoyed a similar—if not more privileged—access to acquire copies from the imperial collection, though Ban Gu probably had little information or interest to celebrate a triumph like this external to his own family. In this regard, the case of the Ban family not merely indicates its own rise to a prominent status with the aids of their text collection, but also implies the formation of a larger network of reciprocal activities of sharing, circulating, and displaying knowledge and texts which derived from the complex labor of the library project.

Such activities around the Ban family took places—according to the age of Ban Biao and the presence of Yang Xiong there mentioned—most likely during the regency of Wang Mang 王莽 (45 BCE–23 CE), a few years after Ban You received his award. During the late Western Han, the imperial collections of texts were not regularly open to request from the outside of the court.[50] Even if an official like Ban You—or probably some other contributors of the library project as

50 See *Hanshu* 100A.4203 (and Yan Shigu's commentary) and 80.3324–25, for the records of Liu Yu 劉宇 (i. e. the Prince of Dongping 東平), who requested for copies of the "Masters" texts (*zhuzi* 諸子) and the *Taishigong shu* 太史公書 (i. e. *Shiji*) from imperial collection but was refused by the court. For relevant discussions, see also Li Ruiliang 李瑞良, *Zhongguo gudai tushu liutong shi* 中國古代圖書流通史 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 2000), 91; David C. Schaberg, "Word of Mouth and the Sources of Western Han History," in *Idle Talk: Gossip and Anecdote in Traditional China*, 31.

well—was awarded part of the copies, he and his inheritors were probably not supposed to (or not willing to) display and circulate these treasured cultural capitals around a wide range of readers, but had more likely offered limited access only and made their own household a more preeminent gathering place.[51] Conversely, during his regency, Wang Mang had reportedly—according to Liu Xin—opened the imperial text collection to a larger number of *ru* scholars, a gesture indicative of a transition toward a more reciprocal mode of sharing knowledge and texts within and outside the court.[52]

These observations altogether open a window toward understanding Ban Gu's retrospective point of view, one that took the library project as an emblem of *haogu* in the specific sense as an enthusiasm for the values of *gu* embodied in ancient textual legacy. The connection between the Ban family and practitioners such as Liu Xiang, Yang Xiong, and the anonymous *hao gu zhi shi* in particular suggests Ban Gu's indebtedness to those he identified as *haogu*.[53] Namely, the notion itself can be situated back into the circumstance during and after the late Western Han, when the library project served as a breeding ground for an expanding network of "admirers of antiquity," a community that eventually exceeded the specific spatio-temporality surrounding the project in the

51 Consider, for instance, Ban Si's 班嗣 (presumably the inheritor of Ban You's 班斿 collection) refusal to lend Huan Tan 桓譚 the texts of the *Laozi* 老子 and the *Zhuangzi* 莊子 that he cherished in particular (*Hanshu* 100A.4206, see also Schaberg, "Word of Mouth," 31). Consider too, that Ban You (and Ban Si)'s house was made a gathering place that the "admirers of antiquity" would like to visit in person.

52 See *Hanshu* 99.4091 for the record. See also Xu Jianwei 徐建委, *Wenben geming: Liu Xiang, Yiwenzhi yu zaoqi wenben yanjiu* 文本革命：劉向、《藝文志》與早期文本研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2017), 10.

53 For a strong claim that the compilation of the *Hanshu* was largely in accord with Liu Xiang and Liu Xin's stances, perspectives, and previous works, see Wang Chunhong 汪春泓, "Lun Liu Xiang Liu Xin he *Hanshu* zhi guanxi" 論劉向、劉歆和《漢書》之關係, *Lingnan xuebao* 嶺南學報, No. 1 (2015): 303–35.

first place. This leads to a couple of further questions: Back to the time when the library project was ongoing, what role(s) did the notion "antiquity" play within it, and how was it expressed, performed, and accepted?

What Liu Xiang and his colleagues first engaged with was a huge, miscellaneous, and ever-growing collection of texts that no one prior to them had access to roam in. During the project, the court-appointed scholars and officials collated and edited a now-uncountable number of texts from various repositories and keepers, including those preserved in palace archives and academic institutes, provided by official ministers as personal tributes, and collected from all over the realm and centralized at the capital. The entire collection, in the first place, was a world filled with ambiguity, variance, disorderliness, redundancy, and incompleteness. The way such a world of miscellaneousness first occurred to Liu Xiang and his colleagues was certainly different from the later conception of early Chinese textual traditions as being lined up onto various axes of transmission, which was precisely a product of Liu Xiang and his colleagues: an organized, categorized system of knowledge and texts with its own coherence, selectiveness, and bias.

According to several fragments of Liu Xiang's record preserved in comparatively later texts, as well as some general introductions offered by Eastern Han sources, especially the *Hanshu*, the library project operated with a set of collaborative procedures—no longer known in full details—contingent on the natures and conditions of textual objects that Liu Xiang and his colleagues once handled.[54] The participants of this project played their roles as collators, editors,

54 For their methods and procedures of textual collation and organization, see *Hanshu* 30, especially the introduc-

producers, and eventually the founders of what later became "the standard account of China's long textual history."[55] What they did, first of all, was a procedure of combining and condensing texts that were physically dispersed but related to each other in contents and forms into new corpora, with what the collators regarded as error and redundancy cut off. In some cases, the collators would also examine and codify the textual variance between sources that they identified as the different versions deriving from the same origins. The texts after their anthologization, codification, and standardization, toward the end, were conceptually—if not physically as well—placed in a range of categorized repositories and streams, associated with specific traditions, groups, and sometimes individual figures, and linked to a series of introductive summaries of their origins, contents, and contextual information. Through these managements, the project produced a wealth of texts in new physical forms, with their new contents and positions located in a new system.

A condensed form of this project is presented in a bibliographical account now preserved in the "Yiwen zhi" of the *Hanshu*. Suffice it to mention that the formation of this bibliography was an multi-layered process from Liu Xiang's organization to Liu Xin's synopsis titled "Seven Summaries" ["Qi lüe" 七略] and, finally, Ban Gu's editorial contributions. The extant "Yiwen zhi" begins with an opening introduction presumably by Ban Gu; and its main body consists of the records and summaries of textual items countable as over 13,000 *pian* 篇 (as often rendered as

---

tive entries spread over the "Six Arts/Classics" (*liuyi* 六藝) category (for example, *Hanshu* 30.1704, 1706). See also Yao Zhenzong, *Qilüe bielu yiwen · Qilüe yiwen*, passim.; Yu Jiaxi 余嘉錫, *Gushu tongli* 古書通例 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985), passim., esp. 35–49, 98–109; *Mulu xue fawei* 目錄學發微 (Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 1991), 15–69; Yao Mingda, *Zhongguo mulu xueshi*, 29–46; Van der Loon, "On the Transmission of of Kuan-tzŭ," 360–64; Xu Jianwei, *Wenben geming*, 6–48.

55 Loewe, "Liu Xiang and Liu Xin," 378.

"chapter") or *juan* 卷 (as often rendered as "scroll" or "volume")[56] based on the works of Liu Xiang and Liu Xin, who divided these items into six primary and thirty-eight secondary categories respectively in terms of *lüe* 略 and *lei* 類. Each of these categories is linked with an introductive entry presumably from the "Qi lüe" (according to Ban Gu's opening introduction).[57] To some extent, this bibliography was not merely the final but the only crystallization that the project truly left behind. Contrary to the longevity of this bibliography, the physical existences of the imperial institutes as well as the textual items it once incorporated and stored had been completely—and probably forever—lost. Moreover, though there could be some practical purposes involved in the production of this bibliographic account in its very first place,[58] its received version in the "Yiwen zhi" can be hardly read as a practical manual or useful guide for a library system[59] but, more significantly, as a "theoretical mapping"[60] as well as a conceptually organized system beyond the physical bodies of repositories and written texts. Was this true, therein lie the questions: What messages with essential conceptual significance were encoded in the bibliographic crystallization of the entire project? And, to whom they mattered?

Central to these messages was a grand narrative distributed among the "Six Arts/Classics"

56 Yu Jiaxi takes *pian* 篇 and *juan* 卷 in this context respectively as the textual units written on bamboo/wood and silk. See *Mulu xue fawei*, 27–29.

57 *Hanshu* 30.1701. See also Zhang Shunhui 張舜徽, *Hanshu yiwenzhi tongshi* 漢書藝文志通釋 (Huhan: Hubei jiaoyu chubanshe, 1990), for a thorough and detailed annotated version of the entire "Yiwen zhi."

58 See Loewe, "Liu Xiang and Liu Xin," 78, where he suggests that the "Seven Summaries" ["Qi lüe" 七略] was perhaps also intended for practical purposes as Liu Xin arranged to move manuscripts from one depository to another.

59 See Michael J. Hunter, "The 'Yiwen zhi' [Treatise on Arts and Letters] Bibliography in Its Own Context," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 138 (2018): 770.

60 Hunter, "The 'Yiwen zhi'," 770.

(*liuyi* 六藝) category—the first of the overall six sections of the entire "Yiwen zhi"—and, to be specific, located in Liu Xin's introductive entries attached to several secondary categories (each linked to a specific classic) and a concluding introduction (for the entire *liuyi* category) in general. The narrative involved a recurring theme—as well as a rhetorical trope—that took antiquity as a guide for the widely diffused and dispersed textual traditions, with a specific motif to trace them back to an ideal state of completeness, unity, and coherence of the past, which was associated with legendary sages, former kings, Kongzi with his followers, and in some cases, "antiquity" (*gu*) per se.

For instance, the introduction to the *Shu* catalogue claimed that a complete version with one hundred *pian* were once compiled by the hands of Kongzi with his own introductions to each;[61] that of the *Li* 禮 catalogue claimed that a fully designed ritualistic tradition was established by the Zhou rulers;[62] that of the *Yue* 樂 catalogue claimed that the musical system derived from former kings headed by Huangdi 黃帝;[63] and that of the *Chunqiu* 春秋 catalogue claimed that a unified system of recording words and events was once in operation under the reigns of ancient (*gu*) kings.[64] Every of these idealized narrations was then followed by Liu Xin's description of a decline from the loss of the Zhou authority (or the demise of Kongzi) to the early empire, a process by which the presumably once unified, completed form of cultural legacy were gradually dispersed into fragmentary traditions held by different masters and their followers. The *Yi* 易 and the *Shi*, as claimed by Liu Xin, survived the fire of Qin—from a Han point of view—in comparatively com-

61 *Hanshu* 30.1706.
62 *Hanshu* 30.1710.
63 *Hanshu* 30.1711.
64 *Hanshu* 30.1715.

plete forms thanks to the practical utility of the *Yi* for divination and the reliance on orality and memory in the transmission of the *Shi*.[65] For both these two classics, nevertheless, the transmitted learning and interpretations had been dispersed and separated as well. Liu Xin's general introduction attached to the end of the "Six Arts/Classics" category, then, demonstrated, that the six arts/classics ought to work in concert with each other by constituting a correlative and coherent system of cultivation, a statement that led directly to his proposal for an "ancient" model of literary learning.[66]

When the ancient models were invoked from the imaginary aura of the past, they altogether bespoke a late Western Han anxiety in dealing with the overall miscellaneousness of texts and knowledge in their current forms of transmission and deployment, as well as an intellectual aspiration for the alternative: a comprehensive, encompassing mastery of the ever-growing tradition.[67] It was not until the occurrence of a newly acquired total vision of the overall miscellaneousness that an aspiration for comprehensiveness and completeness became unprecedentedly significant. The texts produced therefrom—as well as their copies that flowed into further transmission and circulation—were essentially *new* instead of *old*, regarding their contents, forms, and positions correlated with each other within a *new* system. Therefore, the recurring expressions and realizations of *gu*

65 *Hanshu* 30.1704, 1708.

66 *Hanshu* 30.1723. For a detailed analysis of his proposal for the "ancient" model of learning in line with Yang Xiong's discourse, see section 3 of the present chapter.

67 For two references, Martin Kern situates the library project within "the enterprise to close the canon and to reconstruct it as a self-contained unity" from which "a new comprehensive vision of the canon as a perfect unity arose to replace fragmentary scholarship." See Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," 79–80. Michael J. Hunter, from another perspective, situates the "Yiwen zhi" in the contexts of the ten "Treatises" (*zhi* 志) in the *Hanshu*, in which the early strata of texts represent a mode of synthesizing and systemizing various knowledge in the Western Han. See Hunter, "The 'Yiwen zhi'," 771–73.

within this project, as well as the surrounding atmosphere of *haogu*, were eventually transcendent beyond a material interest of antiquarianism[68] that focuses on collecting, owning, controlling, and investigating ancient artifacts (including but not limited to texts). Such a notion beyond material specificity is a useful guide to question the following: How did these idealized narrations of "ancient" textual legacies, along with a new model of literary praxis in the name of *gu* (to be fully discussed in the next section), enchant the contemporary and even later intellectual minds primarily due to the values and significance of *gu* on a conceptual level? To this end, the inquiry into the meaning of *gu* should be eventually saved from a myth of historicity in terms of "where" it was located and "when" it happened, but led to an ahistorical one: Other than the particularity of the present moment, what kind of alternative reality can be imagined?

1.3. "Man-of-Learning in Antiquity"

When "antiquity" was in general performed as a sharable authority and a desirable value for public affairs and literary culture, the late Western Han intellectual world witnessed, more specifically, the rise of a new model of literary learning proposed in the name of *gu* per se. This model was presented in a pair of discourses composed by two late Western Han "admirers of antiquity" noted in the *Hanshu* by Ban Gu, who himself echoed that model in his own discourse (to be discussed in the next section). One of these two discourses was proposed by Yang Xiong in the form of hypothet-

68 For an introductory account for cultural practices related to material-culture-focused "antiquarianism" in East Asia, especially China, see Lothar von Falkenhausen, "Antiquarianism in East Asia," in *World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Alain Schnapp (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2013), 35–66.

ical conversation[69] in his *Fayan*, and the other from the introductive entry attached to the *liuyi* category presumably by Liu Xin (now in the "Yiwen zhi" of the *Hanshu*)—

Fayan 7.8

或問："司馬子長有言曰，五經不如《老子》之約也，當年不能極其變，終身不能究其業。"曰："若是，則周公惑，孔子賊。古者之學耕且養，三年通一。今之學也，非獨爲之華藻也，又從而綉其鞶帨，惡在《老》不《老》也。"或曰："學者之說可約邪？"曰："可約。解科。"[70]

Someone asked,

> "Sima Zichang (Sima Qian) had a saying that the Five Classics (*wujing*) are not as concise (*yue*) as the *Laozi*. One is unable to completely explore their variability in his prime years, or to fully accomplish his project [of studying them] throughout his entire life."

Reply:

> "Was that true, the Duke of Zhou would be deceptive, and Kongzi would be fraudulent. [How can that be the case?] The condition of learning in antiquity was self-cultivating (*geng*) and self-supporting (*yang*), [hence one could] penetrate/comprehend one [classic] thoroughly in every three years. The condition of learning at the present day not merely makes up flowery patterns but even fabricates excessive ornaments. [So, the problem] is not about resembling *Laozi* or not."

Someone asked,

> "Is it possible to make the sayings of [today's] men-of-learning concise?"

Reply:

> "Yes, [if we] dissolve the divisional system of education and examination (*ke*)."[71]

Hanshu 30, "Yiwen zhi"

---

69 In the broadest sense, the dialogical and hypothetical natures involved in such a verbal structure are commonly identifiable in early Chinese texts, including several intellectual discourses related to the present dissertation. In the narrowest sense, this structure shows conformity to the subgenre *shelun* 設論 ("Hypothetical Discourse") as identified in later literary tradition. For relevant examples and scholarships on *shelun*, see Chapter 3.

70 Wang Rongbao 汪榮寶 annot., *Fayan yishu* 法言義疏 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), 222. Here, I am not following Wang's punctuation and explanation of the last four characters (which he combines into one line) and the explanations he cites from previous comments (Ibid., 222, 224). The quotation of Sima Qian at the beginning of this passage is roughly (not word-by-word) parallel to an earlier quotation that Sima Qian attributed to his father Sima Tan 司馬談 (*Shiji* 130.3290). Yang Xiong's attribution probably represented a common late Western Han acknowledgement of this saying instead of a mere misremembering. See also Qian Zhongshu 錢鍾書, *Guan zhui bian* 管錐編 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1979), vol.1, 392, for a brief discussion.

71 For another translation, see Michael Nylan trans., *Exemplary Figures/Fayan* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2013), 106–07.

古之學者耕且養，三年而通一藝，存其大體，玩經文而已。是故用日少而畜德多，三十而五經立也。後世經傳既已乖離，博學者又不思多聞闕疑之義，而務碎義逃難，便辭巧說，破壞形體，說五字之文至於二三万言。後進彌以逐馳。故幼童而守一藝，白首而後能言。安其所習，毀所不見，終以自蔽，此學者之大患也。[72]

A man-of-learning in antiquity was self-cultivating (*geng*) and self-supporting (*yang*), and he penetrated/comprehended one classic thoroughly in every three years. What he did was to interiorize the grand ideas and to get familiar with the textual contents [of the classics]. Therefore, the time he spent was comparatively short yet the virtue he accumulated was a lot, and [his learning of] the Five Classics was established at the age of thirty. The classics and their transmitted traditions in later ages had been deviated and set apart, yet the [so-called] men with broad learning did not even think about the principles of being extensively informed and leaving puzzles open. They insisted on deconstructing the meanings and escaping from challenges, adjusting their words and crafting their statements, and breaking down the shapes and patterns [of the written scripts]; and their explanation of a line with five characters was extended to around twenty and thirty thousand of words. Their followers competed in doing this even more intensely. Consequently, one was entrenched in one classic since his childhood, but was unable to speak until he was white-haired. Content with what one has learned, slanderous of what one did not see before, and finally self-blinded—these are the big problems for a man-of-learning.

These two passages, with their authors' different rhetorical styles, shared a constellation of concepts, tropes, and structural elements that constituted a condensed body of utterances and meanings. Central to the two passages was a notion—if not a mere belief—that there existed an "ancient" model of "learning" (*xue*) which cultivated one's self-oriented and wide-ranging mastery across a broad array of textual traditions in the scheme of the classics, a model opposed to what they criticized as a "modern" model in terms of *jin* or *houshi* 後世 ("later ages"). To begin with, it is necessary to reach some clarity of the term *xue* as a main focus of the two discourses under review. The term covered a spectrum of meanings such as "imitate," "study," "learning," and "scholarship,"

72 *Hanshu* 30.1723.

and it was widely foregrounded as a topic with preeminent importance across a variety of early Chinese texts. This prominence is shown, for instance, in the arresting placement of *xue* as an element in the title of the first chapter of a text, a recurring phenomenon across a considerable number of pre-Han and Han philosophical compilations and compositions.[73] In the present context, to be precise, *xue* was specifically about the literary learning of the classics in its first place. However, the principles, methods and ethics embedded in the model of *xue* proposed in the two discourses then performed a wider applicability to literary learning and practicing across more diverse areas.

The following synopsis presents how the two discourses can relate to each other through a series of identifiable correspondences. The left column provides the full text of the *Fayan* passage following its original sequence, with the corresponding utterances excerpted from in the "Yiwen zhi" horizontally listed on the right.

Synopsis 1
Intertextual Correspondence between the *Fayan* and the "Yiwen zhi"

73 Consider, for example, the *Lunyu* (beginning with the chapter "Xue er" 學而, which indicates *xue er* as the first two words of the first chapter), *Xunzi* 荀子 (beginning with the chapter "Quan xue" 勸學 ["Encouraging Learning"]), *Fayan* 法言 (beginning with the chapter "Xue xing" 學行 ["Learning and Practicing"]), *Qianfu lun* 潛夫論 (beginning with the chapter "Zan xue" 讚學 ["In Praise of Learning"], *Zhonglun* 中論 (beginning with the chapter "Zhi xue" 治學 ["Mastering Learning"]), and so on. For a more specific evidence for the preeminent status of *xue* 學 as a foregrounded topic, consider also the sharing of the exact phrase *quan xue* per se as a chapter title (e. g. the *Xunzi*, *Xinshu* 新書, *Da Dai Liji* 大戴禮記, *Lüshi Chunqiu* 呂氏春秋, and beyond), as well noted in Paul R. Goldin, "Xunzi and Early Chinese Philosophy," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 67 (2007): 141.

Fayan

或問
Someone asked,
司馬子長有言曰
"Sima Zichang (Sima Qian) had a saying that
五經不如《老子》之約也
the Five Classics (*wujing*) are not as concise *yue*) as the *Laozi*.
當年不能極其變，終身不能究其業
One is unable to completely explore their variability in his prime years, or to fully accomplish his project [of studying them] throughout his entire life."
曰
Reply:
若是，則周公惑，孔子賊
"Was that true, the Duke of Zhou would be deceptive, and Kongzi would be fraudulent. [How can that be the case?]
古者之學耕且養，三年通一
The condition of learning in antiquity was self-cultivating and self-supporting, [hence one could] penetrate/comprehend one [classic] thoroughly in every three years.
今之學也，非獨爲之華藻也，又從而綉其鞶帨
The condition of learning at the present day not merely makes up flowery patterns but even fabricates excessive ornaments.

"Yiwen zhi"

幼童而守一藝，白首而後能言
"One was entrenched in one classic since his childhood, but was unable to speak until he was white-haired"

古之學者耕且養，三年而通一藝
"A man-of-learning in antiquity was self-cultivating and self-supporting, and he penetrated/comprehended one classic thoroughly in every three years"
後世經傳既已乖離, 博學者又不思多聞闕疑之義，而務碎義逃難，便辭巧說，破壞形體，說五字之文至於二三万言
"The classics and their transmitted traditions in later ages had been deviated and set apart, yet the [so-called] men with broad learning did not even think about the principles of being extensively informed and leaving puzzles open. They insisted on deconstructing the meanings and escaping from challenges, adjusting their words and crafting their statements, and breaking down the shapes and patterns [of the written scripts]; and their explanation of a line with five characters was extended to around twenty and thirty thousand of words"

惡在《老》不《老》也
[So, the problem] is not about resembling *Laozi* or not."
或問
Someone asked,
學者之說可約邪
"Is it possible to make the sayings of [today's] men-of-learning concise?"
曰
Reply:
可約，解科
"Yes, [if we] dissolve the divisional system of education and examination (*ke*)."

What is the most noticeably shared by these two discourses is seen in their utterances of the "ancient" model of learning, a notion phrased as "the condition of learning in antiquity" (*gu zhe zhi xue*[74]) in the *Fayan* and "man-of-learning in antiquity" (*gu zhi xue zhe*) in the "Yiwen zhi." Both of them are followed by the phrase *geng qie yang* 耕且養, which I translate as "self-cultivating and self-supporting." A straightforward reading of the term *geng* 耕 as "to plow" would make the whole line a statement that a man's learning in the "ancient" times was accompanied by his farming that supported the livelihood of himself and his family (in terms of *yang* 養).[75] Nevertheless, it

74 Yu Yue 俞樾, in his exegetical reading, suggested that the phrase *gu zhe zhi xue* 古者之學 was a transcriptional error from *gu zhi xue zhe* 古之學者, for the latter would be grammatically symmetrical to the phrase *jin zhi xue ye* 今之學也 that appeared in the next sentence. Wang Rongbao, in his later commentary, chooses to follow the sequence *gu zhe zhi xue* because there is nothing grammatically and semantically abnormal in the phrase itself, though Yu's revision would indeed make this utterance word-by-word identical to that in the "Yiwen zhi" (see *Fayan yishu*, 223, for Yu and Wang's arguments). My decision is in line with Wang to keep the received version *gu zhe zhi xue*, which is also supported by a great number of pre-Han and Han utterances beginning with the phrase *gu zhe* 古者. In the present case, regardless of whether the *Fayan* and the "Yiwen zhi" had used the same phrase word-by-word identical to each other in their first places, their utterances both referred to the model of learning attributed to *gu* 古 vis-à-vis that of *jin* 今.

75 This seems to be tacitly approved by traditional commentators and modern translator as far as I saw. See *Fayan yishu*, 224; *Hanshu* 30.1723; Nylan trans., *Exemplary Figures*, 107.

makes more sense to take *geng* in this context as an analogy or a metaphor—namely, a mode of individual engagement in cultivating one's learning independent from external financial supports but relying on one's own endeavor and products. This explanation gains support from early Chinese sources within a broader context. First, it corresponds to at least two old utterances found in the *Xunzi* and the *Hanshi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳, as well as another passage in the *Fayan*, in all of which the theme "plowing" was analogically correlated with the noble way of learning and practicing *dao* 道 through one's consistent and hands-on engagement.[76] Second, my explanation avoids an obvious contradiction with a widespread notion in early sources (in either positive or negative way) that Kongzi and his followers assumed their roles detached from farm-based laboring but as the educators and specialists of cultural business.[77] In this regard, Yang Xiong and Liu Xin, both of whom were self-identified and recognized as Kongzi's followers, were unlikely using the term "plowing" only in the narrow, literal sense of "farming." Third, and for the "Yiwen zhi" in particular, there occurs another metaphorical trope of the "accumulation/storage" (*xu* 畜) of one's virtue that comes a few lines after. This configures a process from "plowing" to "self-supporting" and "ac-

76 Wang Xianqian 王先謙 annot., *Xunzi jijie* 荀子集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988), 27–28, "What a noble man deals with *dao* is akin to what a farmer deals with plowing. Even if he does not gain a good harvest of the year, there is nothing changed about [his engagement]." 故君子之於道也，猶農夫之耕，雖不獲年之優，無以易也。Xu Weiyu 許維遹 annot., *Hanshi waizhuan jishi* 韓詩外傳集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), 340, "A good farmer would not stop plowing because of flood or drought; a good merchant would not stop marketing because of the falling price; and a noble man would not get tired of *dao* because of poverty." 故良農不爲水旱不耕，良賈不爲折閱不市，士君子不爲貧窮怠乎道。 *Fayan* 1.19 (*Fayan yishu*, 31), "Someone asked, 'If one plows without gaining a harvest and hunts without obtaining a supply of food, shall he plow and hunt?' Reply: "Plow (cultivate) *dao* and then gain one's *dao*, hunt (seek) *de* and then gain one's *de*. …" 或曰："耕不獲，獵不饗，耕獵乎？"曰："耕道而得道，獵德而得德。…" A further discussion of *Fayan* 1.19 and its correspondence with the present discourse will be offered later in the present section.

77 For example, see *Lunyu* 13.4, 18.7 (*Lunyu jishi*, 896–98, 1272–77); *Mengzi* 孟子, 3A.4 (Jiao Xun 焦循 annot., *Mengzi zhengyi* 孟子正義 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987], 365–401, esp. 391–92); *Hanfeizi jijie*, 425.

cumulating/storing" altogether not as a way of farming but as a *farmer-like* fashion of literary learning, which promises a richer repository of earning depending on one's self-dependent and self-oriented cultivation.[78]

For the strongest support, my reading also coheres with the presumably oldest and most widely transmitted notion related to the phrase *gu zhi xue zhe*. One of the two earliest occurrences of this phrase was that attributed to *zi yue* 子曰 ("the Master said," presumably referring to Kongzi) in the *Lunyu*,[79] and the other was an amplified version in the *Xunzi* 荀子—

> *Lunyu* 14.24
> 子曰："古之學者爲己，今之學者爲人。"[80]
> The Master said, "A man-of-learning in antiquity [did it] for the sake of himself, yet a man-of-learning at the present day [is doing it] for the sake of others."

> *Xunzi*
> 古之學者爲己，今之學者爲人。君子之學也，以美其身；小人之學也，以爲禽犢。[81]
> A man-of-learning in antiquity [did it] for the sake of himself, yet a man-of-learning at the present day [is doing it] for the sake of others. A noble man engages in learning in order to perfect himself, yet a petty man engages in learning in order to become [others'] fowl and livestock.

Both the *Lunyu* and the *Xunzi* did not specify a particular time period of "antiquity," and the same

78 For an Eastern Han analogical correlation between farming and literary learning similar to this, see *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 595.

79 The date of composition of the *Lunyu* was called into questions most critically in the recent study by Michael J. Hunter. See Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects* (Leiden: Brill, 2017). Yet his conclusion of postdating the *Lunyu* to the Western Han does not theoretically contradict the possibility that any particular *Lunyu* material had its own history prior to the *Lunyu* as an integrated corpus.

80 *Lunyu jishi*, 1004.

81 *Xunzi jijie*, 13.

was true for the two passages in the *Fayan* and the "Yiwen zhi." What the four passages shared in common was a gesture of invoking *gu* as a source of timeless authority, which constantly undertakes the *imaginaire* of an ideal model of "learning" vis-à-vis a specific "present day." Within such a *gu-jin* framework, the basic ideological criticism encoded in the *Lunyu* and the *Xunzi* shows conformity to my previous reading of the two Han discourses. Akin to the metaphorical use of "plowing" as a self-oriented mode of learning essential to the "antient" model, the two pre-imperial master voices demonstrate a similar notion of "learning" (*xue*) that—also in the name of *gu* against *jin*—liberates one's scholarly labor and individuality from alienation—namely, as a secondary tool serving the interests of the "others" instead of the "self."

Being the two pre-imperial master voices a pair of guides, it remains unclear what specific models, objects, or materials were to be "learned." In the two late Western Han discourses, however, "learning" was specified as a practice targeted on a certain range of textual traditions canonized as the "classics," which reflect the system of knowledge formation and transmission in a new institutional matrix. Within this context, the ancient model is described as "penetrating/comprehending one [classic] thoroughly in every three years" ("三年通一" in the *Fayan*, and "三年而通一藝" in the "Yiwen zhi"), a mode of studying across the major classics with completeness and efficiency. Moreover, the phrase in the "Yiwen zhi" passage is attached with an additional line, "[their learning of] the Five Classics was established at the age of thirty" 三十而五經立也. This particular utterance instantiates an anachronistic yet innovative appropriation of a previous notion. To be precise, the author (Liu Xin) synthesized a set of old and new ideas that were

initially irrelevant to each other: First, the notion of the "Five Classics" (*wujing*), which beard no substantial meaning until the Western Han;[82] second, an idea of studying one classic in every three years, which became a matter of concern only after early imperial canonization; and finally, a couple of old utterances attributed to, again, Kongzi, that one "develops his aspiration for learning at the age of fifteen" 十有五而志于學 and hence becomes "established at the age of thirty" 三十而立.[83]

The two discourses unfold themselves not as straightforward argumentations but, more sophisticatedly, as the fabrication and transformation of a cluster of old concepts, utterances, and tropes into a new unity of meanings. The process was actualized by means of metaphor, allusion, appropriation, and especially a revisionary approach of meaning-production that constituted the texts' own *rhetorics* and *poetics* equipped with the power of the past. To be specific, when Yang Xiong and Liu Xin made rhetorical uses of the old ideas and utterances—along with the notion *gu* per se—in their proposal for the "ancient" model of learning, they had in practice revised and adjusted those ideas and utterances according to the linguistic, material, and socio-cultural contexts of their own time. Therefore, they had consciously participated in a social communication on contemporary issues with their own insights and biases. The values they attributed to *gu* can be synthesized as a scholarly aspiration for self-dependence, broadness, and comprehensiveness in the spe-

82 See Fukui, "Rikukei rikugei to gokei," 139–64; "Shin Kan jidai ni okeru hakase seido no tenkai: gokei hakase no secchi o meguru gigi sairon" 秦漢時代における博士制度の展開：五經博士の設置をめぐる疑義再論, *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 東洋史研究 54 (1995): 1–31; Michael Nylan, "Classics without Canonization: Learning and Authority in Qin and Han," in *Early Chinese Religion, vol. 1*, 765–73. For a more detailed discussion on this issue, see Chapter 2.

83 *Lunyu* 2.4 (*Lunyu jishi*, 70–71). See also *Lunyu jishi*, 72, for Huang Kan's 皇侃 commentary that made conceptual connection between this utterance and the "Yiwen zhi" passage.

cific sense of cultivating one's integrative and syncretic mastery of classics through an efficient progress of learning. Corresponding to this, both Yang Xiong and Liu Xin concerned the division of canonical studies in Han official system and the academic sectarianism thereof as the problems central to contemporary scholarly world.

Compared to the *Fayan*, the "Yiwen zhi" passage made more explicit arguments against the fashion of limiting one's scholarly inquiry within a small corpus of texts and teachings. In the passage, Liu criticized the official academicians' institutional affiliation to specific texts in terms of "entrenched in one classic" 守一藝, as well as their methods of "deconstructing the meanings and escaping from challenges, modifying their words and crafting their statements, and breaking down the shapes and patterns [of the written scripts]" 碎義逃難，便辭巧說，破壞形體[84] and their narrow-minded sectarianism in terms of "content with what one has learned, slanderous of what one did not see before, and finally self-blinded" 安其所習，毀所不見，終以自蔽. These lines speak well to a rhetorical statement that Liu made at the beginning of his judgements of the "later ages," that a man who disobeys the principle of being "extensively informed" (*duowen*) cannot become *truly* "broadly learned" (*boxue*), a term that he ironically conflated with the court-appointed academicians, *boshi* 博士—literally, "Men with Broad Learning"—and their followers, who had however failed to reach that state of "broadness" due to their sectarian affiliations to specific lineages, tutors, and texts as divided within the official system.[85] This critical stance also worked in

84 Qian Mu convincingly reads these phrases as references to specific methods employed by Han official academicians in their studies and teachings of "chapters-and-sentences" (*zhangju* 章句). See Qian, "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao," 231.

85 For a detailed discussion on the issue of *boshi* 博士 and the official academic system they represented, see

concert with Liu's proposal to incorporate the four non-canonized texts—i. e. the *Zuozhuan* 左傳, the "ancient-script" (*guwen*) *Shangshu* 古文尚書, the *Maoshi* 毛詩, and the *Yili* 逸禮—into the official system of canonical studies, as well as his subsequent debate with the group of *boshi*. In the debate, Liu made explicit expositions for an open-ended inquiry into knowledge and texts beyond the divisional repositories held by official academicians whom he regarded as sectarian and narrow-minded.[86]

The value of a broadened scheme of literary learning was also related to the problems of method and efficiency. Both scholars presented their worries about the present-day proliferation of tedious, far-fetched, and time-consuming explanations conducted by scholars affiliated to a narrow range of literary materials with verbatim precision. This concern was explicitly expressed in the latter half of the "Yiwen zhi" passage and, more delicately, by the master voice in the *Fayan*. Yang Xiong's portrayal of the ancient model of learning was precisely a reaction to a quote of (?) Sima Qian that the "Five Classics" were not as "concise" or "essential" (*yue* 約) as the *Laozi* 老子, and that any attempt to completely study them would be time-consuming yet fruitless.[87] Yang's defense, in response, suggested that the studies of classics could be "concise" as well if one follows the ancient model, hence he accused the present-day (*jin*) scholars for making "patterns" and "ornaments" that metaphorically denoted their excessive explanations. In his response to the final question that

---

Chapter 2.

86 *Hanshu* 36.1967–71. For an English translation of Liu Xin's debate against the court-appointed academicians, see Loewe, "Liu Xiang and Liu Xin," 380–84.

87 This quote has a roughly parallel version in the *Shiji* which however quotes from Sima Tan rather than Sima Qian (*Shiji* 130.3290). See also Note 70, for a brief discussion of this intertextual correspondence. For a further discussion of the tension between *bo* 博 and *yue* 約 in early China, especially the Han, see section 4 of the present chapter, as well as Chapter 2.

if it is possible to make the present-day learning *yue*, the answer was "yes," with a solution that one should be set free from the institutional matrix of divisional education, selection, evaluation, and examination in terms of *ke* 科.[88]

Taking *ke* as a sign of institutionalization in the "modern" frame, Yang Xiong set up the opposite of his self-oriented model of broad learning in the name of "antiquity." The discourse worked in concert with another hypothetical conversation he made in *Fayan* 1.19, where we read, "Someone asked, 'If a text has the same [quality/value/form] with the classics yet it is not venerated by the world, would it be right to study it?' Reply: 'Yes, it is right.'" 或曰："書與經同，而世不尚，治之，可乎？"曰："可。"[89] By this reply, Yang confirmed, that the true value of a text does not depend on its status as a privileged canon/classic (*jing* 經) or not, and that there is potentially a possibility that a text alternative to the already-canonized corpus could have the same quality as a *jing*. What was hence implied was an open-minded principle, that one ought to be devoted to a broader range of literary sources only depending on their values instead of institutional supports. This stance is further shown in his response to the next claim made by the interlocutor that this

88 For an Eastern Han reference, see the *Shiming* 釋名, "Shi dianyi" 釋典藝 ("Explanations of [the Glossary of] Texts and Classics") chapter, where *ke* 科 was semantically conflated with *ke* 課 that referred to an imposed system of examination and censorship to keep people obeying the standard doctrines in terms of *fa* 法 (Ren Jifang 任继昉 annot., *Shiming huijiao* 釋名匯校 [Jinan: Qilu shushe, 2006], 344). Cf. *Fayan yishu,* 222, 224, for other explanations of Yang's use of *ke* in this case. See also Chapters 3 and 4 (Notes 365 and 489), for another important use of the term *ke* in the phrase *sike* 四科 ("four categories") as employed in contexts respectively related to the teaching of Kongzi and the division between literary genres, where *ke* referred to "category" that involved a broad sense of division and evaluation as well, yet without the implication of institutional imposition of censorship and control; and Fang Yixin 方一新, *Donghan Wei Jin Nanbeichao shishu ciyu jianzhi* 東漢魏晉南北朝史書詞語箋釋 (Hefei: Huangshan shushe, 1997), 89–90, for another use of *ke* specifically referring to "selection" in early medieval historiography.

89 *Fayan* 1.19 (*Fayan yishu*, 31). For another two translations, see Nylan trans., *Exemplary Figures*, 16–19; Mark Csikszentmihalyi, *Readings in Han Chinese Thought* (Indianapolis & Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2006), 20–21.

non-canonical text cannot be properly studied because it is not situated within the institutional system of division and examination (in terms of *fa ce jue ke* 發策決科).[90] In response, Yang demonstrated, that "a great man's learning is for the sake of *dao*, and a petty man's learning is for the sake of profits" 大人之學也爲道，小人之學也爲利, an utterance corresponding to the notion *gu zhi xue zhe* in the *Lunyu*, the *Xunzi*, and their echo in *Fayan* 7.8. Right after Yang Xiong's approving response, the conversation takes an analogical shift onto the descriptions of farmers and hunters, where the trope of *geng* ("plowing/cultivation")—here accompanied with *lie* 獵 ("hunting")—occurs, in a way bearing clear similarity to the same trope in *Fayan* 7.8, as the metaphor of a self-oriented mode of learning detached from external patronization and imposition.[91]

Such a condensed body of interconnected utterances, expressions, and rhetorical tropes, as well as their conceptual, linguistic, and historical contexts, altogether provide a coherent understanding of Yang Xiong and Liu Xin's discourses in the name of "antiquity" with its binary opposition between the past and the present. The institutional scholars, under their critical reviews, were described as supported by imperial investments and official positions instead of their own products, and hence working for the sakes of "others" instead of "plowing/cultivating" for their own interest. Correspondingly, the "ancient" model of learning eventually unfolds itself as the expression of a scholarly aspiration for a broadened, comprehensive, and encompassing mastery of texts and

90 *Fayan yishu*, 31. For a later use of *ke* with similar meaning and implication to this case, see Ban Gu's "appraisal" (*zan* 贊) attached to the "Rulin zhuan" 儒林傳 of the *Hanshu* (*Hanshu* 88.3620), where he criticized the official academic system of division, examination, and selection in terms of *ke* for it attracted scholars by means of official positions and financial benefits, which resulted in the excessive divergence of the explanations of classics.

91 *Fayan yishu*, 31. See also Note 76. Consider too, that *lie* 獵, in a way akin to *geng* 耕, was widely used as a metaphor of literary leaning during and after the Han.

knowledge, as well as a gesture of self-oriented engagement that was, at least nominally, independent from the imagined "others."

These ideas and utterances in Yang Xiong and Liu Xin's discourses show conformity also to their (along with Liu Xiang's) biographic and auto-biographic accounts as now preserved in the *Hanshu*, where their scholarly identities as the admirers of antiquity were narrated and presented along with their engagements in a broadened scheme of literary learning. Both Liu Xiang and Liu Xin were recorded as "fond of antiquity" (*haogu*) with their capability "broad in information and great at memorization," as well as their encompassing investigation of textual materials in a fashion "with nothing missed in their inquiry" 無所不究.[92] Yang Xiong, in his self-narrative (now preserved in his *Hanshu* biography),[93] asserted that he had "viewed (or read) broadly with nothing missed" 博覽無所不見 through an efficient way of comprehending the texts by means of "literary glosses" (*xungu* 訓詁), as well as his deliberate detachment from "chapters-and-sentences" (*zhangju* 章句),[94] a standard procedure of text-based learning employed by the Han official academicians and their followers.[95] Their practices collectively exemplified the scholarly values of

92 *Hanshu* 36.1967.

93 The transmitted *Hanshu* biography of Yang Xiong 揚雄, according to Yan Shigu's widely accepted annotation (see *Hanshu* 87B.3583), consists of two parts divided by Ban Gu's introductory formula *zan yue* 贊曰 ("The Appraisal Says"). The first part of the biography (before the *zan yue* formula) is an excerpted version of Yang Xiong's self-narrative, *zixu* 自序 ("self-recounting," noted by Ban Gu), which to an uncertain degree reflects Ban Gu's editorial revision as well. For a revised and augmented English version of this biography, see David R. Knechtges, *The Han shu Biography of Yang Hsiung (53 BC–AD 18)* (Tempe: Arizona State University, Center for Asian Studies, 1982).

94 *Hanshu* 87A.3514.

95 *Zhangju*, in its narrow, neutral, and literal sense, referred merely to the division of a whole text into minor textual units, namely, "chapters" and "sentences" per se, a procedure that hence led to multiple consequences related to the reading and the interpretation of the text, as well as the divergence of different textual versions, hermeneutic traditions, and scholastic authorities. The extended meanings and often negative implications of *zhangju* during and after the Han were largely due to its status within the institutionalized academic system, as well as the exces-

broadness, comprehensiveness, and self-dependence not merely in dealing with texts categorized as the "classics," but also toward a more extensive range of literary legacies and their engagements in composing new literary productions under their own names.[96] Their images as exemplary individuals-of-erudition in the *Hanshu* joined into a broader flux of socio-cultural communications, as they were further recognized, commemorated, and reproduced during the Eastern Han and beyond.[97] In these regards, the "ancient" model of learning invented by Yang Xiong and Liu Xin turns out to be their self-portraits beyond a narrow temporality, as being manifested not merely to their own time but toward the envisioned future.

1.4. "Broadly Learned about Wen"

The idea central to Yang Xiong and Liu Xin's revision of the "ancient" model of learning was echoed by Ban Gu, in the opening of his "Rulin zhuan" 儒林傳 ("Biographies of the *Ru*") of the *Hanshu*—

> 古之儒者，博學虖六藝之文。六學者，王教之典籍，先聖所以明天道，正人倫，致至治之成法也。[98]
> The *ru* in antiquity was broadly learned about textual legacies (*wen*) of the Six Arts/Classics (*liuyi*). Those six majors of learning were the textual records/accounts (*dianji*) of the kings' indoctrinations, and the established codes by which the former sages demonstrated the principle

sive proliferation of interpretations and rigid division of scholastic lineages as its actual consequences. For references, see Qian Mu, "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao," 181–261; Chen Mengjia 陳夢家, "Handai zhangju xue de shishi" 漢代章句學的試釋, in *Wuwei Hanjian* 武威漢簡 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1964), 35–39. For further discussions of the scholarly resistance against *zhangju* over the period under review, see Chapter 2.

96 For further discussions on these issues, see Chapters 2 and 4.

97 See Chapter 2, for a detailed investigation of the Eastern Han memories of these three exemplary figures.

98 *Hanshu* 88.3589.

of Heaven, corrected the relations among humans, and achieved the greatest order.

While phrasing his idea in terms of "broadly learned about *wen* of the Six Arts/Classics (*liuyi*)" 博學虐六藝之文, a Han scholar as well-informed as Ban Gu was certainly aware of his revisionary allusion to an old notion related to Kongzi, that one ought to act with the spirit of "broadness" (*bo*) in dealing with *wen*. This notion appears in the *Lunyu* for three times, twice as the quote of *zi yue* and once of Yan Yuan 顏淵—

> *Lunyu* 6.27, 12.15
> 子曰："君子博學於文，約之以禮，亦可以弗畔矣夫！"[99]
> The Master said, "A noble man is broadly learned about cultural patterns/legacies (*wen*) and make it restrained/concise/essential (*yue*) by [the principle of] ritual propriety (*li*). May thus not overstep what is right!"

> *Lunyu* 9.11, a quote of Yan Yuan
> 夫子循循然善誘人，博我以文，約我以禮。[100]
> The Master is good at guiding people in orderly way. He broadens me by cultural patterns/legacies (*wen*), and he makes it restrained/concise/essential (*yue*) by [the principle of] ritual propriety (*li*).

Both—or technically saying, all the three—utterances specify the concept *bo* as a value linked with *wen*, as parallel to *yue* ("restraining/conciseness/essentialness") that was linked with *li* 禮 ("ritual propriety"). The key question about the meaning of Ban Gu's revision rests with his appropriation of *wen*, a concept that encompassed a diverse range of meanings including but not limited to pat-

99 *Lunyu jishi*, 417, 863.

100 *Lunyu jishi*, 594; see also *Shiji* 47.1941 for a closely parallel account.

tern, ornament, culture, writing, and textual objects.[101] With a serious engagement in this two-on-two binary juxtaposition, Stephen Durrant interprets *wen* in the present *Lunyu* context as "literary culture" in a specific sense of an "ever-broadening circle of aesthetic and literary possibilities."[102] Such a reading, nevertheless, is not without anachronism, for *wen* in the *Lunyu* was more likely used as a general reference to cultured patterns, legacies, or behaviors but rarely specified as particular literary or textual form of embodiment. However, in Ban Gu's revisionary utterance, the meaning of *wen* indeed took a conceptual shift to literary/textual objects. It was specified as the embodiment of the "Six Arts/Classics" (*liuyi*), a term that could either denote six practical skills or refer to six classical texts[103] but, in the present context, was used as a reference to the "six majors of learning" (*liuxue* 六學) about the "textual records/accounts" (*dianji* 典籍) of former kings and their cultural accomplishments. In light of this, Ban's revision corresponds to a semantic transition that Martin Kern—based on a diachronic investigation of lexical items such as *wen*, *wenxue*, and *wenzhang*—describes as a gradual process by which "literary text rose to its status as the main emblem of culture."[104] By specifying *wen* in the present passage as the textual contents (of the six classics), Ban Gu's configured "broad learning" (*boxue*) as a method—and hence *bo* as a value—applicable to the major objects of literary learning of his own time. Meanwhile, he tacitly left

101 For a more detailed discussion of the composite meanings of *wen*, see Chapter 4.

102 Stephen Durrant, *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writing of Sima Qian* (Albany: State University of New York, 1995), "Introduction," xiv.

103 For a brief discussion, see Nylan, "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han," 256.

104 Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," 88–89. See also Chapter 4, for a further discussion on this issue and Kern's argument.

aside the latter half of the old utterance associated with Kongzi, a half with its emphasis on *yue* that stands for the principles of conciseness.

Ban Gu's revisionary approach was, therefore, entangled with the opposition between *bo* and *yue*, a recurring theme in the Han intellectual world.[105] For one instance, Fan Sheng 范升 (fl. ca. 26 CE), in a discussion prior to Ban Gu's time on the proposal to incorporate the *Zuozhuan* and the Bi 費 tradition of the *Yi* into official academic system, quoted the old utterance (specifically, the one attributed to Yan Yuan) with emphasis on the virtue of *yue*, which he specified as a principle of "subtraction" (*sun* 損) and hence conflated with a statement in the *Laozi*, that "learning *dao* is a progress of increasing subtraction" 學道日損. Fan Sheng's gesture was a rejection against the expansion of imperial investments in textual traditions that were not yet incorporated into the current canonical corpus.[106] Correspondingly, he suggested, that the imperial spirit of being "broadly informed" (*bowen* 博聞) involved a risk of lending support to unworthy learnings in terms of *yiduan* 異端 ("the unorthodox"),[107] a statement that situated the value of *bo* in a condition of moral ambivalence. Such a stance was responded by Chen Yuan 陳元 (fl. ca. 26 CE), who then invoked the precedent cases of the expansion of imperial patronage, in order to support the incorporation of the *Zuozhuan* into canonical studies.[108] From a long-term perspective, this debate was also an

105 For a further investigation of Han intellectual discourses on *bo* and *yue*, see Chapter 2.

106 Fan Ye 范曄, *Houhan shu* 後漢書, annot. Li Xian 李賢 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2000), 36.1228–29.

107 *Houhan shu* 36.1228.

108 *Houhan shu* 36.1230–32.

echo of the previous controversy between Liu Xin and the court-appointed *boshi* on a similar issue.[109]

Ban Gu's projection of the ancient mode of "broad learning," which itself involved a gesture of communicative practice to participate in the scholarly controversy about *bo* and *yue*, shows conformity—if not direct indebtedness—to Yang Xiong and Liu Xin. The phrase *gu zhi ruzhe* 古之儒者 ("*ru* in antiquity"), not found elsewhere in extant pre-Han and Han sources, shows the closest textual correspondence with the phrase *gu zhi xuezhe* that Yang Xiong and Liu Xin had appropriated from pre-imperial sources and revised as a projection of the "ancient" model of literary learning. A similar correspondence can be then found between Ban Gu's use of the phrase *liuyi zhi wen* 六藝之文 and the opening line of Liu Xin's introduction of the six classical majors (right before his proposal for the "ancient" model of learning), where Liu configured all the six classics as a coherent unity.[110] Embedded with a similar meaning, as well as encoded via a similar, revisionary approach of meaning-production, the above "Rulin zhuan" passage stands out as an Eastern Han echo that condensed and crystallized what Yang Xiong and Liu Xin's proposed in their discourses in the name of *gu*.

Such an idealized construction of the "ancient" model of broad learning was, not by coincidence, overlapped with Ban Gu's comment in praise of his father Ban Biao—

仕不爲祿， [Ban Biao's] official career was not for the sake of salary,

109 As previously discussed in section 3 of the present chapter. For the reference, see Note 86.

110 *Houhan shu* 30.1723.

所如不合；　　and the circumstance he resided did not match [his own principle];
學不爲人，　　his learning was not for the sake of others,
博而不俗。[111]　　and [the way he did it] was broad instead of vulgar.

In this appraisal offered by a son, the image of Ban Biao was depicted as transcendent above secular interest in official salary (*lu* 祿), and "his learning was not for the sake of others" 學不爲人 in a manner detaching from personal affiliation to others. Meanwhile, he was praised for his scholarly broadness in terms of *bo*, as well as his principled selectiveness to protect this value from the risk of being "vulgar" (*su* 俗). The *Hanshu* image of Ban Biao was, therefore, conceptually conflated with the "ancient" model of learning as proposed by Yang Xiong and Liu Xin.

Wang Chong, as a peer of Ban Gu and also a student who once followed Ban Biao, in his *Lunheng* 論衡, exemplified a more radical but also revisionary use of the old utterance about *bo* and *wen*—

> 夫孔子之門，講習五經，五經皆習，庶幾之才也。顏淵曰：'博我以文。'才智高者，能爲博矣。顏淵之曰'博'者，豈徒一經哉？[112]
> The school of Kongzi taught and learned the Five Classics. If one's learning covered all the Five Classics, he was hopefully a talented man. Yan Yuan said, "broaden my mind by literary learning (*wen*)." Those who are superior in talent and intelligence are indeed capable of being broad. How can Yan Yuan's saying about "broadness" be merely limited to one single classic?"

Similar to Ban Gu's statement made in the "Rulin zhuan," Wang Chong conflated the old utterance about *bo* and *wen* with his aspiration for a comprehensive, syncretic, and encompassing mastery of

111 *Hanshu* 100A.4213.
112 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 592.

all major classics (in this case, five instead of six). After claiming that "those who are superior in talent and intelligence are indeed capable of being broad" 才智高者，能爲博矣, Wang concluded, with a rhetorical question that actually meant to say the following: Were Kongzi and his followers indeed superior to others, what they performed as "broadness" ought to be an ideal model applicable to the Han intellectual world as well. Thus, a Han scholar's study of the "Five Classics" should encompass them all, instead of just focusing on one. Such an inner logic of argumentation justified Wang Chong's anachronistic projection of Kongzi and his followers. The argument then worked in concert with a recurring theme in the *Lunheng*—namely, a critical stance against the institutional division of canonical studies within the Han official academic system.[113]

For a further reference, such an ideal model of broad learning can be conceptually associated with the term *guxue* 古學 (literally, "ancient studies," or, "ancient model of learning"), one that Qian Mu 錢穆 conceptualizes as a method featured by *jiantong* 兼通 ("integratively comprehending") opposed to the sectarian mode of canonical studies affiliated to *shifa* 師法 ("methods/doctrines of the tutor") and *zhangju*.[114] Michael Nylan, with less specificity, suggests that *guxue* as a Han term referred to "a basic curriculum that drew upon many different types of old rec-

113 Wang's criticism against the official academic system and his aspiration for broadness and comprehensiveness in literary learning (mostly in terms of *bo* and *tong* 通) constituted two interrelated themes recurring in the *Lunheng*. For example, see *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 590–93, 607, 1150–52. For another discussion of the present passage, see Xu Fuguan 徐復觀, "Wang Chong lunkao" 王充論考, in *Liang Han sixiang shi* 兩漢思想史 (Beijing: Jiuzhou chubanshe, 2014), vol. 2, 538.

114 See Qian Mu, "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao," 238, where he conceptually conflates *shifa* (which he uses as a synonym to *jiafa* 家法 ["methods/doctrines of the school/scholastic lineage"]) with *zhangju* as the main features of the "modern model of learning" (*jinxue* 今學) in the Han. See also Csikszentmihalyi and Nylan, "Constructing Lineages and Inventing Traditions," 94–95, for their query of the traditional assumption of taking *shifa* and *jiafa* as synonyms. For my more detailed references to these two terms, see Note 138.

ords."[115] The *Houhan shu* 後漢書, as an early medieval reference in general, consists of around a dozen of instances of *guxue* that are almost all presented from the narrator's later point of view, being a quotation of Lu Zhi 盧植 (d. 192 CE) the single only exception.[116] These instances were either associated with texts that were traditionally tagged as *guwen* or vaguely mapped with a broader scope of literary learning with no clear affinity.[117] There are only two instances of *guxue* found in other Han sources. The first is from Cai Yong's *Duduan* 獨斷, in which *guxue* referred to an old explanation of a given ritual;[118] and the second is from He Xiu's 何休 (129–182 CE) "*Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan* jiegu xu" 春秋公羊傳解詁序, in which the author introduced a group of scholars as "people who master *guxue* and cherish *wenzhang*" 治古學貴文章者 against another group, who made dubious interpretations of the *Chunqiu* and was hence labeled as *suru* ("vulgar *ru*").[119] He Xiu's reference to *guxue* can be better understood according to a range of possible meanings and implications of *wenzhang* and *suru* in the Eastern Han context. In the present passage, the former most likely referred to written texts as either old literary sources or new literary products, and the latter was a negative tag of identity referring to institutionalized scholars with sectarian affiliation to particular texts and authorities.[120] In light of this contextual information, the meaning of *guxue* actually coincided with that embedded in the discourse of the "ancient" (*gu*) model of "learning" (*xue*)

115 Nylan, "The Chin Wen/Ku Wen Controversy," 96. Her examples for analyzing this term are all from the *Houhan shu*.

116 See *Houhan shu* 64.2116, for Lu Zhi's 盧植 narration of his reception of *guxue* 古學 from Ma Rong 馬融, yet without specifying what kinds of texts and objects were covered by that mode of studies.

117 See also Nylan, "The Chin Wen/Ku Wen Controversy," 96, Note 43.

118 *Cai zhonglang ji* 蔡中郎集, *Sibu beiyao* 四部備要, Fasc. 67, 144.

119 *Chunqiu gongyangzhuan zhushu* 春秋公羊傳注疏, Ruan Yuan 阮元 ed., *Shisanjing zhushu* 十三經注疏 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), 2190–91.

120 For a variety of samples and further discussions of the terms *suru* and *wenzhang*, see Chapters 3 and 4.

proposed by Han scholars from Yang Xiong onward. Moreover, He Xiu's placement of the three categories—*guxue*, *wenzhang*, and *suru*—stands out as a shorthand picture of a prevalent mental structure for the Han intellectual world, in which the motif of broad learning (and hence an "ancient" model of individual erudition) was widely associated with the value of literary writing and, meanwhile, extensively presented as a business detached from institutional powers.

The discourses of Yang Xiong, Liu Xin, Ban Gu, and Wang Chong were tightly associated with each other as a body of collective expressions, with regards to the ideas and models they presented, the utterances, tropes, and revisionary methods they employed, as well as the motif of ideological criticism that they performed in practice communicating with a larger intellectual and political world. Such connections across nearly one century could hardly come true, if without a progressively developed social network among a community of practitioners who were like-minded in circulating and sharing texts, knowledge, and values. The formation of such a reciprocal network, I suggest, can be traced back to the late Western Han library project as an intellectual sphere from which materials and sources were produced and spread, as well as a breeding ground for a growing number of men with developed literacy and enthusiasm for individual erudition. This also explains why the Liu and the Ban families, as the contributors and transmitters of the legacy of that project, were better known than most others for their engagements in reciprocal activities within an expanded literate community across one century.[121]

121 For a recent study on the two families' relations and their connections with other Han scholars, see Wang Chunhong, ""Lun Liu Xiang Liu Xin he *Hanshu* zhi guanxi," 303–35.

The extant biographical accounts for some early Eastern Han scholars involved in this network serve as a useful entry toward further investigation of how such a legacy—a new model of literary learning—was received and enacted. Huan Tan 桓譚 (ca. 23 BCE–56 CE), whose scholarly cultivation was in debt to Yang Xiong and Liu Xin's instructions and influences,[122] was noted by later sources as being "fond of the ancient model of learning" 好古學 and "broadly learned and extensively comprehending" (*boxue duotong* 博學多通), with his coverage of all the five classics by grasping the "grand ideas" (*dayi* 大義) through literary glosses instead of engaging in the studies of *zhangju*.[123] Ban Gu, similar to Huan Tan, was known for his preference to *dayi* and his disengagement from *zhangju*, as well as his integrative and syncretic approach in terms of "learning not merely from a constant tutor" [所]學無常師,[124] a method opposed to the standard procedure of knowledge transmission held by official academicians with their repositories and followers. Wang Chong, who had once followed Ban Biao at his youth but also depended on his own capability of extensive learning and memorizing, was likewise known as being "broadly reading/viewing" (*bolan*) and not fond of *zhangju*.[125]

Equipped with the rhetorical power of antiquity in the first place, the new model of individual erudition enjoyed a growing wealth of textual presentation and social remembrance from the late

122 *Houhan shu* 28A.955.

123 *Houhan shu* 28A.955. For a roughly parallel, earlier, and also more brief account, see Wu Shuping 吳樹平 annot., *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu* 東觀漢記校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008), 547. See also Chapter 2, for a more detailed investigation of the biographic accounts of Huan Tan.

124 *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 675; see also *Houhan shu* 40A.1330 (with an extra particle *suo* 所). For a more detailed investigation of the biographic accounts of Ban Gu, as well as a further discussion of the fashion of learning without constant affiliation to a single tutor, see Chapter 2.

125 *Houhan shu* 49.1629. See also the following chapters, for further discussions of Wang Chong's case in many aspects.

first century BCE onward, especially during and after the Eastern Han. To be specific, the model was distributed among a variety of syncretic, integrative, and encompassing practices of literary learning that transcended the boundaries between specific archives and traditions of knowledge transmission. For instance, the Eastern Han witnessed a remarkably increasing proportion of individuals whose scholarly mastery covered all major classics, as well as the practices of synthesizing different hermeneutic traditions associated with a certain classic.[126] Beyond classics and their hermeneutic traditions, such a self-broadening and self-oriented model of intellectual inquiry was also performed on an even wider range of texts and knowledge toward no end. What makes this particularly clear is the overall proliferation and growing prominence of a cluster of lexical indicators such as *boxue*, *bolan*, *bowu* ("broadly learned about things"), *botong* ("broadly comprehending"), *duowen*, *qiawen* ("richly informed"), *tongren* ("comprehensive man"), *tongru* ("comprehensive *ru*"),[127] and so on. Such a dynamic repository of utterances and expressions—in which *bo* ("broadness") and *tong* ("comprehensiveness") stand out as a pair of core values sustaining each other[128]—was foundational to the production of the ideal images of individuals as the personal embodiments of erudition.

1.5. Summary

126 For s detailed investigation of these two phenomena related to the studies of classics and their hermeneutic traditions, see Chapter 2.

127 Here, my translations of these lexical items may look tentative, as will be further discussed in Chapter 2.

128 For a detailed, analytical examination of the two values, as well as the distributional patterns and meanings of a wider range of lexical items related to them, see Chapter 2.

To invoke the past is to encode a message about the present and beyond. This was made particularly clear when Chinese literary scholars from the first century BCE onward proposed an intellectual model of literary praxis that was essentially a new *imaginaire* but, in more than one aspect, performed as a revisionary invention in the name of *gu* ("antiquity"). This model integrated a constellation of core values such as broadness, comprehensiveness, and a self-oriented interest, all of which constituted the conceptual foundation for a re-orientation of Chinese literary culture. Central to the Han discourses under review were the methods and ethics of studying the major classics categorized as *wujing* or *liuyi*. Nevertheless, the values encoded into these discourses were *de facto* transcendent beyond a particular interest in a limited canonical corpus but presented as an integrative, syncretic, and encompassing mode of literary learning. Such a new mode of scholarly practice was conceptually and practically applied to a significantly extended range of texts and knowledge toward no particular end.

Through an analytical examination of the intertextual correspondences between these discourses and other sources, along with references to a broader socio-cultural context, my reading unravels the process of verbalization and meaning-production by which the new model of literary learning was rhetorically proposed in the name of *gu*. Antiquity was performed, not merely as a source of authority from the past, but also as a projection of the present and an enchanting envisioning of the future. For one thing, the Han scholars under focus invented their ideal model not merely in the name of *gu* per se, but also through the revisionary appropriations of a set of ideas and utterances drawn from their old contexts and circumstances. Such a revisionary approach of

meaning-production would be manifested and actualized across a variety of acts, thoughts, and traces throughout the Han times and beyond. For another, the communicative practices under review undertook a motif of ideological criticism, namely, an oppositional stance against sectarianism and institutional affiliation imposed by the contemporary official academic system and political culture. Finally, what the scholars confronted and hence envisioned was a changing world with ever-growing texts and knowledge, a world beyond the reach of any old model of learning. In lights of these, the discourses of the "ancient" model of learning constituted a part of the grand picture of communications between the dead, the living, and the not yet living,[129] where there was no particular ancient that these "admirers of antiquity" truly modeled themselves after. Instead, *the ancient was modeled on them.*

129 In saying this, I am in debt to Aleida Assmann's description of the contract "between the living, the dead, and the not yet living" that a culture could engender. See Assmann, "Canon and Archive," 97.

- CHAPTER 2 -

Broadness and Comprehensiveness: The Cultivation of Erudition on the Individual Basis

2.1. The Syncretic Mode of Studying Classics and Hermeneutics

The present chapter concerns the following questions: How was an individual scholar cultivated, self-identified, or socially recognized as the personal embodiment of erudition? Namely, by what kinds of values, practices, criteria, and expressive forms one's image as such was produced, acknowledged, and remembered? To begin with, notwithstanding numerous pieces of evidence that suggest an extensive range of intellectual activities transcendent beyond the division of textual objects and scholarly interests, my investigation is first devoted to a series of issues relevant to "classical/canonical studies" (*jingxue*) which, in its traditional sense, covered a relatively clear scope of old textual legacies recognized as the "classics/canons" (*jing*) in the Han, as well as a broader spectrum of hermeneutic sources developed around them, serving as their exegeses, commentaries, and beyond.[130]

The Western Han witnessed a gradual progress of canonization, through which the primary objects with imperial investment and patronage were divided and stabilized into six or five major

130 These hermeneutic traditions were conventionally divided into a series of subcategories—namely, *zhuan* 傳 ("transmitted tradition"), *gu* 故/詁 ("glosses [of old words]"), *shuo* 說 ("explanation"), *ji* 記 ("record"), *lun* 論 ("discussion/selection"), etc. For an entry to the usages of these generic terms, see *Hanshu* 30 ("Yiwen zhi"). For a series of traditional understandings of some of these terms (not without controversy between each other), see *Shiming huijiao*, esp. 322–51, for the two chapters "Shi shuqi" 釋書契 ("Explanations of [the Glossary of] Writings and Writing Tools") and "Shi dianyi"; Pi Xirui 皮錫瑞, *Jingxue lishi* 經學歷史 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008), 67; Ma Ruichen 馬瑞辰 annot., *Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi* 毛詩傳箋通釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 3–5. For an English sketch of the arts and techniques of commentaries on classics and beyond during the Han dynasty, see Rudolf G. Wagner, *The Craft of a Chinese Commentator: Wang Bi on the Laozi* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 31–51.

repositories. The concept *liuyi* ("Six Arts/Classics")[131]—less commonly phrased as *liujing* 六經 ("Six Classics/Canons") or *liuxue* ("Six Majors of Learning")—represents a comparatively early notion related to the six majors of classical studies before the concept *wujing* ("Five Classics"), which is datable not prior to the Western Han.[132] The latter referred to a set of textual crystallization of five of the six old majors—namely, the *Yi* (*Changes*), *Shu* (*Documents*), *Shi* (*Poetry*), *Li* (*Rituals*), and *Chunqiu* (*Spring and Autumn Annals*), with the only exception *Yue* (*Music*). Such a lexical difference demonstrates not merely the changing number but the shifting nature of those objects of learning. To be precise, the term *wujing* gained its substantial meaning not until a moment when the various streams of old traditions were gradually condensed into an integrated system of textual objects endorsed by political authorities and controlled by institutionalized specialists.[133] It was exactly in this sense that the "Five Classics" rose up to their status as the "thread" and the "path/throughfare" by which the otherwise sporadic, aimless texts were held together, as well as a "constant," "instructive" substance central to the entire literary culture—all as the semantic connotations of the term *jing* during the Han[134]—around which a broader range of hermeneutic traditions and practices came into existence.

---

131 As should be differentiated from another common use of the same term as a denotation of the "Six Artificial Skills." For a brief discussion of the double meanings of *liuyi* in correlation with some other terms, see Nylan, "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han," 256.

132 See Fukui, "Rikukei rikugei to gokei," 139–64; "Shin Kan jidai ni okeru hakase seido no tenkai," 1–31; Nylan, "Classics without Canonization," 765–73.

133 For a theoretical reference for the logics, procedures, and effects of canonization in early civilizations, especially the connection between canonization and the formation of "Cultural Memory," see Jan Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), passim., esp. 78–80. For a conceptual appliance of Jan Assmann and Aleida Assmann's general assessments onto the process of canonization in early imperial China, see Kern, *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih-huang*, 191.

134 For two brief entries to these etymological explanations, see Wagner, *The Craft of a Chinese Commentator*, 31–32;

Along with the progress of canonization, the imperial courts from the Qin through the Han established their institutional systems of mastering classical learning via scholastic groups headed by court-appointed specialists entitled as *boshi* ("Erudite," or literally, "Men with Broad Learning"). The position of *boshi*, in its first place, was settled in the Qin and later the early Western Han court, as knowledgeable advisors who mastered a variety of old sources yet without being assigned to control them separately.[135] The mid-Western Han (not prior to the reign of Emperor Wu 武帝 [r. 141–87 BCE]) then witnessed the gradual formation of a more specified and regulated official system of *boshi* in its Grand Academy (*taixue* 太學) as well as the standard procedures of teaching, examining, and controlling the classics incorporated. There had been a fruitful series of traditional and modern scholarships on the employments, assignments, removals, and systematic transitions of *boshi* over the Han dynasty, with a great deal of controversy concerning the dating of specific historical events and hence the problem of historical periodization.[136]

The deployment of materials, labor, and authorities within this institutional matrix can be briefly summarized as follows. The five classics were separately mastered by a changing number of officially appointed *boshi*, each of whom served as the leading representative and prime tutor of a

---

Nylan, "Classics without Canonization," 726.

135 See Qian Mu, "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao," 185–94; Liu Rulin 劉汝霖, *Han Jin xueshu bianian* 漢晉學術編年 (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2010), 71–72.

136 For a selective range of accounts, surveys, and critical investigations of these issues, see Tang Yan 唐晏, *Liang Han Sanguo xue'an* 兩漢三國學案 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008), passim.; Wang Guowei 王國維, "Han Wei boshi kao" 漢魏博士考, in *Guantang jilin* 觀堂集林 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), 174–217; Qian Mu, "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao," 194–231; Liu Rulin, *Han Jin xueshu bianian*, passim.; Fukui, "Rikukei rikugei to gokei," 139–64; "Shin Kan jidai ni okeru hakase seido no tenkai," 1–31; Cheng Sudong 程蘇東, "Xihan zhongqianqi wujing boshi shifa wenti huikao" 西漢中前期五經博士師法問題匯考, *Guoxue yanjiu* 國學研究, No. 2 (2015): 115–59.

specific scholastic lineage (*jia*)[137] associated with a single canon. Attached to the *boshi* were a selected number of practitioners who became their disciples (*dizi* 弟子), among whom the next generation of tutors were supposed to be selected after the retirement or demise of the old ones. The internal division and overall scale of this system diachronically changed over the Han dynasty, as a new position of *boshi* could be set up when an old tradition or scholastic lineage was divided, or when a tradition initially external to the official system was incorporated in; a pre-existing position could be removed from the system, a matter contingent on its imperial patron, as well as the internal and external conflicts it confronted. Given a considerable range of contingency and changeability, central to the official academic system was its imposition of centripetal affiliation to institutional authorities in general, as well as the status of each canon or each hermeneutic tradition as the centerpiece for each scholastic community associated with it. The number of major areas of classical learning central to this system was constantly "five" since they were settled, regardless of the instability of the relative weight of each of them or the changing number of hermeneutic traditions and their *boshi* tutors appointed by the court. Decisions were made on the rises and falls of these scholastic lineages, but mostly as the results of specific preferences of current political authorities. The rules of division and knowledge transmission within the system constituted a mode of lineal affiliation to specific texts, methods, and explanations associated with each single canon, including the hermeneutic doctrines in terms of *shifa* ("methods/doctrines of the tutor") or *jiafa*

137 For a critical examination of the term *jia* in early China, see Csikszentmihalyi and Nylan, "Constructing Lineages and Inventing Traditions," 59–99.

家法 ("methods/doctrines of the school/scholastic lineage")[138] that were developed and differentiated by generations.

The structural constraint and limitation imposed by this institutional system was challenged in the late Western Han, especially by Yang Xiong and Liu Xin in their constructions of the "ancient" model of learning,[139] as well as actualized among an increasing number of practitioners from their time onward. The period from the late Western Han through the Eastern Han witnessed a larger proportion of scholars who were known for learning thoroughly all the major classics (normally in terms of *wujing*, and to a lesser extent *liujing* and *liuyi*). Taking the comparison between historiographic records in the *Hanshu*, *Dongguan Hanji* 東觀漢記, and *Houhan shu* as an entry: There are only six Western Han scholars—including Liu Xiang and Liu Xin—recorded as learning thoroughly or having access to reach a total mastery of all classics; yet the number for Eastern Han scholars recorded in the *Dongguan Hanji* is ten, and *Houhan shu* seventeen. Meanwhile, the survey must have underestimated the true number of instances that the *Dongguan Hanji* once incorporated, for its received versions are far from completeness.[140]

---

138 The *Hanshu* consists of no instance of *jiafa* but *shifa* 師法 for nine times (twice cited from specific Western Han figures). By contrast, the *Houhan shu* incorporates both of the two terms, consisting of five instances of *shifa* (four cited from specific Eastern Han figures) and eight instances of *jiafa* (two cited from specific Eastern Han figures). According to the contexts where these instances occur, I consider it safe to regard *shifa* and *jiafa* loosely as a pair of synonyms in that they both referred to a set of standardized texts, explanations, and methods transmitted linearly from the tutor to the student, though the two terms respectively emphasize "tutor" and "school/scholastic lineage" on the literal level. The diachronic pattern of distribution of the two terms is indeed indicative of the changing use of *jia* from the Han through early medieval times. See also Qian Mu, "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao," passim., esp. 223–31, where he conceptually conflates *jiafa* (which he uses as a synonym to *shifa*) with *zhangju* and offers a diachronic view of both of them over the Han. Cf. Csikszentmihalyi and Nylan, "Constructing Lineages and Inventing Traditions," 94–95, where they query the traditional assumption of taking *shifa* and *jiafa* as synonyms and tentatively propose their own understandings.

139 See my analyses in Chapter 1. For the two Han references, see *Fayan* 7.8 (*Fayan yishu*, 222); *Hanshu* 30.1723.

140 See *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 1–11.

Table 2
The Mastery of All Major Classics Presented in the *Hanshu*

Subjects	Contexts	Narrative Perspectives
Dong Zhongshu	"通五經"	compiler
Chu Da	"通五經"	compiler
Xiahou Shichang	"通五經"	compiler
Wang Ji	"兼通五經"	compiler
Liu Xiang	"領校中五經秘書"	compiler
Liu Xin	"六藝傳記……無所不究"	compiler

Table 3
The Mastery of the All Major Classics Presented in the *Dongguan Hanji*

Subjects	Contexts	Narrative Perspectives
Emperor Zhang	"兼五經"	compiler
Empress Deng	"博覽五經傳記"	compiler
Liu Fu	"作五經通論"	compiler
Lu Pi	※ "兼通五經"	compiler
Huan Tan	※ "遍治五經"	compiler
Jia Kui	※ "能講左氏及五經本文"	compiler
Zhang Ba	※ "博覽五經"	compiler
Huan Luan	"學覽六經，莫不貫綜"	compiler
Zhou Ju	※ "五經從橫周宣光"	Zhou's contemporaries
Jing Dan	※ "五經紛綸井大春"	Jing's contemporaries

* ※ indicates that the present record has a parallel account in the *Houhan shu*.

Table 4
The Mastery of the All Major Classics Presented in the *Houhan shu*

Subjects	Contexts	Narrative Perspectives
Huan Tan	※ "遍習五經"	compiler
Lu Pi	※ "兼通五經"	compiler
	"五經復興魯叔陵"	Lu's contemporaries
Jia Kui	※ "弱冠能誦左氏傳及五經本文"	compiler

Zhang Heng	“通五經，貫六藝”	compiler
Xu Shen	“五經無雙許叔重”	Xu’s contemporaries
	“撰爲五經異義”	compiler
Zhou Ju	※ “五經從橫周宣光”	Zhou’s contemporaries
Zhang Ba	※ “博覽五經”	compiler
Jiang Gong	“博通五經”	compiler
Shentu Pan	“博貫五經”	compiler
Liu Shu	“少學明五經”	compiler
He Xiu	“精研六經，世儒無及者”	compiler
Zheng Xuan	“博稽六藝”	Zheng’s self-narrative
Cheng Zeng	“著書百餘篇，皆五經通難”	compiler
Cai Xuan	“學通五經”	compiler
Bian Shao	“腹便便，五經笥”	Bian’s self-narrative
Li He	“通五經”	compiler
Han Shuo	“博通五經”	compiler
Jing Dan	※ “通五經”	compiler
	“五經紛綸井大春”	Jing’s contemporaries

* ※ indicates that the present record has a parallel account in the *Dongguan Hanji*.

My survey covers all textual accounts in these three compilations that carry at least one of the three terms *wujing*, *liuyi*, and *liujing*.[141] This is not merely for convenience but also because these terms could be hardly left aside in a context where the historiographer indeed meant to introduce someone’s mastery of all major classics. There are only few exceptions as far as I can tell. The annal of Emperor Ming 明帝 (r. 57–75 CE) in the *Dongguan Hanji* recorded his “mastery” (*zhi* 治) of the *Shangshu* and then mentioned his study of the other four classics in terms of *jiantong*.[142] For a more convincing example, the biography of Zheng Xuan in the *Houhan shu* includes two passages that substantially enumerate his experience of learning and scholarly achievements that covered all the

141 The result of my survey incorporates 藝 as the graphic variant of 藝 in the term *liuyi*.

142 *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 54.

five classics[143] yet without mentioning any of the three commonly used terms, although a formulaic utterance "(I) broadly examined the Six Arts/Classics" 博稽六藝 does appear somewhere else in his self-narrative toward his son (but still, in the same biography).[144]

All these samples are informative yet not as straightforwardly self-evident as they seem to be. For the majority of textual accounts that constitute the surveys of lexical indicators, their formations cannot be accurately dated back to specific historical moments; and their existing forms could be only tentatively assigned to the narrative voices of the respective compilers. The compilers had undeniably composed their works based on a wealth of previous materials in either original or re-fabricated form. However, it is often unclear which particular source was actually used by a compiler in a given context unless an unambiguous citation marker is introduced, nor is it clear how precisely a compiler would follow every single phrase of an old source that he drew upon. Finally, texts like the *Hanshu*, *Dongguan Hanji*, and *Houhan shu* themselves have gone through their own histories of transmission, recension, and reproduction, a process filled with changeability and instability in general.[145]

Notwithstanding all these factors of ambivalence and changeability, it is defendable that the majority of utterances showing up in my survey are, (1) first, brief and descriptive modules consisting of phrases and terms commonly found in other Han (especially Eastern Han) materials; (2)

143 *Houhan shu* 35.1212.

144 *Houhan shu* 35.1209.

145 For one case related to my study: the *Houhan shu* could have used the term *zhi* 治 ("to mastery," in the context of literary learning) more often than the received version, for the Tang annotators led by Li Xian could have occasionally—with no obligation—replaced *zhi* by its synonym so as to avoid the taboo of the name of Li Zhi 李治, Emperor Gaozong 高宗 of Tang. See Chen Yuan 陳垣, *Shihui juli* 史諱舉例 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1956), 21.

second, often situated in formulaic, grouped, exaggerative, and therefore more stable and memorable forms that better saved them from random oblivion and changeability;[146] (3) third, not consisting of political problems under censorship that would demand artificial deletions or replacements of specific contents or phrases; (4) and finally, not to be taken as infallible words with verbatim precision, but with allowance for comparatively minor lexical or graphic changes that do not fundamentally replace their meanings. These defenses are not to deny the changeability of these utterances before, during, and after the compilations of texts now under review, but to suggest that these utterances could be viewed as comparatively stable elements with nevertheless minor variance at a degree that is acceptable for the present study.

The six "parallel" accounts in the *Dongguan Hanji* and the *Houhan shu* offer a good example. If the former was—as widely accepted—one of the most important textual sources foundational to Fan Ye's 范曄 (398–445 CE) compilation of the *Houhan shu*,[147] Fan seems to have treated the descriptive utterances in those six records with considerable loyalty to their contents and forms, especially in comparison to his deliberate re-organization and re-composition of previous materials in many other cases. Even if one considers the possibility that Fan was not borrowing those accounts

146 For a close reference regarding literary forms and linguistic features that are suitable to be memorized, see K. E. Brashier, "Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Stelae," in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, ed. Martin Kern (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2005), 254–60, where he generalizes cliché, exaggeration, "memory palace" grouping, and versified format as a set of devices that make texts memorized. Brashier's study particularly takes the Eastern Han stele inscriptions as a showcase illustrating the ritualistic and commemorative natures of a larger range of texts in early China and its "memorial culture." See also Brashier, "Eastern Han Commemorative Stelae: Laying the Cornerstone of Public Memory," in *Early Chinese Religion, vol. 1*: 1027–60; *Public Memory in Early China* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014). The commemorative utterances accounting for individual erudition that occur in Eastern Han and early medieval historiographies are, in terms of vocabulary, patterns, and syntax, similar to the Eastern Han stele inscriptions that Brashier primarily focuses on.

147 Hans van Ess, "Hou Han shu," in *Early Medieval Chinese Texts: A Bibliographic Guide*, ed. Cynthia Chennault et al. (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 2015), 113–14.

directly from *Dongguan Hanji* but other sources, it will lead to an even stronger argument for the stability of these utterances over the course of circulation among various repositories and texts. In these regards, the patterns of distributions of these utterances reflect a diachronic change from the Western through the Eastern Han, that an increasing number of people were recognized by contemporary and then later sources for their engagements in a syncretic, integrative, and encompassing mode of studying the major classics.

Even though, only a naïve reader would take for granted that all these samples were—or even just meant to be—*faithful* records of what truly happened. One may fairly ask, "Did someone really study all the five classics?" "How intensely he did it compared to the others?" and, "What kind of context did that record originally come from?" Indeed, evidence is in awfully short supply for answering these questions case-by-case, with only a few exceptions like Xu Shen 許慎 (ca. 58–147 CE) and Zheng Xuan, whose scholarly achievements survived way better than the others. Moreover, it would be mistaken to regard each data as accounting for the same *fact* with an equivalent value. Digital survey as a tool is certainly useful for collecting raw materials through specific filters, yet it does not automatically evaluate and differentiate the "weight" of each data. Therefore, it is necessary first to study these utterances with regards to their natures and meanings in a larger context.

Formulaic and proverbial utterances—which normally incorporated at least one of the two concepts *bo* ("broadness") and *tong* ("to penetrate," "to comprehend," "to learn thoroughly," "comprehensiveness/thoroughness," and so on[148])—were often invoked, yet often without further

148 For the meanings and translations of *tong*, see, for example, Wagner, *The Craft of a Chinese Commentator*, 39; Brash-

information about one's specific practices in dealing with each of those objects of learning. The same was true in a wealth of biographic accounts found in Eastern Han tombstone inscriptions in praise of the scholarly excellence of the deceased men, in which language was organized with formulaic patterns in conformity to the inscriptions' commemorative function of making both private and collective memories.[149] The pragmatic, performative, and commemorative natures embedded in these utterances, therefore, fairly reject an over simplified notion that takes each piece of textual data as an account with transparent historicity. Instead, these utterances are better understood as the verbal manifestations of a constellation of ideas, notions, and beliefs that sustained the formation of socio-cultural memory, a repository in which the syncretic mode of studying classics was recognized and presented as a positive value.

Textual accounts in the *Dongguan Hanji* and the *Houhan shu* of this new fashion of literary learning greatly exceed the *Hanshu* not only in quantity but also in degree, as reflected in the proliferation and growing diversity of vocabulary, contents, narrative perspectives, and literary forms. Four of the six accounts in the *Hanshu* for Western Han scholars employed the phrase "learning thoroughly the Five Classics" (*tong wujing* 通五經), all from Ban Gu's narrative perspective, with one of them phrased in a more complex form headed by *jian* 兼 ("integratively," or "inclusively"). The phrase *tong wujing* appears in *Dongguan Hanji* and *Houhan shu* as well, yet accompanied by a much richer vocabulary that incorporated phrases such as *jiantong* ("integratively comprehending"),

---

ier, *Public Memory in Early China*, 28–29. For my discussion of the term and negotiation with the two scholars, see section 2 of the present chapter.

149 See Brashier, "Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Stelae," 262–74.

bianzhi 遍治 ("all-inclusively mastering"), *bianxi* 遍習 ("all-inclusively studying"), *bolan* ("broadly reading/viewing"), *botong* ("broadly comprehending"), *boguan* 博貫 ("broadly learning through"), and *boji* 博稽 ("broadly investigating"). Three Eastern Han scholars (Cheng Zeng 程曾 [fl. 78 CE], Liu Fu 劉輔 [d. 84 CE], and Xu Shen) were recorded as producing scholarly works that covered their inquiries into all the five classics; and all those works were titled or described in terms of *tong*.[150] Moreover, the Eastern Han-related records include a considerable proportion of cases in which the praise of a given person's mastery of the five classics came from contemporary voices. Two scholars (Zheng Xuan and Bian Shao 邊韶 [ca. 100–165 CE]) were recorded as commenting themselves in different tones;[151] and four scholars (Jing Dan 井丹 [fl. ca. 50 CE], Lu Pi 魯丕 [37–111 CE], Xu Shen, and Zhou Ju 周舉 [d. 149 CE])[152] were praised by their contemporaries. All these four contemporary comments share the same seven-syllabic formula and an exaggerative style of expression, for example, "五經無雙許叔重" ("Matchless is Xu Shuchong [Xu Shen]'s learning of the Five Classics").

In addition to the above-mentioned accounts of the individual mastery of all major classics, there also existed an array of Eastern Han scholars who were known, more particularly, for their scholarly competence in mastering more than one classic to a degree that deserved specific notes. For instance, Zheng Zhong 鄭眾 (d. 114 CE), besides his concentration on the *Chunqiu* as an ex-

150 Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠, in his *Wenshi tongyi* 文史通義 ("Shi tong" 釋通 chapter), discussed the incorporation of *tong* and a series of relevant terms put into the titles of specific Han writings. See Ye Ying 葉瑛 annot., *Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu* 文史通義校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985), 372–73. For a further discussion on this issue, see Chapter 4.

151 *Houhan shu* 35.1209 (Zheng Xuan 鄭玄); 80A.2623 (Bian Shao 邊韶).

152 *Houhan shu* 83.2764 (Jing Dan 井丹); 25.883 (Lu Pi 魯丕); 79B.2588 (Xu Shen 許慎); 61.2023 (Zhou Ju 周舉).

pert of the *Zuozhuan*, was also known for his competence in comprehending—in terms of *jiantong*—the *Yi* and the *Shi*.[153] The same term was employed by historiographers in their presentations of Ren An 任安 (124–202 CE) and Hua Tuo 華佗 (ca. 145–208 CE), whose learnings covered more than one classic as well.[154] Other examples in the *Houhan shu* include Liao Fu 廖扶 (fl. 114 CE), who mastered the *Shangshu* and the *Shi*;[155] Tang Tan 唐檀 (fl. 130 CE), who mastered the *Yi*, the *Shi*, and the *Chunqiu*;[156] and Zhang Kai 張楷 (fl. 148 CE), who mastered the *Shangshu* and the *Chunqiu*.[157] The Eastern Han tombstone inscriptions offer another array of commemorative presentations of scholars like Xia Cheng 夏承 (d. 170 CE), who "mastered the *Shi* and the *Shangshu*" 治詩、尚書,[158] and Lu Jun 魯峻 (d. 172 CE), who "mastered the *Lushi*, and integratively comprehended the *Yanshi Chunqiu*" 治魯詩，兼通顏氏春秋.[159]

The values of broadness and comprehensiveness were also interiorized in the growing prominence of scholarly practices to study or master more than one hermeneutic tradition associated with one specific canon. The earliest example can be traced back to the late Western Han. Xiahou Sheng 夏侯勝 (fl. 74 BCE), a junior clansman of Xiahou Shichang 夏侯始昌 (fl. 104 BCE),

153 *Houhan shu* 36.1224.

154 *Houhan shu* 82B.2736.

155 *Houhan shu* 82A.2719.

156 *Houhan shu* 82B.2729.

157 *Houhan shu* 36.1242.

158 For most Han stele inscriptions that the present study incorporates, I referred to two modern compilations, Xu Yuli 徐玉立 ed., *Hanbei quanji* 漢碑全集 (Zhengzhou: Henan meishu chubanshe, 2006), transcribed in full-form [*fanti* 繁體] with photocopies; and Gao Wen 高文 annot., *Hanbei jishi* 漢碑集釋 (Kaifeng: Henan daxue chubanshe, 1997), transcribed in simple-form [*jianti* 簡體] but with annotations. The page numbers I give are only for the transcriptions of the main texts being cited. For some that are not include by these two collections, I will refer to other sources such as the *Lishi* 隸釋. For the account of Xia Cheng 夏承 in particular, see *Hanbei quanji*, 1293; *Hanbei jishi*, 348.

159 *Hanbei quanji*, 1495; *Hanbei jishi*, 390.

studied the *Shangshu* first from the his own family tradition and then the scholastic lineage of Ouyang 歐陽.[160] The *Hanshu* recorded such as fashion of learning as "inquiring not merely from one tutor" 所問非一師,[161] which was later echoed in the biographies of Ban Gu in the *Dongguan Hanji* and then the *Houhan shu*, in which he was noted as learning around an even broader range of texts and knowledge beyond classics and with no affiliation to a "constant tutor" (*changshi* 常師).[162] The Eastern Han through the early third century CE witnessed a more fruitful manner of intellectual exchange beyond the boundaries between different hermeneutic traditions or *jia*. For example, Jia Kui's 賈逵 (30–101 CE) study of the *Chunqiu* covered not merely the *Zuozhuan*, but also the five secondary scholastic lineages (*wujia* 五家) within the Guliang 穀梁 tradition;[163] also, he was appointed by Emperor Zhang 章帝 (r. 57–88 CE) to compile the similarities and differences among all main traditions of the *Shangshu* (namely, Ouyang, Senior Xiahou 夏侯, Junior Xiahou, and the *guwen Shangshu*) and the *Shi* (namely, *Lushi* 魯詩, *Qishi* 齊詩, *Hanshi* 韓詩, and *Maoshi*) respectively.[164] Zhang Xuan 張玄 (fl. 185 CE), a scholar of the Yan 顏 tradition of the *Chunqiu*, was known for expanding his study across several different *jiafa*.[165] The integration of the three most influential *Chunqiu* traditions was shown in the cases of Ma Rong 馬融 (79–166 CE) and later He Xiu and Zheng Xuan, each of whom presented a motif of intellectual competition with

160 *Hanshu* 75.3155.

161 *Hanshu* 75.3155.

162 *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 675; *Houhan shu* 40A.1330. The ideas and utterances about learning from more than one tutor can be traced back to the image of Kongzi in the *Lunyu*. For an inquiry into the conceptual foundation and manifestations of this scholarly fashion, see Hsing I-t'ien 邢義田, *Hua wai zhi yi: Handai Kongzi jian Laozi huaxiang yanjiu* 畫外之意：漢代孔子見老子畫像研究 (Taipei: Sanmin shuju, 2018), 111–12.

163 *Houhan shu* 36.1235.

164 *Houhan shu* 36.1239.

165 *Houhan shu* 79B.2581.

previous and contemporary scholars.[166] The late Eastern Han scholar Wei Xi 隗禧 (fl. 200 CE) in particular presented a case of the syncretic mode of studying and representing the *Shi*, that he was broadly learned insofar as being capable of orally explaining the four main traditions at one time toward his audience.[167] Beyond the survey of explicit records like the case of Wei Xi, the syncretic mode of representation and appropriation of the *Shi* and its hermeneutic traditions was also found in the case of Liu Xiang, who was traditionally mistaken as a *Lushi* transmitter in a narrow sense but actually presented *Shi*-related interpretations from multiple traditions in his textual compilations. For a new reference, it is also shown in the poetic writings of Cao Zhi, by whom the various *Shi*-related interpretations were brought into a flexible manner of utilization and appropriation that transcended the internal and external boundaries of the four main schools, making his own works a textual display that exteriorized his scholarly erudition related to the *Shi* as a rich repository of both utterances and meanings.[168]

---

166 See *Houhan shu* 60A.1972, for Ma Rong's scholarship on the three *Chunqiu* traditions, especially his remarks on Jia Kui and Zheng Zhong's 鄭眾 commentaries on the *Zuozhuan*; and *Houhan shu* 35.1207–08, for He Xiu 何休 and Zheng Xuan's commentaries on the three traditions and their sensibilities for scholarly competition.

167 Yu Huan 魚豢, *Weilüe* 魏略, cited by Pei Songzhi 裴松之, in Chen Shou 陳壽, *Sanguo zhi* 三國志, annot. Pei Songzhi (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), 13.422. For a further discussion of this case, see Chapter 5.

168 Such a syncretic and flexible manner of reception and utilization of *Shi*-related materials and interpretations (from Liu Xiang to Wei Xi, Cao Zhi and others) invites critical reflections on a set of traditional methodologies that reconstructed the "Three Schools" (*sanjia* 三家) of the *Shi* 詩 other than the *Maoshi* 毛詩. This vein of scholarship, which has developed from the Song through the Qing and even modern times, is primarily based on the mistaken assumptions of lineal transmission and sectarian affiliation to particular "schools" or hermeneutic traditions. See, for the single most important reference which incorporated a great deal of previous studies, Wang Xianqian, *Shi sanjia yi jishu* 詩三家義集疏 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), esp. 1–17. For another series of studies that query the approaches and methods involved in the reconstruction of *sanjia* (in different ways but mostly focusing on the case of Liu Xiang), see first, the arguments proposed by Quan Zuwang 全祖望 and accepted by Yu Jiaxi, in Yu Jiaxi, *Siku tiyao bianzheng* 四庫提要辨證 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), 556–57; see also James R. Hightower, "The *Han shih wai chuan* and the *San chia shih*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 11 (1948): 252; Xu Fuguan, "Hanshi waizhuan de yanjiu" 韓詩外傳的研究, in *Liang Han sixiang shi*, vol. 3, 12; Xu Xingwu 徐興無, *Liu Xiang pingzhuan* 劉向評傳 (Nanjing: Nanjing daxue chubanshe, 2005), 97–98; Xu Jianwei, *Shuoyuan yanjiu: yi Zhanguo Qin Han zhijian de wenxian leiji yu xueshushi wei zhongxin* 《說苑》研究：以戰國秦漢之

It was within such an atmosphere that a scholar like Zheng Xuan—who reportedly reached the highest level of broadness, comprehensiveness, and scholarly productivity in classical studies—could ever possibly come into being in China's late antiquity. Consider the *Houhan shu* accounts for his experience of learning at youth—

> 遂造太學受業，師事京兆第五元先，始通京氏易、公羊春秋、三統曆、九章算術。又從東郡張恭祖受周官、禮記、左氏春秋、韓詩、古文尚書。以山東無足問者，乃西入關，因涿郡盧植，事扶風馬融。[169]
> (Zheng Xuan) then visited the Grand Academy (*taixue*) to receive his education. He served Diwu Yuanxian in Jingzhao as his tutor, from whom he first learned thoroughly the *Yi* of the Jing tradition, the *Chunqiu* of the Gongyang tradition, the *Santong li*, and the *Jiuzhang suanshu*. Then he followed Zhang Gongzu in Dongjun, from whom he received the *Zhouguan*, the *Liji*, the *Chunqiu* of the Zuo tradition, the *Shi* of the Han tradition, and the *guwen Shangshu*. As there was no one in the east of the [Yao] Mountain worth him asking, he traveled to the west through the [Hangu] Pass, got introduced by Lu Zhi from Zhuojun, and served Ma Rong in Fufeng (as his tutor).

This brief yet informative account portrays the socio-cultural landscape around a young, emerging scholar on his journey of the late Eastern Han intellectual world. He traveled and learned from erudite tutors across the east and the west of the Northern China, each of whom mastered a diverse range of texts and knowledge including the major classics and the relevant hermeneutic tradi-

---

間的文獻累積與學術史爲中心 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2011), 185–99, esp. 188. For a recent investigation of the reception and utilization of the *Shi* during and after the Han (with a detailed case study on Cao Zhi, a discussion of the syncretic mode of studying classics and hermeneutics, and a set of methodological reflections on traditional and modern scholarships), see my article, Yixin Gu 顧一心, "Speaking with the Learning of Odes: Cao Zhi's Representation of the *Shijing* and Its Hermeneutic Traditions in the Contexts of Han-Wei China," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 141.2 (2021): 299–328. The main part of this study was first presented at the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society (Western Branch) (Oct. 2019, UC Davis, Sacramento).

169 *Houhan shu* 35.1207.

tions. With all these learnings interiorized as his scholarly foundation, the young man—as informed by Zheng Xuan's later life experience[170]—eventually returned to where he started from and became a personal emblem of erudition, around whom a new scholarly community was formed. His erudition was constantly cultivated toward the higher level of broadness and comprehensiveness that incorporated manifold sources not merely from the three tutors mentioned above, but other traditions such as the *Maoshi* and the *Yili*.

These accounts altogether demonstrate the growing prominence of individual practices to broaden one's mastery of major classics and to transcend the boundaries between different hermeneutic traditions and scholastic lineages. The elements being involved such as *bo* and *tong* may not surprise readers with professional or even just casual acquaintance with the "history of canonical studies" (*jingxue shi* 經學史) or Chinese "intellectual history" in general. My study, however, is detached from a couple of previous understandings that consider the so-called *guwen*-versus-*jinwen* controversy as the most dominant framework that theoretically maps intellectual phenomena in the Han;[171] it especially rejects a risk of essentializing the values *bo* and *tong* as intrinsic elements of the studies of *guwen*.

Over the last one century, modern scholarship written in both Chinese and English had contested the *jinwen-guwen* dichotomy from several different perspectives.[172] To continue this line of

170 *Houhan shu* 35.1207–10. See also Wang Liqi, *Zheng Kangcheng nianpu* 鄭康成年譜 (Jinan: Qilu shushe, 1983), for a detailed investigation of Zheng Xuan's life experience.

171 See Zhou Yutong, *Jing jinguwen xue*; Shigezawa Toshiro, "Kinko bungaku no honshitsu," 669–97; Tjan Tjor Som trans., *Po Hu T'ung: The Comprehensive Discussions in the White Hall*, vol. 1, "Introduction," 137–41.

172 For two most influential opinions contesting the *jinwen-guwen* dichotomy as a later projection of the Han intellectual history, see Qian Mu, "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao," esp. 231–40; Nylan, "The Chin Wen/Ku Wen Con-

inquiry, the present study challenges the conventional dichotomy by demonstrating how an intellectual model of erudition rose to its preeminent status beyond any particular interest in *jinwen* or *guwen*. It is hardly a matter of dispute that, during the Han dynasty, there existed a specific range of texts categorized as *jinwen* and *guwen* according to the specific written forms in which they were once embodied when being recognized, presented, and remarked. It is also true that a considerable number of scholars characterized as *bo* and *tong* were known for their mastery of specific texts tagged as *guwen*. However, most of these scholars were cultivated on the basis of an expansive scheme of literary learning beyond the division between *guwen* and *jinwen* as a pair of tags. To be precise, the temptation to study a text tagged as *guwen* was not a mere fetishization of its oldness embedded in an archaic written form, but oftentimes an interest in its position outside of the institutional matrix of canonical studies, a position that made the text itself an ideal object that served the ambition to extend, cultivate, and perform one's erudition beyond limitation.[173] Therefore, the growing interest in *guwen* constituted a minor piece of a larger picture of the syncretic, integrative, and encompassing mode of literary learning, one that Yang Xiong, Liu Xin, and Ban Gu constructed as a model also in the name of *gu* but in the specific sense of taking "antiquity" as a

troversy," 83–145. See also Hans van Ess, "The Apocryphal Texts of the Han Dynasty," 29–64, where he partly stays in line with the traditional dichotomy yet also declares that *gu* and *jin* were "two poles between which a great variety of opinions was possible" (quote 62); Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," 76–80; Zhao Lu 趙璐, *In Pursuit of the Great Peace: Han Dynasty Classicism and the Making of Early Medieval Literati Culture* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2019), 185–97.

173 See *Hanshu* 36.1967–71, for Liu Xin's proposal to incorporate the four non-canonized *guwen* corpus into official canonical studies, and his vigorous engagement in the subsequent debate; and *Houhan shu* 36.1230–32, for Chen Yuan's 陳元 engagements in a court debate on the *Zuozhuan* 左傳 in the early Eastern Han. Zhou Yutong, representatively, regards these two debates primarily as a pair of instantiations of the *jinwen-guwen* dichotomy. See Zhou, *Jing jinguwen xue*, 16–20.

rhetorical source of authority.[174] In these regards, neither the orthographic difference between *jinwen* and *guwen* (as two forms of writing) nor the separated transmission of particular texts categorized as such (as two tags of naming) is a matter of division as foundational as the following—namely, put in its baldest, that between the institution and the idealized notion of individuality equipped with erudition.[175]

2.2. The Extension of Individual Mastery of Knowledge and Texts

In *Fayan* 1.19, a passage conforming to the spirit of the "ancient" model of literary learning proposed in the same book (*Fayan* 7.8), the master voice of Yang Xiong demonstrates his scholarly principle within a broader scheme of intellectual inquiry beyond all the "Five Classics" and their hermeneutic attachments. The master confirms, approvingly, that there can be texts undertaking values and contents equal to the "classics/canons" (*jing*) yet not as institutionally privileged and regulated as the latter, and that a principled scholar should study and master a text like that regardless of its status as a *jing* or not.[176] On a theoretical level, the statement downplays the centrality of *jing* not as a corpus of texts that are inherently sacred and unmatchable but, more precisely, as a status as well as an attribute endorsed by institutional authority and hence opened to intellectual

174 See my reading and analyses of their discourses in Chapter 1.

175 Xu Fuguan proposes a similar argument concerning this fundamental controversy in Han intellectual world, one that he regards as more important than the separated transmission of particular classical texts through particular tutors and trainings. Xu then categorizes—roughly and inadequately—scholars whose expanded their learnings and detached from the official academic system of *boshi* and *zhangju* as "free-minded scholarly community" (自由學派), which included Yang Xiong, Liu Xin, Huan Tan, and Wang Chong. See Xu Fuguan, "Wang Chong lunkao," 536–37. For a further discussion of Xu Fuguan's arguments, see the following part of the present chapter.

176 *Fayan yishu*, 31, as previously discussed in Chapter 1.

challenges. Correspondingly, the master encourages a practice of broadening one's horizon toward an unlimited range of text and knowledge, a realm beyond existing canonical corpus but subject to alternative criteria and evaluations.

For an Eastern Han elaboration on the same idea, see Wang Chong's statement in the *Lunheng*—

> 夫儒生之業，五經也。南面爲師，旦夕講授章句，滑習義理，究備於五經，可也。五經之後，秦漢之事不能知者，短也。夫知古不知今，謂之陸沉，然則儒生所謂陸沉者也。五經之前，至於天地始開、帝王初立者，主名爲誰，儒生又不知也。夫知今不知古，謂之盲瞽。五經比於上古，猶爲今也。徒能說經，不曉上古，然則儒生所謂盲瞽者也。[177]
>
> The business of the *ru* is all about the Five Classics. Facing south as a tutor, teaching chapters-and-sentences (*zhangju*) from morning to evening, getting familiarized with their meanings and principles, and eventually reaching the complete mastery of all the Five Classics—these are what they are capable of doing. However, what came after the Five Classics, as well as the events of the Qin and the Han that they are incapable of knowing, are their shortcomings. [The condition of] knowing the past/antiquity but not knowing the present is called "land-sinking." Being this the case, the *ru* shall be called "land-sinking." As for what happened prior to the Five Classics, as far back as the initial opening of Heaven-and-Earth and the establishment of the earliest kings, as well as what was/were the name(s) of the dominator(s) [of that time], the *ru*, again, have no idea. [The condition of] knowing the present but not knowing the past/antiquity is called "eyes-blinded." Compared to the high antiquity, the Five Classics shall be still regarded as belonging to the present. The *ru* merely talk about the classics yet have no idea about the high antiquity. Being this the case, they shall be called "eyes-blinded" too.

The statement stands out as a proposal for the extension of individual mastery of knowledge and texts in two aspects. First, from a linear point of view, Wang challenged the inherent limit of time span covered by canonical studies, envisioning a broadened scheme of intellectual inquiry from the

177 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 555.

beginning through the recent age. Accordingly, from a non-linear point of view, his argument conceptually weakened the primacy and centrality of any particular archive and repository, but aspired for an open-minded condition of encompassing "knowing/understanding" (*zhi* 知) of whatever matter to one's interest.

From the eve of the Eastern Han onward, the motif of expanding individual mastery of knowledge and texts toward no particular end gained prominence and significance among the literate community. It would be inadequate to cherry-pick even a great number of individual cases and exemplary figures that cover every generation under focus. Exemplary figures, as well as their remarkable acts, thoughts, and practices, had been repeatedly discussed as the highlighted parts of a literary culture by a fruitful series of scholarship. Many of these individual cases are certainly to be revisited in the present study as well. Before that, however, it is useful to approach another inquiry into the foundation of language and knowledge, a repository from which a set of concepts and notions regarding the literary culture of the Han dynasty and beyond can be delivered, generalized, and examined. Specifically, this approach incorporates an investigation of a wealth of lexical items spread over a variety of sources across a wide time span. These lexical indicators altogether instantiate the living flux of utterances and expressions by which the model of individual erudition became an emblematic construction of socio-cultural ideology.

It is first necessary to reflect on the nature, value, and textuality of the enormity of textual evidence that is transmitted to our hands. The available materials have inevitably gone through a great deal of changes over centuries, a condition that raises methodological challenges but also great po-

tentials to an inquiry into the patterns and meanings of a wealth of recurring key words in varying contexts. In what follows, I will offer an analytical examination of a constellation of descriptive terms—all as compound words[178]—such as *boxue* ("broadly learned"), *bolan* ("broadly reading/viewing"), *bowu* ("broadly learned about things"), *botong* ("broadly comprehending"), *tongren* ("comprehensive man"), and *tongru* ("comprehensive *ru*") from a larger repository of their synonyms or similar utterances. The recurring uses of *bo* and *tong* in this lexical repository demonstrate their unmatchable prominence compared to any other single element in the descriptions and imaginations of literary practices and intellectual lives from the eve of the Eastern Han onward. They are, therefore, performed as the two core elements that constituted the conceptual foundation for the representation and public recognition of individual erudition.

A considerable proportion of these terms, as previously discussed, are indicative of the syncretic and integrative mode of studying classics and their hermeneutic traditions during the Han.[179] As the investigation proceeds to a broader range of literary practices beyond canonical studies, a reviewer is witness, then, to a remarkably growing wealth of instances of relevant vocabulary in terms of both quantity and diversity. The lexical items now incorporated in the analysis share the same features and natures with those I analyzed in Section 1, that they were, simply put, brief and descriptive textual modules commonly seen in Han (especially Eastern Han) materials including

178 For a selective range of linguistic approaches to the overall proliferation of compound words from the Eastern Han onwards, see Feng Shengli 馮勝利, "Prosodic Structure and Compound Words in Classical Chinese," in *New Approaches to Chinese Word Formation: Morphology, Phonology and the Lexicon in Modern and Ancient Chinese*, ed. Jerome Packard (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998), 197–260; Xu Zhengkao 徐正考, *Lunheng tongyici yanjiu* 《論衡》同義詞研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2004); Wang Yunlu 王雲路, *Zhonggu hanyu cihui shi* 中古漢語詞彙史 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2010), esp. 95–171.

179 See section 1 of the present chapter.

transmitted texts and stele inscriptions; phrased in regular, formulaic and therefore more stable forms that better endure changeability; not politically problematic to a degree that required editorial rewriting; and finally, not to be taken as infallible words with verbatim precision but with allowance for comparatively minor lexical or graphic variance that keep their basic meanings stable. And again, the performative and commemorative natures of these utterances reveal themselves not as straightforward accounts of historicity but, more fruitfully, the verbal manifestations of an extensive backdrop of ideas, beliefs, and values among which "broadness" and "comprehensiveness" gained their meanings and positions.

My investigation begins with the four historiographic works—namely, the *Hanshu*, *Dongguan Hanji*, *Sanguo zhi* 三國志, and *Houhan shu* that constitute the most important textual repositories of available materials. Within this database, my survey covers a selected range of descriptive lexical items by means of recording every context where a specific instance occurs, as well as the perspective—narrative or quotative, if any—from which that instance comes forward. The *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*, though being the furthest from each other regarding the dates of composition, stand out as a pair of ideal samples for one-on-one comparison, for they match each other in terms of the size of volumes, the time span, and the arrangements of materials.[180] In more than one aspect, the *Dongguan Hanji* could have been a more reliable database of Eastern Han materials; yet the ex-

180 This is not to disregard a series of differences between the *Houhan shu* and the *Hanshu* in terms of their principles, strategies, and arrangements of materials, especially that the *Houhan shu* shows more diverse interest in compiling the "Arrayed Biographies" (*liezhuan* 列傳) by means of its overall expansion of individual accounts, as well as its setting of a series of new categories for historical figures. See Stephen Durrant, "The Place of *Hou Hanshu* in Early Chinese Historiography," *Monumenta Serica* 67:1 (2019): 174, esp. Note 41, for a general overview of previous opinions on this issue.

isting volumes of this book are too incomplete to support a fruitful comparison with the other three. The *Sanguo zhi*, with its main body constructed by Chen Shou 陳壽 (233–297 CE) and the immense materials compiled in Pei Songzhi's 裴松之 (372–451 CE) commentary, is doubtlessly rich in evidence for any inquiry into literary culture from the late Eastern Han through the Three Kingdoms. Nevertheless, the main body of the *Sanguo zhi* was constructed in a comparatively small size and with a succinct style of writing. The commentary of Pei Songzhi, albeit being the single most informative collection of materials related to this period, was a miscellaneous collection of dispersed sources that differed in nature from the four historiographic compilations in general.[181] That said, the overall results in my survey of all the four compilations are rich in evidence by offering a repository of utterances in their mutually related linguistic, intellectual, and socio-cultural contexts. For the readers' information, I attach the data I collected from the *Dongguan Hanji* and the *Sanguo zhi* in Appendix 1, with the same format as the following tables about the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*.

Table 5 shows the distribution of four descriptive terms associated with *bo* ("broadness") in the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*. Each of these terms is a combination of *bo* and another verbal el-

181 On the methods, styles, and strategies of Chen Shou and Pei Songzhi's compilations, as well as the underlying transition of historiography toward a more miscellaneous condition of variation and proliferation in early medieval China, see Hu Baoguo 胡寶國, *Han Tang jian shixue de fazhan* 漢唐間史學的發展 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2014), 69–90. For a larger range of relevant references in traditional and modern scholarships, see Liu Zhiji's 劉知幾 criticism, in Pu Qilong 浦起龍 annot., *Shi tong tongshi* 史通通釋 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1978), 116–17; Zhao Yi's 趙翼 discussion of Chen Shou's *shufa* 書法 ("rules of writing"), in Wang Shumin 王樹民 annot., *Nianer shi zhaji jiaozheng* 廿二史札記校證 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1984), 121–25; Gao Ming 高敏, "*Sanguo zhi* Pei Songzhi zhu yingshu kao"《三國志》裴松之注引書考, *Henan keji daxue xuebao* 河南科技大學學報, No. 3 (2007): 5–21; Qiu Luming 仇鹿鳴, *Wei Jin zhi ji de zhengzhi quanli yu jiazu wangluo* 魏晉之際的政治權力與家族網絡 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2012), 20–31.

ement, which specifies a certain scholarly activity or object such as *xue* ("learning"), *wu* 物 ("things"), *lan* ("viewing/reading"), and *tong* ("comprehending") that can be studied or conducted in a "broad" way. The four terms are selected from a larger constellation of utterances consisting of the word *bo* that includes phrases like *bowen* ("broadly informed"), *bocai* 博采/博採 ("broadly collecting/selecting"), and *boqia* 博洽 ("broad and rich [in learning]"), which were nevertheless not as commonly used as the four selected ones.

Table 5
Boxue, *Bowu*, *Bolan*, and *Botong* in the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*

Terms		*Hanshu*			*Houhan shu*		
		Total	W. H.	W. H. C.	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
博學	*Boxue*	10	9	1	25	24	4
博覽	*Bolan*	5	4	3	9	8	2
博物	*Bowu*	4	4	0	9	7	7
博通	*Botong*	3	3	1	20	20	1
	Sum	22	20	5	63	59	14

* "W. H." as the abbreviation for "Western Han," and "E. H." for "Eastern Han." "C." indicates that the sample is specified as a citation of a specific person or writing of the respective period.

The numbers put into the three columns under the title of each compilation mark the occurrences of a given term in that book (1) in total; (2) in contexts where that term refers to the practices or features of specific figures in the dynastic era that the book was primarily about;[182] (3) identifiably cited or quoted from a person or a source dated to that era. The numbers in column 2 are usual-

182 In doing this, I have carefully excluded a comparatively small number of cases in which a specific *bo*-related term was not meant to be descriptive or narrative.

ly—and not surprisingly—close to the total numbers in column 1, but those in column 3 normally count as a small proportion only. On the one hand, it would be risky to grant each data an equivalent value, and it is necessary to distinguish the utterances attributed to particular persons or texts from those that are unspecified. On the other hand, it would be arbitrary as well to downplay the unspecified voices—which comprise the majority of available samples—into silence, for many of them could have come from sources as validly old as they were foregrounded to be. In general, the formation of all the four historiographic works under review largely depended on previous textual records, and there were cases in which a whole chapter or volume was directly based on a pre-existing source. Yet the demand for stylistic consistency could have often accommodated a linguistic material into a narrative tone without marking the source from which it was drawn in the first place, let alone a greater variety of deliberate or random changeability that could have happened to old materials in all steps of textual composition. Simply put, in the cases under review, if an investigation is limited only to materials distinctly cited or quoted from an "old" source dated to a given era, it would highly underrate the wealth—as well as the degree of reliability—of evidence for that era that are actually contained in a late-emerging database.

Confronted with all these issues, the task is, therefore, to begin with a description of the distributional patterns of all selected terms in all three ways of occurrence (as reflected in the three columns). In every case of comparison, the total occurrence of a selected term in the *Houhan shu* usually outnumbers—and sometimes greatly exceeds—that in the *Hanshu*. Moreover, the overall occurrences of the four selected *bo*-related terms (as shown in numbers at the bottom of the table)

in columns 1, 2, and 3 reflect basically the same ratio of increase from the *Hanshu* to the *Houhan shu* (22 versus 63, 20 versus 59, and 5 versus 14). The same is true as I applied the same methods of comparison to another cluster of descriptive terms—namely, *duowen* ("extensively informed"), *qiawen* ("richly informed"), and *duozhi* 多識 ("extensively knowing/understand"), all of which characterize the capability of mastering and internalizing an extensive range of knowledge and texts. The following table is indicative of fundamentally the same pattern of diachronic increase from the *Hanshu* to the *Houhan shu*. These observations in general tend to minimize—albeit never erase—the chronological gaps between the "specified" and "unspecified" accounts. Consequently, the foregoing analyses grant greater confidence to take the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu* as reliable reflections of the increasingly emblematic status of scholarly broadness from the Western Han through the Eastern Han.

Table 6
Duowen, *Qiawen*, and *Duozhi* in the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*

Terms		*Hanshu*			*Houhan shu*		
	Total	W. H.	W. H. C.	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
多聞 *Duowen*	6	3	2	5	3	2
洽聞 *Qiawen*	4	3	3	9	7	6
多識 *Duozhi*	1	1	0	3	3	2
Sum	11	7	5	17	13	10

It becomes possible and meaningful, then, to take a more detailed examination of all the seven selected lexical items within their surrounding contexts. The Eastern Han accounts in general provide

a way more diverse range of information about what is objected to a particular "broad" or "extensive" practices of learning. In the *Hanshu*, however, the selected terms come forward often without any object mentioned after. Among the overall 33 occurrences of these terms in the *Hanshu*, there are only five instances in which a given term is followed by a reference to a certain range of object(s). All of them are phrased in generic terms such as *liuyi*, *jingshu* 經書 ("canons/classics and texts"), *gujin* 古今 ("the past and the present"), and *jiuwen* 舊聞 ("old sayings").[183] By contrast, among the overall 80 occurrences of these terms in the *Houhan shu*, as many as 28 of them are followed by a reference to certain object(s). To be specific, nearly half of these 28 instances specify and categorize the objects in terms of *jingdian* 經典, *wujing*, *jingji* 經籍, *jingxue*, and so on that are literally associated with canonical studies, while the other half of them are connected with another cluster of phrases that denote a more extensive range of texts and knowledge. This phenomenon is indicative of a radical expansion of what were supposed to be "broadly" covered by literary learning in the Eastern Han context. The second cluster of utterances includes, for example, commonplace terms such as *gujin*, *qunshu* 群書 ("clusters of texts/documents"), *shuzhuan* 書傳 ("texts/documents and traditions"), and *shuji* 書記 ("texts/documents and records"), as well as something more specific such as the phrase "the words of the Hundred Schools" (*baijia zhi yan* 百家之言), which appears twice, respectively characterizing Wang Chong and Yan Du's 延篤 (d. 167 CE) practices of "broadly comprehending" (*botong*).[184] The image of Cai Yong portrayed in the

183 The five references are respectively related to: Liu Dan 劉旦; Gu Yong 谷永; the "*ru* in antiquity" 古之儒者 addressed by Ban Gu; Emperor Cheng 成帝; Tang Lin 唐林 and Ji Qun 紀逡 (mentioned together).

184 *Houhan shu* 49.1629; 64.2103. For more textual references for one's extensive learning of *baijia* 百家, see also *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 675, *Houhan shu* 40A.1330 (for the case of Ban Gu); *Houhan shu* 35.1211 (Zheng Xuan);

Houhan shu best exemplifies the diversity of objects and materials incorporated into one's extensive learning in the late Eastern Han context. Right after mentioning his "broad learning" (*boxue*), the text offers a brief overview of his versatile talents in literary writing, numerology, astrology, and music,[185] as well as a contemporary comment that he "extensively knew" (*duozhi*) "the events of the Han" 漢事.[186] What makes the proliferation of objects particularly clear is the increasing use of the term *bowu* ("broadly learned about things"), which in itself incorporates the concept *wu* ("things") that generalizes an unspecified yet diverse range of objects of learning.[187] In the *Houhan shu*, the term has nine occurrences in total, in which as many as seven are cited from specific Eastern Han figures who referred to previous models and contemporary figures. The growing prominence of *bowu* particularly reflects the scholarly interest in collecting and synthesizing multiple phenomena and materials beyond any previous boundaries of scholarly activities.

The increasingly emblematic status of *bo* as a scholarly value during and after the Han withstood another phenomenon since pre-imperial China—namely, the validity of *bo* as a matter of ambivalence in both moral and intellectual terms. To be precise, the usage of *bo*—with its basic, neutral meaning as "broad/broadness"—fell into a wide spectrum of possible implications, a spec-

---

Wang Shen 王沈, *Weishu* 魏書, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 2.57 (Cao Pi 曹丕). For a detailed investigation of the meaning and usage of the expression *baijia* in early Chinese sources, see Petersen, "Which Books Did the First Emperor of Ch'in Burn."

185 *Houhan shu* 60B.1980.

186 *Houhan shu* 60B.2006.

187 For a study on this term/concept in particular and its involvement with Han literature, especially the writings of *fu* 賦, see Xu Gongchi 徐公持, "Handai wenxue de zhishihua tezheng: yi Han fu bowu quxiang wei zhongxin de kaocha" 漢代文學的知識化特徵：以漢賦"博物"取向爲中心的考察, *Wenxue yichan* 文學遺產, No. 1 (2014): 17–30. The traditional utterance that best supports this approach is an early third century reference to Zhang Heng's 張衡 "Erjing fu" 二京賦 as "a text with broad information about things" 博物之書. See *Sanguo zhi* 11.340. For a further discussion of the reception of the "Erjing fu," see Chapter 4.

trum from a positive sense of openness, inclusiveness, and comprehensiveness to a negative—subtly or explicitly—sense of excessiveness, miscellaneousness, or the failure in understanding the more profound essence of reality.[188] Oftentimes, the messages encoded in a given instance of *bo* can be informed by other superior or inferior value to which it is related in a given context. Such a context-dependent flexibility is shown, especially when *bo* was related or the notion *yue* ("conciseness/essentialness") or *yao* 要 ("essentialness/importance"). The subtle tension between *bo* and *yue* can be traced back to the utterances located in the *Lunyu* and beyond where *bo* and *yue* was respectively—both in positive tones—associated with *wen* and *li* (as previously discussed). The *Laozi*, with its well-known affinity to the principle of conciseness against excessiveness, prepared another foundation for the elaboration of the *bo-yue* tension in Han intellectual world. Following these, consider a quote of Sima Tan 司馬談 (d. 110 BCE) in the *Shiji* 史記 saying that the *ru* who modeled on the "Six Arts/Classics" were exhausted by the accumulated enormity of textual materials and, therefore, "broad in learning but poor in grasping the essential ideas, diligent in working but fruitless in making accomplishments" 博而寡要, 勞而少功.[189] The problem of *bo* was hence a tension between a belief and a fact—namely, the presumably concise nature of the

188 In addition to more Han utterances to be discussed later, suffice it to mention the following examples in early Chinese texts: For cases presented in a positive tone, see *Lunyu* 6.27, 12.15, and 9.11 (as previously discussed in Chapter 1); and *Liji* 禮記, "Zhong yong" 中庸, where *boxue* 博學 occurs as the first of the five positive behaviors of self-cultivation (*Liji zhengyi* 禮記正義, *Shisanjing zhushu*, 1632). For cases presented in a negative tone, see the *Laozi*, "One who understands is not broad, and one who is broad does not understand." 知者不博，博者不知 (Lou Yulie 樓宇烈 annot., *Laozi Daode jing zhu jiaoshi* 老子道德經注校釋 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008], 191–92); *Xunzi*, "If one is broadly informed and great at memorization yet does not conform to the kingly order, the noble men would regard him as inferior." 博聞彊志，不合王制，君子賤之 (*Xunzi jijie*, 409); and finally, a quote of Kongzi accusing Shaozheng Mao 少正卯 first seen in the *Xunzi*, "(of someone like Shaozheng Mao) the possession of memory is disgraceful but broad" 記醜而博 (Ibid., 521).

189 *Shiji* 130.3290.

truth and, simultaneously, the overall proliferation of textual materials to be confronted.

Within this context, Yang Xiong appears to be the first Han scholar who repeatedly managed to resolve such a tension in his own terms. In *Fayan* 7.8, in response to a critical opinion that he attributed to Sima Qian (one that resembled the previously mentioned passage in the *Shiji*), Yang suggested that the ideal model of broad learning he proposed in the name of *gu* has no conflict with the principle of *yue*, for it gets rid of the tediousness of unnecessary explanations and the institutional matrix of scholarship in terms of *ke*.[190] Such a syncretic and integrative approach was also presented in other passages of the *Fayan*. For example, in *Fayan* 2.16, Yang argued that *yue* is specifically applicable to a condition of being "extensively informed" (*duowen*) and, accordingly, "if one is poorly informed, there is no point about conciseness/essentialness" 寡聞則無約.[191] In this regard, the principles of "broadness"—not in terms of *bo* per se in this case—and "conciseness" are not contradictory but reciprocally interconnected with each other: The former constitutes a necessary precondition to be hence navigated, along with the latter, toward a higher status of epistemology. For a couple of other references, Yang also proposed that one, while learning from various texts, should focus on the essential (*yao*) points by following the principles of Kongzi, so as to avoid a disordered condition of excessive proliferation that he metaphorically referred to as "book

190 See Chapter 1, for a detailed analysis of this *Fayan* passage.

191 *Fayan* 2.16 (*Fayan yishu*, 77). The full quote of this saying, "If one is extensively informed, he shall retain it by [the principle of] conciseness/essentialness (*yue*); if one sees a great deal, he shall retain it by [concentrating on] what is outstanding. If one is poorly informed, there is no point about conciseness/essentialness; if one sees only a little, there is no point about what is outstanding." 多聞則守之以約，多見則守之以卓。寡聞則無約也，寡見則無卓也。

store" (*shusi* 書肆).[192] Similarly, he suggested, that one should follow the sagely model—in terms of *shengren* 聖人—to synthesize one's "extensive knowing" (*duozhi* 多知) from the risk of *za* 雜 ("miscellaneousness").[193]

The tension between *bo* and *yue* continued to exert significant influences on the Eastern Han intellectual world. Fan Sheng, in a court discussion on a proposal to incorporate the *Zuozhuan* and the Bi tradition of the *Yi* into official academic system, quoted the old saying about *bo* and *yue* yet emphasized the latter only, so as to justify his objection against the expansion of imperial patronage of previously non-canonized texts (in this case, the *Zuozhuan* in particular).[194] By contrast, Ban Gu and Wang Chong, in their revisionary appropriations of the same notion, attached importance to the value of *bo* but left aside *yue* probably in order to avoid controversy.[195] Considering the various ways of conceptualization of *bo* vis-à-vis *yue* (and to a lesser extent *yao*) in different contexts, it is not merely fruitless but misleading to generalize a single universally accepted understanding of each of these two terms during the Han. Yet there was indeed a progressively developed and interiorized notion from the late Western Han onward—as shown in Yang Xiong, Liu Xin, Ban Gu, and Wang Chong's arguments—that justified *bo* as a positive value for the extension of one's learning, as well as a manageable tool to achieve a synthesized status of comprehensive knowledge, with also a caution to avoid the risks of excessiveness and miscellaneousness involved in that pro-

192 *Fayan* 2.14 (*Fayan yishu*, 74). For a specific discussion of this metaphor and its implication of book market, see Chapter 5.

193 *Fayan* 5.16 (*Fayan yishu*, 163).

194 *Houhan shu* 36.1228. See also Chapter 1, for a detailed analysis of this event.

195 *Hanshu* 88.3589; *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 592. See also Chapter 1, for detailed analyses.

cess. In this sense, what they put into practices through their engagements with both canonical and non-canonical studies was not to apply equivalent values onto all kinds of knowledge and texts without clarification and differentiation, but an effort to reach a better mastery of what they considered as important and valuable within an extended intellectual scheme.[196] Such a positive conceptualization of *bo* was further reflected in the growing prominence of *bo*-related utterances during and after the Eastern Han.

For a late Eastern Han reflection on the theoretical problems of *bo* and *yue*, see the following argument of Xun Yue 荀悅 (148–209 CE) in his *Shenjian* 申鑒, where the master voice offers a lesson to an imagined interlocutor—

> 或曰：“至德要道約爾，典籍甚富，如而博之以求約也？”“語有之曰：‘有鳥將來，張羅待之。’得鳥者一目也，今爲一目之羅，無時得鳥矣。道雖要也，非博無以通矣。博其方，約其說。”[197]
>
> Someone asked,
>
> > “The ultimate virtue (*de*) and the essential principle (*dao*) are just concise, yet the textual sources are tremendously abundant. On this account, how can one acquire the conciseness through the process of broadness?”
>
> Reply:
>
> > “There is a saying that, ‘When a bird is about to come, settle a net and wait.’ What catches the bird is just one grid [of the net], but if one settles a net that has only one grid, there will be no chance to catch that bird. Although the principle is concise, there is no way but through broadness that one can achieve it. Be broadness the key of method/scope, and

196 For their practices that exemplified such extensive learning across either canonical or non-canonical materials, see *Hanshu* 36.1967 (Liu Xiang and Liu Xin); Ibid., 87A.3514 (Yang Xiong); *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 675, and *Houhan shu* 40A.1330 (Ban Gu); Ibid., 49.1629 (Wang Chong). Wang Chong, though in praise of the ideal conception of *bo*, was aware of the risk of excessive proliferation of what he regarded as misleading notions and utterances in the widely expanding texts and knowledge. This is especially shown in the three chapters titled with *zeng* 增 (“proliferation”) and nine with *xu* 虛 (“insubstantiality”) in the *Lunheng*.

197 Huang Xingzeng 黃省曾 and Sun Qizhi 孫啟治 annots. *Shenjian zhu jiaobu* 申鑒注校補 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2012), 100.

conciseness the key of discourse/explanation."

The passage stands out as a closure of my inquiry into the intellectual anxiety in dealing with the ambivalence of *bo* throughout the Han dynasty. The metaphors of "net" and "bird," as well as the term *fang* 方 as a pun referring to both "method" and "scope," altogether reflect Xun Yue's configuration of *bo* as a scholarly value—namely, a practice of extending the network of one's mastery of knowledge and texts in order to better grasp the presumably "essential" and "concise" (in terms of *yue* and *yao*) meanings, a "bird" that is otherwise uncatchable. Conceptually conforming to what Yang Xiong proposed in *Fayan* 2.16, Xun Yue's argument was articulated in a rhetorically more persuasive way. The conflicts between *bo* and *yue*, according to the passage, can be resolved by prescribing the two values respectively as the tool and the goal within the same scheme of intellectual inquiry.

The concept *tong* constituted the core element of another series of descriptive terms that denoted a comprehensive mode of learning and inquiry. In the following table, I incorporate four lexical indicators that are representative—namely, *botong* (see also my analysis of the *bo*-related terms), *jiantong* (see also my analysis of the syncretic and integrative mode of studying major classics), and the two titles *tongru* ("comprehensive *ru*") and *tongren* ("comprehensive man"). Compared to Table 5, the rising tendency of *tong*-related terms from the *Hanshu* to the *Houhan shu* is even more remarkable than the growing prominence of *bo*. This phenomenon implies that *tong* gained currency as an exemplary value perhaps at a comparatively later stage.

Table 7
Botong, *Jiantong*, *Tongru*, and *Tongren* in the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*

Terms		*Hanshu*			*Houhan shu*		
		Total	W. H.	W. H. C.	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
博通	*Botong*	3	3	1	20	20	1
兼通	*Jiantong*	3	3	0	8	8	0
通儒	*Tongru*	1	1	0	12	12	2
通人	*Tongren*	0	0	0	8	2	4
	Sum	7	7	1	48	42	7

The term *tong* entailed a wide range of possible meanings applicable to literary and intellectual activities.[198] Rudolf G. Wagner and K. E. Brashier have respectively emphasized its basic meaning as "penetrating" yet on two different levels—namely, the notion of "penetrating the meaning" of a text without verbatim precision (Wagner) and the capability of "penetrating" a text in the specific sense of one's familiarity with its textual contents insofar as being able to memorize and hence recite it thoroughly (Brashier).[199] The second rendering may work particularly well for a recurring expression that a specific figure *tong* a specific classic, sometimes in terms of the formulaic utterance *tong yijing* 通一經. This recurring phenomenon, to a larger degree, reflects the condition of institutional regulation within the Han official academic system by means of education, selection, and examination. However, such an explanation becomes unsettling when it is tentatively applied to terms such as *jiantong*, *botong*, *tongren*, and *tongru*, for these terms in their contexts were associated

198 Zhao Guohua 趙國華, "Handai xueshu zhuti pinglun yanjiu" 漢代學術主體評論研究, *Nandu xuetan* 南都學壇, No. 1 (2007): 3; Brashier, *Public Memory in Early China*, 29.

199 Wagner, *The Craft of a Chinese Commentator*, 39; Brashier, *Public Memory in Early China*, 29. For a detailed investigation of the acts and representations of memorization and recitation in Han-Wei China, see Chapter 5.

with a syncretic mode of learning that traversed a broad—sometimes exaggeratively extensive—spectrum of texts and traditions. If one takes *tong* in such contexts as an indicator of the capabilities of memorization and recitation of a whole text, he/she may fairly ask, "Was that true that someone—for example, Wang Chong and Yan Du[200]—was indeed able to recite, even just loosely, the 'Words of the Hundred Schools'?" or, "Did these texts reach a degree of stability and precision according to which one's recitation could be examined and evaluated in terms of accuracy?"

With these queries, I suggest considering *tong* within these contexts in an alternative way that is compatible to what Wagner vaguely defines as "penetrating the meaning" but, simultaneously, works particularly well in explaining the growing prominence of *tong* within a scheme of broadened multiplicity of texts and knowledge. Namely, *tong* could refer to a gesture or a capability of "penetrating" not merely the words or the meanings of a particular text thoroughly from the beginning through the end, but also the boundary that sets a given text apart from the others. Such a gesture of penetration, therefore, indicates one's comprehension of texts and knowledge by liberating them from the archives, repositories, or categories where they are located and, furthermore, bringing them into a broadened, interpenetrated scheme of appropriation and integration.[201] In other words, *tong* shows conformity to a syncretic notion of "comprehensiveness" instead of that of word-by-word familiarity with specific textual objects. This understanding works in concert with

200 *Houhan shu* 49.1629; 64.2103.

201 This understanding of *tong* works in concert with Zhang Xuecheng. In his *Wenshi tongyi* ("Shi tong" chapter), according to a series of Han compilations titled with *tong* and some related terms such as *yitong* 異同 and *jijie* 集解, Zhang explained *tong* as an indicator of one's syncretic and integrative comprehension of various classical sources with no affiliation to any particular scholastic lineage and textual tradition. See *Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu*, 372. For a further discussion on this issue, see Chapter 4.

what Wang Chong proposed in the *Lunheng*, that the value of *tong* does not rest with the number of words and volumes that one recites and reads, but one's capability of making effective use of them (especially by means of literary productions).[202] Consider too, the late Eastern Han dictionary *Shiming* 釋名, in which the meaning of *tong* was further expounded as, "to penetrate, and that by which all can be passed through and penetrated with no exception" 洞也，無所不貫洞也.[203]

The term *Botong*, which in-itself combines the two prominent values into a lexical unity, indicates a late-emerging recognition of a condensed scholarly individuality as being "broad" and "comprehensive" at once. In a broader sense, such conceptual connectivity is widely shown in a wealth of cases in which scholars were presented as *bo* and *tong* in similar or closely related contexts in either contemporary or later sources. For one of the most arresting examples in the Eastern Han, consider the image of Ma Rong, who was pictured in a set of interrelated narrative scenarios as "broadly comprehending classics and transmitted texts" (*botong jingji* 博通經籍),[204] "broad and rich (in learning)" (*boqia*),[205] "broadly learned about things and richly informed" (*bowu qiawen* 博物洽聞),[206] and, more than once, a *tongru*.[207]

In the Eastern Han context, the emergence and proliferation of scholarly titles in the name of *tong*—especially *tongren* and *tongru*—indicates how this value was used as a tag of identification. For

202 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 606.

203 *Shiming huijiao*, 175.

204 *Houhan shu* 60A.1953.

205 *Houhan shu* 60A.1972.

206 Ying Rong 潁容, "*Chunqiu shili* xu" 春秋釋例序, in Yan Kejun 嚴可均 comp., *Quan Shanggu Sandai Qin Han Sanguo Liuchao wen* 全上古三代秦漢三國六朝文 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1958), *Quan Houhan wen* 全後漢文, 86.938.

207 See *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 454; for a parallel account, see *Houhan shu* 60A.1972. See also *Houhan shu* 64.2116, for Lu Zhi's remark.

a theoretical reference to the term *tongren*, see Wang Chong's classification of four types of scholarly persona in his *Lunheng*, where he ranked them into a hierarchic array according to the degrees of their literary erudition and productivity—

> 故夫能說一經者爲儒生，博覽古今者爲通人，采掇傳書以上書奏記者爲文人，能精思著文連接篇章者爲鴻儒。故儒生過俗人，通人勝儒生，文人逾通人，鴻儒超文人。[208]
> On that account, one who is capable of (orally?) explaining one classic is a [regular] member of *ru* (*rusheng*); one who reads/views broadly from the past through the present is a comprehensive man (*tongren*); one who draws upon transmitted texts so as to submit official memorials and records is a literary man (*wenren*); and one who refines his thinking, produces his literary writings, and connects chapters and passages is a grand *ru* (*hongru*). On that account, a [regular] member of *ru* surpasses an ordinary person, a comprehensive man exceeds a [regular] member of *ru*, a literary man prevails over a comprehensive man, and a grand *ru* is superior to a literary man.

Wang Chong's definition of *tongren* was associated with a *bo*-related utterance, *bolan gujin* 博覽古今 ("read/view broadly from the past through the present"). According to Wang's classification, the identity of *tongren* was privileged as superior to the ordinary *rusheng* 儒生 in the specific sense of exploring a broad range of knowledge insofar as exceeding the latter's limits within the scope of "one classic" 一經. This idea also worked in concert with his statement—as previously discussed—about *bo* and *wen*.[209] Wang's arguments, therefore, presented *bo* and *tong* as a pair of core values with conceptual connectivity internal to the intellectual model of individual erudition, as opposed to the institutional sectarianism represented by the canonical studies in Han official academic system. Based on this, Wang then developed his argumentation toward a new stage of erudi-

208 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 607.

209 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 592. See Chapter 1, for a detailed analysis of this statement.

tion to present *bo* and *tong* via one's literary productions, a notion that instantiated the growing awareness of personal agency and authorial credits along with the surplus of literary productivity.[210]

Wang Chong's conceptual differentiation between *tongren* and *rusheng* also worked in concert with a specific Eastern Han notion, that a *ru* in a conventional sense was assumed not as comprehensive as a man titled as *tongren*. See, for example, the following scenario presented in an anecdote of Zheng Xuan (now preserved in his biography in the *Houhan shu*), one that constituted a charismatic moment in the formation of his scholarly image—

> （袁）紹客多豪俊，並有才說，見玄儒者，未以通人許之，競設異端，百家互起。玄依方辯對，皆得所未聞，莫不嗟服。[211]
> Among [Yuan] Shao's guests, there were a great number of vigorous and outstanding men who were both talented and eloquent. Recognizing [Zheng] Xuan as a *ru*, they had not yet regarded him as a comprehensive man (*tongren*). They competed to set up their statements on alternative standings, proposing theories of the Hundred Schools one after another. Xuan argued and responded them with reasons and strategies, making all of them learn something that they had never heard. All without exception sighed and admired him.

In the *Houhan shu* context, this scenario is presented in a banquet held by Yuan Shao 袁紹 (142–202 CE), once the strongest warlord in the late second century CE who invited Zheng Xuan among a great number of outstanding guests. In the beginning, the guests assume Zheng Xuan not as a *tongren* according to their first recognition of his identity: a *ru* scholar. This bias coincides with another opinion—also recorded in the *Houhan shu*—held by some scholars known as *tongren* who regarded Zheng Xuan's scholarship of making literary exegeses (*cixun* 辭訓) as being too "com-

210 For a detailed investigation of this issue, see Chapter 4.

211 *Houhan shu* 35.1211. See also Chapter 3, for a discussion of the plots following this scenario.

plicated" (*fan* 繁).[212] In the banquet scenario, then, the guests' attitude is responded by Zheng Xuan's spectacularly display of erudition that defeats all the challenging voices he confronts. In the triumph of his master voice, it is hardly a matter of dispute that the image of Zheng Xuan is now recognized as a *tongru*—namely, a dual persona that incorporates what makes him initially identified as a *ru* and, simultaneously, a "comprehensive man" (*tongren*) that he is now presented as. The emergence and proliferation of *tongru* as an identity, as well as the communicative context—as symbolically foregrounded in this scenario related to Zheng Xuan—in which it was recognized, are hence indicative of a meaningful connection between *tong* as a scholarly value and *ru* as a social identity.

As evidenced in a further investigation of textual data in the *Dongguan Hanji* and the *Sanguo zhi*, the majority of lexical indicators mentioned above were employed as a part of commonplace vocabulary from the latter half of the Eastern Han through the third century CE.[213] The Eastern Han tombstone inscriptions, then, constitute another important collection of textual evidence, where these utterances were widely applied for the remembrance and commemoration of the

212 *Houhan shu* 35.1212. This account works in concert with a traditional image of Zheng Xuan as an expert of "literary glosses" (*xungu* 訓詁) and, therefore, a precursor for the Qing evidential studies in the specific sense of focusing on fully explaining the lexical items transmitted in classical texts. Yet the issue is more complicated as one considers Zheng as a manager of his all-inclusive mastery of classical sources available to him, and that his methodologies in dealing with literary glosses was a flexible tool instead of the main body of his scholarship. For a useful case study querying Zheng's traditional image, see John Makeham, "The Earliest Extant Commentary on *Lunyu*: *Lunyu Zheng shi zhu*," *T'oung Pao* 83 (1997): 260–99; for an innovative discussion of Zheng's general methodologies and intellectual scheme published in recent years, see Qiao Xiuyan 喬秀巖 (Hashimoto Hidemi 橋本秀美), "Zhengxue diyi yuanli" 鄭學第一原理, in *Beijing dujing zaji* 北京讀經雜記 (Taipei: Wanjuan lou, 2013), 229–50.

213 Taking the same constellation of key terms as an entry, the samples spread over the *Dongguan Hanji* and the *Sanguo zhi* cover a broad range of scholars across two centuries such as Huan Tan, Ma Rong, Jia Kui, Zhou Ju, Huang Xiang 黃香, Ying Shao 應劭, Wang Can 王粲, Liu Zhen 劉禎, Zhang Zhao 張昭, Qiao Zhou 譙周, Kan Ze 闞澤, Zhong Hui 鍾會, etc. See also Appendix 1.

dead.[214] The enormity and interconnectivity of textual evidence under review demonstrate an ever-growing repository of ideas, utterances, and exemplary models, which altogether sustained the image-making of individuals equipped with erudition during and after the Han. It was within this context that *bo* and *tong* were performed as a pair of core values that fundamentally transformed the landscape of Chinese literary culture and intellectual lives.

In the past one century, it was not uncommon for scholars, especially those who wrote in Chinese, to incorporate a handful of these *bo*-or-*tong*-related concepts as essential elements in their general accounts or schematizations of the Han (especially the Eastern Han) intellectual and literary history. Qian Mu, for example, takes *jiantong* as the primary feature of an intellectual tradition that he conceptualizes as *guxue*, a broad and encompassing mode of learning beyond the institutional division of canonical studies.[215] Yu Yingshi 余英時, in dealing with a comparatively later period, places *jiantong* among a diverse range of individual values, from all of which he generalizes the notion of "Self-consciousness" (*zijue*) presumably located at the heart of multiple intellectual phenomena from the Eastern Han though the Jin dynasty.[216] Xu Fuguan 徐復觀, taking Yang Xiong as the first exemplar, demonstrates a specific intellectual persona that he entitles as a

214 For example, see the terms *boxue* and *duoshi*/*duozhi* 多識 applied to Kong Bao 孔褒 (*Hanbei quanji*, 1757; *Hanbei jishi*, 468); *bolan* 博覽 applied to Meng Guangzong 孟廣宗 (*Hanbei quanji*, 835; *Hanbei jishi*, 15) and Lu Jun 魯峻 (*Hanbei quanji*, 1495; *Hanbei jishi*, 390); *botong* 博通 applied to Yin Zhou 尹宙 (*Hanbei quanji*, 1608; *Hanbei jishi*, 425); *bowu* 博物 applied to Zhang Shou 張壽 (*Hanbei quanji*, 1181; *Hanbei jishi*, 300); *jiantong* 兼通 applied to Meng Guangzong (*Hanbei quanji*, 835; *Hanbei jishi*, 15), Lu Jun (*Habei quanji*, 1495, *Hanbei jishi*, 390), and Wu Liang 武梁 (Hong Shi 洪適 comp., *Lishi*・*lixu* 隸釋·隸續 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985], 74). For a detailed analysis of the case of Wu Liang, see Chapter 3.

215 Qian Mu, "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao," 238. For a detailed analysis of the term *guxue*, see Chapter 1.

216 Yu Yingshi, "Han Jin zhi ji shi zhi xin zijue yu xin sichao," 287–400, esp. 351–63. For a further discussion and critical reflection of the concept *zijue*, see Chapter 3, esp. Note 398.

"knowledge-in-focus type" (*zhishi xing* 知識型), to which the primary interest was the search of knowledge instead of morality and politics.[217] Correspondingly, Xu also configures a group-identity that he inadequately generalizes as "free-minded scholarly community" (*ziyou xuepai* 自由學派)—including Yang Xiong, Liu Xin, Huan Tan, and Wang Chong—who took *bo* and *tong* as fundamental approaches of intellectual inquiry with an oppositional stance against the official academic system of *boshi* and *zhangju*.[218] Similar to Xu Fuguan, Ge Zhaoguang 葛兆光 conceptualizes an ethos of "knowledge-centrism" (*zhishi zhongxin zhuyi* 知識中心主義) as a keynote in Eastern Han intellectual world, a notion that incorporates the three concepts *guxue*, *bowu*, and *tongru*.[219] On the two *tong*-related titles *tongru* and *tongren*, Yu Yingchun 于迎春 argues that their growing prominence demonstrates the conceptual transition of Eastern Han canonical studies from a manner of sectarianism toward open-ended learning.[220] Xu Gongchi 徐公持, with a more particular focus on the literary performance of erudition, associates a set of literary works—especially *fu* 賦 ("rhymed prose")—with the concept *bowu*, which he generally conflates with the concept *boxue* and defines as a practice of mastering various knowledge, especially philology and natural science.[221]

The previous studies had chronically—and often repeatedly—referred to a small proportion

217 Xu Fuguan, "Yang Xiong lunjiu" 揚雄論究, in *Liang Han sixiangshi*, vol. 2, 421–26.

218 Xu Fuguan, "Wang Chong lunkao," 532–41.

219 Ge Zhaoguang 葛兆光, *Zhongguo sixiangshi* 中國思想史 (Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2014), vol. 1, 281–84. For another reference regarding the ethos of knowledge-centrism in the Southern Dynasties, see Hu Baoguo, "Zhishi zhishang de Nanchao xuefeng" 知識至上的南朝學風, *Wenshi* 文史, No. 4 (2009): 151–70.

220 Yu Yingchun 于迎春, "Yi tongren tongru wei tixian de Handai jingshu xinbian" 以"通人"、"通儒"爲體現的漢代經術新變, *Zhongzhou xuekan* 中州學刊, No. 4 (1996): 123–28.

221 Xu Gongchi, "Handai wenxue de zhishihua tezheng."

of key words and exemplary cases related to *bo* and/or *tong* that supply a fruitful series of grand narratives of Chinese intellectual and literary history. However, there have been no sufficient efforts devoted to a deep inquiry into the whole range of expressions and utterances—namely, a linguistic context in which both *bo* and *tong* gained their significance within an extended network of communication and meaning-production. To be precise, this approach unpacks a growing, dynamic repository of ideas and utterances with regards to their meanings, connections, and patterns of distribution among varying contexts, as well as a set of literary forms and socio-cultural frameworks in which these ideas and utterances were embedded. Such an investigation is foundational, not merely to the understanding of *bo* and *tong* as a pair of scholarly values but, furthermore, to a critical reflection on the knowledge, power, and logic involved in the formation of these values and their verbal manifestations.

2.3. The Making of Exemplary Individuals as a Collective Memory

As Benedict Anderson puts in his book on imagined communities, the most arresting emblem of the modern culture of nationalism exists in the cenotaphs and tombs of *unknown soldiers*.[222] An emblem as such bespeaks the imaginary nature of a community shared by the dead and the living, to whom the dead are not known in person and their physical bodies are not localized here and now. This process of meaning-construction is embedded in the formations of a wider range of imagined communities through more diverse media and forms, in which the commemoration of

222 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition (London & New York: Verso, 2006), 9.

the dead gained meanings and public significance neither due to their personal connections to the living nor the locus that preserves their bodies, but the living people's collective commitment to the shared values inscribed on stones, as well as written on bamboos and papers.

The collective memory of individuals-of-erudition, as preserved in a variety of texts and materials during and after the Han, provided a backdrop for the emblematic presentation of an even small number of exemplary figures. Most individuals recognized for their erudition can be identified only in brief, fragmentary, and often formulaic descriptions, which are normally found in their biographic accounts in received historiographic compilations[223] or tombstone inscriptions. A small proportion of them, nevertheless, had enjoyed greater popularity through multiple ways of remembrance and literary representation of their acts, thoughts, and traces. The present section, therefore, undertakes an investigation of the logics and the process by which they were selectively remembered, as well as a series of literary forms and patterns by which that remembrance was actualized and widely spread across time and space. Any single account for these exemplars, in this view, can be properly understood as an instantiation of a larger *imaginaire* shared by the community with collective commitment to the values that they embodied.

The literary presentation as a remembrance of exemplary figures stands out as the foremost textual realization of Halbwachs' "collective memory"[224] for the following reasons. First, the textual data under review presents a constellation of recurring themes, tropes, and literary patterns (es-

223 The brief, fragmentary nature of such portrayals of intellectual features in traditional biographies is well-noted by Jean-Pierre Drège. See Drège, "La lecture et l'écriture en Chine et la xylographie," *Etudes chinoises* 10.1–2 (1991): 77–78.

224 See Halbwachs, *The Social Frameworks of Memory*, passim., in *On Collective Memory*.

pecially in the repetitive or clustered remembrance of eminent figures) that generally reflects the collectiveness of the making of these accounts as a social practice distributed and actualized in numerous individual cases. Second, at every specific stage of the period under focus, the deposit of this shared body of elements and instantiations received from previous ages—as well as the coded system of communication and meaning-production in which they existed—altogether constituted the substance of what Halbwachs calls the "social frameworks of memory,"[225] which every individual commemorative writing could have relied on and appropriated from while in communication with each other. Finally, the general accumulation and continuation of these accounts of remembrance with similar contents and forms reflect the collective commitments to the meanings and values encoded in them, as especially shown in a handful of the most spectacular cases, where a preeminent rememberer oftentimes became one of the preeminent remembered,[226] and a condensed body of clustered commemoration of old figures could absorb those who were new. These phenomena reflect the continuation and reproduction of a cultural identity generated along with the collective memory, as well as the occurrence and expansion of an imagined community—not in a national sense but as an *imaginaire* of cultural elitism—based upon that identity.

225 Halbwachs, *The Social Frameworks of Memory*, 37–40, esp. "… the collective frameworks of memory are not constructed after the fact by the combination of individual recollections; nor are they empty forms where recollections coming from elsewhere would insert themselves. Collective frameworks are, to the contrary, precisely the instruments used by the collective memory to reconstruct an image of the past which is in accord, in each epoch, with the predominant thoughts of the society." (40)

226 On the potential role of rememberer as one to be remembered in further remembrance, see Stephen Owen, *Remembrance: The Experience of the Past in Classical Chinese Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 16–32.

For clarity, I will also avoid conflating this collective memory of exemplary figures with concepts such as "cultural memory" and "communicative memory" that are more specifically defined, though what is under review shares a considerable range of features with them. To be precise, it resembles the Assmanns' "cultural memory" in terms of the size of time structure it covered, the educated background of its carriers, its reliance on durable media and recurring forms (especially shown in the appropriation of reusable textual models), and its identity-generating function. Yet it does not entail as highly regulated normativity and institutionalized authority as the latter does, nor does it share the latter's focus on foundational myth, the narration of origin, and the making of national identity.[227] Compared to "communicative memory," on the one hand, it resembles the latter in terms of its heavy indebtedness, in many cases, to the close personal relationships within one or a few generations. Yet on the other hand, it went far beyond the sphere of minor communities such as families, friends, and scholastic lineages, but undertook cultural values and messages with public significance and long-term transmissibility.[228]

What makes the last point particularly clear is the gradually extending remembrance of Liu Xiang, Liu Xin, and Yang Xiong—the three foremost "admirers of antiquity," in Ban Gu's terms[229]—from a comparatively narrow sphere to a broader context shared by a remarkably growing community. Though the three scholars' exemplary status was largely presented in Ban Gu's re-

227 See Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization*, passim., esp. 41. See also Aleida Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

228 See Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization*, 41.

229 See *Hanshu* 36.1967, 87B.3583.

membrance,[230] the latter was arguably a crystallization of the collective memory of the three scholars from the late Western Han through Ban's own time. The formation and transmission of this memory involved scholars like Ban You, Fan Qun 范逡 (fl. ca. 8 BCE) and Huan Tan.[231] The *Hanshu* itself consists of four instances in which Ban Gu juxtaposed Yang Xiong with Liu Xiang and/or Liu Xin as a cluster of exemplary figures in terms of their features of erudition. (1) In his "appraisal" (*zan* 贊) attached to the biography of Sima Qian, Ban Gu juxtaposed Liu Xiang and Yang Xiong as "broadly exploring various texts/documents" 博極群書 so as to justify their positive comments on Sima Qian's work.[232] (2) In the biography of Gu Yong 谷永 (d. 8 BCE), Ban regarded Gu's scholarly achievement as good as Du Qin 杜欽 (fl. 33 BCE) and Du Ye 杜鄴 (d. 2 BCE), yet "not as rich and encompassing as Liu Xiang, his son [Liu Xin], and Yang Xiong" 不能洽浹如劉向父子及揚雄.[233] (3) In one of his own works selected into the *Hanshu*, Ban juxtaposed Liu Xiang and Yang Xiong with Lu Jia 陸賈 (ca. 240–170 BCE) and Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (179–104 BCE), altogether as the four most outstanding Han scholars who represented the excellence of literary achievements.[234] (4) Finally, in the "appraisal" attached to the chapter for Liu Xiang's family (i. e. "Chu yuanwang zhuan" 楚元王傳, *Hanshu* 36), Ban juxtaposed Liu Xiang and

230 For a strong claim that Liu Xiang and Liu Xin were taken as the primary focus in the composition of the *Hanshu*, see Wang Chunhong, "Lun Liu Xiang Liu Xin he *Hanshu* zhi guanxi."

231 For example, see *Hanshu* 87B.3583, for Fan Qun 范逡 and Huan Tan's praises of Yang Xiong's writings; Ibid., 100.4205, for a reference to Yang Xiong as the leading figure among the friends of Ban You, around whom a group of "admirers of antiquity" 好古之士 gathered; *Houhan shu* 28A.955, for Huan Tan's experience of learning after Liu Xin and Yang Xiong; Zhu Qianzhi 朱謙之 ed., *Xinjiben Huan Tan Xinlun* 新輯本桓譚新論 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2009), 39, for Huan Tan's remarks on Liu Xin and Yang Xiong as his scholarly models.

232 *Hanshu* 62.2738.

233 *Hanshu* 85.3472.

234 *Hanshu* 100A.4231. See also Chapter 3, for a further discussion of this work.

Yang Xiong, again, among six masters who "composed/made connections of *wen*" (*zhuiwen* 綴文) after the demise of Kongzi—

> 自孔子後，綴文之士衆矣，唯孟軻、孫況、董仲舒、司馬遷、劉向、揚雄，此數公者，皆博物洽聞，通達古今，其言有補於世。[235]
> After Kongzi, there have been a great number of men who composed/made connections of *wen* (*zhuiwen*). [Among them,] only Meng Ke, Sun (Xun) Kuang, Dong Zhongshu, Sima Qian, Liu Xiang, and Yang Xiong were broadly learned about things and richly informed, thoroughly comprehending the past and the present, with their words contributing to the world.

The six masters were presented as a cluster of idols and lined up onto a chronological axis, in which the names of Liu Xiang and Yang Xiong were mentioned at the end. However, the roles they played were actually more foundational than the old masters to such a reconstruction of intellectual lineage. First, as previously discussed, Liu Xiang and Yang Xiong were presented at the heart of Ban Gu's remembrance of literary scholars throughout the *Hanshu*. Second, the six masters' names were put together precisely in Ban's appraisal attached to the chapter for Liu Xiang's household. Finally, the phrase *zhuiwen*, not found in any previous text, could be particularly a reflection of the Han conceptualization of literary practice as a form of integration and making connection. The meaning of *zhuiwen* in the present context dwells between the practice of "making connections" (*zhui* 綴) of a "cultural legacy" (*wen*) and a more specific one—namely, the composition of "literary writing" (*wen*) as a process of connecting and articulating multiple utterances into an integrative body of verbal structure. The second explanation speaks well to another term that

235 *Hanshu* 36.1972. For a further analysis of this passage, see Chapter 4.

gained currency in the Eastern Han—namely, *zhuwen* ("to compose writing [*wen*]"), in which *zhu* 屬 literally means "to compose/make connections of" as well.[236] In these regards, the images of Liu Xiang and Yang Xiong in this account were not modeled after the previous masters; instead, the previous masters were modeled on them.

The clustered presentation of Yang Xiong, Liu Xiang, and/or Liu Xin constituted an arresting "memory palace"[237] that were instantiated in a broader Eastern Han context. Song Hong 宋弘 (d. 40 CE), while being asked to recommend contemporary people who were *tong* and/or *bo*, regarded Huan Tan as "extensively informed" (*qiawen*) to a degree that "almost matched Yang Xiong, Liu Xiang, and his son [Liu Xin]" 幾[能]及揚雄、劉向父子.[238] Wang Chong, in his *Lunheng*, effusively juxtaposed Liu Xiang, Liu Xin, and Yang Xiong along with Huan Tan as the four outstanding scholars who were great at "producing literary writings" (*zhuwen* 著文) based on their erudition, comparing their occurrences in adjacent generations with the cases of King Wen 文王, King Wu 武王, and the Duke of Zhou 周公.[239] In another *Lunheng* passage, Wang juxtaposed Liu Xiang

---

236 The term *zhuwen* 屬文 appears 11 times in the *Hanshu*, and 9 times the *Houhan shu*, as often situated within the contexts related to the production of literary writings. On the two terms, see also Nylan, "Manuscript Culture in Late Western Han," 164, where she explains them as the practice of producing manuscripts that "wove together elegant phrases and classical allusions," which is dubbed with her conceptualization of "high cultural literacy"; and Wai-yee Li 李惠儀, "Concepts of Authorship," in *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature (1000 BCE–900 CE)*, ed. Wiebke Denecke, Wai-yee Li, and Xiaofei Tian (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 362. Yet Li incorrectly assumes that the term *zhuiwen* 綴文 "gained currency" together with *zhuwen* in the Eastern Han.

237 Namely, method of *loci*, a mnemonic device to help memorize items by imagining them in familiar locations and familiar sequence. I use this term in the present context also in accord with Brashier, "Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Stelae," 256–57. On the clustered presentation of exemplary figures as a trope of remembrance, see also Meow Hui Goh, "Artful Remembrance: Reading, Writing, and Reconstructing the Fallen State in Lu Ji's "Bian wang," in *Memory in Medieval China: Text, Ritual, and Community*, ed. Wendy Swartz and Robert Company (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 21–25.

238 *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 493; see also *Houhan shu* 26.904 (with the word *neng* 能).

239 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 606.

and Yang Xiong along with Lu Jia and Sima Qian altogether as the four exemplary "men with literary productions (*wenzhang*)" (*wenzhang zhi tu* 文章之徒), a phrase that he conflated with his conceptualization of "literary *ru*" (*wenru*) in the specific sense of manifesting one's erudition through producing literary works.[240] For a later instance, Ying Rong 潁容 (fl. 200 CE), in his statement in the "*Chunqiu shili* xu" 春秋釋例序, made a particular statement that resembled Ban Gu's comment attached to the family biographies of Liu Xiang and Liu Xin—

> 漢興，博物洽聞著述之士，前有司馬遷、揚雄、劉歆，後有鄭衆、賈逵、班固，近則馬融、鄭玄。其所著作，違義正者，遷尤多。略舉一兩事以言之。《史記》不識畢公文王之子，而言與周同姓。揚雄著《法言》，不識六十四卦，云所從來尚矣。[241]
> Since the rise of the Han, [speaking of] men who were broadly learned about things, richly informed, and engaged in producing literary compositions, in earlier ages there were Sima Qian, Yang Xiong, and Liu Xin; in later ages there were Zheng Zhong, Jia Kui, and Ban Gu; and in recent years there were Ma Rong and Zheng Xuan. Among their compositions, (Sima) Qian's works deviated from correctness most often. Here are a couple of things that speak for my point. The *Record of the Grand Scribe* (*Shiji*) did not recognize the Duke of Bi as the son of King Wen but merely mentioned that he shared the same surname with the Zhou royal house. Yang Xiong composed the *Exemplary Words* (*Fayan*), in which he did not recognize the Sixty-four Hexagrams but merely said that where they were from was a remote past.

In this, again, clustered presentation of scholarly idols, Ying Rong employed the phrase *bowu qiawen* that was previously used in Ban Gu's appraisal, associating it with an additional element *zhushu* (literally, "to manifest and transmit") that referred to the production of literary compositions. The familiar grouping of Sima Qian, Yang Xiong, and Liu Xin (again, close to Ban Gu's appraisal,

240 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1150–52. For a detailed analysis of this passage, see Chapter 4.

241 Ying Rong, "*Chunqiu shili* xu," in *Quan Shanggu Sandai Qin Han Sanguo Liuchao wen*, *Quan Houhan wen*, 86.938. For a further analysis of this passage, see Chapter 4.

where Ban mentioned Liu Xiang instead of Liu Xin) was then followed by five Eastern Han scholars till Ying Rong's own time. Considering that the earliest version of the "*Chunqiu shili* xu" was only a fragment incorporated into the *Taiping yulan* 太平御覽, it is hence difficult to fully grasp Ying Rong's judgment and attitude—if any—on what he called *bowu qiawen* and those who were recognized as such. The author seems to be unsatisfied with at least some works of these figures for they "deviated from the correctness of meanings" 違義正, yet it remains unclear if he indeed meant to use a specific range of negative samples to criticize *bowu qiawen* in general. Or, what is being read here involves a process from inheritance to self-manifestation, a scenario in which Ying Rong, with indebtedness to previous models but also a capability of reviewing their works, was performing exactly how he himself was "broadly learned" and "richly informed," namely, his own erudition to no lesser extent.[242]

In addition to the clustered presentation and remembrance of exemplary models, the composite image of individual practitioner equipped with erudition was also formulated by means of the articulation of a series of recurring elements and tropes in individual narrations of specific figures. This is manifested, especially in historiographic and biographic contexts, by a series of reusable textual models and their iterations and variations. See, for the first instance, a passage in the self-narrative and self-remembrance of Yang Xiong (now preserved in his *Hanshu* biography[243])—

242 For reference, Ying Rong himself was similarly known as "broadly learned and extensively comprehending" (*boxue duotong* 博學多通) in comparatively later accounts. See *Houhan shu* 79B.2584.

243 See Note 93.

雄少而好學，不爲章句，訓詁通而已，博覽無所不見。爲人簡易佚蕩，口吃不能劇談，默而好深湛之思。清靜亡爲，少耆欲，不汲汲於富貴，不戚戚於貧賤，不修廉隅以徼名當世。家產不過十金，乏無儋石之儲，晏如也。自有大度，非聖哲之書不好也；非其意，雖富貴不事也。顧嘗好辭賦。[244]

[Yang] Xiong was fond of learning at his early youth. He did not engage in the studies of chapters-and-sentences (*zhangju*) but learned thoroughly by means of literary glosses (*xungu*), and he read broadly with nothing missed. As a person, he was simple, easygoing, rakish, and unrestrained. He was a stammerer and hence unable to talk fast, and he was silent and fond of profound thinking. He was pure, quiet, and inactive, with no much addictive desire. He was neither eager for wealth and rank nor distressed by poverty and humbleness, and he did not polish his edges and corners (of character) in order to seek reputation in the contemporary world. His possession of money did not exceed ten *jin* of gold, and his storage of food was less than one or two *dan* of grain, yet he appeared to be taking it easy. He had a grand scheme in himself, and he was only fond of texts of the sages and the worthies. If not in conformity to his intention, he would not serve even if wealth and rank were promised. Retrospectively, he used to be fond of *cifu*.

* Though the present passage was presumably an excerpt from Yang Xiong's self-narrative, my translation employs the third-person pronoun "he" instead of "I" in accord with the tone of narration of the text.

The passage is then followed by a detailed account of Yang's writings across a variety of genres that proves his literary productivity—the last feature mentioned in this short bio—to no end.[245] The present passage itself, as a condensed presentation of a specific scholarly persona, opens a window toward numerous intertextual correspondences within a broader context. From the Eastern Han onward, a passage like the present one—composed by a cluster of brief descriptions of one's experience, features, and talents related to literary learning—instantiated a reusable textual model—namely, a condensed body of narrative elements and tropes that were widely employed and appropriated in biographic, historiographic, and epitaphic writings.

244 *Hanshu* 87A.3514.

245 For detailed analyses and discussions, see Chapter 4.

Some narrative elements in Yang Xiong's case, such as his problem of stammer and his preference to be "silent" (*mo* 默), were comparatively special qualities associated to a quite minority.[246] Most elements and tropes in the passage, however, were much more often employed as constructive modules in numerous biographic accounts for the Eastern Han scholars. See below, for a synopsis of some of these elements in Yang's self-narratives—

Synopsis 2
Narrative Elements in Yang Xiong's Brief Self-Introduction

Narrative Elements	Original Phrases
1) Literary precocity	"少而好學"
2) Detachment from *zhangju*	"不爲章句"
3) Preference to *xungu*	"訓詁通而已"
4) "Broadness" in literary learning	"博覽無所不見"
5) Free-minded persona	"爲人簡易佚蕩"
6) Engagement in pure thinking	"好深湛之思"
7) Indifference to power, wealth, and rank	"清靜亡爲……雖富貴不事也"
8) Literary productivity via writing	"好辭賦"

For the most arresting examples, the clustered presentation of some of these narrative elements and tropes recurred in the biographic introductions of Huan Tan and Ban Gu, each with two iterations respectively in the *Dongguan Hanji* and the *Houhan shu*. See first, the two introductions of Huan Tan—

Dongguan Hanji

246 See Chapter 5, for a further discussion on this issue.

（桓譚）少好學，遍治五經，能文，有絕才，喜非毀俗儒，由是多見排抑。[247]
[Huan Tan] was fond of learning at his early youth. He mastered all the Five Classics (*wujing*), was proficient in composing literary writing, and had excellent talents. He was fond of criticizing and belittling the vulgar *ru* (*suru*) and was, therefore, often pushed aside.

Houhan shu
（桓譚）好音律，善鼓琴。博學多通，遍習五經，皆詁訓大義，不爲章句。能文章，尤好古學，數從劉歆、揚雄辯析疑異。性嗜倡樂，簡易不修威儀，而喜非毀俗儒，由是多見排抵。[248]
[Huan Tan] was fond of music and good at playing *qin*. He was broadly learned and extensively comprehensive, and he studied all the Five Classics (*wujing*). For each of them, he took literary glosses (*xungu*) [so as to grasp] the grand ideas (*dayi*), yet he disengaged from the studies of chapters-and-sentences (*zhangju*). He was proficient in composing literary writing (*wenzhang*), especially fond of the ancient model of learning (*guxue*), and he often followed Liu Xin and Yang Xiong to discuss and analyze puzzles and variances. He was inherently addicted to popular music, simple and easygoing, careless of modifying his external dignity. He was fond of criticizing and belittling the vulgar *ru* (*suru*) and was, therefore, often pushed aside.

The relatively brief introduction in the incomplete *Dongguan Hanji* shares a couple of narrative elements with Yang Xiong's self-portrayal, such as his precocity, broadness, literary productivity, and self-oriented detachment from secular concerns and official authorities (in Huan's case, vis-à-vis "vulgar" *ru* scholars [i. e. *suru*][249]). The *Houhan shu* version was most likely based upon the passage in the *Dongguan Hanji* as one of its textual models, while drawing upon a more extensive range of materials and utterances. It reconstructed Huan Tan's image in a way even more akin to that of Yang Xiong, as it incorporated more detailed elements such as his opposite attitudes toward *zhangju* and *xungu* ("literary glosses"). This case suggests that Huan Tan's image may have been more in-

247 *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 547.

248 *Houhan shu* 28A.955. See also Chapter 1, for a detailed analysis of the term *guxue*.

249 See Chapter 3, for a detailed analysis of the term *suru*.

tensely modeled on Yang Xiong from the Eastern Han through early medieval period, a phenomenon conforming to Huan's own wishes and practices to follow Yang as his master idol.[250] Moreover, it instantiates a diachronic process through which the collective memories of exemplary figures—as well as the values and practices they exemplified—were accretionally developed upon previous textual models.

Ban Gu, the great early Eastern Han *rememberer* who set up a model and a textual repository—the *Hanshu*—of his remembrance of Western Han idols, became another eminent name to be *remembered*, in a way precisely modeled after the model that he admired. See first, the short piece of introduction persevered in the *Dongguan Hanji*—

> *Dongguan Hanji*
> （班固）年九歲，能屬文誦詩賦。既長，博貫載籍，九流百家之言，無不窮究。學無常師，不爲章句，舉大義而已。[251]
> [When Ban Gu] was nine years old, he was able to compose writings (*zhuwen*) and recite poetry and *fu*. As he grew up, he broadly learned through the received texts. He inquired the words of the nine streams (*liu*) and the hundred schools (*jia*) without missing any of them. What he learned was not from a constant teacher. He did not engage in the studies of chapters-and-sentences (*zhangju*), and he brought out the grand ideas (*dayi*) only.

This narrative model has a highly identical iteration in the *Houhan shu* which contains only one minor element of variation (an extra particle *suo* 所 ahead of the phrase *xue wu changshi* 學無常師).[252] The passage as a late Eastern Han product was certainly transferred and made available to

250 *Houhan shu* 28A.955.
251 *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 675.
252 *Houhan shu* 40A.1330.

Fan Ye, who as a later compiler seemingly felt no necessity to make any change or to add any new element. This was probably because this passage, as a received and potentially reusable model, was taken as a perfected condensation of a whole range of narrative elements for the image-making of individual equipped with erudition. These elements, as shown below, incorporate most themes and tropes found in Yang Xiong's self-narrative and the two introductions of Huan Tan. Besides, the passage also consists of the description of Ban Gu's great memorization and his experience of learning from various tutors/traditions.

Synopsis 3
Narrative Elements in the Brief Introduction of Ban Gu

Narrative Elements	Original Phrases
1) Literary precocity	"年九歲，能屬文誦詩賦"
2) Literary productivity via writing	"能屬文"
3) Memorization and oral performance	"誦詩賦"
4) "Broadness" in literary learning	"博貫載籍"
	"九流百家之言，無不窮究"
5) Learning from various tutors/traditions	"學無常師"
6) Detachment from *zhangju*	"不爲章句"
7) Focus on *dayi*	"舉大義"

The foregoing cases of Yang Xiong, Huan Tan, and Ban Gu instantiate the recurring uses of a constellation of themes, patterns, tropes, and elements that constituted the substance of a sharable, emblematic model through a collective process of remembrance. Simultaneously, they showcase a range of circumscribed variabilities with which the *imaginaire* of individual erudition was distributed and realized in every specific persona. Central to the composite image among these instantiations

was the motif of broad learning, which could be phrased in a variety of utterances that normally consisted of *bo* and *tong* per se. Meanwhile, such a central theme was also presented in association with a considerable range of other intellectual features.

The critical attitude toward *zhangju*, for instance, was presented as a motif shared by several scholars around the Eastern Han who were simultaneously recognized as *bo* and/or *tong* by contemporary or later accounts,[253] sometimes in association with another feature—namely, the concentration on the "grand ideas" (*dayi*) of the texts being learned.[254] This phenomenon, along with a series of critiques directly attributed to Han and Wei scholars,[255] was most likely due to two concerns of *zhangju* that, I summarize, was regarded as both a scholarly method and an institutional tool. First, the low efficiency resulting from its tedious explanations obstructed the goal of achieving broad learning and the principle of *yue*. Second, its imposition of personal affiliation to specific tutor-based doctrines obstructed one's self-oriented interest in learning without following constant authorities. For one who aimed at cultivating one's erudition in dealing with a wide range of knowledge and texts, perhaps the approach to quickly grasps the main points of a given source would be much prioritized, in comparison to the presumably tedious, time-consuming, and institu-

253 For more instances—in addition to the cases of Yang Xiong, Huan Tan, and Ban Gu—for the connection between one's *bo* and/or *tong* with the detachment from *zhangju*, see the biographic accounts of Wang Chong (*Houhan shu* 49.1629), Xun Shu 荀淑 (Ibid., 62.2049), Liang Hong 梁鴻 (Ibid., 2765), and Lu Zhi (Ibid., 64.2113). See Note 255, for Han scholars' theoretical criticism of *zhangju*.

254 See, for instance, the cases of Huan Tan and Ban Gu previously discussed.

255 For some Han and Three Kingdoms criticisms against *zhangju*, see the statements of Liu Xin (*Hanshu* 30.1723, and Chapter 1 for my analysis), Ban Gu (Ibid., 88.3620); Wang Chong (*Lunheng jiaoshi*, 555, 580–81), and Xu Gan 徐幹 (Sun Qizhi annot., *Zhonglun jiegu* 中論解詁 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2014], 14–15). See also Wagner, *The Craft of a Chinese Commentator*, 39–44, for a sketch of Han scholars' oppositions against *zhangju* and its relations with *tong* and *dayi* 大義.

tionally regulated procedure of textual studies—namely, *zhangju* in its negative form. This inclination corresponds to a specific cultural phenomenon during the mid-and-late Eastern Han, that several old-fashioned *zhangju* texts were either condensed into shorter forms or replaced by more compendious—and hence theoretically more "concise"—versions.[256]

Literary precocity—normally performed as the excellence of literary learning or literary skills achieved at one's childhood or early youth—was presented as another recurring trope in the image-making of individual erudition. From the late Western Han through Three Kingdoms, before it became an even more formulaic module repeatedly employed in later historiography and biography,[257] this trope was already widely seen in the retrospective narrations of the early stage of specific later renowned literary scholars.[258] The manifestation of literary precocity was not necessarily a proof but a positive indicator of the following: first, the extension of time-in-total that could be spent on the individual basis of literary learning and cultivation; second, a possibly more efficient and productive manner that was interiorized in the process of one's literary education at

256 See Yu Yingshi, "Han Jin zhi ji shi zhi xin zijue yu xin sichao," 351–63; Hu Baoguo, *Han Tang jian shixue de fazhan*, 75–76; Wu Chengxue 吴承學 and He Shihai 何詩海, "Cong zhangju zhi xue dao wenzhang zhi xue" 從章句之學到文章之學, *Wenxue pinglun* 文學評論, No. 5 (2008): 24.

257 See Jack Chen, "On the Act and Representation of Reading in Medieval China," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129 (2009): 58; Hans Frankel, "T'ang Literati: A Composite Biography," in *Critical Readings on Tang China, vol. 2*, ed. Paul Kroll (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 545–65.

258 For more instances—in addition to the three exemplary figures Yang Xiong, Huan Tan, and Ban Gu—for the juxtaposition of one's *bo* and/or *tong* with the precocity of literary excellence, see the cases of Zhang Heng (*Houhan shu* 59.1897); Cui Yin 崔駰 (Ibid., 52.1708); Xun Shuang 荀爽, (Ibid., 62.2050); Xun Yue 荀悅 (Ibid., 62.2058); Ying Shao (Ibid., 48.1609); Zhong Changtong 仲長統 (Ibid., 49.1643); Cai Yong 蔡邕 (Ibid., 60B.1980); Cao Pi (*Weishu*, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 2.57); Cao Zhi 曹植 (*Sanguo zhi* 19.557); Wang Can (Ibid., 21.597–98). For a study of the pre-Han and Han representations of precocious child (in a more general sense) and their socio-cultural implications, see Anne Kinney, "The Theme of the Precocious Child in Early Chinese Literature," *T'oung Pao* 81 (1995): 1–24; see also Wang Zijin 王子今, *Handai ertong shenghuo* 漢代兒童生活 (Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe, 2012), for a more complete collection of relevant materials in the Han context.

its early stage; and third, a series of circumstantial factors surrounding one's education such as family traditions, tutoring sources, and the availability of objects and materials. On the other hand, the recurring trope of literary precocity was also interrelated with a divergence in early Chinese intellectual communications, one that regarded the foundation of individual excellence as either based upon one's inborn nature and gift or developed through a gradual process of cultivation by means of learning and accumulation.[259] The emphasis on the former became increasingly prominent during and after the Eastern Han, insofar as constituting a recurring topic of literary criticism in early medieval China and beyond.[260]

In the following two chapters, my study will undertake a series of detailed investigations of another two important aspects of intellectual lives correlated with the values of broadness, comprehensiveness, and so on. First, from a socio-political perspective, the re-orientation of scholarly interest toward individual erudition were often accompanied by specific performances of resistance against official rank and position. Such a gesture of political disengagement was oppositional to the sectarian affiliation imposed by the official academic system and, furthermore, the authority of institutional matrix in a larger framework. Second, toward a better understanding of the cultivation and exhibition of erudition as a moving progress, my investigation shows that the composite images of individuals equipped with erudition were closely associated with the practice of producing

259 For a relevant investigation with references to both textual and pictorial evidence, see Hsing I-t'ien, *Hua wai zhi yi*, 101–12.

260 See Xu Licheng 徐儷成, "Nanchao shiren qunti you zhuwen xianxiang de liuxing yu wenlun zhong caizhu xuefu guannian de queli" 南朝士人群體"幼屬文"現象的流行與文論中"才主學輔"觀念的確立, *Wenyi lilun yanjiu* 文藝理論研究, No. 1 (2019): 146–53.

literary writings associated with one's own credit and liability. Such a proliferation of literary productivity actualized a process that, on the individual basis, was configured as inside-toward-outside, through which the texts and knowledge assimilated and synthesized from an extensive range of sources were eventually transformed and realized in one's productions of writings with new contents-and-forms.

2.4. Summary

The era from the late first century BCE through the third century CE witnessed a wealth of textual presentations of individual erudition, a model distributed among a variety of personal images and verbal manifestations. The cultivation of erudition—as something individually possessed—was presented as a process of interiorizing various external sources into an imagined archive under individual mastery and control, as well as a syncretic, integrative, and encompassing mode of literary learning across a variety of areas of intellectual inquiry. From a rich database of evidence, *bo* ("broadness") and *tong* ("comprehensiveness"), significantly more explicit than any other lexical indicator and conceptual element, were performed as a pair of core values at the heart of a growing, dynamic repository of ideas and utterances. This repository was foundational to a set of discourses and argumentations that celebrated individual erudition as a model and the making of a collective memory of exemplary models who personally embodied erudition as an *imaginaire*. With the motifs of ideological criticism, the foregoing phenomena altogether involved a foundational re-orientation of individual practice to transcend the boundaries between different texts and different traditions,

as well as a move beyond the imposition of personal affiliation to specific institutes, schools, tutors, and repositories external to one's own intellectual realm. Such a realm, metaphorically, constituted a personal "bibliography" that incorporated wide-ranging knowledge and texts. The institutional system of knowledge transmission, with its primacy and centrality lost, consequently gave way to a new emblem of literary culture—the composite image of individual-of-erudition.

The increasing wealth of textual presentations of individuals-of-erudition is shown not merely in quantity but also in degree. Through an analytical examination of a constellation of utterances consisting of or related to *bo* and/or *tong*, these lexical items unfold themselves as the verbal manifestations of the intellectual values progressively shared by the literate community and attributed to exemplary individuals with different interests and specializations. The centrality of these two values does not disregard the diversity of backgrounds, stances, opinions, and practical strategies of those who presumably acted "broadly" or "comprehensively" in their varying circumstances of literary learning. Instead, it is necessary to make sense of why such a diverse range of acts and interests were altogether presented and transmitted in a growing repository of shared values, beliefs, and exemplary models. The overall emergence and proliferation of these acts, traces, and memories, to this end, can be properly considered as a collective process of enchantment of erudition.

In dealing with another series of concepts, such as *guwen*, *jinwen*, *zhangju*, *shifa*, *jiafa*, *xungu*, and beyond, a better approach is not to essentialize them as intrinsic elements that offer a straightforward schematization of the intellectual world across centuries. Instead, it is more promising to illustrate their conceptual and practical connections with a larger picture of literary culture and in-

tellectuality beyond the conventional repositories of knowledge and text in which these concepts used to be applied. The meanings of these concepts, their formation processes, and diachronic changes were undeniably—and historically—important for any serious inquiry into a specific range of literary activities related to "canonical studies." However, it is even more important to consider them as particular reflections and realizations of more general questions regarding the formation, transmission, reception, and production of knowledge and texts. On the individual level, the questions were extensively presented in terms of the following: how to live and act with the cultural legacy, how to cultivate and manifest oneself, and how to be remembered.

- CHAPTER 3 -

Self-Oriented Interest in Learning: Disengagement from Power and Power of Disengagement in Intellectual Lives

3.1. Vulgar Ru: A Constructed Other versus an Imagined Community

The formation and solidification of a scholarly identity cannot be disentangled from the basic questions of power, authority, and socio-political ideology. In a way akin to what happens to most imagined communities, the scholarly identity under review involves not merely the collective remembrance, commemoration, and projection of shared images and models, but also the production of specific otherness as the opposite, the different, or the inferior. This is shown, as early as in the late Western Han discourses on the "ancient" (*gu*) model of literary learning, where the trope of "plowing" (*geng*) and its potential claim "for one's own sake" (*wei ji* 爲己) at once entailed a self-oriented gesture independent from the institutional matrix and, meanwhile, the production of an inferior otherness affiliated to that matrix that was negatively tagged as *jin*.[261]

What, then, constituted an alternative socio-political ground for the overall proliferation of the personal embodiments of individual erudition independent from that institutional matrix? What kinds of rhetorics and practices had solidified that scholarly identity, making it a power-generating source of authority to be distinguished from the others? The answers to these questions are manifested in a wide spectrum of acts, thoughts, and expressions, among which the matter of produc-

261 See Chapters 1 and 2, for detailed analyses of the "ancient" model of literary praxis and the making of the images of individuals-of-erudition.

ing otherness is shown particularly clear in an Eastern Han phenomenon—namely, the growing prominence of an intellectual criticism against *suru* (literally, "vulgar *ru*").

A great proportion of Han scholars who earned their reputations of erudition were, not surprisingly, identified as a *ru* either in general or of a specific type. The concept *ru* entailed a wide range of meanings and usages in early Chinese context. It was flexibly applied as a tag on those who modeled after particular ritual, political, textual, and cultural legacies from antiquity and, sometimes in a more specific way, men who followed the teachings transmitted through Kongzi and his disciples.[262] The identifiable members of *ru* remarkably expanded since the mid-and-late Western Han, as the ideas and traditions they mastered gradually reached a state-sponsored and socially venerated status, exerting a stronger public influence by serving as a common ground of advanced education.[263] The growing popularity of *ru* was accompanied by an overall proliferation of discourses with an attempt to make internal differentiation and classification within this group according to specific moral, political, and intellectual criteria.[264] Within this context, the term *suru* gained its own significance that reflected a recurring topic in Han intellectual lives.

---

262 For two representative accounts for the Han identifications of *ru* in particular, see the quotation of Sima Tan in the *Shiji*, that *ru* referred to those who "modeled after the Six Arts/Classics" 以六藝爲法 (*Shiji* 130.3290); and the "Yiwen zhi" of the *Hanshu*, that *ru* "derived from the office of *Situ*" 出於司徒之官 as the king's assistants to obey the order of *ying-yang* and to civilize his people 順陰陽掌教化, and was characterized by a series of features such as the learning of the Six Arts/Classics (*liujing* 六經), the moral principles of "benevolence and righteousness" (*renyi* 仁義), the worship to former sage-kings from Yao and Shun to King Wen 文王 and King Wu 武王, and the teaching of Kongzi to whom their tradition was traced back (*Hanshu* 30.1728). For the most comprehensive study in recent decades on *ru* as a concept of identity throughout early China, see Zufferey, *To the Origins of Confucianism*, which also incorporates a rounded review of previous opinions and scholarships on this issue. See also Kern, *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih-huang*, 9; Michael Nylan, *The Five 'Confucian' Classics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 364–65.

263 See Chapter 1, esp. Note 30.

264 See Zhao Guohua, "Handai xueshu zhuti pinglun yanjiu," 1–6.

The earliest occurrence of the term *suru* can be found in the *Xunzi*,[265] where *su* was taken as a tag of a specific type of *ru* whose behaviors were motivated by specific "vulgar" interests. The term was situated within four identities ranked by their intellectual and moral qualities, placed above the "vulgar people" (*suren*) but below the "refined *ru*" (*yaru* 雅儒) and "great *ru*" (*daru* 大儒). Within this context, *suru* entailed negative meanings in two aspects: First, it referred to those whose ideas and doctrines deviated from the true learning and, hence, could not be distinguished from other schools. Second, it referred to those who were committed to vulgar lifestyles, especially by holding a salaried position that served others' interests.[266] A strikingly different use of this term was then seen in Emperor Xuan's disparagement of *ru* (according to the *Hanshu*) that he regarded as *su* and hence called *suru* in general. In accordance with the old statement of the Qin chief counselor Li Si,[267] the emperor considered *ru* (all as *suru*, in his tone) as the admirers of "antiquity" (*gu*) and the disobeyers of modern (*jin*) codes who, therefore, potentially threatened the imperial orders and ideologies of the Han dynasty.[268]

The majority of critical opinions against *suru* over the Eastern Han, nevertheless, did not echo Emperor Xuan's general disparagement, but continued the vein starting from the *Xunzi* that expressed the anxiety of making differentiation among the ever-growing *ru*. This is shown in a series of critical voices by Eastern Han scholars such as Wang Chong, Xu Shen, Cai Yong, and Ying Shao

265 *Xunzi jijie*, 138–41.

266 For another discussion of this passage, see Anne Cheng, "What Did it Mean to Be a Ru in Han Times?" *Asia Major* 14 (2001): 103–04.

267 *Shiji* 6.254–55, 87.2546.

268 *Hanshu* 9.277. See also Chapter 1, for the *gu-jin* dichotomy involved in Li Si and Emperor Xuan's 宣帝 statements.

應劭 (ca. 153–196 CE), against those that they identified as *su* among the *ru*. In line with one of the two aspects of *Xunzi*'s critical remarks on *suru* (namely, their affiliation to salaried positions), the Eastern Han appropriation of this term was more specifically conflated with the academicians and their followers in the Han official academic system, and the remarks on *suru* concerned also specifically a series of problematic issues of literary learning (especially the study of classics) that occurred in that system. Namely, the *suru* were described as entrenched within their loyalty to particular texts or text-based explanations instead of synthesizing a larger collection of materials and, therefore, failing in reaching an unbiased, comprehensive understanding of what they ought to understand about the past and the present.

The *Lunheng* criticized *suru* more intensely than any other received Eastern Han source. All the seven occurrences of *suru* found there was accompanied by Wang Chong's arguments against what appeared to him as mistaken beliefs. Some of his critiques contested the beliefs held by *suru* in understanding a particular text. For example, in his discussion about the twenty-nine *pian* ("chapters") of the *Shangshu* (i. e. the officially canonized *jinwen* corpus), Wang criticized those who set up scholastic boundary for this incomplete corpus by applying exclusive hermeneutic doctrines in terms of *fa* 法—

> 或說曰：孔子更選二十九篇，二十九篇獨有法也。蓋俗儒之說也，未必傳記之明也。二十九篇殘而不足，有傳之者，因不足之數，立取法之說，失聖人之意，違古今之實。[269]

Some said: Kongzi additionally selected twenty-nine chapters (*pian*) which were embedded with

269 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1128–29.

> particular doctrines. This is presumably the saying of vulgar *ru* that may not be as clear as transmitted records. The twenty-nine *pian* were fragmentary and incomplete. Some who transmitted them, according to that incomplete number [of *pian*], made up the explanation that [Kongzi] picked them up and applied doctrines. This notion mistakes the intention of the sage, and it goes against the substantial facts (*shi*) from the past to the present day.

Wang Chong's argument was made against a notion that Kongzi selected twenty-nine *pian* of the *Shangshu* as a distinct corpus with particular doctrines. By examining the epistemological foundation of this notion, Wang suggested that it was an anachronistic projection of a comparatively later time, as the number of *pian* in existing corpus was only a result of what happened to have survived from the great loss of texts during the Qin.[270] As the twenty-nine *pian* constituted a distinct corpus that reached its canonical status with institutional authority, the official academicians and their followers who mastered these texts then privileged them as not merely authentic in terms of contents but orthodox that excluded any newly found fragment of the *Shangshu*. Such a sectarian dominance of official knowledge was shown in a longstanding conflict over the Han between court-appointed curators of the *jinwen Shangshu* and those who applied for imperial patronage of the *guwen* version,[271] a case that occurred in some other old texts as well.[272] In this regard, Wang's critique conceptually expressed a resistant stance against institutional affiliation and sectarian loyalty to a particular limited range of textual objects, as well as the procedure of producing and transmitting knowledge on that foundation. In opposition to this, Wang suggested focusing on what actually

270 See *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1127. This assumption held by Wang Chong was in accord with the "Yiwen zhi" of the *Hanshu*; see *Hanshu* 30.1706–07.

271 This attitude held by official academicians to defend the *jinwen* version of the *Shangshu* 尚書 was earlier reflected in Liu Xin's debate against them. See *Hanshu* 36.1967–71.

272 See *Hanshu* 36.1967–71; *Houhan shu* 36.1228–32, 64.2116.

happened from the past through the present day (*gujin*) in terms of "trueness/substantiality" (*shi* 實), a rhetorical device and a testimony of epistemology commonly seen in the *Lunheng* that Wang used to dispute a variety of misunderstandings in his regard in terms of *xu* 虛 ("untrueness/insubstantiality") or *xuwang* 虛妄 ("insubstantiality and vainness").[273] The truth, according to him, can be grasped only through an unbiased, extensive, and critical survey of sources.

See also, Wang's critique on a *suru* explanation of the title of the *Chunqiu*—

> 孔子因舊故之名，以號《春秋》之經，未必有奇說異意、深美之據也。今俗儒說之：“春者歲之始，秋者其終也。《春秋》之經，可以奉始養終，故號爲《春秋》。”[274]
> Kongzi, according to names drawn from old traditions, gave title to the canon "Spring and Autumn" (*Chunqiu*), not necessarily with any strange explanation and particular meaning, or any profound and brave reason. Yet nowadays the vulgar *ru* explain it as, "Spring is the begin-

273 There had been a long series of scholarship since the 20th century devoted to the *Lunheng* with a focus on its methodology and epistemology, oftentimes accompanied with scholarly evaluations of Wang Chong's philosophy according to comparatively modern criteria and categorizations. For example, see Feng Youlan 馮友蘭, *Zhongguo zhexueshi xinbian* 中國哲學史新編 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1964), along with several studies in the 20th century that place him in the vein of "materialism" (in Chinese, *weiwu zhuyi* 唯物主義) and scientificism as the projections of Marxist philosophy in mainland China. See also Michael Loewe, *Faith, Myth and Reason in Han China* (Indiana: Hackett, 1982), 12, where he identifies Wang Chong as a "rationalist" that represented one of the "four attitudes of mind" in Han thoughts; and Xiao Gongquan 蕭公權, *Zhongguo zhengzhi sixiang shi* 中國政治思想史 (Beijing: Xinxing chubanshe, 2005), 232–39, where he attributes Wang's philosophy to "naturalism-based fatalism" (自然主義的宿命論). Critiques have been laid on Wang's methods and arguments with regards to his lacks of comprehension, methodology, and efficiency (Xu Fuguan), his lack of "good reason" (Loewe), his "pedantic obsession" (Michael Nylan), and his failure in reaching a "coherent position" (Michael Puett). See Xu Fuguan, "Wang Chong lunkao," 543–58; Loewe, "The Religious and Intellectual Background," in *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 1: The Ch'in and Han Empires, 221 B. C.–A. D. 220*, ed. Denis Twitchett and Michael Loewe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 698; Nylan, "Han Classicists Writing in Dialogue with Their Own Tradition," *Philosophy East and West* 47 (1997): 141; Puett, "Listening to Sages: Divination, Omens, and the Rhetoric of Antiquity in Wang Chong's *Lunheng*," *Oriens Extremus* 45 (2005–06): 280. For a recent and more sympathetic reading of the *Lunheng*, see Esther Klein and Colin Klein, "Wang Chong's Epistemology of Testimony," *Asia Major* 29 (2016): 115–46, with a specific focus on Wang's utilization of the concept *shi* 實 as an argumentative apparatus concerning the problem of "epistemology of testimony."

274 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1139. Huang Hui's commentary informs that this particular saying of *suru* was in accord with the "Chunqiu wei" 春秋緯, a series of sub-commentaries that developed around the Gongyang 公羊 tradition during the Han. For another Eastern Han reference to *suru* with regards to the studies of *Chunqiu* 春秋, see He Xiu, "*Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan* jiegu xu" 春秋公羊傳解詁序, *Shisanjing zhushu*, 2190–91, where he situated *suru* as a negative term opposed to those engaged in *guxue* and *wenzhang*. See also Chapters 1 and 4, for my contextualization of He Xiu's statement respectively with focus on *guxue* and *wenzhang*.

> ning of a year, and autumn the ending; the *Spring and Autumn* is that by which one esteems the beginning and supply the ending. Therefore, it is titled as "Spring and Autumn."

To Wang Chong, the interpretation of the phrase *chunqiu* (literally, "spring and autumn") as the title of a given text entailed the problems of sectarianism and particularism as well. In this case, Wang found his answer from a plain fact drawn from "old traditions" (*jiugu* 舊故), instead of accepting the "modern" interpretation—proposed by some *suru*—that privileged the title as encoded with profound philosophical meaning invented by Kongzi, the presumed sage-author of the text. The latter instantiated a hermeneutic principle central to the official traditions of the *Chunqiu* (especially the Gongyang 公羊 lineage) during Han times, that any single utterance found within the text is to be taken as a message with profound, unchangeable meaning encoded by Kongzi himself, and hence the whole text is to be taken as a unity with perfect infallibility and integrity.[275]

The *Houhan shu* biography of Wang Chong offered a brief yet informative summary of his approach, that he "considered the vulgar *ru* as firmly entrenched in [particular] *wen* and often missing the truth" 以爲俗儒守文，多失其真.[276] The phrase *shouwen* 守文 makes a good sense in generalizing Wang's critiques on *suru*'s affiliation to particular "texts," as well as their methods of decoding the textual data with word-by-word precision,[277] both as the byproducts of the official

275 See Yuri Pines, "Chinese History Writing between the Sacred and the Secular," in *Early Chinese Religion, vol. 1*, 327–32.

276 *Houhan shu* 49.1629.

277 Cf. Nylan, "Han Classicists Writing in Dialogue," 141, where she takes Wang Chong's argumentation as falling into "pedantic obsession with absolute linguistic precision." This judgment, it seems to me, is not without ambivalence in evaluating Wang Chong's argumentative strategy, as Wang often engaged in an utterance with word-by-word examination only in order to disprove the illusion (in his regard) that could be taken from that utterance in a manner of deciphering it with loyalty to "absolute linguistic precision."

academic system in which those texts were privileged with unshakable authorities. Such logic, therefore, achieves a new clarity of why the term *suru*—which itself could refer to career-minded *ru* in earlier source—was applied into a context related to the methodological problem of literary learning during the Han.

A similar critique on *suru* was made by Ying Shao in his *Fengsu tong* 風俗通 (or *Fengsu tongyi* 風俗通義). In a discussion about the meaning of the phrase "Three Kings" (*sanwang* 三王), Ying enumerated and compared a series of records drawn from manifold sources, and closed the case with his own explanation.[278] In the end, Ying attributed the divergence of opinions to the failure of *suru*, for they "were unable to select and synthesize so as to extend the range of discussion, and hence ended up with disputations and quarrels" 不能採綜，多共辨論，至於訟鬩.[279] What he himself practiced, as implied, was exactly the opposite: a procedure of "selecting" (*cai* 採/采) and "synthesizing" (*zong* 綜) on an extensive basis. This approach also speaks well to his aspiration for *tong* ("comprehensiveness"), a value embedded in the title of his work.[280]

In the cases of Xu Shen and Cai Yong, the criticism against *suru* was primarily targeted on the latter's rigid and narrow understanding of *wen* in the specific sense of "written characters." Xu Shen, in his postscript for the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字, spectacularly disparaged *suru* in terms of that they "took for granted their familiarity with what they studied, and blinded themselves from

278 Wang Liqi annot., *Fengsu tongyi jiaozhu* 風俗通義校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981), 13–14.

279 *Fengsu tongyi jiaozhu*, 14.

280 Zhang Xuecheng discussed the incorporation of *tong* and an array of related terms in the titles of several Han writings, taking *Baihu tong* 白虎通 and *Fengsu tong* 風俗通 as a pair of models. See *Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu*, 372–73. For a further discussion on this issue, see Chapter 4.

what they scarcely heard about" 翫其所習，蔽所希聞,[281] and that they "did not lay eyes on comprehensive learning, and had not seen the regulated paradigm of the samples of written characters" 不見通學，未嘗睹字例之條.[282] The term *tongxue* 通學 ("comprehensive learning/study") was rarely seen in the Eastern Han context, yet it involved, in the first place, the growing prominence of the concept of *tong*[283] in conformity to Xu Shen's method of having various comparable samples for a given character. Cai Yong, in his proposal for the standardization of classical texts in 175 CE, also blamed *suru* for their far-fetched explanations and distortions of written characters for sectarian interests.[284] In both cases, Xu and Cai's critiques presented an anxiety to refine and to regulate the system of writing, a motif corresponding to a diachronic transition that written words gained unprecedented significance and intellectual attention from the first century CE onward.[285]

Throughout these Eastern Han arguments, there was not a single person's name being mentioned as a *suru*. The intellectual disparagement of *suru* was not personal, nor was it explicitly entangled with specific socio-political agendas or campaigns. The problem of *suru* was not attributed to their lack of intelligence, but their affiliation to a narrow range of texts and knowledge imposed by specific authorities that kept them from an extended horizon beyond. Such a resistant stance,

281 Duan Yucai 段玉裁, annot., *Shuowen jiezi zhu* 說文解字注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988), 763. Such an utterance is akin to what Liu Xin described as the sectarian problem of official academicians, that they were "content with what one has learned, slanderous of what one did not see before, and finally self-blinded" 安其所習，毀所不見，終以自蔽 (*Hanshu* 30.1723). For my discussion of Liu Xin's argument, see Chapter 1.

282 *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 763.

283 See Chapter 2, for a detailed investigation of the growing prominence of *tong*.

284 *Houhan shu* 60B.1990.

285 See Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon"; Nylan, "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han."

therefore, shows conformity to the growing prominence of individual erudition with self-oriented interests vis-à-vis the sectarian mode of knowledge transmission and knowledge production within official academic system, a system that operated by means of the division of classical learning, the imposition of personal affiliation to tutor-based doctrines, and the studies of *zhangju*. What make this particularly clear are the following facts: First, there is not a single existing anti-*suru* statement proposed by a court-appointed *boshi* or his recognized disciple. Instead, all the voices against *suru* came from scholars who attained their own erudition in a manner of detachment from institutional academic system. Second, in addition to the sophisticated statements against *suru*, there were cases in which scholars like Huan Tan and Xun Shu 荀淑 (83–149 CE)—according to their biographic accounts in the *Dongguan Hanji* and the *Houhan shu*—were known as disparaged by their contemporary *suru* for they learned "broadly" (*bo*) and detached themselves from the studies of *zhangju*.[286] The image of *suru*, as can be traced back to the Warring States period, was thereby transformed into a new intellectual discourse on the relationships between erudite individuals and institutional system, a topic that was expressed and performed in a wider range of literary practices and social lives.

3.2. Hypothetical Discourse: An Alternative Ground for Literary Practitioners

286 For Huan Tan, see *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 547; *Houhan shu* 28A.955. For Xun Shu, see *Houhan shu* 62.2049.

During the Han dynasty, literary learning gradually became a normalized access to social recognition and hence official positions through the system of selection and recruitment,[287] while it was meanwhile presented as an active part of intellectual life seeking alternative ground independent from political institutionalization. Such a motif was shown in a variety of individual and collective activities, which included particular behaviors of rejecting or withdrawing from official positions and, as it was often understood as, living in reclusion. The identification and categorization of these behaviors configured a series of titles such as *yinshi* 隱士, *chushi* 處士, and *yiming* 逸民.[288] What is hereafter referred to as "disengagement," to clarify, is a motif as well as a gesture not equal to a physically actualized condition of eremitism or reclusion. The motif of political disengagement can be performed, not necessarily as an action eschewing the game of power, but often as a move toward something powerful that was alternative to the matrix of the largest institutional system. Such a point of view liberates the motif of disengagement from a binary division between the "nominal" and the "substantive" (as Alan Berkowitz's proposes),[289] for "disengagement" as a ges-

287 For references, see Hans Bielenstein, *The Bureaucracy of Han Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 132–42, esp. 138–42; An Zuozhang 安作璋, "Handai de xuanguan zhidu" 漢代的選官制度, *Shandong shifan daxue xuebao* 山東師範大學學報, Nos. 1–2 (1981): 11–21; 14–24; Yan Buke, *Chaju zhidu binqian shi gao* 察舉制度變遷史稿 (Shenyang: Liaoning daxue chubanshe, 1991); Zhao Lu, *In Pursuit of the Great Peace*, 101–03.

288 The English translations of these terms fall into a spectrum of choices yet not without controversy and ambivalence. For example, Aat Vervoorn renders the term *yinshi* 隱士 as "hermit," while Alan Berkowitz suggests using "man-in-reclusion" or "practitioner of reclusion." In the cases of *chushi* 處士 and *yimin* 逸民, Berkowitz agrees with Vervoorn's translations of them as "disengaged scholar" and "man-in-retirement." See, Vervoorn, *Men of the Cliffs and Caves: The Development of the Chinese Eremitic Tradition to the End of the Han Dynasty* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1990); and Berkowitz's review article, "Reclusion and the 'Chinese Eremitic Tradition'," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 113.4 (1993): 575–84. It has to be clarified, however, that the usages and meanings of these terms were flexible within a vague range, and that none of these translations is always the most apt rendering for the respective Chinese term in each particular context.

289 Alan Berkowitz, *Patterns of Disengagement: The Practice and Portrayal of Reclusion in Early Medieval China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 7. Cf. Vervoorn, *Men of the Cliffs and Caves*, in which Vervoorn primarily discusses reclusion as a topos in early Chinese political and intellectual history.

ture could be properly enacted and expressed by a present official position holder[290]—in which case that expression was certainly a "nominal" one—yet with also a "substantive" relation to one's real life and even a broader socio-cultural context.

By blurring the artificial boundary, it becomes possible to examine a condition in which the gesture of political disengagement was reciprocally associated with the agenda in praise of scholarly erudition.[291] What makes this particularly clear is a series of compositions from the Western Han onward that shared a literary form later categorized as a subgenre, *shelun* 設論 ("hypothetical discourses")[292] by the *Wenxuan* 文選, where the compilers selected three representative texts—namely, Dongfang Shuo's 東方朔 (ca. 154–93 BCE) "Da ke nan" 答客難 ("Response to a Guest's Objection"), Yang Xiong's "Jie chao" 解嘲 ("Dissolving Ridicule"), and Ban Gu's "Da bin xi" 答賓戲 ("Response to a Guest's Jest")—under the name of this caregory.[293] During the

290 This included and was not limited to the practices generalized by the notion *chaoyin* 朝隱 or *yin yu chao* 隱於朝 (in Vervoorn's term, "eremitism at court"). See Vervoorn, *Men of the Cliffs and Caves*, 203–27.

291 The main part of the following of the present section was presented at the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society (Western Branch) (Oct. 2021, online) and "Chinese Political Thought: A Global Dialogue Beyond 'Orientalism'" International Workshop, University of Naples & Tallinn University (Jan. 2022, online), both under the title "Disengagement from Power and Power of Disengagement: Rhetorics and Politics in Six 'Hypothetical Discourses' (*Shelun*) in the Han Dynasty."

292 I follow the translation "hypothetical discourse" used by David R. Knechtges. See Knechtges trans., *Wen xuan, or Selections of Refined Literature*, vol. 1 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 24. For an English introduction to this literary subgenre, see Dominik Declercq, *Writing against the State: Political Rhetorics in Third and Fourth Century China* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1–19.

293 See Xiao Tong 蕭統 comp., *Wenxuan* 文選, annot. Li Shan 李善 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1986), 2000–05, 2005–15, and 2015–25. The earliest occurrences of these three *shelun* are all found within the *Hanshu*, respectively in Dongfang Shuo's 東方朔 biography (*Hanshu* 65.2864–68); Yang Xiong's self-narrative incorporated by Ban Gu into his biography (Ibid., 87B.3566–74); and Ban Gu's autobiography (Ibid., 100A.4225–33). I save more detailed information about their *Hanshu* contexts for later discussions. For references about the three works with regards to their shared category *shelun*, see Declercq, *Writing against the State*, 20–59, 63–64; Martin Kern, "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the 'Fu'," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 63 (2003): 402–05; Li Nailong 李乃龍, "Lun *Wenxuan* shelun lei de wenti tezheng" 論《文選》"設論"類的文體特征, *Changjiang xueshu* 長江學術, No. 4 (2008): 25–32.

Han dynasty, literary compositions sharing the same verbal structure and general topic with the three preeminent *shelun* include at least another three works, respectively Cui Yin's "Da zhi" 達旨 ("Declaration of Purpose"), Zhang Heng's "Ying jian" 應閒 ("Reply to Critique"), and finally Cai Yong's "Shi hui" 釋誨 ("Resolving Lesson").[294] Though bibliographic accounts suggest the existence of a larger number of texts tagged as *shelun* or similar genres in early medieval China,[295] what are now fully preserved constitute a corpus of around a dozen of works, which include the six Han works mentioned above and another series of post-Han compositions.

In the by-far most comprehensive English study on this subgenre, Dominik Declercq offers an introduction to all fully preserved *shelun* with a specific focus on the six post-Han iterations.[296] Central to his argument is a generalization of the main theme embedded in these *shelun*—namely, their authors' moral or political choices to stay away from a position in government.[297] This is primarily based upon a detailed, contextual reading of the six post-Han *shelun* and the two early models by Dongfang and Yang, while the generalization is applied to the other four Han *shelun* with a less careful reading of their contents, forms, and languages. Also, as Declercq emphasizes the texts

294 The earliest occurrences of these three texts are all found within their authors' biographies in the *Houhan shu*. See *Houhan shu* 52.1709–18 (Cui Yin), 59.1898–1909 (Zhang Heng), and 60B.1980–90 (Cai Yong). I save more detailed information about their *Houhan shu* contexts for later discussions.

295 See, for example, an early medieval anthology titled *Shelun ji* 設論集 recorded in the *Songshu* 宋書 (Shen Yue 沈約, *Songshu* [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974], 51.1466); three other anthologies—one with the same title *Shelun ji*, one titled as *Shelun lianzhu ji* 設論連珠集 (presumably compiled with another subgenre *lianzhu* 連珠), and the other titled as *Kenan ji* 客難集 (presumably overlapped with *shelun*, for the name *kenan* 客難 matches Dongfang Shuo's work)—that once existed in the Liang dynasty and now with their bibliographic information preserved in the *Suishu* 隋書 (Wei Zheng 魏徵 et al., *Suishu* [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997], 35.1086–87).

296 See Declercq, *Writing against the State*, passim.

297 Declercq, *Writing against the State*, 4, 14–15.

as both "the product of their historical and biographical context"[298] and the reflections of the living experience of the respective authors that differ case-by-case (as exactly informed by that *context*), such a historical/biographic strategy of reading may downplay the significance of a set of timeless, impersonal meanings and connections encoded within these texts that also relate them to a context larger than where they are located.

Back to the questions of *shelun* as a name of genre and the extent to which the works mentioned above can be viewed together as a meaningful, distinguishable series of literary artifacts. Note, first of all, that the term *shelun* is found as a literary subgenre only since early medieval times, when there existed a couple of alternative categories being employed to group some of these works in association with other pieces.[299] Methodologically, it would be misleading to map any "literary genre"—which is by nature a product of categorization and reduction—onto the reality of literary acts and traces which in themselves entail a more nuanced condition of dissimilarities between individual artifacts, as well as more blurred boundaries between established categories. Though *shelun* as a name of genre may fairly summarize the fictional nature and quasi-speech for-

298 Declercq, *Writing against the State*, 17.

299 For the second point, consider especially the categories *nan* 難 ("Objection") and *duiwen* 對問 ("Response to Questions"), the first being noted as a category of literary genre as early as in the third century CE (for relevant references and discussions, see Fu Gang 傅剛, "Lun *Wenxuan* nan ti" 論《文選》難體, *Zhejiang xuekan* 浙江學刊, No. 6 (1996): 86–89; Hu Dalei 胡大雷, "Lun 'yuti' ji wenti de qian 'wenti' zhuangtai" 論"語體"及文體的前"文體"狀態, *Wenxue yichan*, No. 1 (2012): 20–21), and the latter mentioned in both the *Wenxin diaolong* 文心雕龍 and the *Wenxuan*. Liu Xie 劉勰, who did not employ *shelun* as a name of subgenre, listed a series of works—including all the six fully preserved Han *shelun*, a not fully preserved work by Cui Shi 崔寔, a now-lost work by Cao Zhi, and two other post-Han compositions—as all deriving from the early model of *duiwen* attributed to Song Yu 宋玉. The *Wenxuan* compilers, following the same chronological sequence, placed the category *duiwen* (and the single selected work attributed to Song Yu) righter before *shelun* in the same volume. See Fan Wenlan 范文瀾 annot., *Wenxin diaolong zhu* 文心雕龍注 (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1958), 254–55; *Wenxuan*, 1999–2000.

mat embedded in several works tagged by it, it cannot—and is never supposed to—fully grasp what essentially distinguish those works from a variety of other literary expressions. It is not unusual in early Chinese literature across diverse archives of literary and philosophic traditions—as found in numerous philosophical proses attributed to specific "schools," a number of verses in the *Chuci* 楚辭, and a fruitful series of *fu* in Han times—that a "discourse" is "hypothetically staged" between two or more interlocutors with different stances and a "host-guest" division of voices.[300] Nor is it unusual that the main theme of *shelun*, broadly or narrowly defined by Declercq and others, can be found in other literary pieces that share such a fictional, dialogical structure. Such a condition of miscellaneous diffusion and interpenetration raises questions to what are now fully preserved and viewed together as a corpus of *shelun*, regarding the degree to which they constitute a body or a network of interconnectivity beyond random categorization. What—if any—made such a relatively small number of texts stand out and stay together, especially considering that a notion of emulation or inheritance of previous models was self-declared or regarded by later historians as some authors' own wishes?[301] What factors may have constituted a specific body of utterances and meanings that distinguishably mattered to their composers and possible readers? These questions encourage a reconsideration of the received *shelun* pieces not merely within the historio-

300 The fictional and dialogical structure embedded in *shelun* can be related back to a wide range of rhetorical practices, literary traditions, and oral performances in early China. For references, see Yu Jiaxi, *Gushu tongli*, 83; 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), 6, 110–11; Kern, "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the 'Fu'," 400–05; Hu Dalei, "Lun 'yuti' ji wenti de qian 'wenti' zhuangtai"; Chen Tongsheng 陳桐生, "Xian Qin duihua ti sanwen yuanliu" 先秦對話體散文源流, *Xueshu yanjiu* 學術研究, No. 8 (2017): 159–64; Li Jia 李佳, "*Wenxuan* nan ti yu xian Qin yu ti: jianlun duiwen shelun de wenti suyuan" 《文選》"難"體與先秦"語"體：兼論"對問""設論"的文體溯源, *Anhui daxue xuebao* 安徽大學學報, No. 4 (2019): 43–49.

301 See Note 308.

graphic, biographic, and anthological contexts *from which* they were presented but, furthermore, to grasp more closely the intertextual connections *in which* they exist: their contents, forms, and languages, as well as the persona and authority they perform.

The six Han *shelun* share a basic rhetorical structure—also seen in the post-Han *shelun*—of dialogical debate between a responsive, self-referential master voice and a guest-like interlocutor. The dialogue begins with an interlocutor who demonstrates a conflict between the master's scholarly excellence—in terms of his erudition of texts and knowledge and/or his devotion to literary productions—and his lack of power, rank, and public recognition. The main body of the dialogue is then—sometimes in a back-and-forth way—unexceptionally dominated by the voice of the master himself, with either arrogant or modest self-defense of his choice, that he would stay with his business as a literary scholar but disengage from the pursuit of higher power and rank. These texts in general present a web of interconnected themes, utterances, and rhetorical tropes that tightly correlate them (especially the five later ones) together to a degree stronger than what relate them with other texts including the post-Han *shelun*. Such correlations fundamentally release the inquiry from the necessity to defend or to eschew *shelun* (or other alternative terms) as a post-Han name of genre per se, as well as an early medieval product of anthologization and literary criticism.[302] Meanwhile, the correlations had most likely not been lost to the Han and early medieval authors,

302 For the logics and effects of the retrospective constructions of literary genres in early medieval anthologies and literary criticism, see Pauline Yu 余寶琳, "Poems in Their Place: Collections and Canons in Early Chinese Literature," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 50 (1990): 163–96.

compilers, and editors as they associated some of these Han pieces with each other on an axis of inheritance and recompositions.

Central to these *shelun* is a topic, as well as a problem, to which their authors confronted in common: the relationship between scholarly individuals and institutional matrix in an imperial political culture. Such a problem is performed as both a historical matter and an issue of timeless significance. On the one hand, the master persona foregrounded within the texts is a *historical* one: He is not merely as a *shi* 士, a "gentleman," or a worthy individual in general; nor is his "writing against the state" (Declercq) equivalent to the expressions of the "oppositional stance" (Mark Edward Lewis) prevalent in early Chinese writings attributed to specific philosophical "schools." It would also be inaccurate to consider that persona as a representative practitioner of "eremitism," for the textual performance of his disengagement from political career is presented more as a topos or a condition of mentality, rather than a fully actualized way of life. The persona is, to be specific, a practitioner of erudition equipped with extensive literary learning and technologized by proficient literary skills, whose identity is largely recognized on an intellectual rather than a moral dimension. Such an *imaginaire* of individual-of-erudition gained prominence and social significance especially during and after the late Western Han. The *timelessness* involved in these *shelun*, on the other hand, rests exactly with what they were trying to deal with: a seemingly finalized and everlasting matrix of imperial institutionalization in which any personal choice, including that to be made by a literary scholar, is now under the gaze of the supreme power. This is shown in the collective expressions of an anxiety of self-manifestation of one's literary business as a matter related

to the matrix of imperial institutionalization, a shared motif beyond the specificity of the living experience and political circumstance of each of the six Han *shelun* authors themselves.

Dongfang Shuo's "Da ke nan," first introduced and preserved in the *Hanshu* as a written work,[303] was presumably composed as the author's response to his dispossession of high official rank that he was supposed to earn by his scholarly erudition. The work was, according to the *Hanshu* context, a practice of "hypothetically staging a guest to challenge himself" 設客難己 by which he made a self-defense in his own voice "Master Dongfang" (*Dongfang xiansheng* 東方先生).[304] Despite the common employment of imaginary debate in earlier texts, the "Da ke nan" could have stood out as an innovation for its unprecedented integration of this literary form with a specific topic related to scholarly identity in an imperial circumstance. The dialogue begins with a "Guest" (*ke* 客) who praises "Master Dongfang" for his extensive mastery of transmitted texts and knowledge, which hence delivers a question why he only earns a position as *shilang* 侍郎 ("Gentleman Attendant"), a low-rank advisor and subordinate who serves the emperor at the inner court.[305] In response, the master explains his dispossession of power as an outcome of the change

303 *Hanshu* 65.2864–68 (without a formal title); *Wenxuan* 45.2000–05 (with the first occurrence of the title "Da ke nan" 答客難). For an introduction with annotated English translation of this work, see Declercq, *Writing against the State*, 20–38. There exists a similar yet brief version cited—not as a writing but a speech in a court debate—and interpolated by Chu Shaosun 褚少孫 into the *Shiji* (*Shiji* 126.3206–07). The different texts, contexts, and media forms between the two presentations in the *Shiji* and the *Hanshu* can be explained in more than one way. Conceptually, it speaks well to what Hu Dalei configures as a process from a scattered, heterogenous "pre-genre status" 前文體狀態 to a self-contained "literary genre" (*wenti* 文體). See Hu Dalei, "Lun 'yuti' ji wenti de qian 'wenti' zhuangtai."

304 *Hanshu* 65.2864.

305 Dongfang Shuo, Yang Xiong, and Ban Gu, the authors of the three most preeminent *shelun* were all at their positions as *lang* 郎 (with different specific titles and assignments). For references about the *lang* system in relation to the writings of Han scholars, see Cai Danjun 蔡丹君, "Xi Han fu jia de langguan shenfen dui qi fuzuo de yingxiang" 西漢賦家的郎官身份對其賦作的影響, *Wenxue yichan*, No. 5 (2013): 27–37; Wu Yiyun 吳沂澐 (more specifically related to the three preeminent *shelun*), "Cong *Wenxuan* shelun san pian lun wenren zhushu

of time, attributing it to the transition of sociopolitical order from the Warring States period to the Han dynasty.[306] The former is described as an age of conflicts and competitions so that men with extraordinary talents had greater opportunities to be discovered and promoted, and the latter as a peaceful era in which the chance became less available. Though much can be said about the extent to which Dongfang Shuo's self-defense was insincere or ironic, the solution foregrounded in his response was to normalize his dispossession of power as a neutral outcome of the changing political circumstance before and during his time. Involved in his praise of the current imperial Han dynasty was a grand narrative of history, a transition from chaos to order that a worthy man is supposed to embrace and adapt himself to. Though Dongfang Shuo's subtle jealousy of the inviting political circumstance in the Warring States could be morally problematized from a Han point of view,[307] the solution he offered reinforced an assumption of individual dependence on the institutional matrix of power. Namely, one's political choice, as well as the degree to which one gets recognized and manifested, depend on how well the power operates and what it demands.

All the five later Han *shelun* employ an interlocutor to speak with essentially the same basic question. Three of the five *shelun* after Dongfang Shuo were, according to the contexts where they were presented, composed with the authors' consciousness of being inspired or triggered by one or more previous models within the same vein and, simultaneously, his awareness of carrying forward

---

guannian de chansheng" 從《文選》設論三篇論文人著述觀念的產生, *Jiangsu shifan daxue xuebao* 江蘇師範大學學報, No. 3 (2015): 75–84.

306 *Hanshu* 65.2864.

307 For the changing views and presentations of Warring States in Dongfang Shuo, Yang Xiong, Ban Gu, and others' works, see Jiang Wenyan 蔣文燕, "Handai danan ti fuzuo zhong 'Zhanguo qingjie' de neihan ji bianhua" 漢代答難體賦作中"戰國情結"的內涵及變化, *Nandu xuetan*, No. 6 (2007): 63–66.

this inherited legacy by creating his own version.[308] Similar to what happened to other literary traditions, it was such a practice of revisionary composition—often tagged as *ni* 擬 (inadequately translated as "imitation," "emulation," and so on)—that constituted the actual foundation of a later recognized tradition or genre.[309] Beyond an over-simplified point of view seeing all the six Han *shelun* on a linear axis from an initial master text to its many "imitations" or "variations," a more meaningful approach is to investigate the entire body of literary proliferation beyond the "first" model, with regards to the following questions: Why would the Han authors after Dongfang continue to deal with the same central topic within a shared verbal structure? On whose behalf and for what kind of interest, the voices encoded into these works gained their meanings and significance by generations?

This approach leads to an observation, that the five *shelun* after Dongfang Shuo constitute a web of even more tightly interconnected utterances, voices, and rhetorical tropes to be distinguished from its first model, a phenomenon that reflects the changing views and thoughts in Han intellectual world. What essentially distinguishes them from the "Da ke nan" is their collective articulation of a new scholarly stance—a politically more radical one—that, simply put, claims for a self-oriented condition of intellectual life supplied by one's engagement in literary learning and practicing and, simultaneously, one's deliberate detachment from the matrix of imperial system and

308 See *Hanshu* 100A.4225, for the case of Ban Gu (according to his self-narrative, influenced by Dongfang Shuo and Yang Xiong); *Houhan shu* 52.1709, for the case of Cui Yin (according to the historian, deliberately modeled after Yang Xiong); Ibid., 60B.1980, for the case of Cai Yong (according to the historian, deliberately modeled after Dongfang Shuo, Yang Xiong, Ban Gu, and Cui Yin).

309 As Joseph Allen proposes in his study of *yuefu* 樂府 poetry, it was the "imitation" of previous "model" that substantively defined and constituted a particular literary tradition. See Allen, *In the Voice of Others: Chinese Music Bureau Poetry* (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, The University of Michigan, 1992), esp. 57–58.

bureaucratic power. The condition of a scholar's disengagement from that power, as performed by Dongfang Shuo as a frustration, was hence transformed into an ideal, desirable, and promising mode of life, from which power is not lost but obtained in an alternative way.

First of the five later *shelun* was Yang Xiong's "Jie chao,"[310] which, according to Yang's self-narrative, was composed as a self-defense for his disinterest in pursuing a higher official rank and his satisfaction with his philosophical masterpiece *Taixuan* 太玄.[311] Similar to Dongfang Shuo, the master voice "Master Yang" (*Yangzi* 揚子) explains the issue in terms of the change of time. Nevertheless, in a way akin to his revisionary and competitive approaches dealing with other sources of influences,[312] Yang Xiong took "Da ke nan" as another model to be critically revised via his own innovation. Instead of praising the contemporary dynasty, Yang Xiong performed his voice in a sarcastic tone, as he portrayed the time he lived in as an age where there was "no event going on" (*wang shi* 亡事), so that people without extraordinary talents could acquire and keep their high positions—

> 故當其有事也，非蕭、曹、子房、平、勃、樊、霍則不能安；當其亡事也，章句之徒相與坐而守之，亦亡所患。[313]
> Therefore, when there were events going on, the problems could not have been solved without Xiao [He], Cao [Can], [Zhang] Zifang, [Chen] Ping, [Zhou] Bo, [Fan] Kuai, and Huo [Guang]. When there is no event going on, even if the fellows who study chapters-and-sentences (*zhangju*) just sit together and stay with it, there is nothing to worry about.

310 *Hanshu* 87B.3566–74; *Wenxuan*, 2005–15. For two thorough readings of this work with English translations, see Knechtges, *The Han Rhapsody*, 97–104; Declercq, *Writing against the State*, 38–59.

311 *Hanshu* 87B.3565–66.

312 To be fully discussed in Chapter 4.

313 *Hanshu* 87B.3568.

Yang Xiong's sarcasm of *zhangju* shows conformity to another statement in his self-narrative, that he was fond of broad learning of a variety of literary sources but disengaged from *zhangju* as a specific method of studying classical texts.[314] Moreover, this sarcasm entails a deeper criticism of *zhangju* as a product of the Han official academic system which imposed a linear, divisional mode of knowledge transmission, as well as personal affiliations to institutional disciplines. Taking *zhangju* as a trope of the institutionalization and alienation of scholarly individuality, the master's oppositional stance is then expressed in his enumeration of a series of previous examples (9 figures in 6 regularized lines[315])—mostly in the Western Han, including Sima Xiangru 司馬相如 (ca. 179–117 BCE) and Dongfang Shuo—for their various accesses to glories and fames that were not achieved independently but in debts to others' patrons and helps. By contrast, throughout the "Jie chao," Yang Xiong found his self-contained pleasure with his own work, the *Taixuan*, a business disentangled from external powers, patrons, and regulations. He closed the case and the whole text, right after his enumeration of previous examples, with an ending couplet that made a rhetorical statement of his own position and choice—

僕誠不能與此數公者並，	Indeed I cannot juxtapose myself with these gentlemen,
故默然獨守吾太玄。[316]	Thus, I silently stay alone with my *Taixuan*.

314 *Hanshu* 87A.3514. For a detailed analysis of the self-portrait and later remembrance of Yang scholarly persona, see Chapter 2; for references about the different meanings and implications of *zhangju*, see Chapters 1 and 2.

315 Each line, by principle, presents one particular figure as an exemplary case, with the only exception in which the early Han recluses "Four White-headed Men" (*sihao* 四皓) are presented as a group. See *Hanshu* 87B.3573.

316 *Hanshu* 87B.3573.

The two-line coda in the "Jie chao"—and the way it is contextually presented—opens a window toward an inquiry into the intratextuality[317] among all the five *shelun*, beginning with Yang Xiong, as a web of interconnected utterances, voices, and tropes that constituted not merely a condensed body of collective expressions but also an ever-renewing framework open to iterations, appropriations, and variations. Noticeably, in each of the four Eastern Han *shelun* after Yang Xiong, the master's speech includes an utterance—composed by two or more thematic lines—bearing formal and contextual similarities to the coda of Yang Xiong, with also the Eastern Han master's declaration of his willful engagement in literary learning and his critical stance against power, rank, and political status. To line them up onto an axis of continuous expressions, chronologically, starting with that by Yang Xiong—

Yang Xiong, "Jie Chao"
僕誠不能與此數公者並，　Indeed I cannot juxtapose myself with these gentlemen,
故默然獨守吾太玄。　Thus, I silently stay alone with my *Taixuan*.

Ban Gu, "Da bin xi"
僕亦不任廁技於彼列，　I do not rely on [such] skills in line with these people,
故密爾自娛於斯文。[318]　Thus, I secretly take my own pleasure within that *wen*.

Cui Yin, "Da zhi"

317 For the concept "intratextuality" and its applicability in the studies of early and medieval Chinese poetry, see Allen, *In the Voice of Others*, passim., esp. 10–12.

318 *Hanshu* 100A.4231. I save my detailed, case-by-case discussions of the four utterances in Ban Gu, Zhang Heng, Cui Yin, and Cai Yong's *shelun*—along with their literary and biographic contexts—for later.

僕誠不能編德於數者， 竊慕古人之所序。[319]	Indeed I cannot attach my virtue to a few people like them, And I personally admire the ancient men's instructions.

Zhang Heng, "Ying jian"

僕進不能參名於二立， 退又不能群彼數子。 愍三墳之既穨， 惜八索之不理。 庶前訓之可鑽， 聊朝隱乎柱史。[320]	Forwardly I cannot add my name with two "establishments," Backwardly I cannot be one among those men. I take pity on the decay of the "Three Tombs," And I am sorry for the messiness of the "Eight Inquiries." May it be possible to explore the previous instructions, I just stay in reclusion at the court as a scribe-under-pillar.

Cai Yong, "Shi hui"

僕不能參跡於若人， 故抱璞而優遊。[321]	I cannot step into the traces of those people, Thus, I hold my undiscovered jade and wander at leisure.

All the five sets of thematic lines employ an "I would not …/but I would …" structure which yields a formal statement of one's position and choice, though their tones of speech are often modestly—sometimes ironically—softened as "I cannot …/thus I would …." Most of them are expressed in the form of couplet and syntactically resemble each other. The only exception is in Zhang Heng's "Ying jian," where the master provides an extended version consisting of six lines in total, splitting the negative "I would not …" expression into two lines—respectively modified by "forwardly" (*jing* 進) and "backwardly" (*tui* 退)—at the beginning and putting the positive "I would …" expression at the end.

319 *Houhan shu* 52.1716.

320 *Houhan shu* 59.1908.

321 *Houhan shu* 60B.1988.

All these position-generating utterances are presented within essentially the same context. To be precise, each of them comes right after a regularized, rhymed passage of the master's clustered enumeration of around a dozen of previous figures with glories, fames, merits, and ranks, to whom the master voices refer as specific others—in terms of "these gentlemen" 此數公, "those men" 彼數子, "those people" 若人, and so on—that he himself "would not/cannot" be. In most cases, the master labels his examples as men talented in specific arts, skills, and techniques—in all the five *shelun*, distributed among around 60 different figures and a dozen of areas such as music, medicine, performance, handicrafts, physiological talents, martial arts, and so on—with also allusions to the occasional chances by which these skills got recognized and hence earned them merits and fames. Moreover, the master normally presents these examples in an emotionally disinterested—if not disdainful—tone of speech, which then delivers his own position-making declaration in terms of "I would not …" (in the "Ying jian," modified by "backwardly" in particular). The only exception is Cui Yin's "Da zhi," where the master lists 16 exemplary figures—beginning with Kongzi—who embodied the triumph of moral excellence instead of specific skills.[322] In this case, though the "Da zhi" employs the same form of clustered presentation of specific others that leads to the master's own position-generating statement of being a literary scholar, the choice is made with a sincere expression of modesty without irony.

Equally important is the function of these position-generating statements as the codas which close the ongoing debates and empower the masters' voices as the winning ones. All of these

322 *Houhan shu* 52.1715–16.

statements are located at—or close enough to—the end of the master's entire speech (normally, the end of the entire text as well), giving the text a formal closure with the master's triumph over his secular-minded interlocutor. For the two strongest cases, in both Ban Gu's "Da bin xi" and Cui Yin's "Da zhi," the master's position-generating couplet constitutes exactly the last two lines that close the entire text as the coda of "Jie chao" does. Such a setting verbally constructs a scenario from which the master's winning voice is delivered. By reviewing all that "I would not" be, the master comes to his closure, that "I would" stay with the business of "my" own interest—namely, a realm of literary learning and practicing in dealing with texts.

The position-generating codas, along with the clustered presentations of various figures to which they are attached and the masters' winning voices in which the debates are closed, altogether constitute an identifiable body of utterances that stands out as the core text distributed among all the five *shelun*, around which numerous expressions and meanings are progressively articulated with circumscribed variability. The "Jie chao," in this regard, gains its significance not as the first "imitation" of the "Da ke nan" but the actual foundation on which a critical, revisionary literary tradition was gradually formulated and constructed, as well as the core text—in another sense—surrounded by its echoes and variations.

Ban Gu's "Da bin xi,"[323] according to his self-narrative in the *Hanshu*, was a reaction to those who looked down upon his broad and concentrated interests in literary learning and textual pro-

323 *Hanshu* 100A.4225–33 (without a formal title); *Wenxuan*, 2015–25 (with the first occurrence of the title "Da bin xi" 答賓戲).

ductions—in terms of *boxue* and *zhushu*—that did not get him a desirable status of official power.[324] Within the "Da bin xi," such a critical voice is performed by the persona of a secular-minded interlocutor "Guest" (*bin* 宾), whose opinion is then rejected by Ban Gu's own master voice, the "Host" (*zhuren* 主人) of his text. The second motive to compose this work—also introduced in Ban's self-narrative—was to compete with Dongfang Shuo and Yang Xiong's models, which he found inspiring but politically incorrect.[325] In the "Da bin xi," the "Host" first gives his effusive praise of the glorious unity of the Han dynasty and, correspondingly, a critique on the Warring States period for its chaotic disorder and how it encouraged immoral ways of political promotion. This argument of political legitimacy, sincerely or not, involved a critique on Dongfang and Yang for they seemed to be mistaken while judging and periodizing the changes of time.[326] Notwithstanding this divergence, the voice of the "Host" gets close to Yang Xiong when it comes to a self-identification modeling after scholarly individuals who manifested themselves by literary learning and writing. In his defense against the guest, the "Host" invokes a series of eminent exemplars in the Han, including Yang Xiong, after Lu Jia, Dong Zhongshu, and Liu Xiang—

近者	In the recent age,
陸子優繇，	Master Lu wandered at leisure,
新語以興。	Giving rise to his *Xinyu*.
董生下帷，	Master Dong laid down his curtain (to teach),
發藻儒林。	Advancing the literary elegance in the circle of *ru*.
劉向司籍，	Liu Xiang took charge of texts,

324 *Hanshu* 100A.4225.

325 *Hanshu* 100A.4225.

326 See Jiang Wenyan, "Handai danan ti fuzuo zhong 'Zhanguo qingjie' de neihan ji bianhua."

辯章舊聞。	Differentiating and manifesting the old sources.
揚雄覃思，	Yang Xiong deeply engaged in thinking,
法言大玄。[327]	[Then there come] the *Fayan* and the *Taixuan*.

In this highly condensed, clustered presentation of Western Han scholarly idols, each couplet follows the same structure in which a scholar's action or gesture is presented in the first line and his scholarly achievements or literary productions demonstrated in the second. During the Eastern Han, as especially showcased in the *Hanshu*, the remembrance of scholarly idols in terms of their literary learning and practicing became a significant part of collective memory shared by a growing literate community, in which the clustered presentation of exemplary figures—with often recurring names in familiar groupings and familiar sequences—stands out as an expressive form of making highlighted "memory palaces" and hence enduring memories in particular.[328] Such a scenario is then mirrored, in a contrary tone of speech, in the core passage of the "Da bin xi," where the master voice presents another clustered enumeration of men with talents (11 figures in 9 regularized lines) who are famous for various arts and techniques such as music, medicine, martial skills, handicrafts, and so on.[329] Right after this, the master's position-generating coda—clearly modeled after that in the "Jie chao"—appears at the end of the text: "I do not rely on [such] skills in line with these people. Thus, I secretly take my own pleasure within that *wen*" 僕亦不任廁技於彼列，故密爾自娛於斯文.

327 *Hanshu* 100A.4231.

328 For numerous examples and my discussions, see Chapter 2.

329 *Hanshu* 100A.4231.

The coda itself foregrounds an imagined realm of intellectual and literary activities—in terms of *siwen* 斯文 (literally, "that *wen*")—to be distinguished from the whole range of practical skills and techniques. It is within such an imagined realm that the "Host" finds himself self-contained with his "own pleasure" (*ziyu* 自娛) independent from external judgments. The phrase *siwen*, as drawn from the famous quote attributed to Kongzi, used to be a reference to the cultural legacy (*wen*) left behind by the former king of Zhou.[330] In the "Da bin xi," however, Ban Gu appropriated it more precisely as a reference to a specific form of *wen* embodied in textual sources and literary learning. This appropriation instantiated the shifting usage of *wen* and *wen*-related concepts around his time, as especially performed in his *Hanshu*.[331] Meanwhile, the position-generating coda speaks well to the life experience of Ban Gu, the protagonist, who was not merely a court-appointed specialist working with texts, but also a man who extensively cultivated his erudition since his early youth.[332]

The self-oriented interest in literary business, as well as the separation of this business from a means to acquire power, rank, and fame, were also expressed by Cui Yin, Zhang Heng, and Cai Yong in their own *shelun*. In his "Da zhi," a work contemporary to the "Da bin xi," Cui Yin responded in his first-person voice "I myself" (*ji* 己) to the anonymous interlocutor "Someone" (*huo* 或), concerning the behavior of exchanging one's talents simply for an official salary as not in ac-

330 See *Lunyu* 9.5 (*Lunyu jishi*, 576–79).

331 See Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," esp. 48–76.

332 See *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 675; *Houhan shu* 40A.1330. For a detailed analysis of the remembrance of Ban's scholarly persona, see Chapter 2.

cord with the right way. With numerous examples and tropes, his principle is summarized as such—

> 暴智燿世，因以干祿，非仲尼之道也。[333]
> Exposing one's wisdom and showing off to the world, taking it as the means to acquire official salary—these are not in accord with the principle of Zhongni (Kongzi).

It is an echo but also a variation to the "Jie chao"—a text that Cui deliberately took as a model, according to the *Houhan shu*—when the master comes to a clustered enumeration of previous figures along with his own position-generating coda. There is nothing seemingly ironic and critical when he lists the 16 merit-winning examples beginning with Kongzi (all as pre-imperial figures, mostly from the *Chunqiu* period), assigning them roughly into a spectrum of excellent virtues such as benevolence, courage, wisdom, and trustfulness, instead of merely a range of practical skills and techniques. The chronological deployment of authorities rhetorically implies a critique against the imperial era, when nobody deserves to be mentioned together with the pre-imperial (especially *Chunqiu*) idols from the master's point of view. This bears similarity to what Yang Xiong did against the political circumstance in the imperial Han dynasty, when the recognition of individual values is now tightly regulated within an institutionalized system that encourages career-seeking minds. Thus, Cui Yin's position-generating coda claims to follow the models of "the ancients" (*guren* 古人) only, so as to defend his decision to concentrate on literary learning but stay away from an official career

333 *Houhan shu* 52.1715.

at the present time, during which he was known for his "broadly learning" (*boxue*) since early youth and that he "constantly took textual sources as his business, yet without concerning the matter of official promotion" 常以典籍爲業，未遑仕進之事.[334]

The next fully preserved *shelun*, Zhang Heng's "Ying jian," presents another case of echoes and variations. The work was reportedly composed at a moment when he returned to a previous position (the "Grand Chronicler" [*taishi ling* 太史令]) after a five-year withdrawal, based on which the interlocutor named "One Who Criticizes Me" (*jian yu zhe* 間余者) makes his career-minded argument.[335] The first-person master "I" (*yu* 余) begins with a position-generating statement expressing his indifference to power and rank—

君子不患位之不尊，	A noble man is not troubled for his position not being high,
而患德之不崇。	but for his virtue not being venerable.
不恥祿之不夥，	He is not ashamed for his official salary not being much,
而恥智之不博。[336]	but for his intelligence/knowing not being broad.

The four lines quoted above specifically brings the tension between self-oriented scholarly stance and career-minded interest into a larger conceptual framework. "Broadness" (*bo*), a value at the heart of the Eastern Han literary culture and intellectual lives, is here taken as the primary goal of a noble man's (*junzi* 君子) cultivation of his "intelligence/knowing" (*zhi* 智), as in line with his moral pursuit for higher "virtue" (*de* 德) and his moral disinterest in official "rank" (*wei* 位) and

334 *Houhan shu* 52.1708.
335 *Houhan shu* 59.1899.
336 *Houhan shu* 59.1901.

"salary" (*lu*). The interlocked pairing of these concepts situates the value of *bo*—a code of scholarly erudition—onto an esteemed status within the grand discourse of one's disengagement from power, a stance that was traditionally taken as a moral instead of intellectual choice.

This opens a window to better understand why, for Zhang Heng, there is neither a shame of coming back to a low-rank official position after a five-year withdrawal, nor a shame involved in the gesture of that "coming-back" itself. The position that he is now back to take is desirable, simply because it offers a good access to his scholarly inquiry into texts and knowledge that he cherishes, as declared in his position-generating coda (after a 10-line listing of 10 clustered examples skilled in various arts and techniques that he "would not" do). As suggested by Hans van Ess, the entire work proposes an alternative choice "alongside the dichotomy of official career and hermitism" to practice a politically disengaged life even at one's official position.[337] This is best presented by the phrase *chaoyin* 朝隱 ("reclusion at the court")[338] in his position-generating line, "I just stay in reclusion at the court as a scribe-under-pillar" 聊朝隱乎柱史. What remains true, as shown within the *shelun* and also his biography, appears to be his consistent indifference to both glory and dishonor related to an official rank, as well as his constant interest in "broadening" his learning throughout his life.[339]

337 Hans van Ess, "Literary Works and Allusion in Three Biographies of the *Hou Hanshu* and Their Purpose," *Monumenta Serica* 67:1 (2019): 115.

338 For the idea of eremitism at court, see also Vervoorn, *Men of the Cliffs and Caves*, 203–27, where he considers it as "an invention of the Han dynasty" (203) and takes Dongfang Shuo and Yang Xiong as two preeminent exemplars.

339 See Zhang Heng's biography thoroughly (*Houhan shu* 59.1897–1951).

The last fully preserved Han *shelun*, Cai Yong's "Shi hui," presents the by-far most polyphonic performance of *shelun* as a game of speech, as well as the author's spectacular display of the power of language related to his persona as an erudite scholar. These are shown, in the text's frequent exchange between the perspectives of the master and the interlocutor (5 times, more than any previous *shelun*); the playful titles put onto the two speakers' names ("Hoary-headed Old Man" [*Huadian Hulao* 華顛胡老] and "Worldly-minded Young Gentleman" [*Wushi gongzi* 務世公子]); the fruitful descriptions of their appearances, gestures, and tones; and finally, a spontaneous song performed by the winning master himself after the young gentleman has already surrendered, a scenario that makes a spectacular stylistic exchange at the end of the whole text (an element seen in verses of the *Chuci* and Han *fu* yet not found in previous five *shelun*).

The "Shi hui" was, as informed by the *Houhan shu* context, a composition written during a period of Cai Yong's reclusion after he refused an offer from the court for his talent as a musician.[340] Thus, the work was a critical response to this calling, as well as an expression of his pleasure taken from literary learning detached from the attraction of power and rank. This was highlighted in his textual presentation of an imaginary journey around various sources of texts and thoughts—

方將騁馳乎典籍之崇塗，	[I] am about to gallop on the lofty way of classical texts,
休息乎仁義之淵藪。	Rest at the deep locus of benevolence and righteousness,
槃旋乎周孔之庭宇，	Hover in the lobby and hall of Duke of Zhou and Kongzi,
揖儒墨而與爲友。[341]	And fold my hands to befriend the *ru* and the *mo*.

340 *Houhan shu* 60B.1980.

341 *Houhan shu* 60B.1987.

Later on, modeling after the four previous *shelun*, the master enumerates a series of specialists (14 figures evenly distributed into 14 regularized lines) skilled in specific crafts and techniques. This part then leads to an ending couplet that "I cannot step into the traces of those people. Thus, I hold my undiscovered jade and wander at leisure" 僕不能參跡於若人，故抱璞而優遊. Here, the trope "undiscovered jade" (*pu* 璞) stands out as a metaphor for Cai Yong's inner excellence that is, first, cultivated through his extensive literary learning since his early youth,[342] and second, not yet discovered and recognized by the power of the court. Satisfied with his "jade" undiscovered, this position-generating statement becomes a declaration that he would rather stay in reclusion with his inner beauty, instead of catering the gaze of power and risking the alienation of himself from a high-minded scholar to a salaried man living on an unimportant skill. With this being said and heard, the perspective turns to the young gentleman who is silenced in front of the master and ashamed for his own secular-mindedness.[343] With nothing to respond anymore, the text comes to its final closure, a song performed by the master himself that celebrates—in a musical form—his triumph greater than music.[344]

The intra-textual and inter-textual networks within these Han *shelun* or relating them to other sources are doubtlessly more complicated and diverse.[345] One may also differentiate and categorize

342 For the cultivation of his scholarly erudition, see *Houhan shu* 60B.1980.

343 *Houhan shu* 60B.1989.

344 *Houhan shu* 60B.1989.

345 In addition to the thematic consistency and interconnected utterances that correlate the five *shelun* after Dongfang Shuo as a condensed body of expressions, there also exist a considerable range of topoi, tropes, and stylistic features that are shared only by a small number of *shelun*. Consider, for example, the discussions of the three ways of "establishments" (*li* 立) with "unfadability" (*buxiu* 不朽), especially the "Establishment of Words" (*liyan* 立言), only occur in the "Da bin xi" and the "Ying jian" (*Hanshu* 100A.4225; *Houhan shu* 59.1899, 1904, 1908). The philosophical/metaphorical mapping of one's choice with the bipolar concepts *wen* ("[exterior] pat-

these *shelun* according to their different opinions for or against a particular issue, their relations to specific texts or philosophical traditions, or the official positions held by their authors at the times their *shelun* were composed, and so on. Moreover, each of these *shelun* can be arguably considered as unique in terms of contents or forms. Finally, and only in case that a biographic and historical reading is still to be followed, each of these *shelun* is certainly unique as being related to the specific need of specific author in a specific circumstance. However, all these possible points of specificity do not downplay—and sometimes even strengthen—a point of view considering the five *shelun* beginning with Yang Xiong as a collective expression of a new persona, whose scholarly stance was largely different from Dongfang Shuo's first model. The authors of the five *shelun*, along with many others, were recognized by their contemporaries and later accounts as acting "broadly" (*bo*) or "comprehensively/thoroughly" (*tong*) in their business of literary learning and hence literary writing. The gestures and voices performed in their *shelun* can be hence viewed as the textual realizations of acts, thoughts, and utterances taking places in a larger context.

Within these hypothetically staged debates, the various master voices play as the hosts of the imaginary settings built within the verbal structures, as well as the avatars of the actual hosts who control the texts. The master's victory over his guest-like interlocutor is settled in advance and, meanwhile, declared with a set of recurring forms once and once again. Such a winning voice over its rival not merely relies on the effects of its philosophical and ethical powers but, more essentially,

---

tern/manifestation") versus *zhi* 質 ("[interior] substance"), as well as *hua* 華 ("[flowery] ornament") versus *shi* ("[substantial] core"), are foremostly presented in the "Ying jian" and the "Da zhi" (*Houhan shu* 52.1709, 1714; 59.1899). For further discussions of the notions *buxiu* and *liyan*, as well as the *wen-zhi* 文-質 dichotomy, see Chapter 4.

the rhetorical power of language that overwhelms the text by means of its condensed output of utterances, as well as the knowledge of how to make it happen.[346] This is expressively embodied in the great advantages of length, vocabulary, and the range of knowledge taken by the master's speech over the interlocutor, especially the spectacular display of numerous ways of making clustered examples, with even a deliberate intention to avoid repetition with previous *shelun*. These features are not obvious in the first *shelun* presumably by Dongfang Shuo but extensively found in the five later ones from Yang Xiong onward.

Such a textuality shows conformity to the central themes and ideas encoded in the five *shelun* themselves. The utterances of the texts, in this sense, constitute exactly the textual display of the values being uttered: first, a self-oriented and wide-ranging scholarly interest in literary learning and writing, a business performed as superior to skills, crafts, or techniques in a general, utilitarian sense; and second, a gesture of disengagement from the matrix of imperial institutionalization, as well as a radical resistant oppositional stance against the alienation of intellectual labor and scholarly individuality imposed by that matrix. Each of the two sides provides an alternative ground for each other, suggesting a more desirable mode of intellectual life in comparison to affiliating an individual to an institutional system.

It is within the texts—but not necessarily in the actual secular lives of the respective authors—that these values claim a triumph over the enormous matrix and its representatives, verbal-

346 For the rhetorical effect of spectacular language in Han *fu* (from which *shelun* cannot be distinguished in terms of language and style) and its implications, see Kern, "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the 'Fu'." For *fu* as an expressive form for the display of extensive knowledge, see Xu Gongchi, "Handai wenxue de zhishihua tezheng."

izing a mode of intellectual life disengaged from external powers but, simultaneously, an alternative authority gaining power from that disengagement. Such an agenda is performed by means of imagining, commemorating, and self-projecting the images and models who embodied these values, as well as the production of specific otherness as the opposite, the different, or the inferior. This is precisely where the hypothetical discourse reveals its very nature of rhetorics and politics: a discourse is hypothetically staged, only for the sakes of its closure in a winning voice.

3.3. Detachment from Official Career and Its Consequences

While Yang Xiong, Ban Gu, and Zhang Heng's *shelun* were all composed during their terms of office, the other two works by Cui Yin and Cai Yong were produced during their authors' reclusion away from position. Both Yang, Ban, and Zhang had benefitted from the rich availability of literary sources for the specific positions they once held, yet the other two Eastern Han scholars were portrayed, in their *shelun*, as leading a fruitful life engaged in literary learning only with their own supply. Such a condition was widely presented in numerous textual records and literary portrayals of men-in-reclusion around the Eastern Han, from which the following questions arise: What kinds of motifs, tropes, and narrative elements were embedded in a substantively reclusive life that prepared an ideal ground to cultivate one's erudition?

The most typical action of declaring one's present status as a practitioner of reclusion was to decline a given opportunity of gaining an official rank,[347] especially by rejecting official summoning

347 Berkowitz offers a stronger statement that, "the rejection or acceptance of official appointment in the end sepa-

for recruitment under the names of *zheng* 徵 and *pi* 辟, which were respectively sent from (at least nominally) the emperor and various offices in central or regional governments.[348] This action was often recorded by the *Houhan shu* as *bujiu* 不就 ("not attending"), *buying* 不應 ("not responding"), and *buzhi* 不至 ("not coming"),[349] sometimes accompanied by excuses such as sickness and mourning, and was in fact contingent on a more diverse range of reasons. The acceptance or declining of a given offer was, first of all, largely depending on the attraction of the position being promised, and also the status and reputation of the offer provider. It was also common that one would change his roles—sometimes back-and-forth—between a recluse and an official at different stages of his life. Recluses themselves, according to their moral, social, and intellectual positions, used to be divided by traditional and modern scholars into several groups of thinkers and practitioners in various ways.[350] Chronological and geographical patterns can be found among the occurrence of recluses over time, as some particular ages—such as the transitional period from the Western to the Eastern Han and the late Eastern Han—had indeed witnessed the climaxes of the occurrence of recluses, especially in certain areas, as often explained as the collective reactions to

---

rated practitioners of reclusion from practicing officials," though he also points out that practitioners of reclusion would sometimes proceed to audience at court. See Berkowitz, *Patterns of Disengagement*, 117.

348 For an informative introduction of these two ways of recruitment, see An Zuozhang, "Handai de xuanguan zhidu," 17–21.

349 My survey in the *Houhan shu* comes up with 72 instances for the records/representations of *bujiu* 不就, 52 for *buying* 不應, and 22 for *buzhi* 不至 that refer to specific actions of declining a given opportunity for official position sent from different patrons or offices. The vast majority of these samples are portrayals of individual choices, yet they indeed collectively reflect a series of chronological and geographical patterns (see below).

350 For example, see Meng Xiangcai 孟祥才, "Ping Donghan shiqi de yinzhe qun" 評東漢時期的隱者群, *Liaocheng shifan xueyuan xuebao* 聊城師範學院學報, No. 6 (1999): 13–21; Jiang Bo 蔣波, *Qinhan yinyi wenti yanjiu* 秦漢隱逸問題研究 (Changsha: Xiangtan daxue chubanshe, 2014), 55–79.

particular crises and public events.[351] Notwithstanding such diversity and contingency of historical factors, it still deserves an investigation of what may have supplied the foundations and contents for a reclusive man's mental life on the daily basis.

It was possible that several recluses had indeed intended to erase their traces from any kind of public recognition and commemoration. However, for the Eastern Han recluses whose words and deeds were manifested and transmitted to us, their gestures of disengagement from official career more likely presented a signal to engage in something else that entailed values recognized and appreciated on a solid social basis. On a general level, as Berkowitz points out, that individual "strength of character" was the most commonly shared element found in all practices of reclusion as a way of life.[352] The great proliferation of textual presentations of recluses around the Eastern Han, nevertheless, needs to be placed in a circumstance in which reclusion was performed not merely as a way of life with highlighted individuality, but also a ground for an alternative *career* seeking its own public authority and significance. It can be noted, from this point of view, that a great number of practitioners of reclusion were simultaneously known as men with advanced erudition on which their authorities were precisely based—in terms of *bo*, *tong*, and other related expressions and utterances,[353] and that numerous reclusive behaviors were tightly associated with the

351 Jiang Bo's observations (according to *Hanshu*, *Houhan shu*, *Gaoshi zhuan* 高士傳, *Huayang guozhi* 華陽國志, and other traditional sources) indicate that these two periods witnessed remarkable proliferation of men-in-reclusion. See *Qin Han yinyi wenti yanjiu*, 49–79, 233–55. See also Tan Huicun 譚慧存, *Qin Han shiren yinyi sixiang yanjiu* 秦漢士人隱逸思想研究 (Chengdu: Sichuan daxue chubanshe, 2015), 176–327. For a general guide of the patterns of geographic distribution of Han literary scholars, see Liu Yuejin 劉躍進, *Qin Han wenxue dili yu wenren fenbu* 秦漢文學地理與文人分佈 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2012).

352 Berkowitz, *Patterns of Disengagement*, 5.

353 A great number of examples can be drawn from historiographic, biographic, and epitaphic portrayals of scholars known as *bo*, *tong*, or other related features while choosing to be a man-in-reclusion at least at specific stages of

overall surplus of knowledge, texts, and literary practices occupying individual and public lives. Meanwhile, the growing representations of the individuality of men-in-reclusion was precisely owing to an extended social foundation on which the intellectual values they embodied were recognized and revered.

The practice of reclusion away from official career identifiably traversed a wide spectrum of economic conditions and social classes.[354] Several men-in-reclusion were known as the members of superior clans in their local communities in terms of wealth, rank, social leadership, and sometimes specific family traditions of literary learning. Ma Rong, for example, enjoyed a rich supply from his family during his withdrawal from office, a condition that provided a solid ground for his life with both scholarly and sensual pleasures.[355] By contrast, there also existed a considerable number of cases in which literary scholars who were raised in humble families at their youth—for example, Wang Chong, Wang Fu 王符 (83–170 CE), Zheng Xuan, and Xun Yue—determined to stay in reclusion while being offered a chance for official career.[356] Given the diverse economic conditions and social classes, their shared gesture of practical detachment from official career

---

their lives. For instance, see the *Houhan shu*'s accounts for Wang Chong (*Houhan shu* 49.1629), Yang Zhen 楊震 (Ibid., 54.1759), Liang Hong (Ibid., 83.2765), Cai Xuan 蔡玄 (Ibid., 79B.2588), Ma Rong (Ibid., 60A.1972), Zhang Heng (Ibid., 59.1897), Xun Shu (Ibid., 62.2049), Yan Du 延篤 (Ibid., 64.2103), Wang Fu 王符 (Ibid., 49.1630), Jiang Gong 姜肱 (Ibid., 53.1749), Shentu Pan 申屠蟠 (Ibid., 53.1751–54), Cai Yong (Ibid., 60B.1980), Lu Zhi (Ibid., 64.2113), Zheng Xuan (Ibid., 35.1207–08), Ying Rong (Ibid., 79B.2584), and Zhong Chantong (Ibid., 49.1643–44). See also the tombstone inscriptions for Wu Liang (*Lishi · lixu*, 74–75), Lou Shou 婁壽 (Ibid., 103), Lu Jun (*Hanbei quanji*, 1495), and Yin Zhou (Ibid., 1608).

354 For a discussion of the various economic foundations for reclusion, see Jiang Bo, *Qin Han yinyi wenti yanjiu*, 130–40.

355 *Houhan shu* 60A.1972.

356 See *Houhan shu* 49.1629 (Wang Chong); 49.1630 (Wang Fu); 35.1207 (Zheng Xuan); 64.2058 (Xun Yue).

worked in concert with their shared interest in literary learning, an interest accompanied by pleasures, powers, and authorities gained from an alternative socio-cultural ground.

Such a choice made by the living was echoed in the social recognition and remembrance of the dead. What makes this particularly clear is the commemoration of scholarly reclusion—along with scholarly erudition—inscribed on tombstones,[357] a media that constituted a significant emblem of public memory that gained currency especially during the latter half of the Eastern Han.[358] For two instances—

> Tombstone Inscription for Wu Liang 武梁 (78–151 CE)
> （武梁）治韓詩經，闕幘傳講，兼通河雒諸子傳記。廣學甄徹，窮綜典[?]，靡不[?]覽。州郡請召，辭疾不就。安衡門之陋，樂朝聞之義。誨人以道，臨川不倦。恥世雷同，不闚權門。[359]
> [Wu Liang] mastered the *Shi* of the Han school, transmitted and explained [his studies] without yet wearing his headband, and integratively comprehended [the learning from] the [Yellow] River and the Luo River, the various masters, and the transmitted records. He broadly learned and selectively investigated, fully synthesized textual [?], [?] read them with nothing missed. As the state and the county invited or summoned him, he declined them by excusing himself with sickness. He was contented with the austerity of a humble house and took pleasure from the principle of hearing in the morning [about the *dao* and being willing to die in the evening with no regret]. He educated people with the right way (*dao*), [as if he] stood at the riverside without feeling tired. He took the common fashion of the world as a shame and did not peep at the powerful clans.

357 The indifferent attitude to wealth, rank, and official career, as Patricia Ebrey notes, was a widely extolled individual character in Eastern Han tombstone inscriptions and relevant historiographic accounts. See Ebrey, "Later Han Stone Inscriptions," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 40 (1980): 334; "The Economic and Social History of Later Han," in *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 1*, 643; "Toward a Better Understanding of the Later Han Upper Class," 70.

358 As later noted by Liu Xie, tombstone inscriptions from the Eastern Han onwards greatly outnumbered previous ages (*Wenxin diaolong zhu*, 214). For the nature and function of these texts as a cornerstone of "public memory," see Brashier, "Eastern Han Commemorative Stelae"; *Public Memory in Early China*. For a general albeit incomplete statistics that shows the diachronic pattern of proliferation, see Ebrey, "Later Han Stone Inscriptions," 332.

359 *Lishi · lixu*, 74–75.

* "[?]" indicates a character that is missing in the transmitted inscription. According to the context, the two missing ones were most likely *ji* 籍 ("textual accounts") and *bi* 畢 ("completely/thoroughly") or their synonyms.

Tombstone Inscription for Lou Shou 婁壽 (97–174 CE)
（婁壽）遁世無悶，恬佚淨漠。徨遲衡門，下學上達。有朋自遠，冕紳莘莘。朝夕講習，樂以忘憂。郡縣禮請，終不回顧。高位厚祿，固不動心。[360]
"[Lou Shou] detached himself from the world with no depression, as being silent, disengaged, clean, and aloof. He resided at a humble house, learning in the lower position as being received by the upper (Heaven). Like-minded friends [visited him] from distant places, with a great many titled gentlemen involved. He taught and studied from morning to evening, taking pleasures and forgetting about his worries. He was cordially invited by the state and the county, yet constantly without taking a look. [Confronted with] high positions and plenty salary, he consistently did not change his mind."

The main bodies of these two passages were both composed with a standard, tetrasyllabic meter and embedded with a series of similar topoi, utterances, and rhetorical tropes, all of which collectively present an ideal image of scholar-in-reclusion who detaches himself from official career and enjoys a self-oriented engagement in his own intellectual life. In Wu Liang's case, this persona can be precisely situated within the ritual and pictorial contexts of the Wu family shrine—arguably attributed to the deliberate design by Wu Liang himself or not—that expressed a motif to place one's individuality within the entire cultural legacy instead of the circumstance dominated by contemporary powers.[361] In both excerpts, the biographee is portrayed as refusing the offer given by local government, placing himself to the opposite of career-minded interest in terms of "powerful clans" (*quanmen* 權門), "high position" (*haowei* 高位), or "plenty salary" (*houlu* 厚祿). He resides

360 *Lishi · lixu*, 103.

361 See Wu Hung 巫鴻, *The Wu Liang Shrine: The Ideology of Early Chinese Pictorial Art* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989), 213–17.

in his humble house metonymically referred to as *hengmeng* 衡門 (literally, "door under a crossing wood,", a trope from the *Shi*) but fully engages in his "learning" (*xue*) with "pleasures" (*le* 樂); his behaviors are in accord with particular principles associated with Kongzi;[362] and finally, he was not alone but connected with his audience or student-followers by sharing, teaching, and transmitting his scholarship.

Beyond the commemoration inscribed on stones, for another instance of political disengagement as a source of public authority, see a *Houhan shu* account for a dialogue between Zheng Xuan and Ying Shao in the banquet held by Yuan Shao. The scenario takes place right after Zheng Xuan's spectacular performance of erudition defeating all his challengers.[363] As a continuation of his winning master voice, Zheng Xuan makes a declaration of his disinterest in power and rank in response to Ying Shao, another accomplished scholar at his time, who introduces himself with an official title—

> 時汝南應劭亦歸於紹，因自贊曰："故太山太守應中遠，北面稱弟子何如？"玄笑曰："仲尼之門考以四科，回、賜之徒不稱官閥。"劭有慚色。[364]
> At that time, Ying Shao from Runan was also affiliated to Yuan Shao. Hence, he spoke [to Zheng Xuan] with a self-introduction,
>
> > "[Here is] Ying Zhongyuan, the previous Prefecture Chief of Taishan. How about I face the north and claim myself as a student [of you]?"
>
> [Zheng] Xuan smiled and replied,

362 For example, the phrase "the principle of hearing in the morning" 朝聞之義 coheres with *Lunyu* 4.8; "learning in the lower position as being received by the upper" 下學上達 coheres with *Lunyu* 14.35, in which the "upper" (*shang* 上) refers to "Heaven" (*tian* 天) instead of secular authority; and "like-minded friends [visited him] from distant places" 有朋自遠 coheres with *Lunyu* 1.1.

363 *Houhan shu* 35.1211. See also Chapter 2, for my discussion of Zheng Xuan's performance of erudition in this banquet.

364 *Houhan shu* 35.1211.

"The school of Zhongni (Kongzi) examined and evaluated people according to the four categories (*ke*).[365] The fellows like [Yan] Hui and [Duanmu] Ci did not address themselves with official titles."

Shao looked ashamed.

Both Zheng Xuan's response and Ying Shao's regretful reaction can be imagined as presented in front of a large audience who, as shown in the previous scenario, should have just witnessed Zheng Xuan's great triumph of erudition in his winning master voice. The two consecutive scenarios constitute a meaningful form of anecdote that, "without necessarily being real, gives the illusion of the real."[366] Instead of taking the plots and the sayings as what actually happened, it makes more sense to consider the two highlighted moments attributed to the same master as the epitomes of social appreciation and commemoration of the values encoded in the story—namely, the disinterest in political power in association with the individual model of erudition. In the *Houhan shu* context, the two moments are then followed by a storyline of consecutive plots—a refusal to Yuan Shao's recommendation; a returning to his hometown; a dream of Kongzi that foreshadows the end of his life; his death of illness in a military expedition that is forced by Yuan Shao; and finally, the honorable commemoration that he received after death, along with a summary of the reception of his

365 The phrase *sike* can be persuasively taken as a reference to the four categories of learning mentioned in *Lunyu* 11.3, namely, "moral behaviors," (*dexing* 德行), "words and speeches" (*yanyu* 言語), "political affairs" (*zhengzhi* 政事), and "cultural/literary learning" (*wenxue*). The term *ke* in this context refers to the category of learning that involves a sense of division and evaluation as well. This shows a loose commensurability with the usage of *ke* in the context related to Han official academic system, yet without the implication of institutional imposition of censorship and control (as previously discussed in Chapter 1, esp. Note 88). For a later appropriation of the phrase *sike* as an apparatus in the theory of literary writing, see Cao Pi, "Lun wen" 論文, to be discussed in Chapter 4.

366 Xiaofei Tian 田曉菲, "Tales from Borderland: Anecdotes in Early Medieval China," in *Idle Talk: Gossip and Anecdote in Traditional China*, 38.

scholarship.

The full picture of Zheng Xuan's life experience presented in his *Houhan shu* biography stands out as an exemplary case for the making of an emblematic image, a persona as both a scholar equipped with erudition and a practitioner of high-minded reclusion. After spending more than ten years traveling and learning from several tutors, Zheng settled down in Donglai (nearby his hometown) as a tutor of classical learning with thousands of followers. During the period when he resided as a reclusive scholar, he declined the official offers and patronage first from the Han imperial court and later Dong Zhuo 董卓 (d. 192 CE) and Yuan Shao, two of the most powerful warlords in Northern China in the last decade of the second century CE.[367] For decades, the reclusive life granted Zheng Xuan plenty of time for a long-term progress of accumulating, integrating, and producing his scholarship that covered all major classics and a long series of secondary and hermeneutic traditions, also thanks to the external financial supports from Kong Rong 孔融 (153–208 CE)[368]—an admirer but also a patron of Zheng Xuan—and probably a regular income received from his students. Such a long-term practice, as well as its public impacts within and beyond local society, constituted his far-reaching reputation even among commoners that provided him extra protection during the age of rebellion and wars.[369] In a broader sense, his disengagement from political life prepared a solid foundation for the reception and transmission of his teachings

367 *Houhan shu* 62.2057–58; 35.1208, 1211.

368 *Houhan shu* 35.1208.

369 See *Houhan shu* 35.1209, for a record of the Huangjin 黃巾 army's respectful recognition of Zheng Xuan. For a recent study on this phenomenon, see Feng Yujie 馮渝傑, "Cong huangjin bai Zheng Xuan kan Han mo yinyi yu difang zhixue de chongjian" 從黃巾拜鄭玄看漢末隱逸與地方秩序的重建, *Wenshizhe* 文史哲, No. 2 (2017): 141–54.

and writings, which evidently survived in large volumes after his death compared to most of his contemporaries.

Such a well-organized and logically coherent presentation of one' acts and their consequences, as shown in the case of Zheng Xuan, instantiates what Hayden White conceptualizes as the "emplotment" of historiographic narrative and its potentials of interpretation.[370] By means of selective arrangement of chronological events, as well as highlighted presentation of significant moments, the narrative—to be precise, a multi-layered construction of Zheng Xuan's life experience—encoded an ideology into a specific plot structure. Such a plot structure was instantiated, similarly, in the tombstone inscriptions for reclusive scholars as previously discussed. Altogether, these pieces of evidence instantiate the collective *imaginaire* of the ideal image of literary scholar, an image disengaged from the current political order and, simultaneously, playing as the authority on an alternative socio-cultural ground.

To summarize, the gesture of disengagement—either performed as a rhetorical topos or actualized as a reclusive mode of life—prepared an alternative ground for the cultivation of individual erudition, as well as a source of power and authority that a new model of scholarly individuality would necessarily demand. From a practical point of view, the detachment from official career—in its substantively actualized form—could simply mean the following: a more efficient way of spending time, labor, and energy and, consequently, a liberation of individual productivity. This is manifested, specifically, in an array of Eastern Han cases in which the scholars who shifted be-

370 See White, *Metahistory*, 1–42; "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," esp. 83–84.

tween the two modes of life produced greater volumes and diversity of works during their reclusion or detachment from offices.[371] Meanwhile, and also practically, the gesture of disengagement was enacted in a more specific way of liberating scholar labor from the official academic system—namely, the imposition of personal affiliations to institutional authorities embodied in state-sponsored tutors, schools, and texts. Being imperial patronage limited to a condensed—albeit not completely frozen—corpus of canonical texts, the world outside of official institutes actualized an ever-broadening scheme of intellectual exchange across different traditions—consider, for instance, the growing scholarly engagements in texts tagged as *guwen*.[372] With all these factors, especially during the mid-and-late Eastern Han, the official academic system gradually lost its centrality and authority to scholars and practitioners of literary learning. What makes this particularly clear is an event in 188 CE, when the imperial court was trying to summon a number of reclusive scholars—including Zheng Xuan, Xun Shuang 荀爽 (128–190 CE), and Shentu Pan 申屠蟠 (fl. 188 CE)—as *boshi*, some of them simply declined the offer with no interest.[373] The ideal locus to practice the scenario of broad learning was no longer grounded at that center, but somewhere else.

3.4. Centrifugal and Centripetal Movements of Cultural Resources

371 Suffice it to mention the following examples: Wang Chong, after a cynical withdrawal from a low position in county government, fully devoted himself to writing his voluminous work *Lunheng* (*Houhan shu* 49.1629); Zhang Heng spent ten years on the longest *fu* (i. e. the "Erjing fu") that he ever composed, during which he constantly rejected opportunities for official positions (Ibid., 59.1897); Ma Rong's textual productions were mostly accomplished during reclusion after his withdrawal from office (Ibid., 60A.1972).

372 For a brief account in English, see Robert Kramers, "The Development of the Confucian Schools," in *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 1*, 764. See also Chapter 2, for my discussions.

373 *Houhan shu* 62.2057–58.

Where did that scenario physically take place? As shown in a wealth of textual evidence, the Eastern Han witnessed a great number of scholars equipped with erudition who taught and spread their learnings in local societies where they resided. The formations of such communities, with both local members and visiting students involved, collectively constituted a multi-centered distribution of materials, sources, and authorities, a condition vis-à-vis the system of official educational institutes under the dominance of centripetal forces.

Suffice it to provide a shorthand picture of the deployments of educational sources across most times of the Han dynasty. Central to the official educational system was the Grand Academy (*taixue*) settled in the imperial capitals, Chang'an and later Luoyang, as well as the court-sponsored traditions under the mastery of *boshi* and their registered disciples. Below them, official institutes of education were hierarchically settled—under the names of *xue*, *xiao* 校, *xiang* 庠, and *xu* 序—and spread over the realm, with a set of curriculum assigned to be taught on a regular basis.[374] Alternative to the educational practices conducted via the official system, and also beyond those conducted within a narrower sphere constructed by personal or family networks, the proliferation of regional academic communities led by scholars without institutional chairs constituted a more diversified and multi-centered scholarly world. Normally, a community like this was pictured as a sphere surrounding a single leading figure, who was known as a scholar equipped with erudition and, often-

374 This is not to define the local official institutes of education as the late-emerging branches of the Grand Academy. Instead, as Yu Yingshi argues, the formation of the Han official educational system was likely modeled after a school established by a local minister in the early Western Han. See Yu, "Handai xunli yu wenhua chuanbo" 漢代循吏與文化傳播, in *Shi yu Zhongguo wenhua*, 159–61. For brief introductions of the formation and distribution of official educational institutes during the Han dynasty, see Li Ruiliang, *Zhongguo gudai tushu liutong shi*, 82–84; Zhao Lu, *In Pursuit of the Great Peace*, 103–06.

times, his expertise in a particular range of texts. The growth of these communities was not only in quantity but also in scale, as some of them had reportedly incorporated thousands of registered students.[375]

During the late Eastern Han, the growing prominence of regional academic communities was intertwined with a large-scale resistant movement against the corrupted powers of the empire and the local societies,[376] as well as the production and circulation of particular scholarship in which a resistant political ideology was encoded.[377] Entangled with a dynamic complex of social networking, the formation of these local cultural centers arguably entailed a notion of culture supremacism beyond the matrix of imperial state powers and, furthermore, constituted an ideological foundation for the construction of the superior class in early medieval China.[378] As an outcome of manifold social, political, and intellectual factors, the proliferation of regional academic communities in general extended an alternative ground for literary learning, one that weakened the institutional authority embedded in the official academic system.

For clarity, the "official" and "private/non-official" learnings—as often categorized in Chinese as *guanxue* 官學 and *sixue* 私學—shall not be simply essentialized as two separated intellectual

375 For example, see the cases of Cai Xuan (*Houhan shu* 79B.2588), Ma Rong (Ibid., 60A.1972), Jiang Gong (Ibid., 53.1749), Zhong Hao 鍾皓 (Ibid., 64.2064), Zheng Xuan (Ibid., 1207–08).

376 See Kawakatsu Yoshio 川勝義雄, *Rikuchō kizokusei shakai no kenkyu* 六朝貴族制社会の研究 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1982), 8–13, esp. 10–11, where he suggests that the formation of regional academic communities in the late Eastern Han solidified the social network foundational to the resistant movements against the corrupted empire. For more references about the resistant movements in the late Eastern Han, see Note 384.

377 See Ch'en Ch'i-yün (Chen Qiyun), "A Confucian Magnate's Idea of Political Violence: Hsün Shuang's (128–190) Interpretation of the *Book of Changes*," *T'oung Pao* 54 (1968): 73–115; "Confucian, Legalist, and Taoist Thoughts in Later Han," in *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 1*, 797–801.

378 See Kawakatsu, *Rikuchō kizokusei shakai no kenkyū*, 8–17, esp. 16, for the notion "culture supremacism" 文化至上主義.

realms with a constellation of opposite values, ideologies, and practices. Nor is it appropriate to apply the same set of codes to every single participant who engaged in a certain official or non-official community. Instead, what the two modes represented were a spectrum of possibilities between two conceptual poles that changed over time and varied from person to person. During the Eastern Han, a great number of individuals had been known as visiting the capital (sometimes the Grand Academy in particular) or regional academic communities—normally at their youth—in terms of *you* 遊/游 ("traveling/roaming") or *youxue* 遊學/游學, without a constant affiliation to any particular tutor or scholastic lineage but flexibly "roaming" across them.[379] Speaking of the Grand Academy only, according to Fan Ye's remark, the fashion of *youxue* gained prominence especially since the mid-and-late Eastern Han as the Academy offered access to visiting students as flexible auditors, during which the conventional imposition of affiliation to official academicians and their doctrines were correspondingly weakened.[380] On the other hand, sectarianism and particularism—as often noted as the problems in the official academic system—were involved in some local academic communities as well.

In his final comment attached to the "Rulin liezhuan" 儒林列傳 ("Arrayed Biographies of the *Ru*") of the *Houhan shu*, Fan Ye offered a critical overview of the multi-centered proliferation

379 For some Eastern Han instances of *youxue* in the capital or the Grand Academy, see *Houhan shu* 49.1629 (Wang Chong), 52.1722 (Cui Yuan 崔瑗), 59.1897 (Zhang Heng), 79A.2560 (Kong Xi 孔僖), 82B.2729 (Tang Tan 唐檀), 35.1207 (Zheng Xuan); for those around regional academic communities, see *Houhan shu* 60A.1953 (Ma Rong), 49.1643–44 (Zhong Changtong), 35.1207 (Zheng Xuan), 82B.2736 (Hua Tuo 華佗). For some general introductions, see Zhang Hequan 張鶴泉, "Donghan shidai de youxue fengqi ji shehui yingxiang" 東漢時代的遊學風氣及社會影響, *Qiushi xuekan* 求是學刊, No. 2 (1995): 104–09; Zhao Lu, *In Pursuit of the Great Peace*, 104–18.

380 *Houhan shu* 79A.2547.

of academic communities during the Eastern Han.[381] On the one hand, the comment included a criticism of this proliferation for it became a breeding ground for the fashion of sectarianism affiliated to specific tutors and doctrines and, therefore, led to a "rigidified" (*gu* 固) condition of learning as criticized by the "comprehensive man" (*tongren*). Such a situation was conflated by Fan Ye with the earlier argument made by Yang Xiong's against the scholarly fashion of his own "present day" (*jin*, i. e. the late Western Han, in Yang's case[382]). By this conflation, Fan Ye implied that what Yang considered as the problem in official academic system was, now, a problem spread all over the realm as a result of the proliferation of local academic communities. On the other hand, Fan Ye's criticism also demonstrated a potential to overcome this problem, a potential actualized by a minority of "elite students who made their own names renowned" 成名高第, who "could eventually make their ways far-reaching" 終能遠至. Though without naming any of those scholars in this context, Fan implied, that a promising scholarly mind would benefit from the extended foundation of intellectual communities and transcend beyond the problems of sectarianism and particularism there involved. This is particularly true in a handful of instances in which scholars flexibly shifted their associations with specific tutors and traditions located in different official institutes or non-official communities, equipping themselves with wide-ranging intellectual sources, and finally established their masterships to their own audience. The local academic community as a breeding ground was enlarged and regenerated, especially when scholars like Lu Zhi and Zheng Xuan constructed their own communities after their journeys as visiting students to other masters

381 *Houhan shu* 79B.2588–89.

382 See *Fayan* 7.8 (*Fayan yishu*, 222). See also Chapter 1, for a detailed discussion of Yang Xiong's discourse.

were fulfilled.[383]

In the late second century CE, such an increasingly multi-centered diffusion of knowledge and scholarship became overlapped with the more spectacular movement of political resistance, which involved a diverse range of influencers of public opinions—officials, recluses, and the leaders of local societies—whose practices altogether led to a foundational decentralization of political and social powers.[384] Following these, the last few decades of the Eastern Han witnessed social turmoil among rebellions and the conflicts between warlords, all of which caused a violent destruction and dispersal of cultural resources—texts, knowledge, materials, and people—from the central plain, especially the capital, toward all over the realm. Until the fire of Luoyang set on by Dong Zhuo in 190 CE, the capital still served as the most important gathering place of knowledge, texts, and scholarship. Yet this centrality was increasingly relying on the patronages and cultural resources it supplied for activities that took place away from the Grand Academy and official academic system.[385] The destruction of Luoyang directly caused the ruin of the Grand Academy and a great

383 *Houhan shu* 64.2113; 35.1207–08.

384 For a series of previous studies that investigated the issues of resistant movements among various classes during the late Eastern Han, see Kawakatsu, *Rikuchō kizokusei shakai no kenkyū*, 1–55; Masubuchi Tatsuo 増淵龍夫, "Go Kan tōko jiken no shihyō ni tsuite" 後漢黨錮事件の史評について, *Hitotsubashi Ronsō* 一橋論叢 44.6 (1960): 727–46; Tanigawa Michio 谷川道雄, *Chūgoku chūsei shakai to kyōdotai* 中国中世社会と共同体 (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1976), 83–90; Ch'en Ch'i-yün (Chen Qiyun), *Hsün Yüeh (A. D. 148–209): The Life and Reflections of an Early Medieval Confucian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 1–39; "Confucian, Legalist, and Taoist Thoughts in Later Han," 795–804; "Guanyu Donghan shi de jige wenti: qingyi danggu yu huangjin" 關於東漢史的幾個問題：清議、黨錮與黃巾, in *Ruxue yu Handai lishi wenhua*, 197–214. Rafe de Crespigny, *Fire over Luoyang: A History of the Later Han Dynasty, 23–220 AD* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 375–81.

385 A series of events speak for the centrality of Luoyang as still the most important gathering place of cultural resources in the late Eastern Han before 190 CE. For example, see the project of Xipin 熹平 Stone Classics (*shijing* 石經) in 175–183 CE and its great attraction for visiting scholars from various areas to the capital (*Houhan shu* 60B.1990); and, the short-term establishment of Hongdu men 鴻都門 studies under the patronage of Emperor Ling 靈帝 (Ibid., 60B.1991–92). As Crespigny notes in particular, that both these two events showed ideological objection and threatening against the Grand Academy. See Crespigny, *Fire over Luoyang*, 381–88. See

loss of imperial and private collections of texts, as well as specific materials and knowledge of rituals and music.[386] Wars and fires in the central plain in general led to a large-scale dispersal of scholars and specialists in cultural affairs: some transformed their previous roles into the assistants of warlords, and some found a peaceful life by living as a recluse in where they settled down. The most large-scale migration occurred during 190 CE, that a number of scholars moved from areas around Luoyang to Jingzhou, and later participated in a short-term cultural reconstruction patronized by Liu Biao 劉表 (142–208 CE).[387]

In the early third century CE, mostly the Jian'an 建安 (196–220 CE) period, this dispersed condition was pushed toward a progress of re-centralization with the rise of Cao Cao 曹操 (155–220 CE) and his regime as the dominant power in Northern China.[388] When the Cao regime gradually re-unified the North through military triumphs over other warlords, it also put into practice a series of measures to repair the broken culture. During this progress, the Cao regime commemorated deceased sage and scholar of the *ru* tradition,[389] reconstructed the systems of rituals

---

also *Houhan shu* 79A.2547, for Fan Ye's review of the gradual decline and disfunction of the Grand Academy and official academic system in the mid-and-late Eastern Han; and Liu Rulin, *Han Jin xueshu biannian*, 523.

386 See *Houhan shu* 79A.2548, and Crespigny, *Fire over Luoyang*, 32–33, 461, for references about the great loss of texts (for a further discussion, see Chapter 5 of the present dissertation). See *Sanguo zhi* 21.598; *Songshu* 19.534, for references about the damage of rituals and music.

387 A brief overview of the Jingzhou scholarship can be found in *Houhan shu* 74A.2421. See also Wang Can, "Jingzhou wenxue ji guan zhi" 荊州文學記官志, in Yu Shaochu 俞紹初 comp. *Jian'an qizi ji* 建安七子集 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005), 137.

388 The main part of the following of the present section can be also seen in my article, Yixin Gu, "Speaking with the Learning of Odes," 306–09.

389 For example, see *Houhan shu* 64.2119 (for Cao Cao's 曹操 commemoration of Lu Zhi); *Sanguo zhi* 2.77–78 (for Cao Pi's edict to commemorate Kongzi and repair his temple in Lu); *Quan Shanggu Sandai Qin Han Sanguo Liuchao wen*, *Quan Sanguo wen* 全三國文, 6.1082 (for Cao Pi's edict to put restriction on the local worships to Laozi 老子 and place him below the sagehood of Kongzi).

and music,[390] rebuilt the Grand Academy (224 CE),[391] and gathered a number of dispersed scholars from either its enemies or local recluses all over the re-unified realm.[392] Those who gathered around this new center of power, for example, included literary specialists such as Wang Can 王粲 (177–217 CE), Chen Lin 陳琳 (d. 217 CE), and Xu Gan 徐幹 (170–217 CE),[393] and some known as respected *ru* classicists of their time such as Handan Chun 邯鄲淳 (ca. 132–221 CE), Wei Xi, and Su Lin 蘇林 (fl. 200 CE).[394] Many of them were characterized in contemporary and later accounts as individuals-of-erudition in terms of *bo*, *tong*, or related utterances,[395] and some were identifiably indebted to specific scholarly tutoring or family traditions, especially those from Cai Yong.[396] These scholars, along with the cultural legacies they interiorized and embodied, were appointed into the assistant system in service of Cao Cao himself and his sons, especially Cao Pi (i. e. Emperor Wen 文帝 of Wei [r. 220–226 CE]) and Cao Zhi, transforming their roles as secretar-

390 For the reconstruction of rituals, see *Sanguo zhi* 21.598. For the reconstruction of the system of court music (*yayue* 雅樂), see *Songshu* 19.534; Fang Xuanlin 房玄齡 et al., *Jinshu* 晉書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), 22.684.

391 *Sanguo zhi* 2.84.

392 For an early signal of this socio-political agenda, see Xun Yu's 荀彧 proposal to Cao Cao (not prior to 212 CE) for bringing together scholars from all over the reunified realm in order to preserve and re-organize classical studies (from an individual biography [*biezhuan* 別傳] of Xun Yu, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 10.317).

393 *Sanguo zhi* 21.598 (Wang Can); 599 (Xu Gan); 600 (Chen Lin 陳琳 and Ruan Yu 阮瑀); 601 (Ying Yang 應瑒 and Liu Zhen 劉楨).

394 Seven scholars known as the "Masters of *ru*" (*ruzong* 儒宗) at their time were recorded by Yu Huan in his *Weilüe*, as cited by Pei Songzhi in his *Sanguo zhi* commentary attached to different chapters. See *Sanguo zhi* 13.420–422 (for Dong Yu 董遇, Jia Hong 賈洪, Xue Xia 薛夏, and Wei Xi 隗禧); 16.507 (for Yue Xiang 樂詳); 21.603 (for Handan Chun 邯鄲淳); 21.621 (for Su Lin 蘇林).

395 For a more detailed discussion with references, see Chapter 4.

396 For the records of those with scholarly indebtedness to Cai Yong, see *Sanguo zhi* 21.597 (for Wang Can); 600 (for Ruan Yu); 603 (*Weilüe*, cited by Pei Songzhi, for Lu Cui 路粹). For Cai Yong's influences on his contemporaries and younger generation, see also Liu Yuejin, "Cai Yong de shengping chuangzuo yu Han mo wenfeng de zhuanbian" 蔡邕的生平創作與漢末文風的轉變, *Wenxue pinglun*, No. 3 (2004): 138–46; Mark Asselin, *A Significant Season: Cai Yong (ca. 133–192) and His Contemporaries* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2010), 298–99, esp. Note 20.

ies, advisers, and tutors of literary education.[397]

The re-centralization of dispersed scholars constituted a solid foundation of a new circle around the Cao household. This condition gave rises to a variety of intellectual activities covering education, conversation, entertainment, and literary production, which involved both a serious attempt to revive and transmit cultural legacies and, meanwhile, a motif of competition in literary and intellectual talents. For later generations, the most remarkable achievement produced from this circle was a constellation of literary works including a variety of genres such as poems, *fu*, letters, discourses, etc. The forms, contents, and ideas involved in these works were widely taken by modern scholars as reflections of the concept "Self-consciousness" (*zijue*) of either human spirit and mentality in general or philosophy, aesthetics, and "literature" (*wenxue*) in a narrow, modern sense.[398]

---

397 For a series of general accounts for the movements and activities of some of these literary scholars, see first, the classical comments made by Liu Xie (*Wenxin diaolong zhu*, 673–74) and Zhong Rong 鍾嶸 (Cao Xu 曹旭 annot., *Shipin jizhu* 詩品集注 [Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1994], 17). For relevant modern studies, see Hu Dalei, "Yexia wenxue jituan lun" 鄴下文學集團論, *Guangxi shifan daxue xuebao* 廣西師範大學學報, No. 2 (1991): 52–57; David R. Knechtges, "From the Eastern Han through the Western Jin (AD 25–317)," in *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature, vol. 1*, ed. Kang-i Chang and Stephen Owen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 166–72; Xiaofei Tian, *The Halberd at Red Cliff: Jian'an and the Three Kingdoms* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018), 11–156. See also Appendix 2 (Table 10), for a more inclusive survey of their backgrounds and official positions held in the Cao regime.

398 In modern scholarship, the concept "self-consciousness" (*zijue*), as well as notions akin to it such as *juexing* 覺醒 ("awakening") and "self-discovery," have been often employed to essentialize the central feature of Chinese literature, philosophy, arts, and literary theories around the period from the late Eastern Han through Wei-Jin. For a long series of studies including those with the most far-reaching influences and their derivations, see Suzuki, *Shina shilon shi*, 40–43; Lu Xun, "Wei Jin fengdu ji wenzhang yu yao ji jiu zhi guanxi," 523–53; Wang Yao, *Zhonggu wenxue shilun*; Yu Yingshi, "Han Jin zhi ji shi zhi xin zijue yu xin sichao," 287–400; "Individualism and the Neo-Daoist Movement in Wei-Jin China," in *Chinese History and Culture, vol. 1* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 134–65; Li Zehou, *Mei de licheng*, 88–104; Wai-yee Li, "*Shishuo xinyu* and the Emergence of Aesthetic Self-Consciousness in the Chinese Tradition," in *Chinese Aesthetics: The Ordering of Literature, the Arts, and the Universe in the Six Dynasties*, ed. Zong-qi Cai (Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004), 237–76. See also Gong Kechang 龔克昌, "Han fu: wenxue zijue shidai de qidian" 漢賦：文學自覺時代的起點, *Wenshizhe* 5 (1988): 67–75; Kao Yu-kung 高友工, "The Nineteen Old Poems and Aesthetics of Self-Reflection," in *The Power of Culture: Studies in Chinese Cultural History*, ed. Willard J. Peterson, Andrew H. Plaks and Ying-shih Yu (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1994), 80–102, for their applications of *zijue* on comparatively earlier Han literature with attempts to map this concept to a longer time span. For some critical reflections on the common use

However, literary activities in this circumstance should be first placed back into the larger picture in the early third century CE. Central to this picture was the re-orientation of various knowledge and intellectual sources from their dispersed conditions toward an integrated body of high culture. The proliferation of literary productions within this dynamic milieu was, therefore, an emblematic manifestation of the surplus of literary learning and literary productivity gathered around the new center of power. This phenomenon cannot be reduced by a couple of notions such as "literary group/society" (*wenxue jituan* 文學集團) or "literary salon"[399] that were conventionally mapped on it in a comparatively narrow sense. Different from the previous imperial patrons, the second generation of the Cao regime cultivated a more modest and reciprocal relations with scholars and literary specialists around them, and shared with them a fruitful live of intellectual exchange as both their patrons and friends.[400] They even cast themselves into the desirable model of erudite scholar in the Eastern Han, performing their broadened, comprehensive, and self-oriented interests in literary learning, as well as their ambition for literary productivity.[401]

---

of this concept (especially the discourse that the Jian'an period was an era of *zijue* for literature and literary theory), see Sun Mingjun 孫明君, "Jian'an shidai wen de zijue shuo zai shenshi" 建安時代"文的自覺"說再審視, *Beijing daxue xuebao* 北京大學學報, No. 6 (1996): 43–51; "Ershi shiji Jian'an wenxue yanjiu fansi" 20 世紀建安文學研究反思, in *Han Wei wenxue yu zhengzhi* 漢魏文學與政治 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshu guan, 2004), 236–37; Xiaofei Tian, *The Halberd at Red Cliff*, 79.

399 David R. Knechtges has pointed out that it can be misleading to claim that the Jian'an literature was exclusively the products of the literary "salon" patronized by the Cao household. See his, "From the Eastern Han through the Western Jin (AD 25–317)," 168. For a recent reflection on the notion of "literary group/society," see Xiaofei Tian, *The Halberd at Red Cliff*, 79–156, where she configures these literary scholars who gathered around the Cao household as a "sociopolitical community" instead of a "literary group/society" in a traditional sense (149).

400 For the changing roles of patrons, see Su Jui-Lung 蘇瑞隆, "Patterns and Changes of Literary Patronage in the Han and Wei," in *Interpretation and Literature in Early Medieval China*, ed. Alan Chan and Lo Yuet-Keung (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010), 41–62.

401 For traditional references, see *Sanguo zhi* 2.88–90 (for Cao Pi); 19.557, 576 (for Cao Zhi). See also Chapter 4, for a further discussion of the Cao brothers.

3.5. Summary

The re-orientation of literary culture in Han-Wei China was entangled with manifold tensions between different communities, identities, and authorities. Thus, the process of this re-orientation should be fairly investigated through the lens of socio-political ideology, which involved a wealth of communicative practices equipped with specific rhetorics and politics. The ideology proposed in these practices did not endorse a particular organization of powers, nor did it work in concert with a certain socio-political campaign or movement that shared specific leaderships, commitments, and instructions. Instead, central to this ideology was a motif of empowering an imagined scholarly individuality as foundational to the formation of an imagined community. The making of this individuality was performed, at least normally but often practically, with a gesture of exemption that detached the individual from the impositions of powers and authorities other than their self-oriented interests in literary learning and practicing.

Such a self-oriented interest was expressed in a diverse range of practices of resistance and disengagement in both private and public lives. The opposition to *suru* held by some Eastern Han scholars, for instance, entailed a critical reflection—in both methodological and moral terms—on the sectarian mode of knowledge transmission and knowledge production, especially the personal affiliation to particular texts and authorities imposed by the official academic system. Such resistance, and the self-oriented principle of learning it involved, worked in concert with a larger picture of political disengagements from the career-minded interest in official power and rank. This

condition of disengagement—in the form of either literary argument or physical reclusion—presents an alternative ground for the self-oriented cultivation of one's erudition that supplies the contents of one's intellectual life. This is shown in the hypothetical discourses of self-questioning and self-defense later categorized as *shelun*, which collectively displayed a gesture of mental detachment from official career and a desirable lifestyle fulfilled by one's literary practices. In a more practical way, the same values and codes were instantiated by a large number of scholars who acted in a reclusive way by refusing official offers or withdrawing from present positions, as well as engaging in a diverse range of activities that covered learning, writing, and teaching away from the center of power.

Especially during the latter half of the Eastern Han, the gesture of seeking alternative grounds other than the institutional center of power and authorities engendered the overall proliferation of regional academic communities led by erudite individuals and a multi-centered distribution of knowledge, texts, and scholarships. This multi-centered condition of the intellectual world was later entangled with a wider range of social, economic, and military forces that dissolved the imperial authorities and gradually broke the empire apart. The turmoil in the last decades of the Eastern Han caused the violent damage and dispersal of cultural resources and their custodians, a condition that was re-oriented by the Cao regime toward a new center of authority in the early third century CE. Regarding Jian'an literature and scholarship, instead of considering them in terms of a series of artificial conceptions for the discourses of literary evolutions and breakthroughs, it would be more fruitful, now, to explain them in terms of the centrifugal and centripetal movements of cul-

tural resources during the late Eastern Han, as well as their inheritance of the scholarly ethos of individual erudition across a longer period.

- CHAPTER 4 -

Manifesting One's Erudition in Writing: Literary Productivity and Personal Agency

4.1. Terminologies in Their Linguistic and Cultural Contexts

"A mode of reading implies a mode of writing (and vice versa)."[402] This quote of Dominick LaCapra consists of a pair of *synecdoche* of two fundamental aspects of literary practices reciprocally recycling and displaying each other. For one who is equipped with a coded system of language and a developed proficiency of literacy, the two aspects are often, if not overwhelmingly, manifested in the forms of reading and writing. This is not to disregard that "reading" and "writing" as practical skills often have to be considered separately regarding their different physical and mental involvements with material, technology, and human agency.[403] The remaining part of the present study, nevertheless, concerns how these two phenomena of literacy were conceptually related to each other along with a wider spectrum of oral, aural, and memorial acts and traces. Over the period under focus, the interconnectivity between these phenomena was configured and manifested within a sharable paradigm or framework embedded with both a notion of cross-media commensurabil-

402 Dominick LaCapra, *History and Reading: Tocqueville, Foucault, French Studies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 27.

403 For relevant discussions of this separation in early China, see, for example, Tomiya Itaru 冨谷至, *Monjo gyosei no Kan teikoku: mokkan, chikukan no jidai* 文書行政の漢帝国：木簡、竹簡の時代 (Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppansha, 2010), 107; Hsing I-t'ien, "Qin Han pingmin de duxie nengli: shiliao jiedu pian zhi yi" 秦漢平民的讀寫能力：史料解讀篇之一, in *Disijie guoji hanxue huiyi lunwenji: Gudai shuming shehui* 第四屆國際漢學會議論文集：古代庶民社會, ed. Hsing I-t'ien and Liu Zenggui 劉增貴 (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan, 2013), 241–88; Brashier, *Public Memory in Early China*, 11–14; Charles Sanft, *Literate Community in Early Imperial China: The Northwestern Frontier in Han Times* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2019), 8–12.

ity[404] and a recycling and transforming process of individual literary practices between the imagined "inside" and "outside." That is, a process from one's interiorization of diverse sources via multiple approaches of reception—including but not limited to reading—to the various manifestations through which the sources stored in an imagined archive are externalized, displayed, and performed. During the nearly three centuries, the latter was increasingly realized via one's literary productions, or, in a metaphorical sense, one's writing.

For clarity, what I refer to as "writing" and "text" are neither a specific action of writing-something-down on a piece of material, nor the idiosyncratic product of that action embodied in set of physical, visual, and codicological forms. Every piece of written text in a material sense—namely, an artifact produced by means of writing-something-down—is agreeably an expressive form of meaning-production, as well as the container of both verbal and non-verbal contents that constitute the basic data of MacKenzie's "sociology of text"[405] in its broad sense. Not devaluating this, my approach to inquire Han-Wei literary culture nevertheless takes another orientation that considers "writing" as the process as well as the product of the composition of a verbal structure with an integrated body of contents-and-forms. This is not merely because of the awfully short supply of written artifacts and manuscripts with full data of concrete verbal or non-verbal specificity in the study of Han-Wei literary culture. More importantly, a comprehensive inquiry into a literary culture as a coded system must be based upon a well-investigated conceptual foundation

404 See Chapter 5, for detailed discussions of the interplays between textual, oral, and memorial practices and my configuration of the paradigm of cross-media commensurability.

405 D. F. MacKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), passim., esp. 9–30.

of ideas, beliefs, and assumptions in dealing with "writing" as a complex that incorporates both materialized and imagined forms. Namely, one is encouraged to think in terms of the grammatology of what "writing" was about and, meanwhile, how were the conceptualizations of "writing" inscribed and produced in a wide realm of texts, a realm way more expansive than what we happen to *have* at our hands.

During the period under focus, "writing" as a practice was extensively performed and recognized as a significant approach of presenting personal agency and a piece of intellectual property. This is shown in the overall proliferation and diversification of relevant lexicons, utterances, narrations, and discourses found in a variety of sources. On the one hand, these textual accounts assigned a growing number of literary products to particular individuals, who hence became the texts' properties and paratextual guides that supplied a new condition of reception and interpretation of the texts themselves. On the other hand, these phenomena involved a growing awareness of presenting (or self-presenting) individual, the accredited principal, as the central element of the foregrounded scenario of textual production and circulation. Literary product, in this sense, became a displayable property manifesting the images of the accredited principals to which it was attached.

In order to think properly about this interactive relationship between textual productions and their accredited principals, it is necessary to achieve some clarity of relevant terminologies and theoretical frameworks. One of the recurring problems is that related to the notion "author," which is rendered in modern Chinese as *zuozhe* 作者 (literally, "one who *zuo*") and hence conflated with

the traditional Chinese term *zuo* ("to rise/give rise to/initiate/innovate/create/cultivate, etc.")[406] in a somehow mistaken way. Over the past few decades, scholarships in early and early medieval China have explored this issue from different perspectives. As widely acknowledged, the notion of "author" or "authorship" was rarely a significant matter in pre-imperial China, an argument made from the silence of clear indication of authorship in both transmitted sources and unearthed manuscripts.[407] By contrast, it is not uncommon for scholars to ascertain that the period around the Han dynasty, earlier or later, witnessed the growing prominence of "author" or "authorship," a transition shown in the proliferation and sometimes systematic organization of authorial identities that were attached to old or new texts, attributed to historical or legendary figures, or claimed by individual scholars themselves.[408] Meanwhile, it has been also acknowledged that "author" as a

406 I save my further discussions of the concept *zuo* 作 for the following parts of the present chapter. For a comprehensive study of the concept *zuo* with related discourses and debates in early China, see Puett, *The Ambivalence of Creation*.

407 See first, Yu Jiaxi, *Gushu tongli*, 15–26, where he describes the absence of authorial indicator as a common phenomenon in pre-Han Chinese texts. For scholarship in the past few decades that discussed the scarcity of the notion of author in early China, see Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China*, 58; William G. Boltz, "Why So Many *Laozi*-s?" in *Studies in Chinese Manuscripts: From the Warring States Period to the 20th Century*, ed. Imre Galambos (Budapest: Institute of East Asian Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, 2013), 9–10; Martin Kern, "Masters in the *Shiji*," *T'oung Pao* 101 (2015): 335–62, esp. 359–62; "'Xi shuai' 蟋蟀 ('Cricket') and Its Consequences: Issues in Early Chinese Poetry and Textual Studies," *Early China* 42 (2019): 39–74, esp. 54–69; Ke Mading 柯馬丁 (Martin Kern), "*Shiji* li de zuozhe gainian" 史記裡的作者概念, in *Shijixue yu shijie hanxue lunji xubian* 史記學與世界漢學論集續編, ed. Li Jixiang 李紀祥 and Ke Mading (Taipei: Tangshan chubanshe, 2016), 31–36; Cheng Sudong, "Ye tan Zhanguo Qin Han shiqi zuozhe wenti de chuxian" 也談戰國秦漢時期"作者"問題的出現, *Wenyi pinglun* 文藝評論, No. 8 (2017): 4–5; "Shuxie wenhua de xinbian yu shiren wenxue de xingqi: yi *Chunqiu* ji qi zaoqi chanshi wei zhongxin" 書寫文化的新變與士人文學的興起：以《春秋》及其早期闡釋爲中心, *Zhongguo shehui kexue* 中國社會科學, No. 6 (2018): 136; Zhang Hanmo 張瀚墨, *Authorship and Text-making in Early China* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018), 1.

408 For example, see Michael Puett, "The Temptations of Sagehood, or: The Rise and Decline of Sagely Writing in Early China," in *Books in Numbers: Seventh-fifth Anniversary of the Harvard-Yenching Library: Conference Papers*. ed. Wilt Edema (Cambridge: Harvard-Yenching Library, 2007), 23–47; Taniguchi Hiroshi 谷口洋, "Fu ni jijo o tsukeru koto: RyōKan no majiwari ni okeru sakusha no mezame" 賦に自序をつけること：両漢の交における作者のめざめ, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 119 (2010): 22–39; Nylan, *Yang Xiong and the Pleasures of Reading*, 40–61; "Manuscript Culture in Late Western Han," 160–65; Wai-yee Li, "Concepts of Authorship," 361–62; Cheng Sudong, "Ye tan Zhanguo Qin Han shiqi zuozhe wenti de chuxian," 9–10; Zhang Hanmo, *Authorship and Text-making*,

textual property was subject to the overall instability and variability over the collaborative process of textual transmission and production during and after the Han dynasty.[409] These observations of early and medieval Chinese literary culture altogether suggest a fluid and open-ended textuality within a dynamic flux of variance and incoherence,[410] which consequently exorcizes the traditional notion of "original" or "authentic" text, as well as the preconception of a single authorial authority to whom that text can be attributed.

Since 1960s—and especially since Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault—the notion "author" has been widely regarded as a function, a property, a creation, or a paratext imposed upon a given text with either factual or imaginary control of its presence, reception, and interpretation.[411] An

---

passim.

409 For some representative arguments regarding the overall instability and variability of texts and textual properties (especially the "author") in medieval Chinese manuscript culture, see Stephen Owen, *The Making of Early Chinese Classical Poetry* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006), 3, 15; Xiaofei Tian, *Tao Yuanming and Manuscript Culture: The Record of a Dusty Table* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 4, 9; Christopher Nugent, *Manifest in Words, Written on Papers: Producing and Circulating Poetry in Tang Dynasty China* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2010), 15, 18.

410 In a comparative frame, this new discourse for early and medieval Chinese manuscript culture can be traced back and sometimes shows clear indebtedness to the studies of medieval European manuscript cultures and a global range of oral or semi-oral traditions, which conceptualize the overall textual instability and variability on different levels in terms of *variance* (Cerquiglini), *mouvance* (Zumthor), *incoherence* (Dagenais), *repertoire* (Nagy et al.), and so on. For references, see Bernard Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*, trans. Betsy Wing (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999) esp. 77–78; Paul Zumthor, *Toward a Medieval Poetics*, trans. Philip Bennett (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992); John Dagenais, *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture* (Princeton University Press, 1994), esp. 16–17; Gregory Nagy, *Homeric Questions* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), esp. 24, 58, 82, and 89, for the uses of the term *repertoire* by Nagy himself and other philologists. On the other hand, the new discourse on Chinese manuscript culture has extensively gained from traditional interests and efforts in the examination of *yiwen* 異文 (graphic and lexical variants) in Chinese philology and textual criticism, while offering new interpretations of minor variants produced from a "manuscript culture" as heterogenous to those produced from comparatively later eras technologized by printing and finally mass reproduction. On the features and natures of variants and their implications of the modes of textual transmission at different historical stages, see especially Susan Cherniack, "Book Culture and Textual Transmission in Sung China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54 (1994): 5–125; Xiaofei Tian, *Tao Yuanming and Manuscript Culture*, esp. 3–22; Martin Kern, "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.

411 See Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author," in *Image, Music, Text*, ed. & trans. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana Press, 1977), 142–48; Foucault, "What is an Author?" trans. Robert Hurley et. al., in *Essential Works of*

"author" in this specific sense should be critically differentiated from an array of other concepts such as the "producer" by whom a text is materially actualized and the "authority" built within or around a text.[412] Such an already well-received and inevitable differentiation, meanwhile, inspires a constructive approach of seeking useful frameworks to integrate the myth, the formation, and the reception of text by exploring the potentials of "author" as a conceptual tool. As shown in recent scholarship in early China and beyond, the utility of "author" as a concept is configured, either as the central element of the "scenes of authorship" supplying contextual information for a text in the flux of circulation,[413] or as an apparatus transforming the previously fluid textual traditions into closed and stabilized entities that were hence opened to a new condition of reception and interpretation.[414]

Another meaningful approach, I suggest, is to liberate the inquiry from the necessity of confirming, eschewing, or re-defining "author" as both a concept and a product with its own cultural specificity. For a deep inquiry into a literary culture itself as a coded system of communications, any attempt to locate a hypothetically equivalent or contradictory notion/phenomenon to "author"

Foucault (1965–1984), vol. 2: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology, ed. James D. Faubion (New York: The New Press, 1998), 205–22, esp. 221. About "author" as a kind of "paratext," see Gérard Genette, P*aratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1–15, 37–54. See also David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, *An Introduction to Book History* (New York & London: Routledge, 2005), 81–84, for a review of the 1960s reflection on "author" and its consequences. For a representative opinion in the studies of early and early medieval Chinese literature, see Owen, *The Making of Early Chinese Classical Poetry*, 215–16, where he suggests taking "authorship" not as "a historical fact" but "a property of a text" that provides the readers specific guides of reading and interpretation.

412 On the conceptual difference between "author" and "authority," see Finkelstein and McCleery, *An Introduction to Book History*, 68–69.

413 See Alexander Beecroft, *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China: Patterns of Literary Circulation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

414 See Heng Du 杜恆, "The Author's Two Bodies: The Death of Qu Yuan and the Birth of *Chuci zhangju*," *T'oung Pao* 105 (2019): 259–314.

is inevitably limited—albeit not necessarily mistaken—and hence, reductive. To be precise, I suggest re-examining the diversity of the whole range of verbal indicators and traces of utterances—in their linguistic and cultural contexts—in terms of how they constitute a specific scenario in which a person and a text are presented as manifesting and embodying each other. The complexity involved in this phenomenon cannot be reduced and simplified in terms of a however elaborated notion of a single term such as "author," but is distributed among various modes of scholarly labor and literary productivity in relations with multiple factors of knowledge, power, intermediacy, and beyond. From a post-structural perspective, the verbal indicators and traces of utterances under review are arguably the properties and the functions of the texts to which they were related, and their significance as scenarios does not rest with the degree to which each particular accredited principal attached to a given text is "authentic" or "fake" in a sense of historical positivism. My approach, to clarify, is focused on how the phenomenon of the mutual embodiment between a person and a text reflect a wider range of concepts and realities, as well as how this mutual relationship contributes to a better understanding of the potential of "writing" as an active element transforming the socio-cultural matrix.

This leads to the following examination of a series of modes of literary productivity, which were verbally presented in an ever-changing vocabulary and distributed among an expanding repository of expressions and utterances over the period under focus. The productive roles identified in the vocabulary and the repository fall into a broad spectrum beyond what Franciscan St. Bonaventure theoretically classified as *scriptor* ("scribe"), *compiulator* ("compiler"), *commentator* ("commenta-

tor"), and *auctor* ("author").[415] Bonaventure's division, primarily based on medieval European manuscripts, is in accord with the different proportion and importance taken by one's "own" material in a given text in comparison to the materials from other sources. These criteria, however, are not without ambivalence, for it is often unclear what is one's "own" and what is not, nor is it always clear that how much value should be applied to each constituent element of a given text in conformity to the four previously mentioned roles. As shown in the following investigation, personal agency in dealing with literary products was expressed in Han and early medieval sources as a hybrid of a diverse range of possibilities, and the making of a new text could be at once an act of inheritance, collection, and revision, a gesture of making connections between old and new utterances, as well as a creative and innovative construction of a verbal structure essentially new. The result, consequently, transcends any single notion of "author," "producer," or "maker" but embraces a more fruitful understanding of the relationships between texts and their accredited principals.

Most lexical items under review were used as verbs linked to specific individuals, groups, and communities to whom specific textual products were attributed. Instead of calling them equivalently as the "authors" of respective texts, their agencies shall be classified and differentiated according to the nature and meaning of each term in varying contexts. My survey incorporates a constellation of such terms including *zhuan*, *zhu*, *zuo*, *ji*, *zhushu*, *zhuanji* 撰集, *zhuiji* 綴集, and

415 See Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, Nicholas Watson, Andrew Taylor and Ruth Evans eds., *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280–1520* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999), 3.

zhuwen[416] (I save my translations and explanations of these terms for the respective parts of analyses) spread over Han and early medieval sources, with regards to their usages, meanings, and patterns of distribution. This allows me to delineate a broader view of literary productivity in the period under focus.

In the following two tables, I divide these terms into two groups respectively monosyllabic and disyllabic—according to not merely their syllabic (and graphic) forms but also their semantic natures—to show their patterns of distribution among the four historiographic compilations, *Hanshu*, *Dongguan Hanji*, *Houhan shu*, and *Sanguo zhi* (excluding the commentaries). For each lexical item in a specific book, I follow the method that I applied in Chapter 2 (Tables 5–9) by putting numbers into three columns under the book title. These numbers mark the occurrences of a given term appearing in that book (1) in total; (2) in contexts where that term refers to the practices of specific person(s) in the dynastic era that the book was primarily about; (3) identifiably cited or quoted from a person or a source dated to that era. My analysis is then based on the overall distributional patterns of these terms, as well as a series of usages, functions, and implications they were embedded with when they were employed in specific contexts.

Table 11
Zhuan, *Ji*, *Zhu*, and *Zuo* in Four Historiographic Compilations

		Hanshu		
	Terms	Total	W. H.	W. H. C.
撰	*Zhuan*	3	3	0

416 For a brief entry to lexical items like these, see Wai-yee Li, "Concepts of Authorship," 361–62.

集	*Ji*	3	1	1
著	*Zhu*	32	27	6
作	*Zuo*	121	83	31

Dongguan Hanji

	Terms	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
撰	*Zhuan*	3	1	1
集	*Ji*	2	1	1
著	*Zhu*	5	4	2
作	*Zuo*	17	17	0

Houhan shu

	Terms	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
撰	*Zhuan*	34	29	3
集	*Ji*	20	13	2
著	*Zhu*	116	110	7
作	*Zuo*	163	140	33

Sanguo zhi

	Terms	Total	T. K.	T. K. C.
撰	*Zhuan*	20	15	7
集	*Ji*	5	5	0
著	*Zhu*	60	54	7
作	*Zuo*	52	38	18

Table 12

Zhushu, *Zhuanji*, *Zhuiji, and Zhuwen* in Four Historiographic Compilations

Hanshu

	Terms	Total	W. H.	W. H. C.
著述	*Zhushu*	2	1	0
撰集	*Zhuanji*	0	0	0
綴集	*Zhuiji*	0	0	0
屬文	*Zhuwen*	11	11	1

Dongguan Hanji

	Terms	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
著述	*Zhushu*	1	1	1
撰集	*Zhuanji*	0	0	0

綴集	*Zhuiji*	0	0	0
屬文	*Zhuwen*	2	2	0

Houhan shu

	Terms	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
著述	*Zhushu*	8	8	0
撰集	*Zhuanji*	5	4	1
綴集	*Zhuiji*	4	2	0
屬文	*Zhuwen*	9	9	1

Sanguo zhi

	Terms	Total	T. K.	T. K. C.
著述	*Zhushu*	6	5	1
撰集	*Zhuanji*	2	2	0
綴集	*Zhuiji*	0	0	0
屬文	*Zhuwen*	7	7	0

* "T. K." as the abbreviation for "Three Kingdoms."

* The numbers of samples are only drawn from contexts in which a term identifiably refers to a specific practice of composing or producing verbal or textual object(s).

* For the *Dongguan Hanji* (and hereafter the same), numbers that I put in column 3 (E. H. C.) account only for those specified as "cited" from previous Eastern Han figures, though every data is self-evidently an "Eastern Han" material.

* For the *Sanguo zhi* (and hereafter the same), I only collected the occurrence of lexical items identifiably from the writing of Chen Shou, but left aside the materials collected in Pei Songzhi's commentary that was richer in comparatively miscellaneous and anecdotal evidence.

* My survey of the term *zhuan* in the *Hanshu* does not incorporate the 14 occurrences of its homophonous synonym *zhuan* 譔, which all come from Yang Xiong's self-narrative of his composition of the *Fayan*. The 14 instances are distributed into an introduction of the text in general and a series of entries to its 13 volumes (*juan*).[417]

* My survey of the term *zhuiji* in the table temporarily leaves aside its homophonous synonym *zhuiji* 綴輯, which occurs in Ban Gu's self-narrative in the *Hanshu* about his compilation/composition. In the *Houhan shu*, *zhuiji* occurs as 綴集 within the same context (to be fully discussed later).

The two tables above in general demonstrate a remarkable proliferation of textual productions from the Western Han through the third century CE. The vast majority of instances were retro-

417 *Hanshu* 87B.3580–83.

spectively narrated and, therefore, intertwined with the linguistic and cultural contexts surrounding the later historians and compilers themselves. The numbers in the last column, which represent how many samples are clearly cited or quoted from a person or a source dated to the respective dynastic era, are unsurprisingly much smaller than those in column 1 and 2. This, nevertheless, does not mean that most samples under review are the mere representations of the expressions of later historians. For one thing, the historians' late-emerging narrations were largely based upon a gradual process of accretion and crystallization of materials and previous textual models that were received and revised by generations. Moreover, speaking of the specificity of the lexical items under focus, most of them were taken as commonplace neutral terms with stabilized forms and meanings, though graphic and lexical variance would occasionally occur between an earlier and a later instance parallel to each other.[418] With the risk of anachronism—already minimized, I suggest—taken into consideration, one should not underrate the degree to which these samples serve as reliable reflections of the actual verbal representations of textual productions in the respective times they referred to.

Leaving the highly incomplete *Dongguan Hanji* temporarily aside, most of the eight terms under review—with the only exception *zhuwen*—occur in the *Houhan shu* and the *Sanguo zhi* much more frequently than in the *Hanshu*, where some of these terms were rarely or even never used. The data presents a collective scenario, in which the practices of composing and producing new texts were mostly accomplished by individuals yet to a much lesser extent by specific groups or communities.

418 For my methodological concerns of the nature of these lexical items and textual accounts, see also Chapter 2.

Personal agency, therefore, was performed as an essential element emblematic to the overall proliferation of textual productions.

Zhuan, *Ji*, *Zhuanji*, *Zhuiji*, *Zhuiwen*, and *Zhuwen*

Most instances of *zhuan* (roughly, "to compose/compile") referred to a practice of composing a new text on the foundation of a certain range of comparatively raw or old materials by means of collection, selection, compilation, organization, and so on. The term *ji* (roughly, "to collect/to gather"), not as commonly used as *zhuan*, entailed also a general sense of compilation but more specifically referred to the acts of collecting and gathering the materials themselves, instead of further editorial works toward to the final production. As a transitive verb, *zhuan* could be either linked to the final textual production or placed ahead of the materials being collected and compiled. The materials objected to *zhuan* showed relatedness to diverse range of old and new archives and repositories as either institutional or personal possessions. Through the practice of *zhuan*, a new text was produced with a composite nature and, simultaneously, a new status of integration to be distinguished from the previous repositories from which the materials were drawn. Sometimes—being the evidence mostly located in comparatively late textual layer—*zhuan* was juxtaposed with other verbs such as *ji*, *ci* 次 ("to organize/to put in sequence"), and *lu* 錄 ("to record/to make copy of"), which hence constituted compound words such as *zhuanji* ("to compile and collect"), *zhuanci* 撰次 ("to compile and organize"), and *zhuanlu* 撰錄 ("to compile and record")

that specified more complex motifs and procedures involved in the given textual practices.[419] The final textual productions of *zhuan* were sometimes titled or categorized as *ji* 記 ("record"), *tong* (namely, a "comprehensive/thorough" account), *yitong* 異同 (namely, a compilation of "difference and similarity"), and *yiyi* 異義 (namely, a compilation of "different explanations").[420] All these phenomena of diversification corresponded to a spectrum of principles of integration in accord with the chronologic, generic, thematic, and content-related correlations between the incorporated and re-organized materials themselves. While being widely associated with the productions of new texts as "collections" or "compilations," z*huan* was rarely used to refer to the compositions of literary works with comparatively distinct forms and contents such as *shi* 詩 ("poetry"), *fu*, *song* 頌 ("eulogy"), *lun* 論 ("discourse"),[421] and beyond.

The more delicate specification of the integrative nature of textual productions is made particularly clear in the uses of a set of compound words during and after the Han. The term *zhuanji*, for example, is a lexical integration of the two singular elements *zhuan* and *ji*, which altogether constituted a process as both a compilation and a collection. *Zhuanji* was not employed even once in the *Hanshu* to categorize a specific Western Han practice, yet it is presented as a proper lexical choice in the *Houhan shu*—and to a lesser extent in the *Sanguo zhi*—to denote the composite and

419 For instances of the term *zhuanji* 撰集, see *Houhan shu* 40B.1373 (the historian referring to Ban Gu's compilation of the *Baihu tong*), 59.1940 (referring to the compilation of the *Dongguan Hanji* 東觀漢記), 60B.2007 (referring to Cai Yong), and *Sanguo zhi* 2.88 (referring to Cao Pi); for *zhuanci* 撰次, see *Houhan shu* 35.1203 (referring to Cao Bao 曹褒), 44.1511 (referring to Hu Guang 胡廣); for *zhuanlu* 撰錄, see *Sanguo zhi* 19.576 (cited from Cao Rui's 曹叡 [i. e. Emperor Ming 明帝 of Wei] imperial edict to compile the works of Cao Zhi).

420 See section 2 of the present chapter for a more detailed discussion.

421 As should be differentiated from *lun* 論 as a sub-category of hermeneutic traditions attached to the classics. For a case of *lun* in that sense, see section 2 of the present chapter.

integrative nature of a number of Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms textual productions.[422] The similar diachronic pattern of distribution is found in the case of *zhuiji* (roughly, "to compose/connect and collect"),[423] in which the term *zhui* ("to make connections of") stands for the integrative nature of composing a new text on the basis of "collection" (*ji*) as well. Related to this, *zhuiwen*, a term that Ban Gu employed in his appraisal of an array of idols from Kongzi through Yang Xiong,[424] was used by the historian to categorize their words and writings altogether as the emblem of a practice "to make connections" of *wen*, which not merely stood for the literary texts and utterances that these masters left behind, but might also refer to the cultural legacy they inherited, continued, and carried forward. Such a profundity of *zhuiwen* was reinforced in Ban Gu's remarks on those masters' capabilities of being "broadly learned about things and richly informed, thoroughly comprehending the past and the present" 博物洽聞，通達古今.[425] For comparison, the term *zhuwen*—literally, "to make connections of *wen*" as well—was more commonly employed than *zhuiwen*. The term denoted the practice of composing literary writing as a procedure of connecting multiple literary utterances into an integrative body of verbal structure. Unlike most compound words under review, the use of *zhuwen* in the *Hanshu* was no less frequent than the cases in the *Houhan shu* and the *Sanguo zhi*. This indicates that *zhuwen* as a term gained prominence as early

422 See Note 419.

423 For instances of the term *zhuiji* 綴集, see *Houhan shu* 40A.1324 (the case of Ban Biao's 班彪 remark on compilers who continued the *Shiji*); 40A.1334 (Ban Gu and the compilation of the *Hanshu*, in which the term *zhuiji* most likely derived from his self-narrative of the same event in the *Hanshu*, where *zhuiji* appears as *zhuiji* 綴輯 [*Hanshu* 100B.4235]); 48.1614 (Ying Shao).

424 *Hanshu* 36.1972. For another two references to this appraisal, see Chapter 2, as well as section 2 of the present chapter.

425 *Hanshu* 36.1972.

as in Ban Gu's time and, simultaneously, a distinguished and perhaps more profound meaning embedded in the term *zhuiwen*, which occurred only once among the four historiographic texts under review.

Zhu and *Zhushu*

The term *zhu*, which entails a basic, standard meaning as "to manifest," "to foreground," or "to (make) stand out," was gradually appropriated in the Han times as a verb referring to the practice of composing and producing literary texts. To be precise, the term gained currency in the specific sense of marking and manifesting a person and a text as a pair of properties embodying each other, a double-oriented relationship in which the person who composes or produces a text makes it "stand out," and the text reciprocally makes the producer "manifested" as its own principal of credit and liability. Though there is no easy translation of *zhu* without losing these delicate connotations, I will hereafter render *zhu* (as it occurs as a transitive verb linked to a text) as "to produce," for it carries a sense of putting something forward at a manifested foreground.

From the third century CE—if not even earlier—onward, a particular usage of *zhu* emerged and gained currency as an indicator of a new way of literary reception and information organization. Namely, *zhu* was employed there as a verbal connecter to manifest a specific figure by attaching to him/her a list of his/her literary products, which normally incorporated a series of general information about the numbers, genres, titles, and sometimes sizes (numbers of chapters, volumes, or words) of the works being included. This particular usage of *zhu* was found in the *Sanguo zhi*

and more extensively in the *Houhan shu*, normally at the end of a given biography in retrospect to one's literary productivity within a lifetime scheme.[426] In a narrative scenario like this, a reader would be informed not merely a particular corpus of textual productions but also a conceptual connectivity between the text and the person. The text was displayed as an identifiable property and cultural capital, and the person as the accredited principal of credit and liability. In general, the growing prominence and specific uses of *zhu* demonstrate that literary productivity gradually became a new standard and social value, by which one's personal labor and agency would be marked, manifested, and hence evaluated.

In a way akin to the case of *zhuan*, the growing prominence of *zhu* was accompanied by a set of compound words during and after the Eastern Han. Most noticeable is the term *zhushu*, which consists of another component *shu* ("to transmit") and hence entails a semantic duality in itself. In actual usage, *zhushu* was not far from a general reference to the act or the outcome of the production of literary compositions with no particular limitation. On a conceptual level, it was the combination of a sense of self-manifestation of one's credit and liability (*zhu*) and, simultaneously, a sense of participation into the transmission and continuation of the shared cultural legacy (*shu*). Similar to the cases of most compound words under review, the use of *zhushu* is more frequently found in contexts related to the Eastern Han and beyond in comparison to earlier times.

426 For some instances of the most productive writers (according to the numbers of literary products being recorded) identified by this particular formulaic usage of *zhu* 著, see *Houhan shu* 28B.1003 (Feng Yan 馮衍), 40B.1386 (Ban Gu), 52.1724 (Cui Yuan), 59.1940 (Zhang Heng), 60A.1972 (Ma Rong), 60B.2007 (Cai Yong); *Sanguo zhi* 19.576 (Cao Zhi), 21.599 (Wang Can). Note also, that there was only one female (i. e. Ban Zhao 班昭) whose works were summarized in this particular way of information organization throughout the *Houhan shu* (but also, for the first time in all existing sources).

Zuo

The term *zuo* ("to rise/initiate/innovate/create/cultivate, etc."), which could be used either transitively or intransitively, fell into a spectrum of meanings not without ambivalence.[427] This semantic ambiguity was also because *zuo*, along with another term *shu*, were presented as a pair of key concepts in early Chinese context signifying the tension between innovation and transmission, a topic distributed among a whole range of human activities including those in dealing with texts.[428] Throughout early China, the most spectacular connection between a text and its putative "creator" in terms of *zuo* was that between the *Chunqiu* and Kongzi, a case that—as Martin Kern argues[429]—gained prominence not until the Western Han while reflecting Michel Foucault's "author function," in which the author is conceptualized as "a principle of thrift in the proliferation of meaning"[430] over the process of the text's reception and interpretation.

With evidence drawn from numerous citations in the Han-Wei contexts, *zuo* stands out as the single term with a highly specific function connecting a limited range of textual legacies with legendary cultural heroes. The notion "Kongzi *zuo* the *Chunqiu*," foregrounded at the center of this scenario, was surrounded by a series of other cases related to figures such as King Wen, Duke of

427 For a critical review of related philological studies on the semantics of *zuo*, see Puett, *The Ambivalence of Creation*, 217–24.

428 See section 4 of the present chapter, for a further discussion of the dichotomy between *shu* 述 and *zuo*.

429 See Martin Kern, "Kongzi as Author in the Han," in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, ed. Michael J. Hunter and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 289–90; "*Shiji* li de zuozhe gainian," 31–46.

430 Foucault, "What is an Author?" 221.

Zhou, Qu Yuan 屈原 (trad. ca. 340–278 BCE), and beyond.[431] From the Western Han onward, nevertheless, the overall proportion of this particular usage of *zuo* gradually decreased—albeit never disappeared—as it was increasingly employed in a causal way and, meanwhile, applied to a diverse range of productions and performances of verbal and literary compositions. Within this broadened context, the distribution of *zuo* present a series of new patterns. Compared to *zhuan* and *ji*, *zuo* was more commonly associated with literary genres such as *shi*, *fu*, *song*, and *lun*[432] that, compared to voluminous compilations, were presented as relatively more condensed, distinct, and independent textual entity. Moreover, the use of *zuo* often involved a stronger focus on individuality and spontaneity, as being often employed in one's self-narrative about the composition of a particular literary work, normally related to a specific moment or situation that called for one's expression or reaction via writing.[433]

---

431 For the utterances that Kongzi *zuo* the *Chunqiu*, see, for instance: *Hanshu* 56.2509, 2515 (cited from Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒), 62.2716 (from Sima Tan, see also *Shiji* 130.3295), 2717, 2719 (from Hu Sui 壺遂, see also *Shiji* 130.3297, 3298), 2735 (from Sima Qian, see also *Shiji* 130.3300), 2737 (Ban Gu's comment), 87B.3578 (from Yang Xiong); *Houhan shu* 52.1727 (from Cui Shi), 30B.1071 (from Lang Kai 郎顗); *Sanguo zhi* 38.974 (from Qin Mi 秦宓). For the utterances about texts *zuo* by other pre-imperial figures, see, for instance: *Hanshu* 62.2735 (from Sima Qian, applied to the composition of the classic of *Shi*, see also *Shiji* 130.3300), 30.1756 (presumably from Liu Xin, on Sun Qing 孫卿 [i. e. Xunzi 荀子] and Qu Yuan 屈原), 75.3176–77 (from Yi Feng, on Duke of Zhou 周公), 87A.3515 (from Yang Xiong, on Qu Yuan); *Houhan shu* 40A.1325 (from Ban Biao, on Zuo Qiuming 左丘明), 62.2052 (from Xun Shuang, on King Wen); *Sanguo zhi* 24.684 (from Gao Rou 高柔, on Duke of Zhou).

432 For instance, see *Hanshu* 73.3101 (from Ban Gu's narrative perspective, applied to Wei Meng 韋孟), 3110, 3113 (from Ban Gu's narrative perspective, on Wei Xuancheng 韋玄成), 87A.3515 (five occurrences of *zuo* cited from Yang Xiong, applied to Sima Xiangru 司馬相如, Qu Yuan, and himself), 3542 (from Yang Xiong, on himself); *Houhan shu* 28B.987 (from Feng Yan, on himself), 34.1171 (from Ban Gu, on Liang Song 梁竦), 60A.1955 (from Ma Rong, on himself), 80B.2641 (from Bian Rang 邊讓, on himself); *Sanguo zhi* 21.618 (from Chen Shou's narrative perspective, on Liu Shao 劉劭), 9.292 (from Chen Shou's narrative perspective, on He Yan 何晏).

433 For instances of self-narratives of one's *zuo* of particular writings, see *Shiji* 130.3301–19 (for the case of Sima Qian [see also *Hanshu* 62.2723]); *Fayan* 5.18 (*Fayan yishu*, 164) (Yang Xiong); *Hanshu* 87A.3515, 3542, 87B.3566 (Yang Xiong); *Houhan shu* 28B.987 (Feng Yan), 60A.1955 (Ma Rong), 80A.2596 (Du Du 杜篤), 80B.2641 (Bian Rang), 84.2786 (Ban Zhao); *Sanguo zhi* 21.619 (Liu Shao), 65.1462–63 (Wei Zhao 韋昭 [written as Wei Yao 韋曜]).

The foregoing examination of the vocabulary for textual production demonstrates a diachronic proliferation of acts, thoughts, and traces related to the production of literary texts during and after the Han dynasty. Textual data located in the strata of the Eastern Han and beyond contain lexical evidence that, compared to previous ages, bespeaks an overall surplus of scholarly engagements in textual production not only in quantity but also in diversity and in degree,[434] as especially shown in the growing prominence of a cluster of compound words which were rarely used before.[435] Such a proliferation of concepts and utterances demonstrates a productive condition of literary practices, as well as a growing awareness of personal agency and property associated with the praxis of "writing." The complexity involved in the whole range of mutually correlated lexical items cannot be reduced into an over-simplified discourse of the proliferation of texts and their "authors" or "producers." Instead, it invites further inquiries into the conceptual foundation underlying the expansive accumulation of literary presentations that manifest the entire spectacle.

4.2. Integration and Innovation: The Dual Mode of Textual Production

The present section undertakes a detailed analysis of several individual cases that are indicative of the recurring patterns and structures involved in textual productions in Han-Wei China. The vari-

434 For a late Eastern Han reference, see the *Shiming*, which incorporated a variety of lexical items related to the practices of textual production as mostly located in the three chapters on *yanyu* ("words and speeches"), *shuqi* 書契 ("writings and writing tools"), and *dianyi* 典藝 ("texts and classics"). *Shiming huijiao*, 171–202, 322–51.

435 See Note 178, for a selective range of linguistic studies of the overall proliferation of compound words from the Eastern Han onwards.

ous forms of literary productivity over this period fall into a wide spectrum that involved, put in its baldest, a pair of interrelated conceptions: first, an integrative mode of collecting, connecting, synthesizing, and revising pre-existing materials; and second, an innovative mode of constructing and presenting an essentially new unity of contents-and-forms. The two modes cannot be disentangled from each other in either practical or conceptual way, for the birth of an essentially new text was often considered and performed as the new realization of the old, as well as the crystallization of innovative utilization and appropriation of what pre-existed.

In the past few decades, a fruitful series of scholarship have admirably renewed the paradigm, methodologies, and terminologies in the study of the formation and composition of early Chinese texts and literature in general. One of the most influential opinions among them is that from William G. Boltz, who argues for the concept of "composite text" applicable to a wide range of early textual products as constituted by comparatively short and self-contained textual modules, or, in his words, the "building blocks" that served the function of flexible appropriation in multiple contexts.[436] The notion of "composite text" and that of "building blocks" work as a pair of conceptual tools to explain the common occurrence of textual parallels and correspondences between essentially different texts, as well as the divergence between texts that are essentially close to each other yet instantiated in a broad spectrum of variability. Boltz's model is a part of the general

436 William G. Boltz, "The Composite Nature of Early Chinese Texts," in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 50–78. For the metaphorical use of "building block" characterizing the composite feature of early Chinese texts in different aspects, see, for example, Haun Saussy, "Repetition, Rhyme, and Exchange in *The Book of Odes*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57 (1997): 519–542; Rudolf G. Wagner, "A Building Block of Chinese Argumentation: Initial *Fu* as a Phrase Status Marker," in *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*, ed. Joachim Gentz and Dirk Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 37–66.

re-orientation of scholarly focus that prioritizes the functions and intertextuality of comparatively minor units, modules, and components, a point of view from the imaginary bottom of "material" (as oral, memorial, or written) toward its various actualizations and realizations as presented as individual literary artifacts.[437] Such an orientation involves, simultaneously, an emphasis on the col-

437 See, first of all, a series of case studies focused on specific types of textual units and modules such as rhymes, formulas, quotations, and short passages, as well as their compositional functionalities. For example: Saussy, "Repetition, Rhyme, and Exchange"; William Baxter, "Situating the Language of the *Lao-tzu*," in *Lao-tzu and the Tao-te-ching*, ed. Livia Kohn and Michael LaFargue (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998), 231–53; Eric Henry, "'Junzi Yue' versus 'Zhongni Yue' in *Zuozhuan*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59 (1999): 125–61; David C. Schaberg, "Platitude and Persona: Junzi Comments in *Zuozhuan* and Beyond," in *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture from a New Comparative Perspective*. ed. Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 1–20; "Speaking of Documents: *Shu* Citations in Warring States Texts," in *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy: Studies in the Composition and Thought of the Shangshu (Classic of Documents)*," ed. Martin Kern and Dirk Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 320–59. For studies that shed more lights on the structural connectivity that guided the formations and compositional procedures of specific texts, see Wagner, *The Craft of a Chinese Commentator*, esp. 53–114; David C. Schaberg, *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001); Joachim Gentz, "Ritual Meaning of Textual Form: Evidence from Early Commentaries of the Historiographic and Ritual Traditions," in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 124–48; Paul Fischer, "Intertextuality in Early Chinese Master-Texts: Shared Narratives in Shi Zi," *Asia Major* 22 (2009): 1–34; Dirk Meyer, *Philosophy on Bamboo: Text and the Production of Meaning in Early China* (Leiden: Brill, 2012); Martin Kern, "Creating a Book and Performing It: The 'Yao lüe' Chapter of the *Huainanzi* as a Western Han *Fu*," in *The Huainanzi and Textual Production in Early China*, ed. Sarah A. Queen and Michael Puett (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 124–50; Michael Nylan, "A Note on Logical Connectives in the *Huainanzi*," in *The Huainanzi and Textual Production in Early China*, 225–65; Andrew H. Plaks, "Beyond Parallelism: A Rethinking of Patterns of Coordination and Subordination in Chinese Expository Prose," in *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*, 67–86; Oliver Weingarten, "Intertextuality and Memory in Early Chinese Writings: A Case Study from *Huainanzi*," *Early China* 42 (2019): 201–36; Tobias Benedikt Zürn, "The Han *Imaginaire* of Writing as Weaving: Intertextuality and the *Huainanzi*'s Self-Fashioning as an Embodiment of the Way," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 79 (2020): 367–402. Some studies have attempted to conceptualize the composite nature or compositional procedures of early texts by terminologies that are either brand-new or appropriated from other fields of literary studies. For example, see Owen, *The Making of Early Chinese Classical Poetry*, 1–213; Martin Kern, "The Formation of the *Classic of Poetry*," in *The Homeric Epics and the Chinese Book of Songs: Foundational Texts Compared*, ed. Fritz-Heiner Mutschler (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2018), 39–71; "'Xi shuai' ('Cricket') and Its Consequences," 54–69, for their employments of the concept *repertoire* in the studies of early medieval and pre-imperial Chinese poetry; Paul Fischer, "Authentication Studies Methodology and the Polymorphous Text Paradigm," *Early China* 32 (2008–2009): 1–43, for his proposal for the concept "polymorphous text"; Xu Jianwei, "Zhanguo Qin Han jian de gongong sucai yu Zhou Qin Han wenxueshi xushi" 戰國秦漢間的"公共素材"與周秦漢文學史敘事, *Zhongshan daxue xuebao* 中山大學學報, No. 6 (2012): 1–9, for his proposal for the concept *gonggong sucai* 公共素材 ("public material"); Cheng Sudong, "Xiechaoben shidai yizhixing wenben de faxian yu yanjiu" 寫鈔本時代異質性文本的發現與研究, *Beijing daxue xuebao* 53, No. 2 (2016): 148–57; "Shuxie wenhua de xinbian," 155–57, for his proposal for the concept *yansheng wenben* 衍生文本 ("derivative text"). See also, a set of thematically edited volumes of collected papers with specific concentrations on relevant topics, for example: Martin Kern ed., *Text and Ritual in Early China*; Sarah A. Queen and Michael Puett eds., *The Huainanzi and Textual Production in Early China*; Joachim Gentz and Dirk Meyer eds., *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*;

laborative process and polymorphous nature embedded in the formation, transmission, and transformation of texts. This emphasis also downplays a set of traditional conceptions that fetishize the fixity and authenticity of single "original" text and its "author."

With indebtedness to this scholarly shift, my conceptualization of the "integrative mode" of textual construction incorporates yet not prioritizes the either fluid or circumscribed modularity of textual units and materials in their own rights. Nor do I aim at an all-encompassing generalization of the multiple collaborative labor involved in the entire process of textual production, transmission, and transformation. Instead, I suggest a point of view from which the verbal structure of a text is configured as the condensation of an integrative intellectual labor (not to be conflated with a single person), which exists in relation with but also above the modularity, variability, and utility of "materials." Such a mode of labor and productivity is responsible for the *poetics* and the *choreography* of an open range of potential components to be organized and hence displayed at the foreground of a text as an emerging being; and its function is hence distinguished from other kinds of literal, scribal, and physical efforts involved in the process of textual production.

This, to be clarified, is not a gesture returning to the fetishes of originality, authenticity, and authority of either the single master copy of a given text or its single author. What it aims at is an open-ended inquiry into a perhaps more complicated and sophisticated constellation of human

---

Martin Kern and Dirk Meyer eds., *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy* (some articles collected in these volumes have been selectively mentioned above). Finally, from an interdisciplinary point of view, see Lothar Ledderose, *Ten Thousand Things: Module and Mass Production in Chinese Arts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), for the consideration of "module" and modularity as foundational to the process of mass production in Chinese arts.

agencies that can be better recognized from the top instead of the bottom of a text. This is, in other words, to recover the virtue of a specific kind of intellectual labor which is somehow silenced or diminished into a hypothetically simple notion of authorship and, consequently, only to be downplayed and exiled from the study of early Chinese literature in the past decade.

Such a mode of intellectual labor and hence literary productivity is foregrounded in a wealth of textual presentations from minor lexical indicators to scenario-like narrations, part of which being already examined in the previous section focusing on relevant terminology. To clarify, a scenario—either brief or detailed—that connects a given text with a certain figure to whom the text was attributed as a property (and vice versa) should not be simply taken as the falsifiable construction/misconstruction of specific historical facts. Instead, the immense accumulation of this expressive form itself demonstrates a growing anxiety of manifesting and understanding the foremost human labor inscribed into the enormity of literary artifacts. Following this, the present section particularly focuses on a series of cases in which the formation of a given text was narrated, introduced, and presented as the crystallization of specific intellectual managements of sources and materials. The making of such a kind of scenario configures a text as not merely an instantiation of collective modularity but also a product that, on the individual basis, represents the integration of multiple elements into a distinct unity of contents-and-forms.

Therefore, the inquiry negotiates with a reductive notion of literary productivity that is presumably conducted on an assembly line of collaboration subject to a semi-automatic mechanism of regeneration, by which a text primarily comes out from "materials" embodied in their either

fluid or circumscribed modularity, variability, and functionality. Instead, a text as an integrated body of productivity should be specified from the plural possibilities of human agency reciprocally interacting with language, material, and beyond. The effects and instantiations of these possibilities can be observed in a spectrum of compositional methods of appropriating, transforming, and re-fabricating materials from their old repositories into essentially new verbal structures, a process by which the previous models, containers, and individual pieces actualize their full potentials of transmissibility and productivity. The question to be confronted, eventually, dwells at the blurred boundary between integration and innovation—namely, what makes a new text essentially new?

Liu Xiang's composition of the *Hongfan wuxing zhuan lun* 洪範五行傳論—according to Ban Gu's account[438]—offers a late Western Han example for the integrative process of textual production. The work was based on an earlier compilation—the *Hongfan wuxing zhuan* 洪範五行傳 by Xiahou Shichang[439]—and, therefore, constituted a "discussion/selection" (*lun*) that elaborated the forms and contents of Xiahou's work in particular. Every lexical element in the titles of these two compilations[440] stands for a specific textual stratum incorporated in the multi-layered process of their formations. "Hong fan" 洪範, the title of a *Shangshu* chapter, represents the oldest textual

438 As first recorded in Liu Xiang's biography in the *Hanshu* (*Hanshu* 36.1950). The text, however, is transmitted only in fragments mostly preserved in the late-emerging "Wuxing zhi" 五行志 ("Treatise on the Five Phases/Elements") of the *Hanshu* after Ban Gu's editorial compilation. For a reliable textual criticism of the extant "Wuxing zhi," see Xu Xingwu, *Liu Xiang pingzhuan*, 283–91.

439 As first recorded in Xiahou Sheng's 夏侯勝 biography in the *Hanshu* (*Hanshu* 75.3155).

440 It is uncertain if these two titles were initially given by Xiahou Shichang 夏侯始昌 and Liu Xiang themselves or a result of Ban Gu's standardization. For another reference that most likely reflected a late Western Han titling, in the "Yiwen zhi" of the *Hanshu*, Liu Xiang's compilation was recorded (most like by Liu Xin) as a *ji* ("record") for the *Wuxin zhuan* 五行傳 among a series of other works under the category of *Shu* 書, in which the number of textual unit *pian* of this compilation (11) matches that recorded in Liu Xiang's *Hanshu* biography.

elements foundational to the works of Xiahou Shichang and Liu Xiang. The term *wuxing* 五行 ("Five Phrases/Elements") then indicates the theme central to these two compilations, as well as an uncertain range of thematically interrelated materials drawn from the "Hong fan" and other sources; *zhuan* 傳 ("transmitted tradition"), a generic category referring to the secondary, interpretative traditions surrounding specific "classics" (*jing*), demonstrates the hermeneutic nature embedded in Xiahou's work as a contribution to the studies of the *Shangshu*; and finally, the term *lun*, as often used as a sub-category secondary to *zhuan*,[441] marks Liu Xiang's work as a further elaboration of Xiahou Shichang's *zhuan* (i. e. the *Hongfan wuxing zhuan*). Technically, the full meanings embedded in the multi-layered title *Hongfan wuxing zhuan lun* can be unfolded as follows: "an elaborated 'discussion/selection' (*lun*) based upon a previous hermeneutic 'tradition' (*zhuan*) related to the topic 'Five Phases/Elements' (*wuxing*) rooted in the 'Hong fan' chapter of the *Shangshu*."

The multi-layered title of the *Hongfan wuxing zhuan lun* opens a window toward the examination of the text as a hybrid of two principles of integration. Linearly, the *Hongfan wuxing zhuan lun* was based on the accretional integration of old sources related to a certain topic (*wuxing*) and hence—according to the *Hanshu*—accomplished via Liu Xiang's "collection and combination" (*jihe* 集合) of materials on a chronological axis from the high antiquity through the current Han.[442] Horizontally, Liu Xiang organized the collected materials according to their mutual typological affinities by means of "(making them) attached to each other category-by-category" (*bi lei xiang cong*

441 For a series of traditional and modern understandings of the categories *jing* 經, *zhuan*, *lun*, and beyond, see Pi Xirui, *Jingxue lishi*, 67; Ma Ruichen annot., *Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi*, 3–5; Nylan, "Classics without Canonization," 726–32.

442 *Hanshu* 36.1950.

比類相從).[443] The linear and horizontal principles of integration were also applied to Liu Xiang's other works, such as the *Shuoyuan* 說苑, *Xinxu* 新序, and *Lienü zhuan* 列女傳.[444]

Both the linear and horizontal principles of integration were employed during and after the Eastern Han on a more extensive basis. This is showcased in a variety of textual productions including historiographic, philosophic, and other multi-layered compilations that served different intellectual and utilitarian interests. Simply put, the linear mode of integration tended to arrange materials in chronological order within a structure of narration or enumeration. This principle was most typically employed in historiographic compilations and, to a lesser extent, in a diverse range of other writings that incorporated a diachronic point of view as well. The gesture of making linear connection was also enacted in a series of practices with aims to continue or to extend the contents and frameworks of previous works that were considered "unfinished" or "incomplete."[445] So was it presented in the composition of a new work depending on a specific old textual model, a practice that involved a sense of linear transmission of a particular topos, form, or style, a notion that eventually became an essential element foundational to the phenomenon of literary antholo-

443 *Hanshu* 36.1950.

444 For some brief entries to the compositional procedures of these compilations, see Xiang Zonglu 向宗魯 annot., *Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 說苑校證 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), 1–4; Shi Guangying 石光瑛 annot., *Xinxu jiaoshi* 新序校釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001), 1–4. For some case studies on the methods and natures of the composition of Liu Xiang's works, see Bret Hinsch, "The Composition of *Lienüzhuan*: Was Liu Xiang the Author or Editor?" *Asia Major* 20 (2007): 1–23; Xu Jianwei, *Shuoyuan yanjiu*.

445 Suffice it to mention the following instances: From the late Western Han onwards, there arose a series of writings interpolated into the "incomplete" *Taishigong shu* (*Shiji*) of which ten chapters were "lost" after Sima Qian's demise. For a comprehensive review with critical examination, see Yu Jiaxi, "*Taishigong shu* wangpian kao" 太史公書亡篇考, in *Yu Jiaxi wenshi lunji* 余嘉錫文史論集 (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1997), 1–99. Consider too, a series of Eastern Han writings that continued and extended Yang Xiong's writings of *zhen* 箴 ("admonishment"), a collection that were partly lost after his demise (*Houhan shu* 44.1511); and furthermore, the continuous collaboration of the compilation of the *Dongguan Hanji* by Eastern Han scholars (see *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 1–6, for a general review).

gization during and after early medieval China.[446]

By the horizontal principle of textual formation, a given text was divided into several categorical sections with generic or thematic distinctiveness, a process by which every single material would find its place(s) in correlation with the others. Liu Xiang's method of category-by-category compilation in terms of *bi lei xiang cong* (as can be phrased with little variance such as *yi lei xiang cong* 以類相從 or *sui lei xiang cong* 隨類相從), for example, progressively gained prominence in Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms textual productions as shown in some works by Jing Luan 景鸞, Ying Shao, and Cao Pi.[447] Such a method further constituted the central logics of the formation of *leishu* 類書 ("encyclopedia," as it is often translated as) in later times.[448] The horizontal principle was also applied broadly in textual compilations with purports to collect and to compare similar and different accounts drawn from manifold sources related to the same issues and topics, as shown in a series of official and private compilations titled with *tong*, *yitong*, and *yiyi*.[449] The proliferation of this type of composition particularly reflected the integrative, syncretic, and encompassing mode of literary learning—especially on classics and their hermeneutics—that transcended

446 To be discussed later in the present section.

447 *Houhan shu* 79B.2572 (Jing Luan 景鸞), 48.1613 (Ying Shao); *Sanguo zhi* 2.88 (Cao Pi).

448 For a recent review and discussion of the features and the history of *leishu* 類書, see Xiaofei Tian, "Encyclopedias and Epitomes," in *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature*, 132–46, esp. 133–34, for a brief discussion of the early history of *leishu* associated with the compilation of the *Huanglan* 皇覽.

449 As often associated with the term *zhuan* (see section 1 of the present chapter). For instance, see *Houhan shu* 36.1239 (for the case of Jia Kui 賈逵 and his compilation of the similarities and differences [in terms of *tongyi* 同異 and *yitong*] between the various hermeneutic traditions of the two classics *Shi* and *Shu* respectively), 40B.1372 (Ban Gu and the *Baihu tong*), 42.1427 (Liu Fu 劉輔 and the Wujing lun 五經論, as known by his contemporaries as the *Peiwang tonglun* 沛王通論), 48.1614 (Ying Shao and the *Fengsu tong*), 60A.1972 (Ma Rong and the *Sanzhuan yitong shuo* 三傳異同說 on the three hermeneutic traditions of the *Chunqiu*), 79B.2588 (Xu Shen and the *Wujing yiyi* 五經異義). See also Zhang Xuecheng's comment and discussion of this phenomenon, in *Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu*, 372–73.

the scholastic boundaries but moved toward a more comprehensive status of erudition.[450]

The two principles of integration did not exclude each other, though they might take different structural functions depending on the nature and purport involved in each particular type of textual production. The works of Liu Xiang, for example, were the crystallizations of these two principles in general. The same was true in the composite structure of a variety of transmitted works such as the *Hanshu*, *Baihu tong* 白虎通, and *Fengsu tong* in which the textual components were collected and arranged in both these two ways. Furthermore, toward a higher conceptual level, a producer might consciously consider his entire work as an effort to reach a more comprehensive integration of ideas and materials beyond both the linear and horizontal limits of what his writing project was initially about. See, for example, Ban Gu's self-narrative of his compilation of the *Hanshu*—

> 故探篹前記，綴輯所聞，以述漢書，起元高祖，終于孝平王莽之誅，十有二世，二百三十年，綜其行事，旁貫五經，上下洽通。[451]
> … Therefore, [I] explored and organized previous records, connected and collected what I heard, so as to compile the *Book of Han* (*Hanshu*). I began with the High Ancestor (Gaozu) and ended up with the periods of Emperor Ping and the doom of Wang Mang, spanning over the reign of twelve [emperors] across two hundred and thirty years. I synthesized the conducts and the events within this period and, for another reference, cut through the Five Classics (*wujing*), making the upper (earlier accounts) and the lower (later accounts) compatibly connected.

In this self-narrative, Ban Gu regarded the *Hanshu* as not merely an account for a specific history

450 See Chapter 2, for a detailed discussion on this issue.

451 *Hanshu* 100B.4235.

spanning over two centuries based on his collection and arrangement of materials in terms of *tanzhuan* 探篹 and *zhuiji*,[452] but also an integrative effort that, on another level, "synthesized" (*zong*) the historical process along with a thorough investigation of the contents and meanings of the "Five Classics" (*wujing*). This effort, as Ban Gu informed, led him to a status of making things "compatibly connected" (*qiatong* 洽通) within a larger framework that, in terms of time structure, was way more extensive than a dynastic period and moreover, in terms of meaning and profundity, carried a set of more significant values than what an account of linear history would do.[453]

For another instance, see the case of Ying Shao, who introduced his systematic compilation of eighty-two "cases/events" (*shi* 事) drawn from a collection of materials within a wide time span—

> ……又集駁議三十篇，以類相從，凡八十二事。其見漢書二十五，漢記四，皆刪敘潤色，以全本體。其二十六，博採古今瑰瑋之士，文章煥炳，德義可觀。其二十七，臣所創造。……[454]
> … Moreover, [I] compiled thirty chapters of critical memorials by connecting materials category-by-category, with my incorporation of eighty-two cases in total. Twenty-five of them were seen in the *Hanshu*, and four in the *Hanji*. [For these twenty-nine cases,] I had cut short, narrated, and refined all of them in order to complete a coherent unity. Twenty-six of them were broadly selected from outstanding men from the past through the present, whose literary productions/utterances (*wenzhang*) are brilliant and illuminating, and whose virtues and principles deserve to be recognized. Twenty-seven of them were innovated and created by me, your subject. …

452 See also a brief account in *Houhan shu* 40A.1334, where the phrase *zhuiji* appears as 綴集. For more instances of this term, see Note 423.

453 On this aspiration, see also Wang Jilu 王記錄, "*Hanshu* gujin ren biao zhuanshu zhiqu xintan" 《漢書·古今人表》撰述旨趣新探, *Shangxi shida xuebao* 山西師大學報, No. 2 (1996): 67–71, with a specific focus on the "Gujin ren biao" 古今人表 ["Table for People from the Past through the Present"] in the *Hanshu*.

454 *Houhan shu* 48.1613.

The introduction bespeaks Ying Shao's awareness of the composite and integrative nature embedded in his compilation, as well as the logics and procedures by which it was actualized as a condensed body of contents-and-forms. One of his approaches was to select the eighty-two cases according to the horizontal principle of categorization in terms of *yi lei xiang cong*, a method employed before and after him as well.[455] In addition, he divided the selected materials into three sections according to where they came from: First, those drawn from the *Hanshu* and the [*Dongguan*] *Hanji*, on which he applied a series of revisionary methods in terms of *shan* 刪 ("to delete/to cut short"), *xu* 敘 ("to narrate/to put into narrative context"[456]), and *runse* 潤色 ("to polish/to refine [the gloss of utterances]"); second, those "broadly selected" (*bocai*) from an unspecified range of excellent writings that were individually composed by previous and contemporary figures; and finally, those "innovated and created" (*chuangzao* 創造) by himself, with also a claim for his own credit and liability. The three sections, therefore, stand for three types of textual repositories underlying the formation of a new textual structure, respectively (1) previous textual entities that were already closed and hence could be directly drawn from, (2) dispersed and less circumscribed materials available for an open survey, (3) the personal archive of one's own productions. Above all these, it was Ying Shao's labor that integrated, revised, and re-contextualized all selected items, and it was also his decision that arranged the three parts in an even structure by controlling the numbers of items respectively as 29, 26, and 27. Such practices altogether defined his compilation as

455 See the cases of Liu Xiang and others as previously mentioned in the present section (Notes 443 and 447).

456 More precisely, "to put into narrative context," which fits more specifically the compiler's revisionary approaches to the official memorials he selected from the *Hanshu* and the *Dongguan Hanji*, for there would be a need to create a context by means of narration for each memorial he selected out of its initial repository.

the actualization of a highly synthesized intellectual labor dominating the formation of a new text in relations to many others, and Ying Shao himself was hence performed and foregrounded as the most active agency involved in the composite and integrative structure of the entire work.

Though the widely-shared integrative mode of textual composition conceptually entails a notion of dependence on pre-existing or pre-fabricated materials, it is true as well that a literary product based upon integration could perform its innovative motifs and praxes in more than one aspect. The innovative nature was embodied, not merely in the process of navigating various materials toward a newly integrated body of contents-and-forms, but also in the transformation of those materials themselves which gained their new functions, values, and meanings as they were appropriated and re-fabricated in that integrated body.

The synthesis of innovation and integration can be grasped, moreover, in a fashion of composing individual pieces of writing depending on or gaining inspiration from previous textual models in terms of themes, contents, and forms. This process of production hence situated the new text itself as the imitation, parody, revision, or recomposition in response to the inherited source of influence. Such practices took place across a variety of literary forms, especially since the late Western Han, as most spectacularly summarized in Yang Xiong's self-narrative and later Ban Gu's synopsis of his writings (both preserved in the *Hanshu*). According to Yang's self-narrative, he deliberately composed a series of writings including the "Contra the 'Li sao'" ("Fan Li sao" 反離騷), the "Expansion of the '[Li] sao'" ("Guang sao" 廣騷), and four grand *fu*, all modeled after but also innovatively created based on previous works presumably by Qu Yuan and Sima

Xiangru.[457] Ban's later recounting, accordingly, can be regarded as an even more inclusive synopsis of Yang's important works—including the verses mentioned above but also his *Taixuan*, *Fayan*, and beyond—collectively as a textual display of his innovative productivity based upon an integrative reflection on pre-existing traditions.[458] The case of Yang Xiong, therefore, foregrounded a notion of writing beyond a simple sense of "imitation" or "inheritance" of the past,[459] but a proficiency that was retroactively advanced and integratively developed by means of—to quote Ban Gu—"carefully thinking over the roots, modeling and depending on them, and hence letting [his own utterances] move forward" 斟酌其本，相與放依而馳騁.[460]

Though not always performed as spectacularly as such, a considerable range of literary works from the late Western Han onward took their own revisionary approaches to renew previous textual models to various new ends. The accretional compositions of "hypothetical discourses" (*shelun*, as later categorized as) by Yang Xiong and later Ban Gu, Cui Yin, Zhang Heng, and Cai Yong, as previous discussed, present a series of strong cases of integrating previous model(s) as the essential elements within the new verbal structures.[461] Zhang Heng's "Fu on the Two Capitals" ("Erjing fu"

457 *Hanshu* 87A.3515.

458 *Hanshu* 87B.3583. For a further discussion of Ban Gu's recounting of Yang's writings and its implications, see section 3 of the present chapter.

459 For some references—from varying perspectives—on the imitative features and critical reflections involved in Yang Xiong's literary and philosophical compositions, see Xu Jie 許結, "Lun Yang Xiong yu Donghan wenxue sichao" 論揚雄與東漢文學思潮, *Zhongguo shehui kexue*, No. 1 (1988): 157–74, esp. 161–65; Kern, "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the 'Fu'," 383–437; Feng Shuxun 馮樹勛, "Shi moni hai shi chuangxin: fanshi chongtu nei de Yang Xiong" 是摹擬還是創新：範式衝突內的揚雄, *Guoli zhengzhi daxue zhexue xuebao* 國立政治大學哲學學報 30 (2013): 27–71.

460 *Hanshu* 87B.3583.

461 For a detailed analysis of these *shelun* and relevant scholarship, see Chapter 3. See also section 4 of the present chapter for another discussion.

二京賦), for another instance, was a practice clearly modeled after Ban Gu's "Fu on the Two Metropolises" ("Liangdu fu" 兩都賦), as well as an effort to construct an even more magnificent verbal structure that eventually cost him ten years.[462] The awareness of the nuances involved in these revisionary practices were reflected in an array of key words—either employed by the composers themselves or retrospectively attached at a later stage—embedded in the titles of works. For instance, consider *fan* 反 ("contra") and *guang* 廣 ("to expand") in the cases of Yang Xiong's revisionary compositions based upon the "Li sao" 離騷, as well as tags such as *ni* ("to imitate") and *dai* 代 ("to substitute") that were extensively found in different genres, especially a series of poems attributed to Han-Wei period but anthologized, categorized, and titled probably not until early medieval times. To borrow Joseph Allen's insightful observation of the intratextuality among the web of presumably music-related poems (traditionally known as *yuefu* 樂府 ["music bureau poetry"])—it was the "imitation" of previous model that constituted the epistemic foundation on which a specific poetic tradition was lineally constructed.[463]

What is configured by now as the "integrative mode" of literary productivity, therefore, rests with the practices of collecting, connecting, synthesizing, and re-fabricating pre-existing materials from multiple repositories. The process was, simultaneously, actualized with an open-ended possibilities of individual innovation by which the materials were transformed, appropriated, and

462 *Houhan shu* 59.1897. For relevant studies on these two *fu* and their relations, see David R. Knechtges, "To Praise the Han: The Eastern Han Capital *Fu* of Pan Ku and His Contemporaries," in *Thought and Law in Qin and Han China*, ed. W. L. Idema and E. Zürcher (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 118–39; "From the Eastern Han through the Western Jin (AD 25–317)," 124–25, 144–45.

463 See Allen, *In the Voice of Others*, passim., esp. 57–58.

re-contextualized in conformity to the new verbal structures and their newly integrated bodies of contents-and-forms. Over the period under focus, such a dual mode of literary productivity spoke well to the prevailing scholarly values of "broadness" (*bo*) and "comprehensiveness" (*tong*) that, in themselves, entailed a notion of integration by interiorizing a variety of external sources into an imagined archive under personal controls.[464] Meanwhile, it was performed as less dependent on the collaborative practices supported by the institutional matrix but, more frequently, the crystallization of an condensed, personalized labor foregrounded on a stage of self-presentation and self-manifestation. Such a scenario was not merely based upon the extension of individual repository of knowledge and texts but also, as will be further discussed, motivated by a desire to exteriorize one's interiorized erudition via writing.

4.3. Textual Display of Erudition: The Exteriorization of the Interiorized

The dual mode of literary productivity, as presented as a hybrid of integration and innovation in the foregoing readings and analyses, shows conformity to another prevailing notion reflected in a considerable range of Han-Wei utterances and discourses, one that situated "writing" within a recycling and transforming process that presents the imagined "inside" via a displayable "outside." To be precise, such a notion configured literary writing as a performative form by which the individually interiorized knowledge, texts, and materials—in this sense, what was gained from outside and stored inside—were transformed, exteriorized, and manifested in an expressive verbal structure.

464 See Chapter 2, for a detailed investigation of *bo* and *tong* as a pair of core values in Han-Wei literary culture and intellectual life.

Regarding "inside-outside," I do not intend to prescribe both of them as a pair of ontologically divided realms of reality, nor do I intend to reinforce a hierarchized dichotomy—such as that between form and matter, essence and appearance, reality and image, origin and derivation, signified and signifier, and so on—in accord with specific philosophical, metaphysical, and linguistic traditions, especially the inside-outside division in Western linguistics and grammatology rooted in the tradition of logocentrism.[465] Instead, the following investigation will take "inside" and "outside" as a pair of imaginary concepts verbalized within a vague spectrum of possibilities far beyond the specificity of lexical elements such as *nei* 內 ("inside"/"inner") and *wai* 外 ("outside"/"outer") per se. With this linguistic flexibility, I will take "inside" and "outside" as conceptual tools to demonstrate how the notions of literary learning, practicing, and writing were configured and distributed among a variety of media and forms.

The appliance of an inside-outside framework—beyond the lexical specificity of *nei* and *wai*—as a conceptual tool for the configuration of literary phenomena is nothing new in both traditional sources and modern scholarship. Through an analytical examination of lexical changes during the Han dynasty, Martin Kern argues for a diachronic transition from the late Western Han through the mid-Eastern Han by which *wenzhang* gradually shifted from a reference to the patterned display of ritual orders to that more often referring to "literary writing" or "written text,"[466]

465 For a critical philosophical reflection on the inside-outside dichotomy inextricable to Western metaphysics, linguistics, and grammatology, as well as its relatedness to other hierarchized dichotomous frameworks, see Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri C. Spivak (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 30–65.

466 See Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," esp. 48–76.

a transition by which "literary text rose to its status as the main emblem of culture."[467] Within this context, Kern proposes two interrelated understandings of *wenxue* ("literary learning") and *wenzhang* ("literary writing"), presenting them as the "input" and "output" of each other.[468] Another source of inspiration, which shows a more general applicability to early Chinese literary thoughts, comes from Stephen Owen's interpretations of *shi* (poetry) and *wen* in specific early and medieval contexts. Owen's reading situates the genesis of *shi* as a process from the inner to the outer, and *wen*—in the specific sense of literary text—as "the outside of an inside," as well as "the final stage of a process" by which one's inner quality or state of mind is manifested via one's external expression.[469]

In general, both of the two scholars' arguments demonstrate a configuration of the phenomenon of verbal/literary expression as the exteriorization of a specific inner substance or condition of the human correlated with the world. Such a notion, as being widely performed in a variety of linguistic and theoretic sources in early China, opens a window to continue the inquiry into the changing views of *wen* and *wen*-related concepts within a larger repository of utterances and expressions, which indicate not merely the shifting status of "writing" as a material phenomenon but also its conceptual foundation related to broader issues of cosmology, philosophy, aesthetics, and beyond. The inside-outside paradigm, from this point of view, shows a wider applicability to the understanding of a variety of acts, thoughts, and traces across different media and forms.[470] The

467 Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," 88–89. On the changing status of written text in the cultural system of early China, see also Nylan, "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han," 249–53.

468 Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," 76.

469 Stephen Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 40–45, 113–15, quote 114.

470 Here I adopt the concept "paradigm" in a broad sense corresponding to Thomas Kuhn's 1969 revision of his

growing prominence and diversification of literary writing, as I suggest, can be understood not as a revolutionary departure from an old system of *wen* but, more precisely, as a realization of the rich potential of the same concept as the exterior, perceivable, and patterned manifestation of both the human and the world. On both practical and imaginary levels, such a potential was increasingly embodied and actualized by writing as a textual display of erudition.

This specific connectivity between the imagined "inside" and "outside" of erudition was foregrounded in the immense textual presentations of scholarly images. The composite image of individual practitioner equipped with literary erudition—as the ideal inheritor and container with wide-ranging and self-oriented interests in knowledge and texts[471]—was frequently presented with another face of that image—namely, the producer of new texts. Consequently, what makes the case particularly clear is a series of discourses and narrations that echoed and communicated with each other in a more tightly interrelated network of meaning-production. To begin with, consider a passage of Ban Gu's "appraisal" (*zan*) attached to his excerpts of Yang Xiong's self-narrative (the main part of Yang's *Hanshu* biography). Retrospectively, the passage presents a systematic synopsis of

---

definition of the term as "the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community." See Kuhn, *Postscript-1969*, in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd Ed, 175. Though I do not concern myself as qualified to evaluate Kuhn's conceptualizations and appliances of "paradigm" and relevant terms such as "incommensurability" in the studies of the history of science, I find it helpful to reach a better sense of some coded systems and conceptual structures with mutually correlative and commensurable beliefs, notions, and values in the history of ideas and literature. For numerous instances and further discussions of the applicability of the inside-outside paradigm in association with another one, namely, the notion of cross-media commensurability among a wider variety of media and forms beyond writing, see Chapter 5, especially section 2.

471 As discussed in previous chapters with a variety of instances and detailed analyses. Among a greater number of exemplary figures whose images were characterized as incorporating the broadness of learning and the productivity of writing, see especially the cases of Liu Xiang, Yang Xiong, Liu Xin, Huan Tan, Ban Gu, Wang Chong, Zhang Heng, Ma Rong, Zheng Xuan, Cai Yong, Cao Pi, and Cao Zhi that are discussed throughout the present study.

the writings of Yang Xiong—

> （揚雄）實好古而樂道，其意欲求文章成名於後世。以爲經莫大於《易》，故作《太玄》；傳莫大於《論語》，作《法言》；史篇莫善於《倉頡》，作《訓纂》；箴莫善於《虞箴》，作《州箴》；賦莫深於《離騷》，反而廣之；辭莫麗於相如，作四賦：皆斟酌其本，相與放依而馳騁云。[472]
>
> [Yang Xiong] was indeed fond of antiquity and taking pleasure from the principle/way (*dao*), and his intention was to make his name a legacy for following generations by means of literary productions (*wenzhang*). He considered that no classic (*jing*) was as grand as the *Yi*, hence he composed his *Taixuan*; no tradition (*zhuan*) was as grand as the *Lunyu*, hence he composed his *Fayan*; no piece of writing by a scribe (*shipian*) was as refined as the "Cang jie," hence he composed his "Xun zuan"; no remonstrance (*zhen*) was as refined as the "Yu zhen," hence he composed his remonstrance for the [twelve] regions (*zhou*); and no *fu* was as profound as the "Li sao," hence he contradicted and expanded it; no verbal expression was as gorgeous as [those by Sima] Xiangru, hence he composed his four *fu*. [In doing these,] he carefully thought over the foundations of those models, emulating and depending on them, and hence [let his own works] move forward.

Such a spectacular appraisal of one's literary productivity and scholarly excellence reaches a degree of diversity and intensity rarely found in other early Chinese sources. Beyond a mere selection of Yang Xiong's main works, the passage presents a schematized synopsis of writing projects attributed to the intention of Yang himself, a persona who ambitiously matches his own works genre by genre with the most celebrated masterpieces—in terms of *da* ("grand"), *shan* 善 ("refined"), *shen* ("profound"), *li* 麗 ("gorgeous"), and so on—that he receives from a variety of old traditions, with his own anxiety of influence to not only inherit but also compete with the past. What is per-

472 *Hanshu* 87B.3583. The phrase *fan er guang zhi* 反而廣之 ("contradicted and expanded it") referred to Yang's "Fan Li sao" 反離騷 and "Guang sao" 廣騷; and the four *fu* referred to his "Hedong fu" 河東賦, "Ganquan fu" 甘泉賦, "Yulie fu" 羽獵賦, and "Changyang fu" 長陽賦. All were mentioned in Yang's self-narrative in which he explained why he composed them. See *Hanshu* 87A.3515.

formed in this synopsis, to be precise, is an early Eastern Han remembrance of a Western Han hero's erudition and hence his literary productivity, a process from reading to writing, from reception to production, and from interiorization to exteriorization. What makes the last point particularly clear is Ban Gu's summary right after the above-quoted passage, that Yang Xiong "concentrated his heart on the inside with no request from the outside" 用心於內, 不求於外, according to which the master's "inside" was equipped with his self-oriented and wide-ranging cultivation of erudition, and his "outside" was manifested not by receiving [contemporary] external supply but via his own writings, an externalized textual display of his interiority to be recognized across the limits of time.

Such a notion of literary productivity precisely conforms to the beginning of the passage where Yang Xiong himself is described as an admirer of the past (*haogu*).[473] Meanwhile, it works in concert with a wealth of remembrance of Yang Xiong's cultivation and presentation of erudition, an image celebrated in both Yang's self-narratives and an array of commemorative sources during and after the Eastern Han.[474] The image of Yang Xiong was hence presented and represented not merely as an ideal reader who integratively inherited the past, but also as an ideal writer who manifested that inheritance by his own works. Finally, the entire process was expected, either by Yang Xiong or by Ban Gu, to be re-enacted by future readers who would embrace the legacy of the past and hence recognize the value of Yang Xiong's writings—namely, the "literary productions" [*wen-*

473 See Chapter 1, for a detailed investigation of the notion *haogu* 好古 and a cluster of related discourses from the late Western Han through the Eastern Han.

474 See Chapters 1 and 2, for references and discussions about the self-narrative and public remembrance of Yang Xiong's scholarly image as a hero of erudition.

zhang][475] with which he would "make his name a legacy for following generations" 成名於後世.

The coherence between the "inside" and "outside" of one's erudition was demonstrated, likewise, in Ban Gu's own self-narrative: "[I, Ban Gu] concentrate my focus on broad learning, taking the production of literary compositions as my career goal" 專篤志於博學，以著述爲業.[476] Such an inner logic was also embedded in his appraisal attached to the biographies of Liu Xiang and Liu Xin, a passage in praise of six masters after Kongzi (including Liu Xiang and Yang Xiong), for they were "broadly learned about things and richly informed, thoroughly comprehending the past and the present" 博物洽聞，通達古今 and, thereafter, "with their words contributing to the world" 其言有補於世.[477] The term *yan* 言 ("words"), which referred to both their speaking and the received legacy of their textual productions, was precisely situated as an outcome of their broad learning of the past and the present. One century later, the same narrative structure was employed by the late Eastern Han scholar Ying Rong in his recounting of another series of exemplary figures (again, including Yang Xiong).[478] In his narration, Ying expanded the phrase *bowu qiawen* with an additional element *zhushu*, combining the imagined inside and outside of erudition as a more condensed body of utterance.

A more radical configuration of writing as the textual display of erudition was proposed by Wang Chong, who repeatedly demonstrated his praise of broad learning and literary productivity in

---

475 I save a detailed examination and further discussions of the concept *wenzhang* in Han-Wei context for the second half of the present section.

476 *Hanshu* 100A.4225.

477 *Hanshu* 36.1972. See also Chapter 2, for a full quote with translation and discussion of this appraisal.

478 Ying Rong, "*Chunqiu shili* xu," *Quan Shanggu Sandai Qin Han Sanguo Liuchao wen*, *Quan Houhan wen*, 86.938. See also Chapter 2, for a full quote with translation and discussion of this passage.

the *Lunheng*. The recurring motif was performed, for example, in his classification of four intellectual types, from the ordinary *ru* to the *hongru* 鴻儒 ("grand *ru*").[479]

> 故夫能說一經者爲儒生，博覽古今者爲通人，采掇傳書以上書奏記者爲文人，能精思著文連接篇章者爲鴻儒。故儒生過俗人，通人勝儒生，文人逾通人，鴻儒超文人。[480]
> On that account, one who is capable of (orally?) explaining one classic is a [regular] member of *ru* (*rusheng*); one who reads/views broadly from the past through the present is a comprehensive man (*tongren*); one who draws upon transmitted texts so as to submit official memorials and records is a literary man (*wenren*); and one who refines his thinking, produces his literary writings, and connects chapters and passages is a grand *ru* (*hongru*). On that account, a [regular] member of *ru* surpasses an ordinary person, a comprehensive man exceeds a [regular] member of *ru*, a literary man prevails over a comprehensive man, and a grand *ru* is superior to a literary man.

By Wang Chong's placement, a regular member of *ru* (*rusheng*) was ranked at the bottom of the four intellectual types, being only superior to the common people presumably not equipped with literary learning and skills. Most likely, *rusheng* as an old name was appropriated to refer to the official academicians and their followers, whose literary learning and practicing were limited to a narrow range of interiorization and exteriorization (focusing on one classic and unable to do more productive things other than [orally?] interpretating that classic).[481] Superior to the *rusheng* was the title *tongren* ("comprehensive man"),[482] which Wang characterized as "reading/viewing broadly" (*bolan*)[483] beyond the limits of time. The term conceptually combined *bo* and *tong*, the two values

479 See Chapter 2, for another full quote of the following passage, with a discussion focusing on Wang Chong's appliances of the concepts *bo* and *tong*.

480 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 607.

481 See Chapters 1 (esp. section 1) and 2, for previous discussions of *boshi* and the Han official academic system.

482 See Chapter 2, for an analytical examination of the term *tongren* 通人 in Han-Wei context.

483 See Chapter 2, for an analytical examination of the term *bolan* in Han-Wei context.

constantly performed at the heart of the social recognitions of individual erudition during and after the Eastern Han. The title *wenren* 文人 ("literary man"),[484] which was placed one level above *tongren*, was characterized by an additional talent of appropriating various pieces of transmitted materials into personal textual productions. Finally, Wang proposed his ideal model—*hongru*, which supposedly represented the ultimate realization of an individual of erudition. This model was characterized by a highly refined capability of composing an integrative body of contents and forms based upon one's inner thoughts and interiorized knowledge. To summarize, Wang Chong's classification incorporated the two dimensions of literary practicing into a recycling and transforming process from interiorization and exteriorization. The former was exemplified by one's broad and comprehensive reception of various sources, and the latter realized in one's literary productions as a textual display of erudition. The hierarchy he demonstrated in this classification, more specifically, was then according to the degrees to which these two dimensions of erudition were cultivated and expressed in each of the four intellectual types.

Such a fourfold classification worked in concert with another conceptual framework that Wang Chong developed in the *Lunheng*, the dichotomy between *wenru* ("literary *ru*") and *shiru* ("worldly *ru*")—

著作者爲文儒，說經者爲世儒。[485]
The producers of literary compositions are literary *ru* (*wenru*), and the interpreters of classics

484 For a recent study on the notion *wenren* 文人 and a series of relevant terms, see Wu Chengxue and Sha Hongbing 沙紅兵, "Shenfen de jiaolü: Zhongguo gudai duiyu wenren de rentong yu qidai" 身份的焦慮：中國古代對於"文人"的認同與期待, *Fudan xuebao* 復旦學報, No. 1 (2020): 20–39.

485 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1150.

are worldly *ru* (*shiru*).

使儒生博觀覽，則爲文儒。[486]
If a [regular] member of *ru* broadly perceives and views, he would become a literary *ru* (*wenru*).

The definitions of *shiru* and *wenru* as the "producers of literary compositions" (*zhuzuo zhe* 著作者) and "interpreters of classics" (*shuojing zhe* 說經者), respectively, are then followed by Wang Chong's hypothetical debate with an imagined interlocutor on the two identities' social positions, intellectual features, and literary practices (to be discussed later).[487] Compared to the abovementioned fourfold classification, the identity of *shuojing zhe*/*shiru*, by definition, corresponds to the title *rusheng*, and the identity of *zhuzuo zhe*/*wenru* matches the superior *wenren* and *hongru* in general. More specifically, the second quote about how *wenru* is distinct from *rusheng*—by means of "broadly perceiving and viewing" (*bo guanlan* 博觀覽)—is particularly close to the differentiation between *rusheng* and *tongren* as previously discussed. Considering these, Wang Chong's conceptualization of *wenru* can be regarded as a notion that incorporates both the interiorized and exteriorized forms of erudition, a mental picture that was distributed among several titles of intellectual persona superior to those who are narrow-minded in learning and hence unproductive in writing.

It was in debt to this progressively prominent paradigm that Cao Pi, the leading figure of the literate community in the early third century CE, proposed a series of theoretical arguments on the feature and nature of *wen* and *wenzhang* in the specific sense of "writing" or "literary production" in

486 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 581.

487 For a detailed discussion, see section 4 of the present chapter.

his "Lun wen" 論文 ("A Discourse on Literary Writing").[488] His view of taking literary writing as the exterior manifestation of the inside erudition was precisely shown in his discussion of the four categories (each consisting of two genres) of writings—

> 夫文本同而末異，蓋奏議宜雅，書論宜理，銘誄尚實，詩賦欲麗。此四科不同，故能之者偏也。唯通才能備其體。[489]
> Literary writings share the same root but vary through branches. Generally speaking, official memorial (*zou*) and discussion *(yi*) are suitable for elegance/correctness (*ya*); letter (*shu*) and discourse (*lun*) are suitable for orderliness/rationality (*li*); in the case of inscription (*ming*) and funeral eulogy (*lei*), one shall praise substantiality (*shi*); and in the case of poetry (*shi*) and poetic prose (*fu*), one shall aspire for beauty. The four categories are different. On that account, one's capability for specific genre(s) is partial. Only those with comprehensive talent are able to fully incorporate (*bei*) all the genres/forms (*ti*).[490]

But on what kind of conceptual foundation did such a systematic exposition become possible and meaningful? The discourse configures the differentiations between the eight genres and the four styles as the outcomes of the diversification of *wen*, which derives from a shared "root" or "foundation" (*ben* 本) and is eventually distributed among the various ways of actualization in terms of "branches" (*mo* 末). This point of view then works in concert with the author's argument on one's

488 *Wenxuan*, 2270–72. The "Lun wen" was highly celebrated by a long series of modern scholarship as a representation of the "Self-consciousness" (*zijue*) of "literature" (*wenxue*) in a narrow, modern sense. For example, see Suzuki, *Shina shilon shi*, 40–43; Lu Xun, "Wei Jin fengdu ji wenzhang yu yao ji jiu zhi guanxi," 523–53; Wang Yao, *Zhonggu wenxue shilun*. For a way more extensive range of references and my critical reflection of this notion, see Chapter 3, esp. Note 398. For studies concerning the formation of the "Lun wen" as well as other related literary discourses in Cao Pi's time, see Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*, 57–72; Xiaofei Tian, *The Halberd at Red Cliff*, 13–30; Fu Gang, "Lun Jian'an wenxue piping de fasheng" 論建安文學批評的發生, *Wenxue pinglun*, No. 1 (2019): 174–81.

489 *Wenxuan*, 2271. The term *sike* was likely appropriated from *Lunyu* 11.3 where the same term refers to four categories of teaching-and-learning among Kongzi and his followers (see Note 365). See also Chapter 1, esp. Note 88, for another use of the term *ke* in the context related to Han official academic system.

490 For another English translation with discussion, see Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*, 64–65.

qi 氣—inadequately translated in several ways but here referring to one's inner essence and vital force—which varies from person to person.[491] Accordingly, the uneven affinities to different literary genres/styles are the manifestations of the uneven distribution of talents and qualities on the individual basis. Within this conceptual framework, the case is closed with an appraisal of the value *tong*: "Only those with comprehensive talent (*tongcai*) are able to fully incorporate (*bei*) all the genres/forms (*ti*)" 唯通才能備其體. Such a statement hence situates *tong*, a prominent literary learning value, as the interior precondition for a comprehensive proficiency in literary writing, integrating the imagined inside and outside of erudition as a conceptually coherent unity.

Were the various written instantiations of *wen* ("literary writing," in such a context) indeed taken as the textual displays of individual erudition, the foregoing statement by Cao Pi—along with his even more famous proposal for the personal property associated with *wenzhang*[492]—can be read an agenda of promoting literary productivity as a vivid emblem of the overall surplus of cultural resources around a new center of power.[493] The literary scholars who gathered around the Cao regime in the early third century CE indeed lived up to Cao Pi's expectation—as many of them were known not merely for their talents of literary writing but also for their scholarly erudition in terms of "broadly learned" (*boxue*), "broadly [learned] about things" (*bowu*), "extensively knowing" (*duozhi*), "richly informed" (*qiawen*), "comprehensive and broad (in learning)" (*tongbo* 通博), and so

491 *Wenxuan*, 2271; see also Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*, 65–67.

492 To be discussed later in section 4 of the present chapter.

493 See Chapter 3, for my contextualization of literary activities around Cao Pi as a process of re-centralization with the rise of Cao household as a new political and cultural authority.

on, a cluster of utterances widely employed to characterize their Han precursors as well.[494] The same was true in the cases of Cao Pi and Cao Zhi (the leading figures of that intellectual community around the Cao household)—whose images were cast into the desirable model of individual erudition either by themselves or in comparatively later accounts, presenting their literary writings as the exterior manifestation of what they were cultivated with.[495]

The foregoing discourses and utterances altogether undertook their writers' concerns of *wen* and related concepts, such as *wenzhang*, within an inside-outside paradigm, which configured the process from one's cultivation of erudition to one's textual display by which the interiorized erudition is externally manifested. In a broad sense, it conceptually shows conformity to a diverse range of Han-Wei discourses that regarded verbal performance—spoken or written—in general as the exterior manifestation corresponding to specific inner condition, a notion that was correlated with an even larger spectrum of utterances to which an inside-outside paradigm of interpretation can be applied.[496] In early poetic theory, as famously expressed in the "Great Preface" (*daxu* 大序) of the *Maoshi*, the genesis of poetry (*shi*) was explained as the verbal manifestation in terms of *yan* that exteriorizes the "intention/aspiration" (*zhi* 志) stored within one's heart (*xin* 心).[497] Such a para-

494 For example, see *Sanguo zhi* 21.598 (for the case of Wang Can, known as *bowu duozhi* 博物多識); 599 (*Xianxian xingzhuan* 先賢行狀, cited by Pei Songzhi, for Xu Gan, known as *congshi qiawen* 聰識洽聞); 603 (*Weilüe*, cited by Pei Songzhi, for Handan Chun, known as *boxue*); 607 (*Weilüe*, cited by Pei Songzhi, for Wu Zhi 吳質, known as *tongbo* 通博). See also Chapter 2, for my investigation of these lexical items.

495 See *Sanguo zhi* 2.88–90 (for Cao Pi); 19.557, 576 (for Cao Zhi). For a further discussion of the Cao brothers, see section 4 of the present chapter.

496 For a further investigation of this phenomenon, see Chapter 5.

497 *Maoshi zhengyi* 毛詩正義, *Shisanjing zhushu*, 269–70. For two interpretations of this theory concerning the genesis of *shi* in an inside-outside paradigm (from different perspectives), see Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*, 40–45; Chen Shih-Hsiang 陳世驤, "Zhongguo 'shi' zi zhi yuanshi guannian shilun" 中國"詩"字之原始觀念試論, in *Zhongguo wenxue de shuqing chuantong* 中國文學的抒情傳統 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2015), 83–100,

digm was also performed in proverbial literary utterances that juxtaposed "writing" (in terms of *wen*, *shu* ["written words"], and other phrases) with "speaking" (normally in terms of *yan*) as the textual and oral exteriorizations, respectively, of one's inside.[498] Yang Xiong, for instance, proposed a synthesis of *yan* and *shu* as the outflowing "voice" (*sheng* 聲) and "drawing" (*hua* 畫), respectively, of the inner heart (*xin*).[499] Wang Chong, likewise, demonstrated that "what come out of the mouth are the spoken words (*yan*); what come together as textual records are the written pieces (*wen*)" 出口爲言，集札爲文,[500] a statement prescribing *yan* and *wen* as two mediated forms of a presumably inner condition. Such ideas and utterances were echoed by Cao Zhi as well—first in his eulogy for Wang Can, where he effusively juxtaposed Wang's verbal and textual performances: "What he [Wang Can] spoke (*yan*) out was worth chanting; what he wrote down with brush turned into literary pieces (*pian*)" 發言可詠，下筆成篇.[501] A similar utterance was employed in his self-defense for the truthfulness of his own writing: "The words (*yan*) flow out and become discourses; the brush writes down and makes literary passages/manifestations (*zhang*)" 言出爲論，下筆成章.[502]

Within this conceptual and linguistic context, the term *wenzhang*, which was semantically rooted in its general connotation as the "patterned" (*wen*) "display/manifestation" (*zhang* 章) broadly applied to a variety of phenomena and the overall reality of the human and the world,[503] became

---

esp. 99.

498 See Chapter 5, for more examples and a further analysis of these utterances.

499 *Fayan* 5.13 (*Fayan yishu*, 160).

500 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1150.

501 *Wenxuan*, 2435.

502 *Sanguo zhi* 19.557.

503 For one of the most important instances of the term *wenzhang* in early and especially pre-Han China, see *Lunyu* 8.19 (*Lunyu jishi*, 551), where the master voice (Kongzi) praises the sage-king Yao, "Lustrous! The way he had

now more frequently associated with a specific artifact, as well as a specific human trace: writing. To be specific, *wenzhang* gradually exceeded its comparatively old meanings confined to ritual/political orders and ornamental patterns, but increasingly referred to the productions of literary writing[504] as another main approach of self-manifestation. This is shown—for instance, during and after the Eastern Han—in the growing occurrence of expressions in which specific scholars' names were made "manifest," "marked," or "known" in terms of *xian* 顯, *cheng* 稱, and *zhi* by means of their writings in terms of *wenzhang*.[505] Within this context, *wenzhang* progressively gained its significance as a specific personal property distinguished from other ways of self-manifestation. Ban Gu, for example, in his clustered presentation of Western Han celebrities who achieved their reputations by different talents, highlighted four exemplary figures who manifested themselves primarily because of *wenzhang*. Particularly, in the cases of Liu Xiang and Wang Bao 王褒 (ca. 90–51 BCE), the historian specified their excellence of "manifesting themselves by means of *wenzhang*" 以文章顯 in contrast to those who "got promoted by means of *rushu* (*ru*-related proficiency)" 以儒術進.[506] He Xiu, in his critical review of the Han scholarship on the *Chunqiu*,[507] juxtaposed the concepts *guxue* (a notion corresponding to the integrative method of broad learn-

---

wenzhang" 煥乎其有文章, in which *wenzhang* is best understood as the emblem and manifestation of the imagined totality of orders, appearances, and artifacts under the sovereign of the sage-king.

504 See also Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," 48–76.

505 See, for some utterances that are datable to the Eastern Han and the Three Kingdoms, *Hanshu* 58.2634 (on Liu Xiang and Wang Bao 王褒); *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1151–52 (Sima Qian, Liu Xiang, and Yang Xiong); *Sanguo zhi* 21.604 (Ying Qu 應璩 and Ying Zhen 應貞), 612 (Wang Xiang 王象 and Wei Ji 衛覬). For comparatively later references about Eastern Han figures, see *Houhan shu* 61.2042 (Cui Yuan and Ma Rong), 80A.2610 (Cen Zixiao 岑子孝), 61.2042 (Cui Yuan and Ma Rong), 2616 (Li You 李尤), 2619 (Cui Qi 崔琦), 2623 (Bian Shao).

506 *Hanshu* 58.2634. The other two Western Han figures selected by Ban Gu were Sima Qian and Sima Xiangru, who exemplified the successful self-manifestation via *wenzhang* during the reign of Emperor Wu 武帝.

507 *Shisanjing zhushu*, 2190–91.

ing)[508] and *wenzhang* as a pair of positive values opposed to *suru* ("vulgar *ru*"), which negatively referred to official academicians and their followers limited to institutional sectarianism and affiliation.[509] The *Renwu zhi* 人物志 by Liu Shao 劉劭 (d. ca. 240 CE), a work primarily focusing on the classification and taxonomy of individuality, placed *wenzhang* among twelve types—in terms of *liuye* 流業 ("the specialty of class")—of extraordinary people according to their different talents.[510]

A more comprehensive survey of *wenzhang* can be applied to the four historiographic compilations that serve as my database—

Table 13a
Wenzhang in Four Historiographic Compilations

	Hanshu	*Dongguan Hanji*	*Houhan shu*	*Sanguo zhi*
Total	21	2	35	16
"Ritual/Political Order"	12	1	8	2
"Ornamental Pattern"	9	1	4	3
"Writing/Literary Production"	7	1	29	14

* For a more detailed account of the occurrence of *wenzhang* in these four historiographic compilations with contextual information, see Appendix 3 (Table 13b).

This table reflects my reading and tentative understanding of all instances of *wenzhang* in their contexts found in the four historiographic compilations. The meanings of *wenzhang* identified in these

508 For a detailed discussion of the term *guxue* in Han contexts, see Chapter 1.

509 For a detailed discussion of the intellectual criticism of *suru*, see Chapter 3.

510 See Liu Shao, *Renwu zhi* 人物志, *Sibu congkan chubian* 四部叢刊初編, Fasc. 429, 13a–13b, where Liu tagged *wenzhang* on those who "make connection of literary utterances and produce literary compositions" 屬文著述 such as Sima Qian and Ban Gu.

contexts fall into a spectrum covering three basic aspects: as the displayable ritual and political order, as the ornamental pattern of someone or something's appearance, and finally, as writing or literary production. The general result of my survey lends further support to Kern's argument of the lexical and cultural transitions based on his investigation of the same term in pre-Han and Han China. Meanwhile, some samples under review are arguably not limited to a single aspect of meaning but flowing around more than one of them.[511] *Wenzhang* in the Han and even later sources, I suggest, is best considered a code with semantic inclusiveness that, on the one hand, was context-dependently distributed among a spectrum of media, forms, and dimensions but, on the other hand, entailed a meaning universally commensurable across the boundaries of those phenomenal realms. Namely, *wenzhang* can be a particular realization (for example, a written text) and simultaneously—if not always—a *synecdoche* of all perceivable and decipherable forms of exterior patterned manifestations. It was along with this cross-media applicability that the conceptualization of *wenzhang*, from its general connotation as the "patterned display/manifestation" of humans, things, and the world, gradually showed conformity to a notion of writing as the textual display of individual erudition, as well as an imaginary connection between a text and a person as a pair of properties that mutually embody and manifest each other.

The semantic inclusiveness of *wenzhang* conforms to the same quality embedded in *wen*—the concept located at the very heart of Chinese literary thoughts with a broad spectrum of abstract

511 For instances in which *wenzhang* is better taken as a pun consisting of more than one aspect of meaning, see *Hanshu* 88.3594 (cited from Gongsun Hong 公孫弘), 67.2920 (from Mei Fu 梅福); *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 78; *Houhan shu* 40A.1328 (from Ban Biao), 45.1535 (from anonymous comment in the reign of Emperor Zhang 章帝); *Sanguo zhi* 27.748 (from Emperor Ming of Wei).

and concrete meanings, such as "pattern," "ornament," "refinement," "culture," "text," and "writing."[512] The hypothetical equivalence and commensurability between these specificities can be grasped in the recurring verbal schematization that juxtaposes *wen* as the phenomena of the cosmos (most often in terms of *tian* ["Heaven"]) and *wen* as the traces of humans (most often in terms of *ren* 人 ["human"]). This recurring structure, for example, appears in the "Tuan" Commentary 彖傳 for the *Zhouyi* 周易: "Observe the patterns (*wen*) of Heaven, so as to examine the changes over time; observe the patterns of human affairs, so as to transform and accomplish all below Heaven" 觀乎天文，以察時變；觀乎人文，以化成天下.[513] Likewise, for an Eastern Han reference, Wang Chong developed his definition of *wenru*—as previously discussed—precisely based on a statement—"*Wen* is that by which things are manifested, as well as that on which humans are grounded" 物以文爲表，人以文爲基[514]—that integrated the two levels of manifestation of *wen* in the realms of "things" (*wu*) and "humans" (*ren*). Such a distribution of *wen* among the human and the world—in terms of *tian*, *wu*, and so on—conceptually speaks well to a unitary, holistic, and correlative view of cosmology that was hypothetically prominent in classical Chinese thought, a no-

512 For previous discussions on the semantic complexity of the concept *wen*, see Arthur Waley, *The Analects of Confucius* (New York & London: George Allen and Unwin, 1938), 41–42; Liu Ruoyu 劉若愚 (James J. Y. Liu), *Zhongguo wenxue lilun* 中國文學理論, trans. Du Guoqing 杜國清 (Taipei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1981), 9–12, 29–32; Stephen Owen, *Traditional Chinese Poetry and Poetics: Omens of the World* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 21, where he prescribes *wen* the "written word" not as a sign but a "schematization" of the world, a world manifested in multiple levels of *wen* in a correlative structure; *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*, 113–15; Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," 43–76; "Early Chinese Literature, Beginning through Western Han," in *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature, vol. 1*, 6; Nylan, "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han," 256; Zheng Yuyu 鄭毓瑜, "Wen de fayuan: cong tianwen yu renwen de leibi tanqi" "文"的發源：從"天文"與"人文"的類比談起, *Zhengda zhongwen xuebao* 政大中文學報 15 (2011): 113–42; David C. Schaberg, "Classics," in *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature*, 170.

513 *Zhouyi zhengyi* 周易正義, *Shisanjing zhushu*, 37.

514 *Lunheng jiaozhu*, 1150.

tion subject to a long series of discussions and debates over the past half-century. Not intended to close the grand debate, what deserves a note in the first place is the semantic inclusiveness of a term such as *wen* that verbally constructs a hypothetical equivalence between the two phenomenal realms—namely, a shared mechanism by which what is perceived from the surface of a hypothetically deeper reality of the cosmos is commensurable to what is displayed via the "outside" of an imagined "inside" of the human. What makes the second point particularly clear is that *wen*, as being situated in the contexts related to human nature and behavior, was oftentimes paired with the concept *zhi* 質 ("[interior] substance") or *qing* 情 ("[interior] condition/quality/emotion") within a correlative structure connecting the human inside with the outside.[515]

Each piece of the manifestation of *wen*, accordingly, was supposed to be understood as a comparatively minor realization or actualization of a large view of the world with correlative universality, in which all forms of *wen* are correlated with and commensurable to each other. In this

515 For references prior to the Eastern Han about the connectivity between *wen* and *zhi* and that between *wen* and *qing* 情, see *Lunyu* 6.18, a quote of Kongzi about the ideal balance of *wen* as one's external cultural cultivation and *zhi* as one's inner quality (*Lunyu jishi*, 400); *Fayan* 2.12, a follow-up analytical elaboration of the *wen-zhi* dichotomy in the *Lunyu* (*Fayan yishu*, 71), and 9.7 (Ibid., 291, to be translated and further discussed in Chapter 5); *Liji zhengyi*, *Shisanjing zhushu*, 1536–37, a passage about the correspondence between *wen* and *qing* in terms of the exteriorization of human inside by means of poetry, music, and dancing; *Huainan honglie jijie*, 329, a passage about the balance of *wen* and *qing* with its central statement that "*wen* is that by which one gets involvement with things, *qing* is what is linked to one's inner core with a wish to be expressed toward the outside." 文者，所以接物也；情，繫於中而欲發外者也。On the *wen-zhi* dichotomy, here I omit an also extensive range of references and scholarship on the mapping of the dichotomy with the periodization of political cultures from the high antiquity through early empires. See also Note 679, for more references about the appropriation of *wen* and *zhi* in post-Han literary criticisms. About *qing*, the term had also a broad semantic range that cannot be reduced into a single, unified meaning but shows affinity to specific ways of understanding mostly depending on contexts. See Michael Puett, "The Ethic of Responding Properly: The Notion of *Qing* 情 in Early Chinese Thought," in *Love and Emotions in Traditional Chinese Literature*, ed. Halvor Eifring (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 37–68; Cai Zongqi 蔡宗齊, "A Study of Early Chinese Concepts *Qing* 情 and a Dialogue with Western Emotion Studies," *Prism: Theory and Modern Chinese Literature* 17 (2020): 399–429. In contexts where *qing* is paired with *wen* in particular, *qing* is best understood as the interior human condition, quality, or emotional inclination.

regard, the rising status of texts and writings around the Eastern Han breathed new lives into *wen* and *wen*-related concepts, such as *wenzhang*, neither by means of competing with other media and forms nor by means of replacing the shared conceptual foundation. Instead, the shifting conceptualization of *wen* and *wenzhang* took place only in a manner of extending that patterned manifestation toward a greater diversity to be realized in various media and forms.

For a specific instance in lexicology, such a correlative, cross-media understanding of *wen* was clearly showcased in the late Eastern Han dictionary *Shiming*, which indicates the following formulation of *wen* with a specific connection constructed between "writing" and "weaving"—

> 文者，會集眾綵以成錦繡，會集眾字以成辭義，如文繡然也。[516]
> What *wen* is about is a process of bringing together and collecting a variety of colored silks by which a splendid brocade is made, as well as a process of bringing together and collecting a variety of written characters/words by which the verbalized meaning is accomplished—in a way similar to a patterned brocade.

The wide-ranging correlation between "weaving" and "writing" was an arresting phenomenon in early Chinese language and thoughts.[517] In a broader sense, the semantic and metaphorical connec-

---

516 *Shiming huijiao*, 171, where Bi Yuan 畢沅 speculated that the original text should start with "文，彣也" ("what *wen* is about is [correlated to] the fabricated pattern") instead of "文者." This speculation was according to the standard format "A, B 也" employed as the initiator of the vast majority (but not all) of glosses throughout the *Shiming*. Bi's collation does not contradict Liu Xi's following explanation of *wen*, yet there is no necessity to distort the transmitted text—which grammatically and semantically makes no problem—only according to a standard format that itself allows several exceptions. Instead, Liu Xi could have intended to distinct *wen* from the standard format "A, B 也" considering the width of its semantic inclusiveness. In his use of the "A, B 也" format throughout the *Shiming*, the two correlated terms usually appear to be semantically juxtaposed and hence mutually supporting each other. In the present case, however, the meaning of *wen* 彣 is merely a specific derivation completely covered by *wen* 文.

517 This correlation is shown in a series of classical Chinese concepts and terms, including nouns such as *jing* and *wei* 緯 (which, as weaving terms, respectively refer to two kinds of thread in the process of fabrication), verbs such as *bian* 編 and *zhui* 綴, as well as *wen* and relevant terms such as *wenzhang* and *wencai* 文采. For relevant refer-

tions between the web of words as the weaving of fabrics are found in other languages and literary cultures as well.[518] Nevertheless, the above passage deserves a specific note on its own pattern of meaning-production. Central to its figurative utterance is the presentation of the concept *wen* as the nature and the process internal to both "weaving" and "writing." To be precise, the passage does not metaphorically connect two ontologically separated items but, more profoundly, makes them a pair of synecdoche for a shared mechanism that incorporates manifold mutually correlated media, all of which are manifested by means of—and in terms of—*wen*. Within such a conceptual frame, a patterned brocade and a verbalized passage are commensurable to each other in how they are fabricated, connected, and "woven together." Therefore, not enclosed within any specific mediated form, the meaning of *wen* is fully illustrated only via the commensurability between the making of a variety of artifacts—namely, the process of bringing together the potential components and fragments into displayable pieces of realization.

To conclude, the foregoing conceptualizations of *wen* and *wenzhang* in Han-Wei contexts, with their full potential of cross-media applicability and understandability, show conformity to the widely performed notion of writing as a textual display of erudition, a notion associated with an

---

ences, see, for example, Wagner, *The Craft of a Chinese Commentator*, 31–32, about the term *jing*; Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," 54, about the trope of weaving involved in the concept *wenzhang*; Wang Yonghao 汪湧豪, "Zuowei zongti shi de Zhongguo wenxue shi ji qi guannian queli: jianlun xuyao zenyang de Zhongguo wenxue piping shi" 作爲"總體史"的中國文學史及其觀念確立：兼論需要怎樣的《中國文學批評史》, *Fudan xuebao*, No. 5 (2007): 115, about the term *qi* 綺. For a recent study of the Han conceptualizations of writing as a weaving-like practice, see Zürn, "The Han *Imaginaire* of Writing as Weaving."

518 From a comparative point of view, the correlation between "weaving" and "writing" can be found in other languages as well. One of the most preeminent examples is the etymology of "text" that derived from its semantic roots in Vedic, Greek and hence the word *texere* ("to weave") in Latin. For relevant discussions and reflections, see Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London: Routledge, 2002), 13; MacKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, 13–14; Barthes, "From Work to Text," in *Image, Music, Text*, 159.

integrative and syncretic foundation of individual literary learning that constituted the inner substance to be exteriorized in a variety of forms. See, for the last example, another passage in the *Lunheng*, where Wang Chong offered a brief synopsis of *wen* concerning its diverse textual and non-textual instantiations in the Eastern Han intellectual world—

文人宜遵	A literary man shall venerate
五經六藝爲文，	the Five Classics and/or the Six Arts as *wen*,
諸子傳書爲文，	the masters' works and transmitted texts as *wen*,
造論著說爲文，	the created discourses and innovated theories as *wen*,
上書奏記爲文，	the submitted memorials and presented records as *wen*,
文德之操爲文。[519]	and the behaviors of civilized virtue as *wen*.

Such a patterned distribution of *wen* stands out precisely as a synopsis of the process of interiorization via learning and that of exterior manifestation via writing in the Han context. On the individual level, the first two types of *wen* in this schematization supply the old sources and materials subject to one's broad learning, which transcends the scheme of canonical studies and covers a wider range of knowledge and texts. The third and the fourth types of *wen* then represent an ever-growing corpus of new literary writings that are—as demonstrated by numerous Han discourses, especially the *Lunheng*—produced within a recycling, transforming process based upon the cultivation of individual erudition. In the end, by attaching a range of unspecified behaviors that perform "civilized virtue" (*wende* 文德), Wang Chong brought the entire process of cultivating and displaying one's erudition into a larger realm of *wen* across a wider range of media and forms. Within this

519 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 867.

context, there is no way to offer a universal translation of *wen* that satisfies the overall diversity of its manifold traces and realizations. Instead, it was that ever-growing diversity and transformability that sustained the value of *wen* as an imagined totality.

4.4. Credit and Liability: The Mutual Embodiments between Texts and Individuals

Along with the overall proliferation of textual productions, the period under review also witnessed the growing consciousness of individual agency and property to which those products were attributed. The question one confronts, therefore, is not merely about the proliferation of writings in general but also the proliferation of a specific notion of writing as "individual" product. Throughout the long-term intellectual reflections from early medieval times through the 20th century, it was not uncommon for scholars to treat this proliferation as a manifestation of particular political, moral, and socio-cultural changes over time, as well as a matter of controversy between different evaluations and judgments of these changes.[520]

This intellectual phenomenon itself is identifiable in a constellation of Han-Wei utterances and discourses, which constructed the agency of individual as the principal of a given text who takes

520 For some exemplary models of narration and argumentation with far-reaching influences, see *Wenxin diaolong zhu*, 672–74, for Liu Xie's elaboration of a long vein of Han-Wei literature in correspondence with the ever-changing socio-cultural milieu; *Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu*, 296, for Zhang Xuecheng's critical comment on the proliferation of individual literary productions from the Eastern Han onwards; Huang Rucheng 黃汝成 annot., *Rizhi lu jishi* 日知錄集釋 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006), 752–54, for Gu Yanwu's 顧炎武 criticism of the late Eastern Han and Wei literature as an omen of the declines of classical studies and morality; and Liu Shipei 劉師培, *Zhongguo zhonggu wenxue shi* 中國中古文學史 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2010), 10, where he attributes a series of changes of literary styles during and after the late Eastern Han to the transitions of socio-political ideologies. Such a mode of explanation is also interiorized—albeit with a remarkable shift of moral stance and aesthetic interest—in the overwhelming discourse of *zijue* ("Self-consciousness") that gained prominence in the 20th-century studies of the era from the Eastern Han through Wei-Jin. For a brief review and critical reflection on this discourse, see Chapter 3, esp. Note 398.

full credit and liability for all consequences it brought about. As a given text was situated in the aura of the scenario of its genesis, a claim of power and property was created for its accredited principal,[521] and vice versa: on a conceptual level, this phenomenon incited an imaginary connection between the text and the person as a pair of properties that mutually embody, manifest, and belong to each other.

What makes this particularly clear is a series of rhetorical statements by Han scholars who defended their creative praxes of writing in different ways. Such a defensive mechanism, in the first place, was entangled with the conceptual dichotomy between *shu* ("to transmit") and *zuo* ("to create"), a topic that entailed a broad range of activities beyond writing. Central to the immense instantiations of this dichotomy was the statement attributed to Kongzi, that one should "transmit rather than create" 述而不作 in order to pass on the cultural legacy of an idealized past.[522] In such context, the term *shu* normally stood for the continuation of received traditions, while *zuo* referred to innovative creation with an aim to fundamentally replace an older system. In sources that are roughly datable to the Han, such a serious usage of *zuo* was comparatively limited to a small number of figures regarded as sages and cultural heroes, as it was retrospectively applied to fundamental changes they made to institutional or cultural issues and their—at least nominal—creations (*zuo*) of an array of early classical texts.[523] However, as the status of written texts progressively became a main emblem of culture, the actual usage of *zuo* correspondingly changed as being more

521 As previously discussed in section 1 of the present chapter.

522 *Lunyu* 7.1 (*Lunyu jishi*, 431).

523 For some utterances related to the sagely *zuo* of early texts, especially Kongzi's *zuo* of the *Chunqiu*, see Note 431.

widely applied to the praxis of creating a broader range of textual productions,[524] a pattern that occurred in the lexical changes of *wen* and *wen*-related terms during the Han as well.[525] Such a transition brought up a dilemma with both intellectual and ethical concerns: For literary creators who lived centuries after the demises of sagely figures, how to justify the surplus and proliferation of their own creativity, as well as language and thoughts involved in their textual productions?

The first case is drawn from Sima Qian's self-narrative incorporated in both *Shiji* and *Hanshu*, in which he engaged in a hypothetical (?) conversation with Hu Sui 壺遂 (fl. 104 BCE) on the *shu-zuo* issue.[526] The conversation started with Hu Sui's question that if the *Taishigong shu* 太史公書 (i. e. the *Shiji*) performed Sima Qian's intention to *shu* or to *zuo*, with an implication that the latter would cast him into the role of Kongzi who recounted the past in order to criticize and re-orient the disorder of his own time (as in the Han discourse that Kongzi *zuo* the *Chunqiu*).[527] Sima Qian's response was, thereafter, an elaborated defense that saved his work from this potential censorship. Through a retrospect to his family tradition, as well as Kongzi's transmission of previous cultural legacies, Sima Qian nominally situated his work within the vein of *shu* ("transmission") rather than that of *zuo*, and hence avoided juxtaposing his work with the sagely *zuo* of the *Chunqiu*.[528] However, also in his self-narrative, there occurred a couple of other instances in which Sima

524 See section 1 of the present chapter, for a series of Han-Wei instances with discussions.

525 See Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," as previously quoted and discussed.

526 *Shiji* 130.3297–3300; *Hanshu* 62.2717–19 (with variations in terms of structures, phrases, and degrees of detailedness).

527 *Shiji* 130.3299; *Hanshu* 62.2719.

528 *Shiji* 130.3299–30; *Hanshu* 62.2719. For a series of analyses of Sima Qian's rhetoric and intention in this conversation, see Wai-yee Li, "The Idea of Authority in the *Shih chi*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54 (1994): 358–61; Willard J. Peterson, "Ssu-ma Ch'ien as Cultural Historian," in *The Power of Culture*, 74–75. Kern, "Kongzi as Au-

Qian no longer concealed his aspiration for "creation." In his synopsis of the structure of the *Taishigong shu*, Sima Qian employed *zuo* precisely to describe his practice of composing the secondary sections that constituted his whole work as a textual unity.[529] Likewise, in his narration of a series of ancient writings, the case of Kongzi *zuo* the *Chunqiu* was recalled, with a strong sense of Sima Qian's self-projection who wrote in a manner of reaction to the injustice or misfortune suffered by a worthy man.[530] Such an inner conflict, as manifested in one of the greatest minds of literary creators in early China, demonstrates the ambivalence involved in the intellectual attitude toward *zuo* as it was used to measure one's own practice of writing.[531]

Yang Xiong, who lived in a new era of literary culture decades after Sima Qian's demise, took a fundamentally different approach to legitimize his writings. In his self-narrative, Yang claimed repeatedly that he *zuo* his works with a great ambition of competition with previous exemplars, explicitly asserting that his works presented no less excellence in terms of intelligence and aesthetics compared to their early models.[532] Such a claim of *zuo* was further manifested in Ban Gu's more encompassing and systematized recounting of Yang's writings, in which every work he selected

---

thor in the Han," 299–301; Cheng Sudong, "Ye tan Zhanguo Qin Han shiqi zuozhe wenti de chuxian," 9.

529 *Shiji* 130.3301–19; *Hanshu* 62.2723. These two accounts of Sima Qian's synopsis of the *Shiji* greatly differed in structure and details, yet both of them employed *zuo* as a key word describing his practice of writing. See also Puett, "The Temptations of Sagehood," 30, for a brief discussion.

530 *Shiji* 130.3300, *Hanshu* 62.2735. These two accounts, varying in phrases and detailedness, were situated within different contexts as well. In the *Shiji*, this part was located right after the conversation with Hu Sui and ambiguously marked as what Sima Qian "deeply contemplated and stated" (*shen wei yue* 深惟曰); in the *Hanshu*, it was located within the letter to Ren An 任安 that came after his synopsis of the contents of the *Shiji*.

531 See also Puett, *The Ambivalence of Creation*, 177–81, for a discussion of Sima Qian's ambivalent attitude toward *zuo* shown in this debate and other chapters of the *Shiji*.

532 See *Hanshu* 87A.3515, 3565–74. See also sections 2 and 3 of the present chapter, for my discussions of the case of Yang Xiong in other aspects. For a series of Han-Wei cases that performed the consciousness of literary competition with previous models, see the following part of the present section.

from Yang's corpus was described in terms of *zuo* (a lexical choice that most like derived from Yang's self-narrative), placed in a specific category or genre, and regarded as an echo of the respective ancient textual model that Yang aimed to match.[533] As demonstrated by scholars like Taniguchi Hiroshi 谷口洋 and Michael Nylan, Yang's self-narrative for the first time in early China showed a strong, unambivalent consciousness of self-identification as an "author."[534] Leaving aside the ambivalence with the notion of "author," Yang's (and also Ban's) discourses indeed involved an aggressive claim for personal agency and property embedded in one's writings, a notion with imaginary expectation for the reception of these writings not merely in themselves but also attached to the person who created—or, in Yang Xiong's term, *zuo*—them.

Another intellectual solution contemporary to Ban Gu was that proposed by Wang Chong, who took a new approach to transcend the *shu-zuo* dichotomy by proposing a "third" mode of textual production in terms of *lun* ("discourse/argument"). With this apparatus, Wang made a hypothetical defense of his *Lunheng* by locating it at a proper position in a new conceptual system of writing defined in his own terms. According to Wang's classification, *zuo* refers to a manner of independent innovation that "initiates the beginning and starts the making" 造端更爲 of something that "has never existed before" 前始未有, as in the cases of the innovations of the "Five Classics" (*wujing*), the system of writing attributed to Canjie 倉頡, and the Eight Trigrams (*bagua* 八卦) attributed to Fuxi 伏羲.[535] What he defined as *shu* refers to a manner depending on specific

533 *Hanshu* 87B.3583.

534 Taniguchi, "Fu ni jijo o tsukeru koto;" Nylan, *Yang Xiong and the Pleasures of Reading*, 59–60.

535 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1181.

previous materials and putting them in sequence, as exemplified by a series of Han compilations by Sima Qian, Liu Xiang, and Ban Biao.[536] In addition to these two modes of production, Wang claimed that *lun*, as exemplified by his own work, represents a manner of writing based upon existing textual sources as its "roots" (*ben*) yet not simply for the sake of transmission (*shu*), but focusing on the analytical examination and discussion of those sources in order to reach a new level of synthesis and comprehensiveness.[537]

The three cases of self-defense collectively performed an intellectual anxiety for the legitimation of creative agency embedded in textual productions. In Sima Qian's rhetorical strategy, his outstanding creativity involved in the *Shiji* was hidden in ambivalence without explicitly breaking through the *shu-zuo* dichotomy. The case of Yang Xiong (as well as Ban Gu's remarks), however, performed a new intellectual stance in praise of one's creative productivity of writing, as well as a state of surplus and proliferation that one's language and ideas could achieve. Wang Chong's self-defense can be then taken as a gentler but more theoretical breakthrough over the *shu-zuo* dichotomy. By adding new element (*lun*) into the old framework, his solution in practice resolved the tension but explored new space for one's creativity of contents-and-forms.

A more general claim for the legitimation of literary creativity by Wang Chong was seen in another of his hypothetical conversations regarding the differences between *wenru* and *shiru*.[538] The two concepts were respectively defined by him as the "producers of literary compositions" (*zhuzuo*

536 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1180–81.

537 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1181. See also Puett, "The Temptations of Sagehood," 38–39, for a brief discussion.

538 For a brief mentioning of Wang Chong's division between *shiru* 世儒 and *wenru* 文儒, see section 3 of the present chapter.

zhe) and the "interpreters of classics" (*shuojing zhe*) not engaged in *zhuzuo*, as followed by a highly elaborated discussion of their features, status, and intellectual values—

> 著作者爲文儒，說經者爲世儒。……世儒業易爲，故世人學之多，非事可析第，故宮廷設其位。文儒之業，卓絕不循，人寡其書，業雖不講，門雖無人，書文奇偉，世人亦傳。彼虛說，此實篇。折累二者，孰者爲賢？案古俊乂著作辭說，自用其業，自明於世。世儒當時雖尊，不遭文儒之書，其跡不傳。周公制禮樂，名垂而不滅。孔子作《春秋》，聞傳而不絕。周公、孔子，難以論言。漢世文章之徒，陸賈、司馬遷、劉子政、揚子雲，其材能若奇，其稱不由人。世傳《詩》家魯申公，《書》家千乘歐陽、公孫，不遭太史公，世人不聞。夫以業自顯，孰與須人乃顯？夫能紀百人，孰與廑能顯其名？[539]
>
> The producers of literary compositions are literary *ru* (*wenru*), and the interpreters of classics are worldly *ru* (*shiru*). … The accomplishment of worldly *ru* is easy to achieve, and hence a lot of people learn from them; the ordinary affairs can be divided by levels, and hence the imperial court offers them positions. The accomplishment of literary *ru* is outstanding without following others, and their textual productions are rarely available. Their accomplishments are not orally taught, and their gates do not have disciples gathering around; [even though,] their writings are peculiar and magnificent. Therefore, they are circulated among people in the world. Those (the works of worldly *ru*) are insubstantial saying, and these (the works of literary *ru*) are substantial writing. To compare these two, which is the worthy one? In antiquity, the extraordinary men composed and created their words and discourses; they self-dependently set up their accomplishments and manifested themselves to the world. Although the worldly *ru* were superior in social status during their lifetimes, their traces could not have been transmitted if without the writings of literary *ru*. The Duke of Zhou established the ritual and music systems, so his name was passed down instead of fading away; Kongzi gave rise to the *Chunqiu*, so his reputation was transmitted without a cease. The Duke of Zhou and Kongzi can be hardly commented by words; as for the men with literary productions (*wenzhang*) during the Han such as Lu Jia, Sima Qian, Liu Zizheng (Liu Xiang), and Yang Ziyun (Yang Xiong), their qualities and talents were miraculous, and their reputations did not depend on others. It is known to the world that Master Shen of Lu was the expert of the *Shi*; Master Ouyang of Qiansheng and Master Gongsun were the experts of the *Shu*. [However,] if they were not recorded by the Grand Scribe (Sima Qian), people in the world would not have heard about them. To manifest oneself by his own accomplishment, or to manifest oneself only via others: How to compare these two? Being able to save one hundred men from oblivion, or to merely manifest one's own name: How to compare these two?

539 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1150–52.

For clarity, Wang Chong's classification of *wenru* and *shiru* can be schematized as such—

Synopsis 4
Comparison between *Wenru* and *Shiru* in the *Lunheng*

Wenru	*Shiru*
著作者	說經者
"producers of literary compositions"	"interpreters of classics"
卓絕不循	易爲
"outstanding without following others"	"easy to achieve"
業雖不講，門雖無人	世人學之多
"their accomplishments are not orally taught, and their gates do not have disciples gathering around"	"a lot of people learn from them"
自用其業，自明於世	宮廷設其位
"self-dependently set up their accomplishments and manifested themselves to the world"	"the imperial court offers them positions"
實篇	虛說
"substantial writing"	"insubstantial saying"
以業自顯	須人乃顯
"manifest oneself by his own accomplishment"	"manifest oneself only via others"
能紀百人	廑能顯其名
"able to save one hundred men from oblivion"	"able to merely manifest one's own name"

Wang Chong's classification was, first, an effusive appraisal of *wenru* who manifested their own names via their literary productions.[540] To the same degree, the passage was simultaneously a de-valuation of *shiru*, whose image was conflated with the Han official academicians constrained by their partiality in canonical studies and hence their lack of literary productivity. Such a division was,

540 See Yu Jiaxi, *Gushu tongli*, 26, for a discussion of Wang Chong's division between *wenru* and *shiru*, in which Yu points out the growing aspiration for "manifesting one's own name" 自顯姓名 via textual production as a Han phenomenon.

therefore, associated with a more foundational intellectual controversy throughout the Han, a tension between individual erudition and academic sectarianism, as well as that between a gesture of self-dependence and the affiliation to power, rank, and institute.[541] In terms of an opposition between "substantial writing" (*shipian* 實篇) and "insubstantial saying" (*xushuo* 虛說), Wang mapped *wenru* and *shiru* more specifically with two different modes of exteriorization that he respectively judged as the emblems of *shi* ("substantiality") and *xu* ("insubstantiality"), a pair of contrary values throughout the *Lunheng*.[542] From Wang's point of view, it was by means of the "substantial writings" of *wenru*—or, as phrased differently later, *wenzhang zhi tu* ("men with literary productions")—that their own accomplishments, along with those of others (including some *shiru*), were altogether tangibly "manifested" in terms of *ming* 明, *cheng*, and *xian*.[543] Namely, by making his writing greatly exceeding himself, a *wenru* presents himself as a transmitter, as well as a creator, who is way superior to *shiru*. In this regard, a *wenru* is not merely the personal embodiment of erudition, but the primary agency through whom that form of embodiment itself was constructed as a desirable and accessible truth.

From Sima Qian to Wang Chong, the intellectual motif of defending and legitimizing individual literary productivity was normally presented with a stance disengaged from—or even opposite to—official power and authority. When this motif was echoed in the early third century CE, the imaginary locus from which these voices were delivered took a shift from the outside of the central

541 See Chapters 2 and 3, for my discussions of this intellectual controversy.

542 On Wang Chong's conceptual framework of *xu* and *shi*, see Chapter 3, esp. Note 273.

543 See also section 3 of the present chapter, esp. Note 505, for a broader range of relevant utterances.

power into the sphere around a newly established political authority, when the Cao regime managed to navigate the dispersed knowledge and intellectual sources toward the newly-integrated body of high culture.[544] Within this atmosphere, there arose a cluster of expressions and discourses associated with the concept *zuo* in the specific sense referring to a creative practice of writing. For example, see the two excerpted passages from the writings of Cao Pi and Cao Zhi, the leading figures of the intellectual community around their household—

> Cao Pi, "Lun wen"
> 蓋文章經國之大業，不朽之盛事。年壽有時而盡，榮樂止於其身，二者必至之常期，未若文章之無窮。是以古之作者，寄身於翰墨，見意於篇籍，不假良史之辭，不托飛馳之勢，而聲名自傳於後。[545]
> Literary production (*wenzhang*) is a grand cause in the management of state, as well as a great affair that never decays. One's life comes to an end within the limit of time; glory and pleasure do not exceed the limit of one's body. Both of them will certainly reach their regular deadlines, and hence they cannot compare with the infinite eternity of literary production. On account of these, those who created/composed (*zuozhe*) [literary productions] in antiquity lodged their bodies in brush and ink, and they illustrated their minds via the written texts. Without depending on the words of good scribes or relying on the force of galloping promotions, they had their names transmitted to later generations by themselves.[546]

> Cao Zhi, "Wenzhang xu" 文章序 ("Postscript of Literary Productions")
> 故君子之作也，儼乎若高山，勃乎若浮雲。質素也如秋蓬，摛藻也如春葩。氾乎洋洋，光乎皜皜，與雅頌爭流可也。[547]
> On this account, what a noble man innovates/composes (*zuo*) is as lofty as high mountain, and

544 See Chapter 3, for my discussion of this socio-cultural agenda of re-centralization.

545 *Wenxuan*, 2271.

546 For some other English translations with discussions, see Robert Joe Cutter, "The Incident at the Gate: Cao Zhi, the Succession, and Literary Fame," *T'oung Pao* 71 (1985): 249–52; Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*, 68–70; Xiaofei Tian, *The Halberd at Red Cliff*, 26–27.

547 Ouyang Xun 歐陽詢 comp., *Yiwen leiju* 藝文類聚, ed. Wang Shaoying 汪紹楹 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1982), 55.996. See also Zhao Youwen 趙幼文 annot., *Cao Zhi ji jiaozhu* 曹植集校注 (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1984), 434.

> as vigorous as flowing cloud; its inner quality is like fleabane in autumn, and its external embellishment is like blossom in spring. Grand is its magnificence, luminous is its brightness, thus it is qualified to compete with the "Hymns" (*Ya*) and the "Eulogies" (*Song*).

Instead of taking these voices as the expressions of a breakthrough in terms of *zijue* or similar terms conventionally employed to essentialize Jian'an literature,[548] it is more fruitful to consider them as the echoes and re-fabrications of utterances and discourses prior to the Cao brothers and their contemporaries. Akin to Wang Chong, the "Lun wen" passage presented an effusive appraisal of the creative praxis of writing (in terms of *zuo*) and the actualized literary productions (*wenzhang*) as the means by which one achieves personal value, credit, and reputation.[549] Right after this excerpted passage, Cao Pi further enumerated a handful of previous examples of self-presentation via writings, in a way akin to what appear in the self-narrative and the letter presumably by Sima Qian.[550] As the leader of the intellectual community around the Cao regime,[551] Cao Pi's claim in-

548 See Chapter 3, for my discussions and critical reflections on this problem of periodization and essentialization in terms of *zijue* and relevant concepts.

549 Considering the late Eastern Han reception and transmission of the *Lunheng* that were traditionally attributed to Cai Yong since his journey in the southeast (if not even earlier), as well as Cai's great influence on literary scholars in younger generation who later joined the Cao regime, one may fairly speculate that Wang Chong could be a direct source of ideas and utterances for the discourses of Cao Pi and his contemporaries like Cao Zhi. The traditional accounts that support Cai Yong as the first renowned scholar who acquired the *Lunheng* and hence cherished it as a reference can be found, for instance, in Yuan Shansong 袁山松 (or Yuan Song 袁崧), *Houhan shu* 後漢書 (with the same title with Fan Ye's work), cited by Li Xian, *Houhan shu* 49.1629; for Cai's influence on younger generation, see *Sanguo zhi* 21.597, 600, 603. Cf. Shao Yipin 邵毅平, *Lunheng yanjiu* 論衡研究 (Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2009), 117–40, where Shao calls into questions the authenticity of related sources that support the traditional opinion and, furthermore, suggests that the transmission of the *Lunheng* was wider and earlier than what the legends of Cai Yong have told. For some discussions of the conceptual connection between the *Lunheng* and the "Lun wen," see Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*, 57–58; Xiaofei Tian, *The Halberd at Red Cliff*, 22–23; Fu Gang, "Lun Jian'an wenxue piping de fasheng," 179–80.

550 *Shiji* 130.3300, *Hanshu* 62.2735. See also Cutter, "The Incident at the Gate," 250–52, for a discussion of the connection between the "Lun wen" and Sima Qian.

551 See Chapter 3, for a detailed discussion of the socio-cultural foundation of this intellectual community. See also Hu Dalei, "Yexia wenxue jituan lun," 52–57; Xiaofei Tian, *The Halberd at Red Cliff*, 11–156.

volved more specifically a rhetorical purpose to encourage the community around him, to whom he inscribed a self-reflexive projection as the successor of "those who create/compose" (*zuozhe*) their literary productions (*wenzhang*) in antiquity (*gu*). Such an expression conveyed a promising vision for those who *zuo* their own *wenzhang* in the early third century CE, that both their names and their writings would "never decay" (*buxiu* 不朽) but get "transmitted to later generations by themselves" 自傳於後. Such a discourse, therefore, specified a mutually reciprocal connection between *zuozhe* and *wenzhang* as the means by which a status of unfadability can be achieved and shared with each other.

"Writing," in this regard, was presented as an emblem of what is beyond death. Such a notion of unfadability and immortality should be nevertheless distinguished from a variety of imaginations about other-worldly transformations of human body from its mortal limits toward specific immortal forms. Instead, the unfadability based upon writing was associated with another recurring theme in early China—namely, a this-worldly aspiration to save individual merits and accomplishments from oblivion by means of collective memory, a notion that was made particularly clear in the Han tombstone inscriptions.[552] More specifically, Cao Pi's exposition was rooted in the early foundation of Chinese thoughts as most famously expressed in the *Zuozhuan*, where the "establishment of one's words" (*liyan* 立言) was regarded—secondary to the "establishment of one's merits" (*ligong* 立功) and the "establishment of one's virtue" (*lide* 立德)—as one of the three ap-

552 See, for example, the tombstone inscriptions for Meng Guanzong (*Hanbei quanji*, 835; *Hanbei jishi*, 16), Jin Jun 景君 (*Hanbei quanji*, 484; *Hanbei jishi*, 61–62), and Wu Liang (*Lishi·Lixu*, 75).

proaches to acquire a status of *buxiu*.[553] This notion was echoed in Han sources prior to Cao Pi's time, especially those related to Sima Qian and Yang Xiong, who expected an enduring transmissibility of their own literary products in terms of *yan*. Yang Xiong, for example, explicitly titled his composition of a set of hypothetical (?) dialogues as the "Exemplary Words" (*Fayan*) modeled after the *Lunyu*.[554] The utterance "accomplishing an individual authority of words" 成一家之言, as first famously seen in Sima Qian's letter to his friend in the *Hanshu*,[555] was later word-by-word invoked by Cao Pi and Cao Zhi, respectively, in their letters to Wu Zhi 吳質 (177–230 CE) and Yang Xiu 楊修 175–219 CE). In Cao Pi's letter, the phrase was applied to Xu Gan for his composition of the *Zhonglun* 中論, which Cao Pi regarded as a work that would make Xu's fame *buxiu*. In that of Cao Zhi, the same phrase was employed to express his own ambition for a serious writing project vis-à-vis his *cifu* 辭賦, though it was considered as secondary to his highest goal to establish political merits, a statement in conformity to the hierarchy of the three ways of *buxiu* in the *Zuozhuan*.[556] Likewise, in a letter to Wang Lang 王朗 [d. 228 CE], Cao Pi highlighted the value of literary production in terms of *zhu pianji* 著篇籍 ("to compose pieces of writing") as a noble way

553 Yang Bojun 楊伯峻 annot., *Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注, 2nd Ed. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990), 1088. See also Cutter, "The Incident at the Gate," 248. For a further discussion of this notion with specific focus on the meanings of *yan* 言, see Chapter 5.

554 See Yang Xiong's self-narratives (*Hanshu* 87B.3580).

555 See Sima Qian's letter to Ren An (*Hanshu* 62.2735).

556 See Cao Pi's letter to Wu Zhi (*Weilüe*, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 21.608; see also *Wenxuan*, 1897); Cao Zhi's letter to Yang Xiu 楊修 (Yu Huan, *Dianlüe* 典略, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 19.559; see also *Wenxuan*, 1903–04). For a rich discussion of the imprints of the notion *cheng yijia zhi yan* 成一家之言 (either phrase as such per se or with variations) in the prominence of *zishu* 子書 ("masters literature") in early medieval China, see Xiaofei Tian, "The Twilight of the Masters: Masters Literature (Zishu) in Early Medieval China," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 126 (2006): 465–86.

to acquire unfadability that is nevertheless secondary to *lide*.[557] In these regards, literary production was not simply regarded as a value onto-itself but placed in a spectrum of old notions related to self-manifestation. Namely, the value of writing was proposed within a structure, in which it acquired a progressively significant but still—at least nominally—secondary status compared to those related to political merits and virtue.

The "Wenzhang xu" expressed a more self-referential aspiration of Cao Zhi to create one's own literary legacy with aesthetic and moral values that, as he expected, would match the excellence of the *Ya* 雅 and the *Song* 頌, a pair of synecdoche for the *Shi* (or the *Shijing* 詩經 as it was later known as) in general. Such an expression can be precisely regarded as the echo of the writing project of Yang Xiong as recounted by Yang himself and later Ban Gu. Cao Zhi's self-awareness of his property and liability associated with his writings was also shown in another two cases. In an anecdote about his early youth, when his composition was suspected by Cao Cao as written by someone else, he claimed that the work was a trustworthy textual display of his own talents and ideas, and that it was his principle to work on this in person rather than having a ghost writer.[558] The second case is from Cao Zhi's letter to Yang Xiu, in which he recalled a conversation between him and his friend Ding Yi 丁廙 (d. 220 CE)—

> 昔丁敬禮常作小文，使僕潤飾之，僕自以才不能過若人，辭不爲也。敬禮謂僕，"卿何所疑難乎？文之佳惡，吾自得之，後世誰相知定吾文者邪？"吾常歎此達言，以爲

557 See Cao Pi's letter to Wang Lang 王朗 (*Weishu*, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 2.88). See also Cutter, "The Incident at the Gate," 249.

558 *Sanguo zhi* 19.557. For an earlier reference to this anecdote, see section 3 of the present chapter.

美談。[559]

Ding Jingli (Ding Yi) once composed a short piece of writing and asked me to refine it. I considered myself not as talented as that man and declined the request. Jingli said, "How come your excellency is puzzled? I myself will be liable for this writing for both its goodness and badness. Who in the following ages is supposed to know the person who finalizes my writing?" I constantly sigh for this consummate saying, regarding it as a delicate statement.

This conversation explicitly exemplifies the consciousness of personal property and liability associated with textual productions under one's name. After clarifying the difference between public and private spheres for the circulation of texts, Cao Zhi and his friend achieved a consensus: Be one's practice to modify another's writing enclosed within a particular sphere with privacy, it is eventually the one to whom that writing is attributed after "finalization" (*ding* 定) that would become the single only principal of liability who takes all credits and critiques. A text and a person, therefore, were imagined as a pair of constantly identifiable property that manifest each other. Such a consensus illustrates a deeper conceptual foundation—namely, an imaginary notion of "text" as a closed verbal structure that, once "finalized," would keep its stability and integrity without missing or changing any verbal data (its accredited "author," and every phrase that was "finalized") over the course of its public circulation and transmission.

In correspondence with the imagined connection between a person and a text as a pair of properties mutually embodying and manifesting each other, the period since the late Western Han onward increasingly witnessed the performances of literary competitions with previous and contemporary writings. From a comparatively point of view, such a phenomenon works in concert

559 *Sanguo zhi* 19.559; *Wenxuan*, 1902.

with what Harold Bloom configures as the "anxiety of influence,"[560] a mechanism over the process of reception and creative praxis of poetry via the later poets' "misprision" (or misreading) and revisionary appropriations of previous models. Bloom's theory is primarily proposed for the reading of post-enlightenment poets who wrote in European languages, yet one may find its applicability for a better understanding of Chinese literature as well. This is not merely because how often the anxiety of liberating one's literary innovation from the influences of previous exemplars was performed in the latter but, more specifically, for the latter also entailed a spectrum of revisionary possibilities that, in terms of their diversity, resembles what Bloom specifies as a series of "revisionary ratios" that vary in type and degree.[561]

Though Bloom's six "revisionary ratios" cannot be directly mapped onto the Chinese literary objects under review, the elegance of his general notion of "anxiety of influence" rests with the intrinsic connectivity between competition as a motif and revision as an approach, a relation that any serious literary practice with heavy indebtedness to the traditions can hardly eschew. Consider, for some previously discussed examples, the Han "hypothetical discourses" (*shelun*, as later categorized as) as a series of practices of imitation, integration, and competition, with their writers' attempts to exceed previous textual model(s) in terms of contents and forms;[562] the case of Yang

560 Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd Ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), esp. 5–16.

561 See Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence*, 14–16, for a synopsis of the six "revisionary ratios"—namely, *clinamen*, *tessera*, *kenosis*, *daemonization*, *askesis*, and *apophrades*. For an implicit appropriation of Bloom's mapping of different modes of revisionary strategies (and the format of his synopsis in particular) into the studies of classical Chinese literature, see Allen, *In the Voice of Others*, 25–29.

562 For a detailed analysis of these works and their intertextual correspondences, see Chapter 3. See also section 2 of the present chapter, for a discussion of their integrative nature.

Xiong, who integratively matched a whole range of his works genre-by-genre with those he considered as the best in previous traditions, as well as his ambition to improve the tradition of *fu* in terms of both morality and aesthetics;[563] and the case of Zhang Heng, who competed with Ban Gu's *fu* on the two Han capitals, with a more elaborated and time-consuming structure composed by himself.[564] A wider range of examples can be drawn from cases such as that of Ban Biao and Ban Gu, who criticized the ethical stance of Sima Qian, with also an aim to justify their own historiography in terms of its moral agenda;[565] Ma Rong, who composed his syncretic compilation of the three hermeneutic traditions of *Chunqiu*, with also a claim to surpass the works of Jia Kui and Zheng Zhong that he regarded as both imperfect;[566] and Cao Zhi, who expressed his ambition to match the glory of the *Shi* by his own literary products.[567] To a lesser extent, the anxiety of influence was also performed by those who consciously dealt with contemporary works by means of critical remarks and competitive writings, as shown in the cases of Ban Gu,[568] He Xiu, Zheng Xuan,[569] Cao Zhi,[570] and Cao Gun 曹袞 (d. 235 CE).[571]

---

563 See *Hanshu* 87A.3515, 87B.3583. See also sections 2 and 3 of the present chapter, for my discussions of the case in other aspects. For Yang's critical review of the traditions of *fu* in particular, see *Fayan* 2.2 (*Fayan yishu*, 49–50); Xu Jie, "Lun Yang Xiong yu Donghan wenxue sichao," 161–65; Kern, "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the 'Fu'," 383–437; Feng Shuxun, "Shi moni hai shi chuangxin," 29–45.

564 See *Houhan shu* 59.1897. See also section 2 of the present chapter, for a discussion of its integrative nature.

565 See *Houhan shu* 40A.1325, and *Hanshu* 62.2737–38. For relevant studies, see Wang Shumin 王叔珉, "Ban Gu lun Sima Qian shifei po miu yu shengren bian" 班固論司馬遷是非頗謬於聖人辨, in *Shiji lunwen xuanji* 史記論文選集, ed. Huang Peirong 黃沛榮 (Taipei: Chang'an chubanshe, 1982), 65–94; Chen Zhi 陳直, "Han Jin ren dui *Shiji* de chuanbo ji qi pingjia" 漢晉人對史記的傳播及其評價, *Sichuan daxue xuebao* 四川大學學報, No. 3 (1957): 41–57.

566 See *Houhanshu* 60A.1972, as previously mentioned in Note 166.

567 See *Yiwen leiju*, 55.996, as previously discussed in the present section.

568 See the "Lun wen" (*Wenxuan*, 2270), where Cao Pi mentioned Ban Gu's comment of Fu Yi 傅毅 as an example for literary men's underrating of each other with misprision.

569 See *Houhan shu* 35.1208, for He Xiu and Zheng Xuan's competitive works on the *Chunqiu*, especially He Xiu's dramatic reaction.

Around the early third century CE, the mutual embodiment between a text and a person as a pair of properties was also sustained by a solid ground of protection, collection, and anthologization of literary products as a form of individual legacy,[572] especially for the interests of the Cao family. Cao Cao, for example, once requested Cai Yan 蔡琰 (ca. 177–249 CE) to make written copies of texts previously owned by his father Cai Yong.[573] Cao Pi, as the leading patron of literary activities around Jian'an period, showed his enthusiasm in the collection and presentation of his own works,[574] as well as the anthologization of contemporary writers' productions after their demises.[575] Cao Zhi, as a peer to his brother, at least twice compiled his self-selected corpus, once as a collection of seventy-eight *pian* of his *cifu* (to which the "Wenzhang xu" was linked as a postscript), and the other as a collection presented to Yang Xiu.[576] In the next generation, Cao Rui 曹叡 (204–239 CE, i. e. Emperor Ming 明帝 of Wei [r. 226–239 CE]), after the demise of Cao Zhi,

---

570 Cao Zhi, in his letter to Yang Xiu, talked extensively about the issues of literary critics and competitions among his contemporaries. See *Sanguo zhi* 19.558–59; *Wenxuan*, 1901–04.

571 See *Sanguo zhi* 20.584, for Cao Gun's 曹袞 consciousness of competition with Cao Zhi.

572 As earlier noted by Zhang Xuecheng, the late Eastern Han through the early Wei dynasty constituted the foundation for the prominence of *wenji* 文集 ("literary anthology") in medieval China (*Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu*, 296). For the ideas and practices of anthologization of literature in Cao Pi's time, see Xiaofei Tian, *The Halberd at Red Cliff*, 27; "Collections," in *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature*, 222–23. For some comprehensive studies on the nature and history of literary anthologization in early and medieval China, see Pauline Yu, "Poems in Their Place"; David R. Knechtges, "Culling the Weeds and Selecting Prime Blossoms: The Anthology in Early Medieval China," in *Culture and Power in the Reconstitution of the Chinese Realm, 200–600*, ed. Scott Pearce, Audrey Spiro, and Patricia Ebrey (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001), 200–41.

573 *Houhan shu* 84.2801.

574 See *Sanguo zhi* 2.88 (both Chen Shou's record and Wang Shen's *Weishu* cited by Pei Songzhi), for Cao Pi's compilation of his own writings; and Hu Chong 胡沖, *Wuli* 吳曆, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 2.89, for Cao Pi's presentation of a selected corpus of his works to Sun Quan 孫權 and Zhang Zhao.

575 This is shown, first in Cao Pi's edict to collect the writings of Kong Rong 孔融 with rewards to the tributers (*Houhan shu* 70.2279); and, in his anthologization of the works of Chen Lin, Xu Gan, Ying Yang, and Liu Zhen after their demises during the plague in 217 CE as mentioned in his letter to Wu Zhi (*Sanguo zhi* 21.608; *Wenxuan*, 1897).

576 For the first case, see the "Wenzhang xu" 文章序 (*Yiwen leiju*, 55.996); for the second case, see Cao Zhi's letter to Yang Xiu (*Sanguo zhi* 19.559; *Wenxuan*, 1903).

ordered to preserve and compile copies of his works into imperial repositories.[577] This enthusiasm was also performed by literary scholars outside of the Wei regime. Xi Zheng 郤正 (d. 278 CE), when he was a Shu official, was known for his personal collection of individual literary writings from the Han through the contemporary era, including the works of Sima Xiangru, Yang Xiong, Ban Gu, Zhang Heng, Cai Yong and those anonymous to us.[578]

In addition to these spectacular acts and claims of artificial controls, there even existed a possibility that a person would manifest himself in his writing that was intended to be anonymous. What makes this particularly clear is a late Eastern Han legal case, in which Guo Yuan 國淵 (fl. ca. 200 CE)—an official of the Cao regime—identified the author of an anonymous slandering letter by recognizing the traces unconsciously left in the writing. Guo noticed that the author "often quoted/cited the 'Erjing fu'" 多引二京賦, a *fu* that he considered as "a text with broad information about things" 博物之書 that was not widely learned and hence could be employed with such a degree of specificity—as far as Guo could recognize in this slandering letter—only by a small number of people. Therefore, Guo Yuan played a trick sending his assistants to seek tutors who were able to teach this *fu*, and eventually identified the author (in this case, also the writer who physically wrote-it-down) with the aid of calligraphic examination.[579] Such a case involved a circle of evidential links that covered several important aspects of a literary culture: reception and production; authorship and readership; and finally, "text" as both an idiosyncratic artifact and a con-

577 *Sanguo zhi* 19.576.
578 *Sanguo zhi* 42.1034.
579 *Sanguo zhi* 11.339–40.

ceptually stabilized, closed, and sharable entity. Not due to his own wish, the author eventually manifested himself as an agency involved in the following acts and traces entangled with each other: a text ("Erjing fu") he previously learned; the traces of that text reflected in his own writing (the slandering letter); the traces of his physical gestures to write-it-down; and finally, a careful reading conducted by an informed reader who was able to recognize those traces. The first—if not the most important—clue within this evidential circle was the "Erjing fu," a text presumed as a closed verbal structure with a degree of stability that made itself citable (most likely without explicit citation marker) and hence recognizable by an informed reader like Guo Yuan. The reader and the author, in this case, were sharing essentially the "same" text (the "Erjing fu") that was conceptually interiorized as—and, as one may say in this particular case only, legally "proved" to be—a verbal structure featured by its own integrity and specificity, regardless of any possible variance between the certainly different versions available to two different people.

All these cases of the mutual manifestation between text and personal agency could hardly be presented so intensely and extensively, if without a certain degree of construction, interiorization, and appliance of an imaginary concept or notion of "text" as a stabilized verbal structure beyond variance and changeability. Such a concept involved a constellation of beliefs and assumptions of durability and stability, not merely of the texts themselves, but of the process by which they are embodied and presented. In the past few decades, studies in early and medieval China have admirably investigated numerous pieces of evidence of textual variability and changeability involved in

manuscript culture.[580] Admittedly, there was rarely a physically embodied text beyond variance across the living flux of transmission; yet a "text" ideally closed in such an imaginary form constituted another unneglectable aspect of the inquiry. That is, what kind of concept of "text" was constructed, interiorized, and applied in both rhetorical and practical activities by those who lived within a manuscript culture, to whom the variability of manuscript production and circulation was all but unfamiliar and unusual? This, furthermore, invites a critical reflection on what is foundational to the preconceptions of "stability" and "fidelity" as opposed to a "manuscript culture," an object under the gaze of the power of modern knowledge production and hence fetishized in terms of a praise of *variance*—namely, a celebration of what we rarely *have* in our culture but happen to *have* in the world of manuscripts.

This is indeed a problem methodologically and ethically at stake, while the alternative arguments can be made, toward the following: that variance and stability in a manuscript world did not erase each other but co-existed in a spectrum of mutually recycling effects, and that the variance would be better understood as entangled with a powerful concept of "text" beyond it. Such a notion was not equal to a fetish of the "original" or an endorsement for the Lachmannian model of textual transmission that assumes every verbal data as stemming and deviating from a single original textual model to its many descendants. Nor does it straightforwardly reinforce the credibility of any single textual data or textual property (e. g. a word, a line, an author, and so on) of a particular text that we happen to have. The closed textuality beyond variance under review, to be clarified,

580 For some representative arguments on this issue and some theoretical references, see Notes 409 and 410.

was not a fully acquired and fully actualized result, but a conceptually formulated orientation that operated in different spheres of literary activities toward multiple ends. Texts that existed in descriptions and writing materials had *de facto* embodied, rather than being liberated from, the effects of that imaginary being.

During and after the Han, the concept of text beyond variance constituted an active part of a broader range of socio-cultural phenomena including intellectual ethos, literary practices, and material realities. Specifically, it worked in concert with the growing aspiration for legit self-presentation by means of literary products during and after the late Western Han, the collective commitments and artificial controls to preserve and curate textual heritages properly, and finally, the proliferation of literary criticism that was open to a wider range of texts. All these changes would work in concert with—and could hardly be actualized without—a certain degree of collective acceptance of a notion of textuality confirming the transmissibility and stability of the imaginary essence of a text beyond its actually ever-changing forms of actualizations and instantiations. It was this imaginary concept in praise of stability and durability that kept a literary culture with hand-written manuscripts from the otherwise more random and more unmanageable proliferation of *variance* (which, as Cerquiglini suggests, is located as the very heart of a manuscript culture[581]); and it hence calls forth a deeper reflection upon the dichotomy of stability-versus-variability, as

581 Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant*, 77–78, "Now, medieval writing does not produce variants; it *is* variance. The endless rewriting to which medieval textuality is subjected, the joyful appropriation of which it is the object, invites a powerful hypothesis: the variant is never punctual. Paraphrastic activity works on the utterance itself, like dough; variance is not to be grasped through the word; this must be done, rather, at least at the level of the sentence if not, indeed, at the very heart of the complete utterance, of the segment of discourse."

well as that between the presence and the absence of a single "text." A text, to this end, is never rigidly closed in-itself, but closed toward an open criticism.[582]

4.5. Summary

Toward an investigation of grammatology, this chapter focuses on several aspects of the feature and nature of "writing" as a praxis of the composition of a verbal structure with an integrated body of contents and forms. My approach incorporates "writing" into a consideration in which the concept is not privileged with certain centrality or priority vis-à-vis other literary skills, but, on a conceptual level, taken as a specific mode of exterior manifestation that recycles, transforms, and displays one's interiorized erudition. Such a notion was extensively expressed and performed by a variety of terms, utterances, and discourses and showcased by a series of exemplary models in Han-Wei China.

Through an examination of a constellation of crucial terms and a series of exemplary cases in their linguistic and cultural contexts, my preliminary observation demonstrates that nearly three centuries from the late Western Han onward witnessed an overall proliferation of texts as individual products. This phenomenon corresponded with the extension of individual reception and mastery of knowledge and texts over the same period. Furthermore, my observations suggest that the

582 I presented these reflections on the issues of variance and textual stability in Han and Early Medieval China, with more details and examples, first at the 21st Graduates Student Conference of CU Boulder Asian Studies Graduate Association (CUBASGA) (Feb. 2020, CU Boulder, Boulder), under the title "Beyond Variance: Concepts and Practices about Textual Stability in Early Medieval China," and later at the 4th Conference of the Early Medieval China Group (Mar. 2021, online), under the title "Is There a Text Beyond Variance? Concepts, Realities, and Ethics about Textual Stability in Han and Early Medieval China."

process of the formation of textual productions fell into a spectrum between two conceptual modes that were integrative and innovative by nature. The integrative mode featured the collection, selection, connection, organization, and refabrication of pre-existing materials and sources. It also involved the mastery of a variety of chronologic, generic, and thematic correlations between them. The innovative mode, then, was largely manifested in a diverse range of possibilities of textual instantiations derived from that process of integration, through which the producer's own idea, purport, and literary creativity were realized.

The synthesis of these two modes of literary productivity works in concert with my conceptualization of writing as potentially a form of "textual display of erudition." To be more specific, it refers to the exterior manifestation of the recycling process of presenting, appropriating, and organizing what is individually interiorized through the practices of learning, reading, memorizing, and comprehending. This notion was correlated with a wide spectrum of discourses and utterances, in which the inside-outside paradigm shows general applicability to the values of *bo* and *tong*, as well as the self-dependent intellectual stance involved in the cultivation of individual erudition. Thus, this indicates the attainment of deeper interpretation of *wenzhang* (in its narrow sense as "literary production") as a mediated form of exteriorization in terms of its connections with *wenxue* (in one of its traditional senses as "literary learning"), a form of interiorization. Meanwhile, on a conceptual level, the foregoing analyses conforms to an understanding of the concept *wen* with its manifold derivations, not merely in terms of the semantic changes of each specific lexical item, but also taking them altogether as the perceivable—and hence decipherable—manifestation of the correla-

tive structure of human and world, a structure distributed among various media and forms.

This leads to the final analysis of a series of utterances, discourses, and literary practices embedded with the growing motif of personal agency that would take credit and liability for one's textual productions—namely, an imaginary connection between a text and a person as a pair of identifiable property belonging to and manifesting each other. From the standpoint of history of ideas, this phenomenon also reflects a new condition of the concept *zuo*. The dichotomy of *zuo* vis-à-vis *shu* was comparable to that of *bo* vis-à-vis *yue* ("conciseness"),[583] as both *zuo* and *bo* represented a condition of surplus and proliferation in terms of forms, contents, and aesthetics in comparison to their counter-notions (in this context, *shu* and *yue*) in the respective dichotomies, which stood for the principles of thrift and modesty. Diachronically speaking, both *bo* and *zuo* were gradually liberated from the ethical anxieties involved in these dichotomies, and hence permeated a broader range of literary practices in intellectual lives. This, again, coheres with my understanding of writing praxis as a textual display of erudition, a conception for the connection between interiorization and exteriorization, reception and production, as well as tradition and individual talent.

Therefore, a writing—attributed to an individual persona as its principal—gains its significance not merely as a hybrid of pre-existing materials but also as an expressive form of individuality that recycles, transforms, and carries forward those materials into a self-created verbal structure. This concept of writing presents an enchanting point of view of the personal agency involved in literary productivity as a transformative power, through which the labor that verbalizes the world and the

583 See Chapters 1 and 2, for detailed discussions of the connections between *bo* and *yue*.

world being verbalized mutually manifest and exhibit the potentials of each other. Such a notion, by its nature, is not a romantic projection or expression of one's emotion or personality, but a move toward intellectual maturity manifested in its various ends of textual realizations: a process that was eventually *impersonal*.[584]

584 To borrow Eliot's famous claim for the writing of poetry, that "poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion; it is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality. But, of course, only those who have personality and emotions know what it means to want to escape from these things." And, "The emotion of art is impersonal. And the poet cannot reach this impersonality without surrendering himself wholly to the work to be done. And he is not likely to know what is to be done unless he lives in what it not merely the present, but the present moment of the past, unless he is conscious, not of what is dead, but of what is already living." "Tradition and the Individual Talent," in *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, ed. Frank Kermode (New York: Harcourt, 1975), 43–44.

- CHAPTER 5 -

Literary Culture in the Context of Intermediacy: Acts, Thoughts, and Traces within the Paradigm of Cross-Media Commensurability

5.1. Concepts and Realities of Writing Media

For an inquiry into the models and manifestations of *wen*, there can be rarely something disentangled from the traces of spoken and written words in the contexts of materiality and intermediacy. Toward an investigation of relevant notions in classical China, the following dialogical scenario presented in the *Zhuangzi* 莊子 stands out a source of inspiration no less thought-provoking than any other discourse—

> 桓公讀書於堂上，輪扁斲輪於堂下，釋椎鑿而上，問桓公曰："敢問公之所讀者何言邪？"公曰："聖人之言也。"曰："聖人在乎？"公曰："已死矣。"曰："然則君之所讀者，古人之糟魄已夫！" 桓公曰："寡人讀書，輪人安得議乎！有說則可，無說則死。" 輪扁曰："臣也，以臣之事觀之。斲輪，徐則甘而不固，疾則苦而不入。不徐不疾，得之於手而應於心，口不能言，有數存焉於其間。臣不能以喻臣之子，臣之子亦不能受之於臣，是以行年七十而老斲輪。古之人與其不可傳也死矣，然則君之所讀者，古人之糟魄已夫。"[585]
>
> Duke Huan was reading text (*shu*) at his hall. The wheel-maker Bian was chiseling a wheel below.
>
> [Bian] left his awl and chisel aside, walked up, and asked Duke Huan,
>
> "May I dare to ask you, my lord, what was said in the text you were reading?"
>
> The Duke replied,
>
> "The words of sages."
>
> [Bian] said,
>
> "Are the sages still alive?"
>
> The Duke said,
>
> "Dead already."
>
> [Bian] said,

585 Wang Xianqian annot., *Zhuangzi jijie* 莊子集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), 120–21.

"If so, what you were reading is nothing but the dregs of the ancients!"

The Duke said,

"I was reading the text; and how can a wheel-maker have an opinion on this! If you have an explanation, it is fine; if not, you die."

The wheel-maker Bian said,

"In the case of me, your servant, I will look at the thing from the point of view of my business. In making a wheel, if I proceed gently, that is pleasant yet not firm; if I proceed violently, that is toilsome yet not fitting. The point of doing it neither too gently nor too violently is acquired by hands and realized by the heart-mind, but it cannot be expressed by words of mouth; there is something measurable in it. That is something that I cannot make my son understand and he cannot receive from me. Thus, I am in my seventieth year but still making wheels at this old age. The ancients and what they could not transmit are gone. If so, what you were reading is nothing but the dregs of the ancients."

The wheel-maker's response involves, first, a spectacular devaluation of the authority of the written version of "words" (*yan*) of the deceased sages as embodied in text (*shu*); and accordingly, a devaluation of "reading" text as an approach to access those "words." Taking the written text as the "dregs of the ancients" 古人之糟魄, one has to ask, what is implied as the "essence"—if any—vis-à-vis the "dregs" of the dead? Does the wheel-maker imply that the "words" of ancients itself was worth listening to (instead of *reading*), so that the best way to learn from or communicate with a sagely person's words would be attending in person as his audience when he is alive (instead of *dead*)? In this case, the devaluation of writing (and hence reading) could be specifically due to the loss of authenticity in the process of transforming the presumably true words spoken by a true person into written forms that is then entangled with uncertainty and changeability, as well as the loss of vitality and communicability when one has nobody to speak with but an inhuman, unresponsive text as a metaphor of death, as famously proposed by Plato's Socrates and others in dif-

ferent ways.[586] Or, is the *Zhuangzi* rather taking a further move—namely, a more radical reflection on the reliance on language that is localized within the heart of epistemology? Namely, whatever one thinks of how he/she knows about an absent object (for example, a dead person) is always depending on, if not programed within, the formation and transmission of specific intermediate structure encoded in language, instead of the organic *sitz im leben* of that object itself; and one's epistemology is inevitably limited within that intermediacy, which has filtered all the "liquid" but the solid "dregs" that are left to be accessed.

The second step of reasoning is then showcased by the wheel-maker's explanation of the impossibility to convey the subtlety of his skills by means of "words." In the *Zhuangzi*, the entire dialogue comes right after, and is actually an elaboration of, a monologic discourse that situates *yi* 意 ("ideas"), *yu* 語 ("spoken words"), and *shu* ("written words") in a hierarchized sequence in which the latter is reduced as a secondary and imperfect representation of the former with decreasing value and fidelity, for the presumably true *yi* cannot be fully conveyed and transmitted via any form of "words" (*yan*).[587] Such an argument also shows conformity to that expressed in the "Xi ci" 繫辭 of the *Zhouyi*, which devaluates both the written and the spoken with the same logic, that

586 See Plato, *Phaedrus*, where we *read*—paradoxically—Socrates' arguments about writing as a manufactured product that is inhuman, memory-weakening, unresponsive, and undefendable (Plato, *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*, trans. Harold N. Fowler [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005], 413–579, esp. 561–77). For a critical reflection on this anti-writing discourse and the tradition of western metaphysics it is involved in, see Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 37–39; for a gentler summary and discussion, see Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, 78–79, and 102, where he points out that it was in a writing structure that Plato's anti-writing discourse was managed toward its elaborated form of analytical clarification. See also, Ibid., 80, and Ong, *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture* (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1977), 230–71, for the close association between writing and death.

587 *Zhuangzi jijie*, 120.

"written words do not fully express spoken words, and spoken words do not fully express ideas" 書不盡言，言不盡意.[588]

The presumed secondariness of writing to speech, as well as that of speech to truth and reality, were also expressed in western philosophy and linguistics—from Plato and Aristotle to Rousseau and Saussure—with their own epistemological problems. These assessments share a hierarchized placement of speech and writing as respectively the primary and the secondary signifiers of something that ontologically precedes.[589] In the cases of the *Zhuangzi* and the "Xi ci," it is the presumption of a fully self-contained idea or meaning that devalues both the spoken and the written words as the imperfect carriers through which that meaning is never "fully expressed" but progressively decays. However, such a hierarchized division did not dominate the entire conceptual foundation of early Chinese literary culture, in which the epistemological problem of words was usually bracketed out from a world that was phenomenally occupied by the various spoken and the various written, as well as their expressive and enchanting powers. The configuration of such a world of signs and omens was neither logocentric nor phonocentric but presenting a view in which the spoken and the written were mutually correlated and manifested with cross-media commensurability.

Such a view of world yielded an imaginary coherence or hypothetical equivalence between the

588 *Shisanjing zhushu*, 82. For another English translation with analytical discussion and contextualization of this line within the "Xi ci" 繫辭 as a coherent structure, see Willard J. Peterson, "Making Connections: 'Commentary on the Attached Verbalizations' of the *Book of Change*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 42 (1982): 98–99. For an early third century elaboration of this idea in correspondence with the metaphor of texts as the dregs of the ancient, see Xun Can's 荀粲 statement cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 10.319–20. See also Tang Yongtong 湯用彤, *Wei Jin xuanxue lungao* 魏晋玄学論稿 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2009), 35–36.

589 For a critical, epistemological reflection on this hierarchized system rooted in the tradition of Western metaphysics and hence linguistics, see Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, passim., esp. 1–93.

form in which the words are presented and what the words are presumably about. With either explicit or implicit commitment to this imaginary coherence, literary and verbal acts were brought into ever-changing existence and transmission via a variety of media and forms, which hence constituted the context of intermediacy for the ideas and praxes of individual erudition—altogether as a constellation of intellectual phenomena with conceptual connectivity—pivotal to the present study. These intellectual phenomena, to be precise, were not simply built upon but embodied within a dynamic world of language and knowledge that were transmitted and circulated among various repositories, written and inscribed on various media, and entangled with ever-changing material conditions and technologizing devices. To this end, the present chapter concerns the following questions: To what degree the features, natures, and availability of writing media matter to the literary practices they were associated with? How did oral, aural, and memorial practices play their roles along with the growing prevalence and interiorization of text-based experience, especially by means of reading and writing? And finally, how to properly evaluate the connectivity between idea, praxis, material, and technology toward a comprehensive vision of literary culture?

To begin with, my investigation undertakes a critical examination of what is foregrounded as the most tangible part of literary culture—namely, the production, circulation, and reception of texts that had physically existed. Texts in ancient China were written and inscribed on a variety of material media such as bone, bamboo, wood, metal, stone, silk, and later paper. In the most general sense, these media were conventionally divided into two modalities—namely, the system of "manuscripts" and that of "inscriptions." The two systems can be arguably differentiated in terms of

physical features (soft versus hard, light versus heavy, fragile versus enduring, and so on), tools (brush-and-ink versus knife), gestures (writing versus inscribing), as well as their symbolic and practical functionalities that were, to varying degrees, suitable for public/monumental displays or personal/daily uses.[590] This division was most typically expressed in the traditional phrase, "written on bamboo and silk, inscribed on metal and stone" 書於竹帛，鏤於金石,[591] in which the terms *zhubo* 竹帛 and *jinshi* 金石 function as a pair of synecdoche for the two modalities of textual materialization, each of which involves more specific diversification.

From a quantitative point of view, manuscript outweighed inscription for it undertook a much larger proportion of texts that people had ever made, read, and used. Being the words inscribed on metal or stone a piece of enduring material embedded with monumental value and functionality, the world of manuscripts was subject to a more fluid process of changeability altering the material foundation for text-based practices on the daily basis. With even the slightest attention on media and materiality, an investigation of Chinese literary culture certainly would not bypass one of the most important breakthroughs in the history of human technology—namely, the improvement of papermaking datable to 105 CE, traditionally attributed to Cai Lun 蔡倫 (63–121 CE), and its spread thereafter. Such a breakthrough exerted a series of far-reaching influences on almost all areas of literary phenomena and literary activities: the expanded availability of reading and writing materials, the extended boundary of the literate community, the growing prominence of written

590 For some general references about the two modalities of text-bearing media prior to the spread of paper, see Tsien Tsuen-hsuin, *Written on Bamboo and Silk*, 19–144; Li Ling 李零, *Jianbo gushu yu xueshue yuanliu* 簡帛古書與學術源流 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2004), 60–63, 115–52; Kern, "Beginning through Western Han," 1–17.

591 Wu Yujiang 吳毓江 annot., *Mozi jiaozhu* 墨子校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1993), 178.

text and text-based practices, as well as the accelerated proliferation of textual productions.[592]

A widely accepted—and sometimes unwittingly reinforced—notion regarding these impacts is the assessment that takes the mid-Eastern Han—namely, the invention of Cai Lun's paper, as the single most important transitional point that fundamentally changed early Chinese literary culture. Such a notion is nevertheless negotiable in several aspects. First, paper rose to the status as the primary writing media only gradually and context-dependently, as accompanied by a variety of interplays and collaborations between different media. Second, the applicability of any writing medium—including paper—not merely depended on its physical features and economic value, but also rested with its symbolic, aesthetic, and non-utilitarian functions in varying circumstances.[593] It is, therefore, risky to assume an overall transformation—no matter how "gradual" it can be claimed to be—of the material foundation of manuscript culture only from an economic and utilitarian point of view. Third, for each socio-cultural phenomenon that was conventionally attributed to the spread of paper, it deserves a re-evaluation of the role(s) paper had played along with other factors.

---

592 For some up-to-now most comprehensive studies on papermaking and its subsequent influences, see Tsien Tsuen-hsuin, *Written on Bamboo and Silk*, 145–74; "Paper and Printing"; Pan Jixing 潘吉星, *Zhongguo zaozhi shi* 中國造紙史 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 2009). For archaeological evidence of paper datable to the Han, see Notes 595 and 596. For references about the impacts of paper (before or after 105 CE) particularly on the Eastern Han and early medieval intellectual world and literary culture, see, for example, Shimizu, "Kami no hatsumei to Gokan no gakukaze"; Michael Nylan, "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han," 252–53; Michael Puett, "The Temptations of Sagehood," 42–43; Xiaofei Tian, "The Twilight of the Masters," 465; Stephen Owen, "Introduction," in *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature, vol. 1*, xx; Knechtges, "From the Eastern Han through the Western Jin (AD 25–317)," 117–18.

593 For this issue presented in bronze inscriptions, see Lothar von Falkenhausen, "Issues in Western Zhou Studies: A Review Article," *Early China* 18 (1993): 139–226; Kern, "The Performance of Writing in Western Zhou China," in *The Poetics of Grammar and the Metaphysics of Sound and Sign*, ed. Sergio La Porta and David Shulman (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 109–176; for the case of writing on bamboo, see Matthias L. Richter, *The Embodied Text: Establishing Textual Identity in Early Chinese Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 13, 116–17; for the case of writing on paper, see Antje Richter, *Letter and Epistolary Culture in Early Medieval China* (Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013), 23–26.

Was paper the primary force that brought a whole range of new conditions into being? Or should it be more properly regarded as a material catalyst that participated in a complex process of socio-cultural changes? These concerns demand a synthesis of a diverse range of realities across a longer time span with regards to their mutual dependences and interactions, which altogether lead to a more comprehensive vision of literary culture beyond any oversimplified notion of material, economic, or technological determinism.

As shown in both archeological evidence and transmitted sources, the utilization of paper underwent a gradual process of co-existence and collaboration with bamboo, wood, and silk. Over the process, a variety of possibilities were put into practices in different circumstances. As Tsien Tsuen-hsuin 錢存訓 argues, a large-scale replacement of bamboo, wood, and silk by paper approximately took place not until the third-and-fourth centuries CE.[594] Tsien's argument gains support from archaeological evidence discovered in the last one century. The fragments of both primitive paper prior to Cai Lun's improvement (some datable to the Western Han) and those after 105 CE were occasionally found, mostly from the Northwest frontiers of the Han empire.[595] These pieces of evidence, scarce in quantity and not often bearing written texts,[596] do not demonstrate an

---

594 Tsien Tsuen-hsuin, *Written on Bamboo and Silk*, 150.

595 For some brief reviews on the archaeological discoveries of the Han paper (since the early 20th century), see Tsien Tsuen-hsuin, *Written on Bamboo and Silk*, 146–47, 154–56; Song Zhiming 宋治民, *Zhanguo Qin Han kaogu* 戰國秦漢考古 (Chengdu: Sichuan daxue chubanshe, 1994), 208–09; Hua Rende 華人德, *Zhongguo shufa shi: liang Han juan* 中國書法史：兩漢卷 (Nanjing: Jiangsu jiaoyu chubanshe, 1999), 217–18; Sun Ji 孫機, *Handai wuzhi wenhua ziliao tushuo* 漢代物質文化資料圖說 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2011), 330–33.

596 The fragmentary Han papers without written text were discovered in Luobunao'er 羅布淖爾 (1933, datable to the Western Han), Baqiao 灞橋 (1957, the Western Han), Minfeng 民豐 (1959, the Eastern Han), Juyan 居延 (1973, the mid-Western Han), Maquanwan 馬圈灣 (1974, the mid-and-late-Western Han), Zhongyan cun 中顏村 (1978, the mid-Western Han) and Fangmatan 放馬灘 (1986, the early Western Han). Text-bearing Han papers were discovered in the area of the Ejina river 額濟納河 (1942, the Eastern Han), Hantanpo 旱灘坡 (1974, the Eastern Han) and Anxi 安西 (1990, the mid-and-late Western Han). For references of related ar-

overall tendency of paper's replacement of bamboo, wood, and silk as the dominant writing medium during the Eastern Han.[597] Nevertheless, simply relying on extant archaeological evidence involves a risk of underrating the actual spread and utilization of paper. Most of the archeological evidence of paper was found in the Northwest China, where the climate was comparatively cold, dry, and hence suitable for the survival of paper over centuries. Namely, these frontier areas happen to have saved a small proportion of paper from physical oblivion, which happened to an uncountable number of paper-manuscripts in more civilized ancient cities where paper that once existed certainly outnumbered those in the Northwest frontiers.

Therefore, in addition to archeological evidence, it is necessary too to examine the received textual accounts for the use of paper during and after the Han. The Chinese term *zhi* ("paper"), written as the character 紙, is a combination of two graphic components respectively 糸 *si* and 氏 *shi*. According to the *Shuowen jiezi*, the former functions as an ideogram related to the process of fabric-making, and the latter a phonogram.[598] The late Eastern Han dictionary *Shiming* associates *zhi* with another character 砥 *di* ("sharpening stone") for they share the element of being "flat and smooth" (*pinghua* 平滑).[599] The two Eastern Han explanations are mutually compatible to each other, and they jointly define "paper" according to its physical texture and visual appearance. In contexts where *zhi* was mentioned as a writing medium, it was normally distinguished from the different types of silk but properly taken as a new kind of fabric-like, flat, and smooth material

chaeological reports, see Tsien Tsuen-hsuin, *Written on Bamboo and Silk*, 146–47, 155; Song Zhiming, *Zhanguo qinhan kaogu*, 208.

597 Tsien Tsuen-hsuin, *Written on Bamboo and Silk*, 157.

598 *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 666.

599 *Shiming huijiao*, 323.

for writing.

The trace of paper prior to Cai Lun's improvement in transmitted sources is rarely found. According to Ying Shao, during the late Western Han and Eastern Han institutional projects of collation and standardization, the texts preserved in imperial archives and repositories were primarily written and copied on bamboo slips and raw silk (*su* 素).[600] For an early Eastern Han reference, the *Lunheng* mentioned the phrase *zhubo* for 13 times, while the occurrence of the term *zhi* was zero.[601] There are nevertheless two noteworthy accounts for text-bearing paper prior to the second century CE. According to Ying Shao, again, paper was mentioned together with *su* ("raw silk") and *jian* 簡 ("bamboo/wooden slips") as the three text-bearing media for the collection of texts of Emperor Guangwu 光武帝 (r. 25–57 CE) at the beginning of his reign.[602] The second example is datable around two decades prior to Cai Lun's paper, when Jia Kui was appointed by the emperor to teach the *Zuozhuan* among selected students in the imperial academy. According to the *Houhan shu*, this project offered "copies of the *jing* ('classic/canon') and the *zhuan* ('transmitted tradition') written on bamboo/wooden slips (*jian*) and paper to each (student)" 與簡紙經傳各一通,[603] in which the terms *jing* and *zhuan* presumably referred to the *Chunqiu* and the *Zuozhuan* respectively. Though not without controversy,[604] I follow the common agreement that this record was an indi-

600 See *Fengsu tongyi jiaozhu*, 495.

601 See also Xu Zhengkao, *Lunheng tongyici yanjiu*, 89–90, for a summary of a wider range of terms employed in the *Lunheng* that reflect the material forms of written texts.

602 See a passage of the *Fengsu tong* cited in the Tang compilation *Yilin* 意林 (Wang Tianhai 王天海 and Wang Ren 王韌 annots., *Yilin jiaoshi* 意林校釋 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2014], 396). Cf. a related record in *Houhan shu* 79A.2548, where Fan Ye did not specify the material media of that collection.

603 *Houhan shu* 36.1239.

604 For an opposite point of view, cf. Shimizu, "Kami no hatsumei to Gokan no gakukaze," 4, where he regards the term *zhi* 紙 in this line as an anachronistic error that should be replaced by a word referring to silk. Shimizu al-

cator of the use of paper in literary practices prior to Cai Lun. Moreover, the record suggests a manner of collaboration between bamboo/wood and paper according to their applicability for texts with different status: Considering the *jing-zhuan* division in the hierarchy of textual authorities, as well as the different lengths of the *Chunqiu* and the *Zuozhuan*, the comparatively heavy and expensive medium (bamboo/wood) was here used to bear the older, shorter, and highly venerated *Chunqiu*, while the lighter and cheaper medium (paper) was accordingly used to bear the comparatively young, secondary, but much larger corpus of *Zuozhuan* that surrounded the *Chunqiu* as the source of its authority.

Textual accounts for paper-based practices became more prominent in contexts datable to the period from the mid-Eastern Han onward, a pattern that roughly corresponds to the invention of Cai Lun's paper in 105 CE. The earliest account for Cai Lun's paper was recorded in the *Dongguan Hanji*[605] parallel to a later version in the *Houhan shu* with only slight variation.[606] According to these two sources, Cai made use of bark, ragged fabric, and fishing net to produce his new paper as a cheaper (compared to silk), lighter (compared to bamboo), and more easily available writing medium that "since then, was commonly used with no exception" 自是莫不用. This utterance certainly does not indicate an overall replacement of writing media from bamboo, wood, and silk to paper, for they would co-exist and collaborate with each other for centuries from Cai Lun's time onward. Nevertheless, the utilization of paper was convincingly spread over a variety of areas of

---

so considers that the high expense of silk for bearing copies of a text as large as the *Zuozhuan* was not a problem in a condition with imperial supports.

605 *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 816.

606 *Houhan shu* 78.2513.

literary activities, as shown in numerous pieces of textual evidence related to the second-and-third century CE. This resulted in a series of changes in textual collection, circulation, and production among a broad spectrum of social areas from imperial institutions to a larger literate community.

From an economic point of view, the spread of paper greatly expanded the material foundation for a literary culture in many aspects. As a light, flat, and inexpensive medium, paper reduced the costs and hence accelerated the overall proliferation of texts to be read, written, produced, and circulated in a variety of circumstances from the imperial court to a larger literate community. For instance, as recorded in the *Houhan shu*, Empress Deng 鄧 (81–121 CE), well-known for her principle of parsimony, once cut down the expense in the court but maintained the supply of paper and ink only.[607] The physical and economic advantages of paper particularly mattered to the middle and lower classes. For example, in a letter to his friend, Cui Yuan 崔瑗 (77–142 CE) mentioned a corpus of ten *juan* ("scrolls/volumes") written on paper as his present, with a statement that "one as poor as me cannot use raw silk but paper" 貧不及素，但以紙耳.[608] As Shimizu Shigeru 清水茂 speculates from the case of Zheng Xuan, that Zheng's comprehensive and extensive studies of the classics must have been based on a great possession of written texts largely depending on paper considering the restriction of Zheng's economic condition.[609] In supplement to Shimizu's observation, one may also consider Zheng Xuan's long-distance traveling between his tutors and his hometown (where he finally settled down and became a master of his own academic

607 *Houhan shu* 10A.421.

608 *Yiwen leiju*, 31.560.

609 Shimizu, "Kami no hatsumei to Gokan no gakukaze," 7–8.

community).[610] The records of the Eastern Han book market[611] offer another series of clues for the impacts of paper on the exchanging value and economic cost of texts in general. Wang Chong, who lived in an age when reading and writing primarily relied on bamboo/wood and silk, had a poor possession of texts due to his poverty at his youth and, therefore, had to memorize what he read from the book market of Luoyang.[612] By contrast, the late Eastern Han scholar Liu Liang 劉梁 (d. ca. 181 CE) whose poverty at youth was akin to the case of Wang Chong, had reportedly "sold texts on market to support his own livelihood" 賣書於市以自資.[613] In Liu Liang's case, the economic values of texts owned by a poor man could be exchanged for a better financial condition; while in the case of Wang Chong, a poor man could hardly own or afford texts that he wanted, even if he was so fond of reading them. Such a comparison implies that the cost of owning texts on average had been remarkably reduced from the early through the late Eastern Han, during which paper was gradually spread over a larger literate community.

On the other hand, however, the growing surplus of written texts had been in-progress prior to the early second century CE, as first shown in the great proliferation of public and private collections and repositories of manuscripts from the Western Han onward.[614] Scholars as early as Sima Qian and Yang Xiong were already aware of the surplus of written texts at their own times, a

610 See Chapter 2, for a discussion of Zheng Xuan's life experience and intellectual life.

611 For a discussion of the commercial circulation of texts during the Han, see the following part of the present section.

612 *Houhan shu* 49.1629. For a further discussion of this case of Wang Chong from the perspective of memorization, see section 3 of the present chapter.

613 *Houhan shu* 80B.2635.

614 See Li Ruiliang, *Zhongguo gudai tushu liutong shi*, 98–104; Gu Yacheng and Zhang Fangmei, "Qin Han sijia cangshu lüeshu," 114–19.

condition that they called into questions with intellectual and ethical concerns.[615] Though the evidence is inadequate to reach a reliable approximation of the overall increase of texts across periods, the two accounts in the *Fengsu tong* and the *Houhan shu* (as previously mentioned) indicate that the imperial collection of texts increased around three times from the early reign of Emperor Guanwu to the late second century CE. Both of these two sources, however, did not suggest that such an increase was associated with the use of paper.[616] References to book market—in the most general sense—as an indicator of the growing proliferation of manuscripts-in-circulation occurred prior to the spread of paper as well.[617] According to the *Sanfu huangtu* 三輔黃圖, texts were on sale and exchanged along with other products between the candidate students gathered around the Grand Academy in the late Western Han.[618] Yang Xiong, in the *Fayan*, mentioned once the term *shusi* ("book store") as a pun referring to both a place of texts as commercial commodities and a condition of "excessiveness/unrestrainedness" (*si* 肆) of texts-in-circulation.[619] The previously mentioned case of Wang Chong at his early youth stands out as a more detailed reference to individual experience with book market in the early Eastern Han.[620]

---

615 See Chapter 2, for a detailed discussion on this issue in relation to the problem of *bo* and *yue*.

616 *Yilin jiaoshi*, 396; *Houhan shu* 79A.2548.

617 The commercial circulation and production of texts were scarcely mentioned in early Chinese sources in comparison to the extensive accounts about non-commercial circulation among institutes, archives, and private collections. Such scarcity also makes a contrast with the numerous pieces of evidence about book marketing in ancient Greece and Rome, see H. L. Pinner, *The World of Book in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1958), 22–49. Nevertheless, the scarcity of relevant evidence in early China does not necessarily indicate the inactivity of commercial circulation of texts. Instead, it should be considered with the lack of significance and values attached to public commercial activities in general.

618 *Yiwen leiju*, 88.1517. See also Li Ruiliang, *Zhongguo gudai tushu liutong shi*, 94.

619 *Fayan* 2.14 (*Fayan yishu*, 74). See also Chapter 2, for a previous discussion of this statement.

620 *Houhan shu* 49.1629.

In addition to the circulation and reproduction of texts, the utilization of paper also provided more convenient accessibility to the composition and production of essentially new writings, especially those in large volumes. As noted by Pi Xirui 皮錫瑞 (1850–1908) and later Shimizu, scholars during and after the mid-Eastern Han showed a more productive manner than their predecessors in literary compositions in terms of quantity and scale.[621] On the other hand, the spread of paper had also brought further changes to the interpersonal relationship imposed in education. The easier accessibility and reproductivity of written manuscripts in the process of literary learning weakened its reliance on oral transmission that requires a more continuous personal attachment to one's tutor;[622] by contrast, an increasingly paper-based circumstance tended to situate the practice of literary learning on a more individual basis, by which one was enabled to comparatively detached from his affiliation to specific institutional and personal authorities.

However, the great impacts of paper demonstrated in Pi Xirui and Shimizu's arguments is negotiable, for the above-mentioned socio-cultural phenomena can be traced back to the time prior to the early second century CE, presumably the earliest possible date for the spread of Cai Lun's paper. As demonstrated in previous chapters, these changes were already in-progress along with a broader spectrum of ideas, values, and practices before Cai Lun's paper first occurred.[623] In this regard, the spread of paper is best viewed as a "catalyst"—instead of the dominant motivation—among many other factors that participated in an ongoing progress of transitions with both con-

621 Pi Xirui, *Jingxue lishi*, 126–27; Shimizu, "Kami no hatsumei to Gokan no gakukaze."

622 For a traditional reference, see Pi Xirui, *Jingxue lishi*, 131. See also Shimizu, "Kami no hatsumei to Gokan no gakukaze."

623 See Chapter 2, 3, and 4.

ceptual and material impacts.

Numerous pieces of textual evidence suggest that bamboo, wood, and silk continued being used along with paper during the second and early third century CE.[624] The utilization of paper took place in a selective and context-dependent manner involved with specific social, symbolic, and aesthetic functionalities, as shown in several cases in which paper was preferred clearly not because of its inexpensiveness but something else. The case of Jia Kui's teaching of the *Zuozhuan*, as previously discussed,[625] instantiated the symbolic functionality of (early) paper in a project under imperial patronage. From the mid-Eastern Han onward, paper played important roles in epistolary and calligraphic practice[626] as often embedded with non-economic interests. Ma Rong, known for his wealthy and preference to luxury lifestyle, expressed his admiration for the layout of handwriting in a letter that he received as written on paper.[627] In the case of Cui Yuan (as previously mentioned), who was known as an excellent calligrapher of *caoshu* 草書 ("cursive writing") style at his time,[628] his replacement of raw silk (*su*) by paper as the writing medium for the letter to his friend might have entailed a consideration of aesthetics and self-performance as well. For a later reference, when Cai Yan was requested by Cao Cao to make written copies (from her memory) of texts once owned by her father Cai Yong, she asked for the supply of paper rather than silk as her writing

624 See Tsien Tsuen-hsuin, *Written on Bamboo and Silk*, 150.

625 *Houhan shu* 36.1239.

626 For two scholarly references about the use of paper in epistolary writings, see Knechtges, "From the Eastern Han through the Western Jin (AD 25–317)," 118; Richter, *Letter and Epistolary Culture*, 17–26.

627 *Yiwen leiju*, 31.560.

628 See Wei Heng 衛恒, *Siti shushi* 四體書勢, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 21.621.

medium, in order to transcribe her memory in a specific calligraphic style *zhengcao* 真草).[629] According to these cases, the preference to paper sometimes involved the aesthetic and social values of texts as a display of calligraphy, a category of art that gained prominence as a way of manifesting one's versatility especially from the mid-Eastern Han onward. Up to the late Eastern Han, paper had likely been widely treated as an ideal medium for calligraphy,[630] not merely because it was physically flat, smooth, and easy-to-write, but due to its inexpensiveness that could supply a great deal of practices as necessarily needed by a fine art. The aesthetic dimension of paper was also shown in the further improvement of papermaking craft—for example, the famous Zuo Bo 左伯 paper[631]—in the late second century CE. The non-economic interest in paper was best demonstrated in the case of Cao Pi, who once sent two written copies of his own works respectively on raw silk and paper during his reign as a ruler, as two separated gifts to Sun Quan 孫權 (182–252 CE) and his adviser Zhang Zhao 張昭 (156–236 CE).[632] These different treatments instantiated the collaboration between writing media that was economically unnecessary but socially and symbolically meaningful. The expensive copy on silk sent to Sun Quan as the lord of Wu was a proper choice in terms of diplomatic prosperity; while the copy on paper sent to Zhang Zhao not merely corresponded to the political hierarchy between the two receivers, but symbolically presented Cao Pi's self-identification as an elite of a good intellectual taste, who acted with performative modesty to communicate with a man (both an official and a scholar) regardless of his lower power and rank.

629 *Houhan shu* 84.2801.

630 Hua Rende, *Zhongguo shufa shi: liang Han juan*, 218–19.

631 For a brief introduction of Zuo Bo's 左伯 paper, see Hua Rende, *Zhongguo shufa shi: liang Han juan*, 219.

632 *Wuli*, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 2.89.

To summarize, the various acts and representations of paper-based practices took places in a world filled with increasingly complicated interactions between different materials and human agencies. Just like those written and inscribed on bamboo, silk, metal, and stone, a piece of writing on paper presents itself as a condensation of both physical features and non-physical values. The spread of paper, therefore, cannot be simply reduced as an outcome of economic, utilitarian interests, but is better considered also as a matter of social, symbolic, and sometimes aesthetic significance as well. Not denying the great influence of paper on the expansion of the material foundation for a literary culture, the impact can be properly evaluated only within a broader socio-cultural context across a longer time span.

This, in other words, is to consider how the reception, production, and circulation of texts and knowledge had already been oriented toward a condition of overall proliferation and multi-centered distribution—not merely in terms of quantity but also in terms of diversity and intensity—for more than one century prior to the early first century CE, when Cai Lun's paper was invented. These foregoing observations and analyses altogether downplay an over-simplified notion of material determinism, one that takes the occurrence and spread of Cai Lun's paper as the single most monumental turning point which fundamentally changed the history of Chinese literary and intellectual culture. As a matter of fact, it is not the act of writing-on-paper but the act of "writing" itself that manifests a gesture of exploring the surplus of meaning and experience that, as rightly summarized by M. C. A. MacDonald, takes place oftentimes "not in the practical, material, and

economic spheres with which we are accustomed to."[633]

5.2. Beyond the Orality-versus-Writing Dichotomy

Far before the technology of writing—in its narrow, literal sense—came into existence in a small number of human societies and among an even smaller minority of members in them, the communications between the dead, the living, and the not yet living had taken places in the forms of gestures, symbols, and language-speaking. Even for societies that succeeded to develop their elaborated writing systems and a complex of socio-cultural entities and organizations—religions, schools, canons, social classes, political institutions, etc.—largely based upon or built within them,[634] or for society members who acquired varying degrees of literacy and multiple accesses to writing and reading, the storage, transmission, and proliferation of knowledge, information, and meanings were heavily and inevitably relying on orality and memory. The interactions between verbal or linguistic phenomena in various media and forms, simply put, exist before, during, and after all relevant technological revolutions such as the spread of paper and that of printing.

The complexity involved in the acts and traces of cross-media interactions rejects a reductive notion of writing as merely a written copy secondary to speech. For one thing, there is arguably—according to Derrida—a primary concept of "writing" beyond a narrow literal sense but resting with all that gives rise to a gesture of making traces and inscriptions across different me-

633 M. C. A. MacDonald, "Literacy in an Oral Environment," in *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour of Alan R. Millard*, ed. Piotr Bienkowski, Christopher Mee, and Elizabeth Slater (New York & London: T & T Clark, 2005), 81–82.

634 See Jack Goody, *The Power of the Written Tradition* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000), 132–51.

dia.[635] For another, even if one takes writing primarily as an expressive form of language, it does not serve as a mere complement or supplement but a transformer that, once interiorized, had begun to fundamentally re-programed language in both spoken and imaginary forms.[636] Meanwhile, the complexity of interactions and mutual involvement should fairly downplay another prevalent notion, one that reduces the irreducible into a linear model of evolution—and hence a model of hierarchy and teleology—that describes either a given literary culture in particular or the human society in general from its presumably "oral" or semi-oral stage to that technologized and upgraded by the "written."[637] The inquiry into this complex should neither privilege a specific skill, media, or form with priority nor reinforce the orality-versus-writing dichotomy by essentializing them as two modalities opposed to each other, which *de facto* reproduces—albeit often unwittingly—a logocentric configuration of writing as a sign of sign—namely, an exterior, derivate, and representative signifier of speech that is presumably linked to the signified truth.[638]

In these regards, the investigation of any literary culture at its all historical and technological stages should deal with the irreducible complexity involved in the mutual dependence and interactions between orality, literacy, memory, and beyond. Speaking of early Chinese literature, a move toward this orientation in a comparative frame was made in 1960s and 70s that attempted to apply

---

635 Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 6–10, esp. 9. See also Goody, *The Power of the Written Tradition*, 109–18, for a harsh—but somehow mistaken—critique on Derrida's extended conceptualization of "writing" and beyond.

636 Walter J. Ong has argued extensively about the function of writing not as a secondary complement to oral speech but a transformer of verbalization, as well as an interiorized technology in human consciousness. See Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, passim., esp. 81–82.

637 Such a notion is widely employed or suggested, for example, in Jack Goody, *The Interface between the Written and the Oral* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); *The Power of the Written Tradition*, 109–51.

638 See Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, passim., esp. 1–93.

the Parry-Lord Oral Theory to a series of *Shijing* odes and music-related poems categorized as *yuefu* for their presumably oral nature of composition,[639] a paradigm that is now considered as inapplicable to the studies of transmitted early Chinese poetry.[640] In the past decades, a considerable range of studies had laid their focuses on a broader spectrum of phenomena and activities in early and early medieval China regarding their oral-aural, memorial, and written natures, as well as their mutual dependence and interactions. These efforts are not exceptional but fully related and potentially contributive to a global range of studies that shed lights on the shared questions on the table.

One of the many approaches is to investigate the changing status of writing in relation with other verbal skills throughout early China, by means of the examination of a wide range of relevant concepts, evidence, and textual data.[641] As previously mentioned, based upon an analytical discussion of lexical items related to *wen*, Martin Kern argues for a diachronic transition from the late Western Han through the mid-Eastern Han that literary text gradually became a "main emblem

639 See C. H. Wang, *The Bell and the Drum: Shih Ching as Formulaic Poetry in an Oral Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974); Hans Frankel, "The Formulaic Language of the Chinese Ballad 'Southeast Fly the Peacocks'," *Academic Sinica* 39 (1969): 219–44.

640 For a powerful criticism of this research paradigm, see Charles Egan, "Were Yueh-fu Ever Folk Songs? Reconsidering the Relevance of Oral Theory and Balladry Analogies," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 22 (2000): 31–66.

641 Here I tend to be relatively sketchy about a fruitful series of scholarship in which the primary focus is laid on the nature and features of "writing" as a practical skill or a phenomenon of literacy on itself and embodied in substantial artifacts. For some of the most representative works in recent years, see, for example, Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, *Wenzi xue gaiyao (xiuding ben)* 文字學概要（修訂本） (Beijing: Shangwu yinshu guan, 2013); Imre Galambos, *Orthography of Early Chinese Writing: Evidence from Newly Excavated Manuscripts (490–221 BC)* (Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, Department of East Asian Studies, 2006); Tomiya, *Monjo gyosei no Kan teikoku*; Martin Kern, "Offices of Writing and Reading in the *Rituals of Zhou*," in *Statecraft and Classical Learning: The Rituals of Zhou in East Asian History*, ed. Benjamin Elman and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 64–93; Li Feng 李峰 and David Branner eds., *Writing and Literacy in Early China* (Settle & London: University of Washington Press, 2011); Richter, *The Embodied Text*.

of culture."[642] Also focusing on specific crucial concept, Mark Csikszentmihalyi and Michael Nylan revisit the notion *jia* ("school" or "scholastic lineage"), suggesting that its took a shift during the Eastern Han from a group of thinkers sharing specific opinions and socio-cultural agendas to a lineage regulated by continuous affiliation to specific textual tradition and textual authority.[643] In the past two decades, Nylan herself has written extensively on relevant topics, arguing that the late Western Han through the mid-Eastern Han was the transitional period during which the authority of written texts along with a broad spectrum of text-based practices remarkably gained prominence that fundamentally surpassed its inferior status compared to ritual, music, and oral display in earlier stage.[644] These studies collectively laid focuses on the one-and-half century from the late Western Han onward, when text-based practices and text-based authorities gradually gained prominence and a higher status with socio-cultural significance.

Another fruitful series of scholarship in the past decades has dealt with the involvements of oral-aural experience over the courses of the formation, transmission, and reception of texts in early China. The textual presentation of speeches or oral communications was one among the most preeminent phenomena located in almost every major category of writing. This is shown in numerous textual elements such as the structural settings of speeches and dialogues, the introductory formulae of citations and quotations (mostly in terms of *yue* 曰 ["to say"]), as well as the in-

642 Kern, "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon," esp. 48–76. For the quotation, see 88–89.

643 Csikszentmihalyi and Nylan, "Constructing Lineages and Inventing Traditions."

644 See Nylan, "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han"; "Toward an Archaeology of Writing: Text, Ritual, and the Culture of Public Display in the Classical Period (475 B. C. E.–220 C. E.)," in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 3–49; "Classics without Canonization"; *Yang Xiong and the Pleasures of Reading*; "Manuscript Culture in Late Western Han."

dicators of aural perceptions (mostly in terms of *wen* 聞 ["to hear"]). With indebtedness to earlier studies of oral elements involved in texts such as *Zuozhuan*, *Guoyu* 國語, *Lunyu*, *Mozi* 墨子, and so on,[645] the same line of inquiry is now benefitting from increasingly diversified databases of research objects that cover a variety of literary forms across the archives of transmitted sources, unearthed manuscripts, and also inscriptions. For a sketch of representative works contributed to these major categories, David C. Schaberg, for example, suggests that the formation of the *Zuozhuan* and the *Guoyu* underwent a long-term progress of semi-oral transmission and circulation, which specifically downplays the conventional assumption that the speeches located in those texts derived directly from the instant records of the respective historical moments in which those speeches were situated.[646] The *Shu* citations in the Warring States, he argues, was likewise entangled with a semi-oral circumstance of transmission and appropriation.[647] Martin Kern investigates a considerable range of oral, performative elements in a series of early Chinese texts, with a specific focus on rhymed verses. The Zhou bronze inscriptions, for example, were arguably embedded with multiple dimensions of visual, vocal, and linguistic values that constituted "a complex interplay

645 See Kaizuka Shigeki 貝塚茂樹, "Rongo no seiritsu" 論語の成立, in *Chūgoku kodai no denshō* 中國古代の傳承, *Kaizuka Shigeki chosaku shū* 貝塚茂樹著作集, vol. 5 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1976), 273–90; "Kokugo ni arawareta setsuwa no keishiki" 国語に現れた説話の形式, ibid., 291–312; "Kodia ni okeru rekishi kijutsu keitai no hensen" 古代における歴史記述形態の変遷, in *Chūgoku no shigeku* 中國の史學, *Kaizuka Shigeki chosaku shū*, vol. 7 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1977), 201–30; A. C. Graham, *Disputers of the Tao: Philosophical Argument in Ancient China* (La Salle: Open Court, 1989), 35.

646 Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 315–24. This argument is also in response to Yuri Pines, who takes a more positive stance for the reliability of the speeches in the *Zuozhuan*. See Pines, "Intellectual Change in the Chunqiu Period: The Reliability of the Speeches in the 'Zuo Zhuan' as sources of Chunqiu Intellectual History," *Early China* 22 (1997): 77–132. For an early scholarly attention paid onto the recurring patterns of speeches in the *Zuozhuan* with also extensive references to other Chinese and non-Chinese literary sources, see Qian Zhongshu, *Guan zhui bian*, vol. 1, 161–248. See also Yang Bojun, "Qian yan" 前言, *Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu*, 1–56, on the major problems of the formation, transmission, and textual criticism of the *Zuozhuan*.

647 Schaberg, "Speaking of Documents."

between the oral and the written performance of text."[648] Likewise, he argues, that a considerable proportion of *Shijing* odes and Western Han *fu* were embedded with the features of "performance text" suitable for oral displaying.[649] Another series of studies by K. E. Brashier, based upon both transmitted sources and stele inscriptions, investigates a broad range of oral-memorial practices within the scheme of "memorial culture" in early China, with also analytical examination of a set of literary features that constitute what he calls "memorial texts."[650] For a recent study on early imperial China, Charles Sanft extends the scheme of discussions by considering a community with comparatively lower, intermediate literacy and social status, as well as examining a broader range of interactions with texts not necessarily with direct involvement of reading and writing but entangled with the reciprocal cooperation between literacy, orality, and memory.[651]

The studies of unearthed manuscripts concern more specifically the problems of oral and textual elements involved in the procedures of manuscript production. Based on his analytical examination of the graphic variants of the *Shi* found between manuscripts and received version, Martin Kern argues that manuscript production in early China did not fit into the genealogical paradigm of *stemma codicum*, a Lachmannian model of textual criticism based on the assumption of visual copying from text to text on a chronological axis of lineal reproduction. Instead, he argues that there was no single "written original" behind the various, mutually independent written instan-

---

648 Kern, "The Performance of Writing in Western Zhou China," quote 150.

649 Martin Kern, "*Shijing* Songs as Performance Texts: A Case Study of "Chu ci" (Thorny Caltrop)," *Early China* 25 (2000): 49–111.

650 See Brashier, "Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Stelae"; *Public Memory in Early China*, 1–57.

651 Sanft, *Literate Community in Early Imperial China*, esp. 1–27.

tiations of what is essentially the same text; and more specifically, considering that the vast majority of graphic variants were phonologically closed to each other regardless of their different written forms, the transmission and reproduction of the *Shi* in early China was remarkably depending on orality and memory but to a lesser extent on the practice of visual copying from specific textual models.[652] The manuscript evidence of philosophical and argumentative texts shed lights on the issues of orality and memory as well. As Dirk Meyer proposes, the features and functions of individual textual modules found in the manuscripts of what he defines as "context-dependent" texts are indicative of a now-lost oral discourse underlying the process of meaning-construction; and the physical procedure of manuscript production was to a larger extent based on oral-aural transmission as well.[653] Another noteworthy opinion, as represented by Edward L. Shaughnessy, is to highlight textual evidence that is better explained as the consequence of visual copying from specific textual models, as well as to emphasize the status of "writing" and the authority of written models of specific texts.[654] The strongest claims that Shaughnessy makes, in the case of the *Shi* (against Kern), are that "writing could be—and was—involved during each step in the creation of the *Poetry*,

652 See first, Kern, "Methodological Reflections," esp. 149–50, 171–72; and "The Odes in Excavated Manuscripts," in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 149–93, for more specific examination and statistics of the variants. For a further discussion, see "'Xi shuai' ('Cricket') and Its Consequences," 49–69. For an analytical introduction of Lachmann's method, see Glenn W. Most, "What Is a Critical Edition?" in *Ars Edendi Lecture Series, vol. IV*, ed. Barbara Crostini, Gunilla Iversen, and Brian M. Jensen (Stockholm: Stockholm University Press), 162–80, esp. 174–78.

653 See Meyer, *Philosophy on Bamboo*, esp. 150, 202, 227–28.

654 See Edward L. Shaughnessy, "Unearthed Documents and the Question of the Oral Versus Written Nature of the *Classic of Poetry*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 75 (2015): 331–375; "Zheng wengong wen taibo yu Zhongguo gudai wenxian chaoxie de wenti" 《鄭文公問太伯》與中國古代文獻抄寫的問題, *Jianbo* 簡帛 14 (2017): 11–15.

from initial composition through transmission to final recension,"[655] and that the *Shi* still remains its "Zhou clothing"[656] in the specific sense of staying within the textual genealogy derived from their written models in the Zhou (against William Baxter, who metaphorically describes the received *Shi* as "a Zhou text in Han clothing" based on phonological examination.[657]

It is useful to start with a "manuscript," now, not as any existing sample that we happen to *have* (not to mention how many steps of reconstruction it has gone through until we *have* it) but as a piece of any imagined one. For any single manuscript, the process of its formation certainly falls into a wide spectrum of possibilities. A manuscript could be either a pure product or a hybrid of one or more of the following conditions: a practice of visually copying a pre-existing textual model; and an act of writing-something-down according to what one heard, memorized, recollected, or even composed before or during the process of writing. To be more specific, the making of a written text could at once involve the copying of another written text, the crystallization of oral and aural experience, impromptu composition, memory of pre-existing materials, as well as all kinds of contingency that are brought into the present moment of "writing" or "writing-something-down." If a manuscript was indeed a copy of or just consisting of something copied from another one, it would have embodied the uncertainty and plurality of possibilities involved in that previous text as well. Namely, a manuscript is the embodiment of not a single but multiple layers of elements be-

655 Shaughnessy, "Unearthed Documents," 339.

656 Shaughnessy, "Unearthed Documents," 375.

657 William Baxter, "Zhōu and Hàn Phonology in the *Shijing*," in *Studies in the Historical Phonology of Asian Language*, ed. William G. Boltz and Michael C. Shapiro (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991), 30.

yond the closest written or unwritten model(s)—if any[658]—it was directly based upon or copied from.[659] Therefore, the question is not only about the making of a *specific* manuscript as an idiosyncratic artifact presenting itself as an object, but what can be inferred about the multiple factors in a larger context prior to the closure of its own physical formation.

Precisely because of this, as well as the growing supply of newly discovered materials, it certainly goes to no end to collect positive evidence for either oral-memorial or text-based practices embodied in early Chinese literary artifacts. Meanwhile, one should take caution with the risk of over-simplified dichotomy involved in the claims for the priority or centrality of a specific verbal or literary skill vis-à-vis the others. As a matter of fact, the involvements of oral, memorial, and writing elements could vary in type and degree among texts with different forms, usages, and compositional procedures, all of which can be neither diminished into an orality-versus-writing dichotomy[660] nor captured by a discourse of historical evolution from the former to the latter. Instead, such a complexity calls for an inclusive model that is conceptually applicable to a broad spectrum of acts, thoughts, and traces found in both manuscripts and transmitted texts.

This leads to a considerable range of utterances and expressions in which oral, memorial, and text-based practices altogether conform to an inside-outside paradigm, as well as an assumption of

---

658 There are indeed—and not surprisingly will continue to be—positive cases suggesting a manner of visual copying from one manuscript to another. See, for just one example, Matthias L. Richter, "Faithful Transmission or Creative Change: Tracing Modes of Manuscript Production from the Material Evidence," *Asiatische Studien/Etudes Asiatique* 63 (2009): 897, 904–05.

659 This is made particularly clear by Martin Kern, in "Methodological Reflections," 171–72.

660 For a recent case study that prompts new reflections on the orality-versus-writing dichotomy as a falsifiable notion, see Weingarten, "Intertextuality and Memory in Early Chinese Writings," where the author suggests a context-dependent manner of mediating verbal memory into specific types of discourses in the process of composition.

cross-media commensurability and interconnectivity. Such notions constitute a sharable foundation, instead of a battlefield, for the various actualizations of various literary capabilities. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the inside-outside paradigm was conceptually applied in Han-Wei discourses to configure the recycling and transforming process between learning and writing, reception and production, as well as the cultivation and performance of erudition on the individual basis.[661] Taking one's literary productions—or metaphorically, one's "writing"—potentially as a textual display of one's erudition, the various acts and traces of oral presentations—speeches, recitations, communications, and so on—can be likewise taken as the orally exteriorized manifestation of one's scholarly cultivated "inside." Consider, for example, the connection between two series of concepts and utterances prominent during and after the Han: the first centering on the term *yan* ("speaking/words"), which entails a spectrum of meanings about spoken words and oral presentations; and the second related to *wen*,[662] *shu* ("written words"), and later *bi* 筆 ("brush") that in many cases stand for the written forms of one's "outside."

The concept *yan*, just like *wen*, was not limited to the meaning as verbal expression on a single dimension. Though the most natural understanding of *yan* is constantly based on its semantic root "to speak" or "speech," it could be—and it was often—used broadly and analogically without specifying a specific oral or written form. For this semantic inclusiveness and ambiguity, suffice it to mention a couple of early examples as follows: the notion of *liyan* ("establish one's words") in

661 See Chapter 4, esp. sections 2 and 3.

662 See Chapter 4, esp. section 3, for a detailed investigation of *wen* and *wen*-related concepts.

the *Zuozhuan* as an approach to acquire "unfadability" (*buxiu*);[663] the saying attributed to Kongzi in the *Lunyu* about the importance of studying "poetry" or the *Shi*, that "one who does not learn about poetry (*shi*) has nothing to speak of/with" 不學詩，無以言;[664] and that in the "Great Preface" (*daxu*) of the *Maoshi*, that poetry is the verbalized form (*yan*) corresponding to the inner condition of *zhi* ("intention/aspiration") stored within one's *xin* ("heart").[665] During and after the Han, *yan* showed applicability also in contexts more specifically about the textual crystallization of words, as shown in the recurring expression "accomplishing an individual authority of words" 成一家之言 from Sima Qian to the later Eastern Han.[666] For a similar use of *yan*, see Ban Gu's appraisal for those after Kongzi's demise who "have their words (*yan*) contributing to the world" 其言有補於世, in which *yan* stood for the wise men's words that were presumably accessible in texts.[667] A more delicate use of *yan* conflated with writing can be found in Yang Xiong's discussion about *ci* 辭 ("literary/verbal utterances"), in which he stated that one ought to make his *ci* match the *shi* 事 ("actual condition"), according to the principle that "perfected words and perfected appearance are the embellishments of virtue" 足言足容，德之藻也.[668]

Throughout early China, the composite, inclusive, and flexible semantic nature of *yan*, akin to the case of *wen*, illustrate a shared linguistic and conceptual foundation for verbal/literary practices

663 *Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu*, 1088. For a previous discussion of the notion of *buxiu* and its echoes during the Han through the early third century CE, see Chapter 4.

664 *Lunyu* 16.13 (*Lunyu jishi*, 1168).

665 *Shisanjing zhushu*, 269–70. See also Note 497, for more references to previous scholarship.

666 As previously discussed in Chapter 4.

667 *Hanshu* 36.1972. See also Chapters 2 and 4, for more detailed discussions of this statement.

668 *Fayan* 2.7 (*Fayan yishu*, 60).

regardless of their physical actualizations mediated in either oral or written form. Namely, *yan*, just like *wen*, was recognized as an exteriorized manifestation that carries out specific inner conditions via a displayable form. This is specifically showcased in a constellation of utterances from the late Western Han through the early third century CE that, on the one hand, involved a sense of oral-written division, specifying *yan*—or other terms with *yan* as a semantic component, as shown below—as the verbalization of specific inner condition embodied in a spoken form. On the other hand, however, the similar structures and parallelism shared by these utterances tend to liberate the two dimensions from a rigid oral-written dichotomy, bringing them into a synthesis conforming to the "inside-outside" paradigm. For instance—

Fayan 5.13
言，心聲也　　Speaking (*yan*) is that by which the heart is expressed by voice;
文，心畫也[669]　　Writing (*wen*) is that by which the heart is expressed by drawing.

Lunheng
出口爲言　　What come out of the mouth are the spoken words (*yan*);
集札爲文[670]　　What come together as textual records are the written pieces (*wen*).

Tombstone inscription for Zhao Kuan 趙寬 (d. 180 CE)
吟詠成章　　What he [Zhao Kuan] intoned and chanted have made literary passages;
彈翰爲法[671]　　What he finger-played with brushes have become exemplary models.

A quote of Cao Zhi in the *Sanguo zhi*

669 *Fayan* 5.13 (*Fayan yishu*, 160).
670 *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 1150.
671 *Hanbei quanji*, 1645; *Hanbei jishi*, 434.

言出爲論　　The words (*yan*) flow out and become discourses,
下筆成章[672]　　The brush writes down and make literary passages/manifestations.

Cao Zhi, in his eulogy for Wang Can
發言可詠　　What he [Wang Can] spoke (*yan*) out was worth chanting;
下筆成篇[673]　　What he wrote down with brush turned into literary pieces.

Yang Xiu, in his letter to Cao Zhi
成誦在心　　[The composition] was chantable within your heart,
借書於手[674]　　and it was written down by the aid of your hand.

These utterances are drawn from a variety of materials including philosophical proses, tombstone inscriptions, historiographic compilations, eulogies, and letters. All of them were structured in the form of symmetrical couplet consisting of two tetrasyllabic lines, which respectively presented the oral and the written dimensions of verbalization (in a stable sequence that the "oral" precedes the "written"). The first half of a couplet as such was normally phrased with the term *yan* or sometimes a verb such as *yin* 吟, *yong* 詠, and *song* that denoted a vague range of practices "to chant" and "to intone" (even just in an imaginary way, as especially in Yang Xiu's description about Cao Zhi),[675] and the latter half with another series of lexical options such as *wen*, *shu*, and *bi*. This recurring pattern of expression involved, first, a conceptual division between oral and written manifestations of specific verbal contents. Meanwhile, the symmetrical structure implied a positive, homogenous point of view in which the two dimensions were evenly synthesized in a coherent

672 *Sanguo zhi* 19.557.
673 *Wenxuan*, 2435.
674 *Dianlüe*, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 19.560.
675 For a detailed discussion of the term *song* 誦, see section 3 of the present chapter.

unity. To be specific, these proverbial utterances situate orality and writing—on the individual basis—as a pair of mutually commensurable and correlated media, sharing a positive assumption of a process from the inside toward outside. With this framework, the "inside" is *de facto* an imagined subjectivity that contains a precondition of either spoken or written words, a body of utterances equipped with but not yet realized via specific verbal or literary skills. Such a positive notion is, therefore, contrary to the also symmetrical but negative statement made in the "Xi ci," where *shu* ("written words") does not "fully [express]" (*jin* 盡) *yan* ("spoken words") in a way akin to that *yan* does not "fully [express]" *yi* ("ideas").[676]

The notion of cross-media commensurability, along with the inside-outside schematization of the process of self-manifestation, jointly constituted a paradigm—namely, a constellation of ideas, beliefs, values, and exemplary models[677]—beyond the spoken and the written, a framework applicable to a diverse range of exterior human traces including but not limited to appearance, performance, music, singing, dancing, ritual behaviors, and so on. Such inclusiveness was demonstrated in a series of early sources such as the *Lunyu*, the "Yue ji" 樂記 ("Record of Music") of the *Liji* 禮記, and the *Huainanzi*.[678] What makes this spectacularly clear, then, is a discourse made by Yang Xiong in *Fayan* 9.7, where Yang appropriated the classical *wen-zhi* 文-質 division borrowed from

676 *Shisanjing zhushu*, 82. See also Note 588.

677 Corresponding to Kuhn's 1969 revision of his definition of "paradigm" as "the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community." See Kuhn, *Postscript-1969*, in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd Ed, 175. See also Note 470, for an earlier clarification of my use of the term "paradigm."

678 See Note 515 for the references.

the *Lunyu*[679]—which itself was underwritten by an inside-outside paradigm—within a larger schematization of media, forms, and phenomena, all of which were configured as the "exterior manifestations" (*wen*) of specific "interior substances" (*zhi*)—

> *Fayan* 9.7
> 聖人，文質者也。車服以彰之，藻色以明之，聲音以揚之，詩書以光之。籩豆不陳，玉帛不分，琴瑟不鏗，鐘鼓不抗，則吾無以見聖人矣。[680]
> The sage is the one who makes exterior manifestation (*wen*) of the interior substance (*zhi*). By carriages and clothes, it is manifested; by ornaments and colors, it is demonstrated; by voices and sounds, it is announced; by poetry and document, it is illuminated. If the sacrificial vessels are not displayed, the jade and silk are not distributed, the zither and harp are not struck, and the bell and drum are not beaten, then I have no way to recognize the sage.

According to this passage, the interior substance (*zhi*) can be recognized and deciphered only when it is properly exteriorized with both perceivability and performativity, and the way it is exteriorized and perceived—in terms of *zhang* 彰, *ming*, *yang* 揚, *guang* 光—is transcendent above the boundaries of material intermediacy but navigated toward its various ends of manifestations. The terms *shishu* 詩書 and *shengying* 聲音, a pair of synecdoche of *wen* performed through the media of texts and sounds, are reciprocally correlated with a wider variety of visual and aural forms, which altogether constitute an extended realm of exteriorizations of the retroactively imagined and con-

679 *Lunyu* 6.18 (*Lunyu jishi*, 400). The *wen-zhi* division then turned into one the most influential conceptual frameworks employed in early medieval Chinese literary criticism. For relevant primary sources, see *Shipin jizhu*, 39, 97; *Songshu* 67.1778; *Wenxin diaolong zhu*, 671; Xiao Tong, "Da Xiangdong wang qiu wenji ji *Shiyuan yinghua* shu" 答湘東王求文集及詩苑英華書, in Yu Yuan 郁沅 and Zhang Minggao 張明高 eds., *Wei Jin Nanbeichao wenlun xuan* 魏晉南北朝文論選 (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1996), 331. For relevant scholarship, see Wang Yunxi 王運熙, "Wen zhi lun yu Zhongguo zhonggu wenxue piping" 文質論與中國中古文學批評, *Wenxue yichan*, No. 5 (2002): 4–10.

680 *Fayan yishu*, 291.

structed substance of interiority. For a comparable and even more encompassing synthesis underwritten by the same inside-outside paradigm, see what Xu Gan proposed in his *Zhonglun* (the "Yi ji" 藝紀 ["Synthesis of Arts"] chapter)—

> 育材其猶人之於藝乎？既脩其質，且加其文。文質著，而後體全。……君子者，表裏稱而本末度者也。故言貌稱乎心志，藝能度乎德行。美在其中，而暢於四支。純粹內實，光輝外著。孔子曰："君子恥有其服而無其容，恥有其容而無其辭，恥有其辭而無其行。"故寶玉之山，土木必潤；盛德之士，文藝必衆。[681]
>
> Is the process of cultivating a person similar to that by which one deals with arts/artificial skills (*yi*)? Once the interior substance (*zhi*) is refined, do improve one's exterior manifestation (*wen*); once the exterior manifestation and interior substance are both set up, one's totality is accomplished. … A noble man is one whose external and internal conditions mutually match, and whose root and branches are mutually measurable. Therefore, his words and appearance match his heart and intention, and his artificial skills and capabilities can be measured by his virtue and behavior. Beauty/goodness is stored within the core and hence expressed through the four limbs. Be purity his inside is substantialized with, and brilliance his outside is manifested as. Kongzi said, "A noble man is ashamed of owning the cloth yet without the [corresponding] appearance, owning the appearance yet without [corresponding] verbal/literary utterance, or owning the verbal/literary utterance yet without corresponding behavior. Therefore, for a mountain with precious jade, its soil and woods are certainly fertile; for a man with rich virtue, his exterior manifestations and artificial skills are certainly multitudinous.

For clarity, the inside-outside paradigm encoded into this passage can be schematized as such—

Synopsis 5
Inside-toward-Outside Paradigm in the *Zhonglun*, "Yi ji"

Inside	Outside
zhi 質 (interior substance)	*wen* 文 (exterior manifestation)
li 裏 (internal condition)	*biao* 表 (external condition)
ben 本 (root)	*mo* 末 (branch)

681 *Zhonglun jiegu*, 115.

xinzhi 心志 (heart and intention)
dexing 德行 (virtue and behavior)
zhong 中 (core)
nei 內 (inside)
de 德 (virtue)

yanmao 言貌 (words and appearance)
yineng 藝能 (artificial skill and capability)
sizhi 四支 (four limbs)
wai 外 (outside)
wenyi 文藝 (cultured pattern and artificial skill)

* In addition to Xu Gan's own words, this passage also incorporates a quote of Kongzi (as seen in the *Liji*[682]) that juxtaposes *fu* 服 ("dressing"), *rong* 容 ("appearance"), *ci* ("verbalization"), and *xing* 行 ("behavior") altogether as the exterior manifestations commensurable to each other that present the being of a *junzi*.

This conceptual schematization consists of a constellation of mutually correlated concepts covering a spectrum of human traces in terms of physiology, physiognomy, ethics, language, and artificial skills. *Yan* ("words"), as juxtaposed with *mao* 貌 ("appearance"), is situated as the verbal manifestation outside of the corresponding inside of one's *xinzhi* 心志 ("heart and intention"); and *wen*, with its context-dependent flexibility, appears twice—the first as the exterior manifestation of one's *zhi* ("interior substance") and the second conflated with the term *yi* 藝 ("art/artificial skill"), referring to an unspecified range of cultured techniques that exteriorize one's inner beauty of virtue. The overall schematization offers a conceptual but also linguistic context, in which a narrow dichotomy such as that between orality and writing makes no sense but must yield to a more correlative understanding. As a matter of fact, from Yang Xiong to Xu Gan, the two dimensions were performed as commensurable to each other within an encompassing paradigm that synthesized a wider range of exterior manifestations, which altogether enriched the performability of the corresponding "inside" as an imagined construction. The specific items schematized in this in-

682 *Shisanjing zhushu*, 1640.

side-outside paradigm, on the one hand, were flexibly dependent on the ever-changing contexts. On the other hand, they were tightly associated with the notion of *wen*, which itself was embedded with a cross-media potential of meaning-production.

Considering the general applicability of the inside-outside paradigm with cross-media commensurability, it is possible to reach a better understanding of these recurring expressions that symmetrically juxtaposed and synthesized the oral and written performances from the late Western Han onward. From a diachronic point of view, the recurrence of these utterances also corresponds to the period that witnessed the growing prominence of individual erudition; and the specific figures related to these utterances—Yang Xiong, Wang Chong, Zhao Kuan,[683] Wang Can, Cao Zhi, and Yang Xiu—were precisely recognized by their contemporaries and posterities as the personal embodiments of this intellectual model. This condition of overlapping can be hardly explained as a result of coincidence but urges a further inquiry into the reciprocal interactions between literacy, orality, and memory.

5.3. Reciprocal Interactions between Orality, Memory, and Literacy

To begin with, there exists a series of lexical items indicative of the complex of changing realities of orality, memory, and literacy over the period under focus. The following table presents the distributional patterns of four of them in major historiographic compilations. They include, first, *feng* ("to recite") and *song* ("to chant [in a form of recitation]") as a pair of indicators of oral represen-

683 See *Hanbei quanji*, 1645, and *Hanbei jishi*, 434, for the commemorative description of Zhao Kuan's life and persona.

tations of specific verbal contents based on one's memorization and hence recitation, with or without visible text as a source or an aid. The other two terms are *du* ("to read [aloud]") and *lan* ("to view"), which, by comparison, stood for the practice to visually "read" a written text either aloud or silently. Meanwhile, I suggest not taking every lexical data as straightforward evidence for a physical practice with full historicity, for the descriptions of human activities are overwhelming metaphorical based on a loosely accepted notion of commensurability between different media. Consider, for instance, how naturally in today's language people claim that they "wrote" something that was not "written" but "typed" in a computer. That said, to make such an ambivalence less concerned, the gap between having and *not* having a physical text is, to some extent, more fundamental than that between writing media and digital devices.

Table 14
Feng, *Song*, *Du*, and *Lan* in Four Historiographic Compilations

Hanshu

	Terms	Total	W. H.	W. H. C.
諷	*Feng*	4	3	3
誦	*Song*	59	43	27
讀	*Du*	42	40	5
覽	*Lan*	24	20	14

Dongguan Hanji

	Terms	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
諷	*Feng*	1	1	0
誦	*Song*	24	24	3
讀	*Du*	16	15	0
覽	*Lan*	13	13	1

Houhan shu

	Terms	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
諷	*Feng*	9	8	2
誦	*Song*	63	60	18
讀	*Du*	51	44	11
覽	*Lan*	43	41	12

Sanguo zhi

	Terms	Total	T. K.	T. K. C.
諷	*Feng*	0	0	0
誦	*Song*	14	12	1
讀	*Du*	34	27	6
覽	*Lan*	29	25	14

* The numbers of samples are only drawn from contexts in which a term identifiably refers to oral representation or a practice of reading; a phrase like "viewing the past and the present" (*lan gujin* 覽古今), if located in a context related to textual objects, is included in my results as well. I have excluded samples such as *du* used as noun or *lan* as "seeing" or "viewing" something irrelevant to texts.

Before any useful generalization can be drawn from the distributional patterns of these lexical items, their meanings, usages, and implications are not without ambivalence and controversy. Oral presentations in terms of *feng* and *song* (especially *song*) constituted an essential part of literary learning and cultural transmission in early China, as widespread over early sources in a variety of contexts about education, examination, communication, performance, and bureaucratic recruitment from pre-imperial and early imperial times.[684] Textual evidence in my tables includes a great

684 For some of the most representative examples, see the *Zhouli* 周禮, for the juxtaposition of *feng* 諷 and *song* within the six modes of *yueyu* 樂語 attributed to the educational system in Zhou aristocratic society (*Zhouli zhushu* 周禮注疏, *Shisanjing zhushu*, 787); *Lunyu* 13.5, for the practice of *song* related to the *Shi* (*Lunyu jishi*, 900); *Xunzi*, for the necessity to practice *feng* and *song* at one's early youth (*Xunzi jijie*, 509); *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策, for the expectation of a young aristocrat's familiarity with *song* in the late Warring States (Fan Xiangyong 范祥雍 annot., *Zhanguo ce jianzheng* 戰國策箋證 [Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006], 451); *Hanshu* 30.1721, for the training of recitation (*feng*) in the selection of official scribes (*shi* 史) among young candidates at the beginning of the Western Han; Ibid., 30.1708, for the roles of *feng* and *song* played in the transmission of the *Shi*; Ibid., 22.1045, for the performance of local ballads in terms of *song* in the mid-Western Han imperial musical institute; and the "Jijiu pian" 急就篇, for the training of reciting (*feng*) a specific range of classical texts in the recruit-

number of recurring descriptions of the cultivation of one's familiarity with specific textual objects at one's youth by means of *song*, as often followed by a range of general categories such as *shishu*, *jingdian*, *shuzhuan*, and *shifu* 詩賦 or more specific objects among which the most often mentioned were the *Shi* and the *Lunyu* (sometimes abbreviated as *Lun*). Such accounts were occasionally specified, perhaps not without exaggeration, by a quantitative speculation about the number—typically, several hundred thousand—of words or characters that one was able to memorize and hence recite.[685]

It was often ambivalent, however, that to which degree a given practice of *feng* or *song* was in relation to specific textual reference; what kinds of notions of accuracy, precision, and fidelity were interiorized over the process of that practice; and, what kinds of authority—a standard version of text, a reliable person who memorized that text, and so on—could be involved over the process of examining or evaluating that practice.[686] The conventional explanations of these two terms were commonly associated with the *Zhouli* 周禮, where *feng* and *song* are juxtaposed in a series of six methods of oral presentations categorized as *yueyu* 樂語 ("music-related ways of speaking").[687] According to Zheng Xuan's commentary, *feng* referred to the practice to "duplicate/recite the verbal contents" (*bei wen* 倍文, same as 背文 according to Duan Yucai 段玉裁 [1735–1815]) with-

---

ment of civil officials in the Western Han (Shi You 史游, *Jijiu pian*, *Guyi congshu* 古逸叢書, Fasc. 22, 13b).

685 See, for example, the cases of Dongfangshuo (*Hanshu* 65.2841); Sima Fang 司馬防 (Sima Biao 司马彪, *Xu Hanshu* 續漢書, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 15.466); Cao Zhi (*Sanguo zhi* 19.557).

686 On the different concepts of precision and fidelity of memorization between primary oral culture and that technologized by writing, see Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, 56–59.

687 *Shisanjing zhushu*, 787.

out a model (such as a visible text) available to be followed at the same time.[688] As for *song*, Zheng Xuan did not specify its isolation from specific model, but characterized its oral form in terms of "to chant with a rhythm" 以聲節之.[689] A further differentiation between *feng* and *song* was made by Xu Kai 徐鍇 (920–974), who explained *song* as oral representation in a manner of *lin wen* 臨文 ("confronting the text").[690] This particular explanation of *song*, I suggest, was made with a purpose to symmetrically match Zheng Xuan's explanation of *feng* as a form of *bei wen*, and the phrase *lin wen* actually specified *song* as a practice of "reading aloud" (*du*) a text that is physically available at one's hands, for the term *wen* in the phrase *lin wen* can only be understood in the specific sense of visible text, which is hence different from Zheng Xuan's phrase *bei wen*, where *wen* can be vaguely understood as the "verbal contents."

Leaving aside the comparatively late differentiation, the actual usages of *song* in early Chinese sources were flexible and context-dependent. It was often juxtaposed with *feng*, *du*, *ji* 記 ("to memorize") and *yi* 憶 ("to recall") in terms of *fengsong* 諷誦, *songdu* 誦讀, *jisong* 記誦, etc. Most instances of *song* were used in a way conflated with *feng* in contexts about the oral representation of specific verbal contents—including *but not limited to* those that one initially received from a visible text—based on memorization and hence recitation. The verbal contents were, once carried on, *not necessarily* accompanied with text available as a visual reference. This observation corresponds to Xu Shen's glosses of *feng* and *song* in the *Shuowen jiezi*, where he made them mutually explained by each

688 *Shisanjing zhushu*, 787; *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 90.

689 *Shisanjing zhushu*, 787.

690 Xu Kai 徐鍇 annot., *Shuowen jiezi xizhuan* 說文解字繫傳, *Sibu congkan chubina*, Fasc. 72, 11.

other in terms of "A, B 也."[691] In a different way, the *Shuowen jiezi* explained *du* either in terms of *songshu* 誦書 ("to read the text aloud," or more precisely, "to apply the method of *song* on a visible text") or, according to Duan Yucai's revision, *zhoushu* 籀書 ("to draw [the contents and meanings] from the text").[692] Duan's revision considered the *songshu* explanation found in previous transmitted versions of the *Shuowen jiezi* as a textual error, and he found his support from Xu Shen's explanation of *zhou* 籀 as *dushu* 讀書. Both glosses specified *du* as a practice accompanied with a visually readable text. To be specific on their nuanced difference, the *zhoushu* explanation implies that *du* is a gesture to grasp the contents and meanings from the text; while in the *songshu* explanation, *song* itself only refers to a particular mode of voicing—according to Zheng Xuan, as previous mentioned—yet without direct reference to comprehension, memorization, or recitation, though it is true that reading a text aloud can be technically more helpful to internalize its verbal contents than reading it in silence. To sum up, *song* itself as a mode of voicing could be involved in but not to be conflated with "reading" as a text-based practice,[693] otherwise *song* could be equalized with a mode of *dushu*, which was neither the case in the *Shuowen jiezi* nor any other early Chinese source.

There exist a great number of instances of *song* indicative of the detachment—at least temporarily—of the practitioner from the text as an instant reference and hence the practitioner's capabilities of memorization and recitation. What makes the matter particularly clear is an often-quoted passage in the "Yiwen zhi," that the odes of the *Shi* survived from the great loss of texts during

691 *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 90.

692 *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 90.

693 See also Jack Chen, "On the Act and Representation of Reading in Medieval China," 58; Nugent, *Manifest in Words*, 74.

the Qin precisely "because of their existences in the forms of *feng* and *song* instead of merely on bamboo and silk" 以其諷誦，不獨在竹帛故也.[694] The passage also involves an assumption that the transmission of most literary traditions which were not as rhymed, memorable, and widespread as the *Shi* had to rely more heavily on the written texts. The "Yiwen zhi" as a crystallization of the late Western Han (and to a lesser extent Eastern Han) epistemology, therefore, sheds light on both the distinction and the mutual dependence between orality, memory, and literacy.

On a symbolic level, the loss or the absence of visual experience—or physically, blindness—was often imagined and presented as an emblem of the possession of wisdom, knowledge, and talent. Such a notion was manifested in a broad range of societies and cultures and embodied by a series of individuals and groups as the intermediate agents who played irreplaceable roles in their communities. The most preeminent images among them include Homer,[695] Oedipus, and Zuo Qiuming 左丘明, the scribe who presumably lost his sights but compiled one of the largest pieces of writing in pre-imperial China, the *Zuozhuan*.[696] It is unclear if the hero in the story once belonged to the minority class equipped with literacy before his loss of sights or, as suggested by some scholars, had his training and status cultivated among the group of "blind scribes and chanters" (*gumeng* 瞽矇) following the Zhou bureaucratic system.[697] What goes beyond questions

694 *Hanshu* 30.1708.

695 Here I am not engaged with the long-term debate on the historicity or fictionality of Homer the person or his "blindness" in particular, but the symbolic meanings and comparable values involved in his widely circulated image as a blind oral poet in the ancient world. For a discussion of the debate, the image, and its implications of the relationship between visuality and literacy, see Alexander Beecroft, "Blindness and Literacy in the 'Lives' of Homer," *The Classical Quarterly* 61 (2011): 1–18.

696 For the two most importance references to this image of Zuo Qiuming in early sources, see *Shiji* 130.3300; *Hanshu* 62.2735 (Sima Qian's letter to Ren An).

697 For a recent inquiry into this phenomenon within a comparative frame, see Pan Xianghui 潘祥輝, "Gumeng

is that the combination of the images of a blind scribe and a great text producer symbolizes the full potential of individual literary achievement in an oral-memorial circumstance. The growing involvement with visual literacy, correspondingly, could be even sometimes considered as a risk of failure in realizing that potential from a later point of view. Such a notion was specifically expressed by Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) in his "Dushu fa" 讀書法 ("Methods of Reading"), where he suggested that the proliferation of printed texts at his time had weakened one's capability of memorizing and interiorizing the texts' real contents, which used to be managed in a better way an oral-memorial circumstance with little aid of visible texts.[698]

Perhaps not as a surprise, the practices of visual reading (either aloud or in silence) in terms of *du* and *lan* (especially *lan*) were more frequently represented in Eastern Han and later contexts than that of previous ages.[699] This pattern of distribution corresponds to the growing availability of written texts, as well as the fashion of literary learning that increasingly depended on these visual objects. The data grows not merely in quantity but also in diversity and intensity. The individual practice of reading during and after the Eastern Han was often specified as a manner of being done "broadly" (*bo*), "integratively" (*jian*), "encompassingly" (*zhou* 周), "completely" (*bi*), or "with noth-

---

chuansong: Xian Qin 'mangmei' de chuanbo kaoguxue yanjiu" 瞽矇傳誦：先秦"盲媒"的傳播考古學研究, *Xibei shida xuebao* 西北師大學報, No. 2 (2019): 14–23.

698 Li Jinde 黎靖德 comp., *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類 (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1997), 153. This, again, reminds of Plato's *Phaedrus*, where written text was regarded as memory-weakening as well along with its other shortcomings (see Note 586).

699 Here, my investigation leaves aside the *Shiji*, for its unique employment of the term *du* 讀 was way different from other historiographic compilations. Throughout the *Shiji*, the term *du* occurs as much as 57 times (more frequently than any other early Chinese text) as a specific rhetorical apparatus, mostly attributed to the built-in textual authority *Taishi gong* 太史公 ("The Grand Scribe") or the first-person persona *yu* 余, who often "read" (*du*) a specific text related to a particular historical figure or issue in the present context and hence reached a deeper comprehension of either the person or the condition.

ing missed" (*wu suo bu* 無所不), mostly associated with the term *lan*,[700] and sometimes with more detailed descriptions of the efficiency involved in one's reading.[701] In addition to such a manner of "broad reading," both *du* and *lan* were employed to describe the reading of specific texts that covered a diverse range of genres such as edicts, memorials, letters, discourses, biographies, inscriptions, historiographic writings, and poetic compositions. Being *lan* more often employed to describe a scanning mode of broad reading, *du* was more often specified as a practice in dealing with a particular text and sometimes juxtaposed with *song*, a practice of carrying out the verbal contents word-by-word either aloud or by imaginary voice. Reading a particular *fu* with certain requirements of literacy training was presented as a recurring theme in the context of early third century CE,[702] while in earlier contexts such as the *Shiji* and the *Hanshu*, a *fu* was occasionally mentioned as being "read" (*du*) yet in a random, suspiciously anachronistic way.[703] The growing requirement of literacy in the reading of *fu* most likely reflected the extended structure, vocabulary, and rhetorical tropes involved in *fu* as a literary genre, as well as the growing complexity of its written forms as a result of

700 For the term *bolan*, see my investigation in Chapter 2 (esp. Table 5 and Note 214) and Appendix 1 (Tables 8 and 9) which incorporate the occurrence of this utterance in four historiographic compilations and Eastern Han tombstone inscriptions. For the others, see the following instances presumably datable to the Eastern Han or Three Kingdoms (one for each utterance), *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 87 (for the term *jianlan* 兼覽 applied to Emperor He 和帝); *Houhan shu* 44.1508 (*wu suo bu lan* 無所不覽, applied by Shi Chang 史敞 to Hu Guang); 79B.2584 (*zhoulan* 周覽, applied by Kong Rong to Xie Gai 謝該); *Weishu*, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 2.90 (*bilan* 畢覽, applied to Cao Pi).

701 For the most famous example, see the case of Ying Feng 應奉 (Hua Jiao 華嶠, *Hanshu* 漢書 [with the same title with Ban Gu's work], cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 21.601).

702 See, for example, *Sanguo zhi* 11.340 (for the case of the "Erjing fu"); 40.1001 (for the case of "Lu lingguang dian fu" 魯靈光殿賦).

703 The *fu* during the Western Han, especially prior to Yang Xiong, was largely treated as a "performance genre" that was "not meant to be read but to be listened to." See Kern, "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the 'Fu'," 435.

the proliferation of lexicons and graphs.[704]

All these patterns of the growing prominence and diversity of "reading" correspond to the over surplus of literary learning and textual productions over the period under review. The growing accessibility of written texts greatly reduced the average cost of reading, a change that was brought to an enlarged literate community, even including those who had to worry the least about that cost. What make this particularly clear was the growing occurrence of the records of reading (in terms of *du* or *lan*) practiced by both male and female members of the imperial families.[705] These pieces of evidence, albeit not necessarily taken as factual records of in-person conducts, represent the collective imaginations and expectations of the manner of reading to no lesser extent. Moreover, the growing accessibility of written texts also enabled and facilitated a scholar like Yang Xiong, who had a problem of stammer that would downplay his scholarly excellence,[706] to fulfill his anxiety of self-manifestation via writing—namely, a device to impress his readers instead of his audience. In a way mirroring the image of Zuo Qiuming as a blind scribe, the image of Yang Xiong as a speechless writer symbolizes the full potential of what could be accomplished in a fashion mostly depending on one's text-based literacy, a notion that could have made a good sense for the literate community around the Eastern Han when Yang Xiong was widely recognized as an ideal model of

704 See Xu Gongchi, "Handai wenxue de zhishihua tezheng." What makes this particularly clear is the case of the reception of the "Erjing fu," as previously discussed in Chapter 4.

705 See, for example, the cases of Emperor Guangwu (*Houhan shu* 24.831); Emperor Ming 明帝 (*Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu*, 56); Emperor He (Ibid., 87); Empress Ma 馬 (*Houhan shu* 10A.409); Empress Deng 鄧 (Ibid., 10A.424); Cao Cao (*Weishu*, cited by Pei Songhi, *Sanguo zhi* 1.54); Cao Pi (Ibid., cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 2.90); Cao Zhi (*Sanguo zhi* 19.557, 576); Cao Gun (Ibid., 20.583); Sun Xiu 孫休 (Ibid., 48.1159).

706 *Hanshu* 87A.3514.

erudition.[707]

The growing prominence of the instances of *du* and *lan* should be fairly compared with the distributional patterns of *feng* and *song* as well. In general, the representation of individual practices of *feng* and *song* (especially the former) proportionally—that is, in comparison with *du* and *lan*—decrease over the period under review. To be specific, the decreasing ratio is only gentle from the Western Han to the Eastern Han context, yet it becomes way more radical when being viewed from the late Eastern Han to the Three Kingdoms. Such a diachronic pattern of distribution roughly corresponds to the spread of paper and hence the greatly accelerated growth of accessibility of reading and writing after the mid-Eastern Han. However, it would be risky to fall into an over-simplified assumption that oral-memorial skills are the mere complements for the inaccessibility of reading and writing. It would be mistaken, too, to regard the growing prominence of text-based practices as an indicator of the declining engagements with memorization and oral representation.[708] Instead, it is necessary to look beyond a narrow vision that misses a vital part of the total picture—namely, the mutual dependence and reciprocal interactions between orality, memory, and literacy. Given the proportional decrease of the instances of specific lexical indicators, orality and memory did not cease playing their significant roles in a variety of areas of literary and intellectual activities during and after the Eastern Han. On the other hand, they were sometimes transformed into a new fashion of presentation that served specific newly developed social and individ-

707 As previously discussed in Chapter 2.

708 For discussions of these mistaken assumptions, with also a fruitful series of instances in medieval Chinese literary culture, see Nugent, *Manifest in Words*, 72–176; Yu Su 于溯, "Xingzou de shulu: zhonggu shiqi de wenxian jiyi yu wenxian chuanbo" 行走的書籠：中古時期的文獻記憶與文獻傳播, *Wenshizhe*, No. 1 (2020): 154–64.

ual interests. To be precise, the elements of oral presentation and memorization were by no means removable from the heart of Chinese literary culture, a realm that they shared more reciprocally with reading and writing during and after the Eastern Han. This condition, therefore, calls for a more comprehensive understanding of orality, memory, and literacy. Instead of giving any of them the dominant privacy or centrality vis-à-vis the others, these elements should be viewed in a spectrum of mutual dependences and reciprocal interactions by which they recycled and transformed each other in various forms and with various interests.

A great number of records of *song* in the *Hanshu* did not specify the material foundation for the given practices of memorization and oral representation. Namely, it often remains unclear that to what degree the memory sustaining a give practice of *song* was taken from a visible text or based on the reception of oral-aural transmission. This ambiguity is particularly shown in a considerable proportion of cases (16 of the overall 59 instances in the *Hanshu*) that present the scenarios of *song* even before the Western Han. By comparison, the scenarios of *song* situated in Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms contexts entailed a comparatively larger proportion of text-based experience, normally by specifying a given practice of *song* as a process of interiorizing and recycling certain text(s) that was visually "read"—in terms of *du*, *lan*, *jian* 見 ("to see"), *yue* 閱 (closest to *lan*, "to view"), and so on—before it was memorized and hence performed. Such examples were especially found in contexts related to the latter half of the Eastern Han and beyond, when the growing supply of written texts was further accelerated partly thanks to the spread of paper. See first, the three cases of Wang Chong, Xun Yue, and Kan Ze 闞澤 (d. 243 CE) across two centuries—

（王充）家貧無書，常遊洛陽市肆，閱所賣書，一見輒能誦憶，遂博通衆流百家之言。[709]

(Wang Chong's) family was poor and hence not possessing texts. He often roamed in the markets of Luoyang and read the texts on sale. He was able to recite and memorize whatever he once saw, and hence he broadly comprehended the words of various streams [of thought] and the hundred schools (*baijia*).

（荀悦）家貧無書，每之人閒，所見篇牘，一覽多能誦記。[710]
(Xun Yue's) family was poor and hence not possessing texts. Every time he arrived at others' places, once he visually read the written texts (they possessed), he could often recite and memorize them.

（闞澤）家世農夫，至澤好學，居貧無資，常爲人傭書，以供紙筆，所寫既畢，誦讀亦遍。[711]
(Kan Ze) was raised in a family of farmers by generations. When it came to Ze, he started to be fond of [literary] learning. His house was in poverty and with no possession, and he usually got hired [to make written copies of] texts by which he was supplied with paper and brushes. Once he finished the written copy of a text, he had also read it aloud and made it recitable thoroughly.

In these three cases, the scholars' capabilities of memorization worked as compensations for their poverty and hence inability of possessing enough written texts. Simultaneously, what they memorized and became able to recite were interiorized, not from orally transmitted but from visually readable, texts. These practices were, therefore, in debt to the proliferation of texts in circulation by means of book markets (as in the case of Wang Chong), social networks (as in the case of Xun

709 *Houhan shu* 49.1629.

710 *Houhan shu* 62.2058. Such a manner of literary learning conducted by Xun Yue speaks well to his theoretical reflection on the problem of *bo* and *yue*, as previously discussed in Chapter 2.

711 *Sanguo zhi* 53.1249.

Yue), and the personal demands for manuscript reproductions (as in the case of Kan Ze). Such a milieu greatly extended the accessibility of written texts as being readable, useable, and recyclable for an expanding literate community, by which even a man in poverty could be studious in a text-based manner with the aid of his own capability of memorization.

In another cluster of scenarios, the capability of memorizing and representing a visual text was performed primarily as an individual talent with a value of self-presentation in its own rights. See, for instance, the two examples of Wang Can and Mi Heng 禰衡 (173–198 CE), in which the two scholars' memorization of texts involved the experience of a more spectacular visuality embedded in stele inscriptions, a form of textual display of public memory that gained prominence since the latter half of the Eastern Han[712]—

> 初，粲與人共行，讀道邊碑，人問曰："卿能暗誦乎？"曰："能。"因使背而誦之，不失一字。[713]
> Once, [Wang] Can walked along with someone and read a stele by the road. The person asked, "Are you able to recite it?" Wang replied, "Yes." Therefore, [the person] asked Wang to turn his back [to the stele] and recite it, and he did it without misremembering any single word.

> （黃）祖長子射爲章陵太守，尤善於衡。嘗與衡俱遊，共讀蔡邕所作碑文，射愛其辭，還恨不繕寫。衡曰："吾雖一覽，猶能識之，唯其中石缺二字爲不明耳。"因書出之，射馳使寫碑還校，如衡所書，莫不歎伏。[714]
> [Huang] Zu's eldest son [Huang] She was the prefecture chief of Zhangling and befriended [Mi] Heng in particular. Once he travelled along with Heng and read a stele inscription composed by Cai Yong together. She admired its language, and when they came back, he regretted

712 See Note 358.

713 *Sanguo zhi* 21.599.

714 *Houhan shu* 80B.2657. For another translation with discussion of this anecdote, see Brashier, "Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Stelae," 249–50.

> for not making a fine copy. Heng said, "Though I have just viewed it once, I am still able to remember it. Yet the only thing unclear is where there was two missing characters on the stone." Therefore, he wrote down and presented [what he remembered]. She sent someone to make a written copy of the stele and bring it back for collation, and it matched what Heng had written. All without exception sighed and admired him.

The emplotments of these two anecdotes share a series of elements of narration: (1) a process of memorization and hence representation of a specific textual model (by means of recitation in the case of Wang Can, and by writing it down in the case of Mi Heng); (2) a highly accurate, word-by-word (in the case of Mi Heng, even character-by-character) fidelity in accord with that model; (3) correspondingly, a practice of (visually) checking against that model; and, (4) a scene with witness(es) that situated that display of memorization in a context with public significance. Their talents of memorization and representation were, therefore, presented not merely as a showy way of self-manifestation toward the publics, but an emblem of the values of textual stability, as well as the importance of verbatim accuracy of textual contents (of either the already-written or the not-yet-written) that were interiorized and recycled from a world increasingly perceived and performed via the visuality of texts.[715] As a more costing, enduring, and spectacularly displayed text-bearing media than manuscript, stele inscription was a device with stronger function in stabilizing text and controlling variance. This was particularly instantiated by the late Eastern Han project of Xiping 熹平 Stone Classics that, once established at the capital and displayed toward the

715 See Chapter 4, as well as the section 1 of the present chapter, for my investigation of the overall proliferation of textual productions and texts-in-circulation over this period.

literate community, generated an uncountable number of visual written copies.[716] The same was true in the case of Mi Heng, in which the second manuscript (in this case, highly identical to the first one written from Mi Heng's memory) was produced as a visual copy of that inscription of Cai Yong and hence brought it into broader circulation. In lights of these, visible texts were recycled into a larger flux of living language and cultural production in a circumstance that was at once pushed by oral-memorial presentation and the interests in written texts.

Was writing often recognized and performed as "a textual display of erudition" from the eve of the Eastern Han onward,[717] it is also unneglectable that the performance and self-manifestation of one's interiorized erudition took places in an oral-aural circumstance as well. Oral presentation as a conventional device for education and scholarly communication certainly did not cease playing an important role throughout the Eastern Han and the Three Kingdoms. However, it turned into a more flexible manner either attached to or detachable from texts as visual references. What makes this particularly clear is the case of Wei Xi, who taught the *Shi* along with its four main hermeneutic traditions with both the aid of texts and his oral display based on memorization—

> (魚)豢因從問《詩》，禧說齊、韓、魯、毛四家義，不復執文，有如諷誦。[718]
> Therefore, [Yu] Huan followed him (Wei Xi) to inquire about the *Shi*. Xi orally explained the interpretations of the four schools Qi, Han, Lu, and Mao, no longer holding texts at his hands, acting as reciting and chanting.

716 *Houhan shu* 60B.1990.

717 See Chapter 4, for my configuration of "writing" as a "textual display of erudition" in a variety of contexts.

718 *Weilüe*, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 13.422. For my discussion of the case of Wei Xi related to the reception of the *Shi* in the early third century CE, see Yixin Gu, "Speaking with the Learning of Odes," esp. 309–10.

This case informs, first, a syncretic mode of mastering and representing the four *Shi* traditions beyond their scholastic boundaries, an action that echoed a series of integrative practices of studying classics and their hermeneutic traditions during the previous two centuries.[719] Also importantly, the four hermeneutic traditions were previously interiorized through his memorization and then carried out through oral display in the form of recitation (*fengsong*) without the aid of "text" (*wen* in this particular context refers to physical text with no ambivalence) which was available at his hands. There is no clue for what was written—and in what forms—in his *wen*. It may refer to a written memo or outline prepared for his teaching, probably with several excerpts or summaries drawn from the four schools; or it may refer to an uncertain number of copies of textual production from those schools in full sizes. There could also be a variety of possibilities between these two extreme cases. What really calls for further attentions is that Wei's teaching involved both his engagement with and a gesture of detachment from their textual counterparts. Namely, the capabilities of memorization and oral representation, as portrayed here, exceeded their economic and utilitarian functionalities that were assuredly more necessary in the teaching-and-learning circumstance with no sufficient supply of texts. Instead, they unfold another aspect of themselves, that is, by natures, performative and self-presentative.

The oral performance of text-based erudition is showcased, furthermore, in the previously mentioned anecdote of Zheng Xuan's performance in the banquet host by Yuan Shao, where the readers encounter—albeit without many details—perhaps the most spectacular oral display of

719 As previously discussed in Chapters 1 and 2.

one's erudition that was interiorized and developed from an extensive range of textual traditions.[720] For a more specific example related to an individual text, consider too, the story of Cai Yong's reception and utilization of the *Lunheng*, a text presumably not yet circulated in the central Northern China when it was obtained by Cai Yong and hence "secretly studied" (*miwan* 秘玩), taken as a "reference aid for oral conversation" (*tanzhu* 談助).[721] Though little is known about the historicity of both stories and how a text was actually used as a *tanzhu*, these accounts reflect a late Eastern Han notion of text—for a good instance, *Lunheng*—as a potential repository of arguments and utterances to be recycled into an oral circumstance of scholarly communication and verbal performance, which involved the fashion later known as *qingtan* 清談 ("pure conversation") that gained prominence especially during the Wei and Jin.[722]

Sources from specific oral roots and foundations were brought into various forms of verbal actualizations as well. This fluidity transcended the boundary between lower and upper cultural spheres in terms of how they were conventionally regulated. For instance, the late Eastern Han imperial court during the reign of Emperor Ling 靈帝 (r. 168–189 CE) presented a growing interest in story-telling rooted in a vulgar foundation.[723] Though this imperial interest in vulgar cul-

720 *Houhan shu* 35.1211, as previously discussed in Chapter 2.

721 As recorded by Yuan Shansong (or Yuan Song) and cited by Li Xian (*Houhan shu* 49.1629). See also Note 549, for alternative speculation of the Eastern Han reception of the *Lunheng*.

722 There have been a fruitful series of studies on the issue of *qingtan* 清談 and its political, philosophical, and socio-cultural implications. For some opinions with the most far-reaching influences, see Chen Yinke 陳寅恪, "Shu *Shishuo xinyu* wenxue lei Zhong Hui zhuan *Siben lun* shi bi tiao hou" 書世說新語文學類鍾會撰四本論始畢條後, in *Jinmingguan conggao chubian* 金明館叢稿初編 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2001), 47–54; "Tao Yuanming sixiang yu qingtan zhi guanxi" 陶淵明思想與清談之關係, in *Jinmingguan conggao chubian*, 201–29; Tang Yongtong, *Wei Jin xuanxue lungao*, passim., esp. 12–15; Yu Yingshi, "Individualism and the Neo-Daoist Movement in Wei-Jin China," 143–56.

723 See *Houhan shu* 60B.1992.

ture soon became a target of scholarly critique, that interest itself did not cease flowing into intellectual lives that served different individual and social purposes. According to a third century CE anecdote of Cao Zhi's meeting with Handan Chun, the young man orally performed an extensive range of knowledge recalled from his memory, ending up with his recitation of thousands of words of "trivial sayings" (*xiaoshuo* 小說) that he received from vulgar actors and story-tellers.[724] Such a practice shows conformity to what Cao Zhi expressed in his letter to Yang Xiu, that the saying and singing of the commoners were not completely irrelevant to the high culture, and hence they should be selectively preserved instead of simply left aside.[725]

In the broadest sense, verbal elements embedded with specific oral natures or features were constantly recycled or manifested in a variety of media, with also potentials to be presented, appropriated, and transformed within different literary forms. This is shown in the widely employed elements such as speeches, quotations, dialogues, and sometimes songs, as the foregrounded literary apparatus woven into a variety of contexts across historiography, philosophy, and poetic compositions over centuries.[726] In some cases, such a textuality performed in these contexts could be

724 *Weilüe*, cited by Pei Songzhi, *Sanguo zhi* 21.603.

725 *Sanguo zhi* 19.559; *Wenxuan*, 1903. Such a statement can be traced back to the late Western Han categorization of *xiaoshuo* 小說 in the "Yiwen zhi," where *xiaoshuo* was defined as the vulgar sayings circulated among commoners that had enduring transmissibility and was occasionally worth selecting (*Hanshu* 30.1745). Cao Zhi's statement, nevertheless, expressed a more positive point of view regarding its literary and moral values.

726 Just to mention a selective range of studies concerning these phenomena in early China and beyond. For the literary presentations of speeches and citations in early historiographic and philosophic texts, see Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*; "Speaking of Documents"; "Remonstrance in Eastern Zhou Historiography," *Early China* 22 (1997): 133–79. For the dialogical structures employed in Han and early medieval intellectual discourses, see Declercq, *Writing against the State*; Nylan, "Han Classicists Writing in Dialogue." For the use of songs and poetry in the historical imaginations in early China, see Schaberg, "Song and the Historical Imagination in Early China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59 (1999): 305–61, Martin Kern, "The Poetry of Han Historiography," *Early Medieval China* 10 (2004): 23–65. For the literalization of oral elements in Han and early medieval poems, see Egan, "Were Yueh-fu Ever Folk Songs?". For a forthcoming study on speech-related genres in early China in a broader sense,

actually based on specific oral-aural foundation of communication; while for some of them, especially in the Han and post-Han compositions, that textuality was more likely an expressive form built within the text in a manner of imitation or performance in its own right. To clarify, a foregrounded oral setting, device, or element does not indicate that a given text—or any part of it—was "orally composed" or a piece of "oral literature." Oftentimes, the human voices performed within the texts were *de facto* the textual displays or emulations of spoken words, which were hypothetically staged on a ground of imagination and verbal fabrication, a practice progressively equipped with literary knowledge and technologized by literary skills. This is shown, for the closest reference, in the widely shared setting of hypothetical dialogue and conversation distributed among a considerable number of discourses under review in the present study.

For just one more individual case that makes the points particularly clear, consider a poem—or a song—that happens to be presented in a scenario that incorporates the full elements of orality, memory, literacy, and their manifold traces of interaction across centuries. Titled as "Yueren ge" 越人歌 ("Song of a Yue") or so in medieval and later anthologies, the song was first introduced in the late Western Han compilation *Shuoyuan*,[727] presented in the context of a pre-imperial story, and finally echoed in a series of post-Han emulations and recompositions. In the *Shuoyuan* context, the song is chanted by a commoner of Yue in his/her local language, with a mood of affection for a prince of Chu who is sharing his/her boat. Along with the storyline, to be

see Zhuming Yao 姚竹銘, "Voice of Textuality: Speech, Genre, and Speech Genres in Early China" (Ph. D. Diss., Princeton University, in-progress).

727 *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 278.

precise, are not one but two written versions of the song. The first version is a transliteration written in a series of consecutive classical Chinese characters,[728] which semantically make no sense but presumably present a phonological approximation of what that song syllabically sounds like. The second version, then, is a readable one provided by a Yue "translator," who is summoned by the prince and hence "verbalized it (the song) in a Chu way" 楚說之.

For clarity, hereafter I will refer to the Chu-style version as the "poem" so as to distinguish it from the "song." The presumably original "song" that was once chanted, heard, memorized, transliterated and hence translated or re-verbalized is unrecoverable, if not vaguely—not without controversy—reconstructed by modern scholars by means of comparative linguistic methods.[729] If one compares the Chu-style poem preserved in the *Shuoyuan* with all reconstructed modern versions of the song, it turns out that the poem was unlikely a loyal, straightforward "translation" but an integrative hybrid of representation and innovative composition in its own right. More than transferring a source from its home language into another one and accommodating that source with the latter's grammars, vocabulary, and limitations, the poem involves also a practice of creative composition delicately detached from that source but associated with the framework of expression, tradition, and meaning-production of the language in which it is *newly* composed. Within this process, the song was not a mere translatable model but a condensed body of semantic, phonetic, and

728 *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 278. The transliteration of the song is written in the following consecutive Chinese characters: 濫兮抃草濫予昌柁澤予昌州州鎩州焉乎秦胥胥縵予乎昭澶秦踰滲惿隨河湖.

729 See Zhengzhang Shanfang 鄭張尚芳, "Decipherment of Yue-Ren-Ge (Song of the Yue Boatman)," *Cahiers de linguistique: Asie orientale* 20 (1991): 159–68; Zhou Liuxi 周流溪, "'Yueren ge' jiedu yanjiu" 《越人歌》解讀研究, *Waiyu jiaoxue yu yanjiu* 外語教學與研究, No. 3 (1993): 1–15; Wu Anqi 吳安其, "'Yueren ge' jiedu" 《越人歌》解讀, *Nankai yuyan xuekan* 南開語言學刊, No. 2 (2008): 16–22.

sentimental sources of inspiration for potential compositions, and the poem as a verbal fabrication was free to weave together additional elements and meanings that were absent from the song in its first place.

What makes this particularly clear is a couplet at the end of the poem. Jointly, the two seven-syllabic lines carry the poem toward a perfected closure—

山有木兮木有枝	There are trees on the mountains, and branches on the trees.
心說君兮君不知	My heart adores you, my lord, yet my lord does not know about me.

The second half of the couplet has a corresponding line (namely, a line with essentially the same meaning) in all modern reconstructed versions of the song,[730] while the first half shows no such correspondence at all. This is to say, the couplet as a unity exists in the Chu-style poetic composition only, and the images of mountain, trees, and branches are *newly* employed as a set of poetic devices or lyrical initiators that gives rise to a line that is translated from the *old* model.

Moreover, the elegance of the entire couplet rests exactly with the semantic, linguistic system in which it was *newly* composed. Not merely as an expression of affection, the two halves juxtapose the terms *zhi* 枝 as "branch" and *zhi* as "to understand/to know" as a pair of rhymed, homophonic puns that mutually refer to and manifest each other. Both are encoded with a message of the protagonist's emotional gesture or motif to reach out from certain root and make connections,

730 In all modern reconstructed versions, the corresponding part of this line can be roughly translated as something like, "Within my heart is my adoration for you."

a motif that is symbolized in the natural outside yet suppressed in the human inside. Through the literary recomposition, the contents and meanings of the song were extended and complicated in a correlative structure connecting human language and the phenomenal world. The poem showcases how the potentials of "translation" as a translingual practice can be actualized in an extended realm of language, meaning, and aesthetics, a case illustrative of what Benjamin suggests about the task of translator as liberating the "pure" language from its imprisoned condition in any home language itself,[731] as well as David Damrosch's proposal that "world literature" would "gain" instead of "lose" over the process of translation.[732]

This re-composed "poem" therefore became an active part in the dynamic flux of Chinese poetic tradition. The ending couplet, which is half-translated and half-composed by nature, stands out more specifically as an instantiation of a condensed body of lyrical expression that has its own history and transmissibility. See, for example, the following four-line stanza in the ode "Xiao pan" 小弁 ("Little Joy") of the *Shijing*—

譬彼坏木	Yet like that decaying trees,
疾用无枝	deceased and without branches.
心之忧矣	My heart is grieved indeed,
宁莫之知[733]	for no one understands this.

—where the poem employs the symbolic connection between "trees" and "heart," as well as the

731 Walter Benjamin, "The Task of the Translator," in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, trans. Harry Zohn, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken Books, 1999), 69–82, esp. 80.

732 David Damrosch, *What Is World Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 288–97.

733 *Shisanjing zhushu*, 453.

homophonic punning of *zhi* as well. For another example, see the following two lines in the "Xiang furen" 湘夫人 ("Lady of Xiang River") in the *Chuci*. The couplet shares basically the same syntactic structure with that in the "Yueren ge"—

沅有芷兮澧有蘭	There is angelica along the river of Yuan, and agrimony along the river of Li.
思君子兮未敢言[734]	My mind is occupied by the lord, yet I do not dare to speak it.

From the late Eastern Han through medieval times, there occurred another cluster of poetic compositions with their own imitations, appropriations, and revisions of the same body of expression with the ending couplet of the "Yueren ge." For perhaps the most well-received example, see the following stanza by Cao Pi in his "Shanzai xing" 善哉行—

高山有崖	There are edges on the high mountains,
林木有枝	and there are branches on the trees in forests.
憂來無方	My grieve comes from no direction,
人莫之知[735]	and no one understands this.

What Cao Pi did to this inherited body of lyrical expression—namely, a revisionary appropriation of an old utterance—of which the semi-oral and semi-written nature was completely blurred—into a new poetic context, is comparable to a whole series of poetic practices throughout the making of

734 Hong Xingzu 洪興祖 annot., *Chuci buzhu* 楚辭補注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 65–66.

735 *Wenxuan*, 1285; Lu Qinli 逯欽立 comp., *Xian Qin Han Wei Jin Nanbeichao shi* 先秦漢魏晉南北朝詩 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 390–91.

early and late Chinese literature.[736] For the closest but a much richer cluster of examples, consider what his brother Cao Zhi practiced on an extensive range of poetic utterances and meanings drawn from the *Shi* and its manifold hermeneutic traditions.[737] Such a revisionary approach of poetic composition related to previous models and sources of inheritance was inextricable, not merely to the making of classical Chinese poetry, but also to a wider range of literary practices across various genres and forms.

To sum up, all instances of variation of the ending couplet are presented as a condensed body of utterances and meanings: the connection between "trees" and "heart," the homophonic punning of *zhi* as "knowing" and as "branches," and finally, the correlative view of the human and the world. The complex process of the formation, reception, transformation, and variation of the song in its dressing as a poem—or more precisely, the poem in its aura as a song—instantiates the mutual dependence and reciprocal interactions between orality, memory, and literacy, as well as the open-ended possibilities of interactions in both trans-lingual and intra-lingual contexts. More can be said, about the following—

- It was—according to the story—the song presented with a presumably pure orality that initiated the whole process of textual composition and recomposition.

736 To continue this line of inquiry, for two later medieval instances of variation of this couplet, see Wu Jun 吳均, "Xinglu nan" 行路難, "The cinnamon tree in the mountain has branches on its own, the little thing in my heart is known to myself." 山中桂樹自有枝，心中方寸自相知。*Xian Qin Han Wei Jin Nanbeichao shi*, 1728; "Shang you shi" 傷友詩, "Adorable is the branches of the cinnamon tree, holding its fragrance that my lord does not know." 可憐桂樹枝，懷芳君不知。Ibid., 1753.

737 See Yixin Gu, "Speaking with the Learning of Odes."

- It was the technologized system of literacy that interiorized, recycled, and transformed an oral-aural experience into its first textual instantiation and carried it forward into a larger flux of literary manifestations.
- It was the mechanism of memory, remembrance, and recollection that participated in every stage of the various realizations of both the song and the poem.
- It was a relatively minor textual unit or literary body of lyrical expression—instead of the "whole" poem—that stands out as an enduring piece of poetic tradition with its own history of reception, variation, and transformation.
- It was the intersection of sounds and meanings—namely, the punning of *zhi*—that constituted the core element of that enduring piece.
- It was the interactive trans-lingual practice that actualized the potentials of "translation" toward an extended realm of language, aesthetics, and meaning-production.
- It was the intra-lingual diversification of expressive forms and literary styles by which a specific literary tradition is manifested and presented.

What if one "reads" the song and the poem, silently or aloud, along with their many manifestations in front of the wheel-maker in the *Zhuangzi*? What is being read, eventually, has liberated itself from the dregs of the ancient, presented as a crystallization of the traces of time.

5.4. Summary

This chapter situates the main arguments made in previous chapters within the context of material and intermediacy, a cross-media complex that involves the mutual influences and interactions between ideas, practices, and technologies within a world filled with ever-changing conceptual and material realities. To begin with, the chapter deals with the changing foundation of the writing media underlying manuscript production and circulation, especially the spread and utilization of paper from the early second century CE onward. The use of paper, as shown in previous investigations, was way beyond a simple notion of material determinism and its economic/utilitarian function and often embedded with specific symbolic meanings and aesthetic values. In contrast to a conventional opinion that the spread of paper caused a fundamental transition of Chinese literary culture, I regard paper as a catalyst that did not *initiate* but *accelerated* an ongoing progress—namely, the growing surplus of texts and knowledge being made available to a larger literate community, a phenomenon of literary culture with numerous textual representations and intellectual reflections more than one century before Cai Lun's paper.

While literary and verbal practices are constantly influenced and technologized by the changing realities of material media, the material world is constantly verbalized, configured, and conceptualized within the coded system of languages and meaning-construction. Over the period under review, the conceptual schematizations of a world of material and intermediacy dwelled within a constellation of beliefs, models, and assumptions. In this regard, the remaining part of the chapter deals with the issues of orality, memory, and literacy, with a focus on their mutual dependence, interactions, and transformations beyond an over-simplified orality-versus-writing dichotomy. To this

end, the inquiry explores the expressions and schematizations of various oral, memorial, and writing practices found in a series of Han-Wei discourses and utterances. These accounts, altogether, reflect the conceptual foundation from which they were yielded—namely, an inside-outside paradigm accompanied with an assumption of cross-media commensurability, the latter being a notion that integrated manifold verbal, literary, and bodily phenomena within a sharable conceptual framework.

The features and functions of oral, memorial, and text-based practices certainly underwent remarkable changes over the period under focus. The distributional patterns of lexical indicators, such as *feng*, *song*, *du*, and *lan*, in relevant sources suggest that the practice of visual reading was performed in the contexts of Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms more often and more intensely than previous ages—a phenomenon related to the growing availability of written texts, as well as their growing involvements in literary practices on the daily basis. However, instead of reinforcing a model of diachronic evolution by which literacy gradually attained its primacy vis-à-vis oral-memorial skills, my observations demonstrate that orality and memory were by no means removable from the heart of literary culture, which they increasingly shared with reading and writing. In this new milieu, the values and functions embedded in oral performance and memorization became more interactively associated with the visuality of literary culture. Meanwhile, akin to the case of textual production, both orality and memory were situated in a more individualized manner of self-presentation of one's competitive intelligence and erudition. The surplus of texts and text-based practices, in this regard, was not a triumph of material determinism but a transformer

of the mutual relationships between orality, memory, and literacy, which altogether dwelled along with a diverse range of reciprocal interactions within an ever-broadening realm of expressions, communications, and cultural productions.

- CONCLUSION -

Toward a Synopsis of Bibliography, Ideology, and Grammatology

Toward an archaeology of literary culture as a complex dynamic of acts, thoughts, and traces, this study investigates its conceptual foundation—namely, what a literary culture gained from an ever-renewing constellation of cultural codes and, at the same time, how those codes were *coded*. Central to my investigations is an individual form of "erudition," an emblematic model and a collective *imaginaire* distributed among a variety of personal embodiments and verbal manifestations. The emergence and proliferation of this model and its manifold manifestations constituted an enchanting source of power and authority that permeated the landscape of Chinese literary culture and intellectual lives across centuries. What this research unfolds, in the first place, is a shared, ever-growing repository of ideas and utterances attached to this model, which is at once presented as the ideal inheritor, container, producer, and transformer of an increasing wealth of the living legacy of *wen*. The notion of individual-of-erudition can be grasped, not in the specific sense of its ontological status of being, but in terms of the imaginariness involved in how it was configured, performed, and understood. Simply put, the model was presented as an integration of manifold values related to learning, writing, and authority, situated within a recycling and transforming process between the imagined "inside" and "outside" across a variety of media and forms.

To achieve a meaningful reconstruction of the complex intellectual labor and socio-cultural logics involved in the growing prominence of individual erudition, this study takes three lines of

inquiry that, toward a final synopsis, can be tentatively described in terms of bibliography, ideology, and grammatology. For now, in terms of "bibliography," I do not mean to refer to an analytical or descriptive account of particular books or texts that once physically existed and were hence recorded for specific interests. Instead, I use the term in a metaphorical sense referring to the construction of an imaginary archive of texts and knowledge, a realm entangled with a diverse range of literary and intellectual practices conducted in both individual and collaborative ways. The metaphor of bibliography involves a complex sense of collection, reception, categorization, and to no lesser extent, an anxiety of power to put the incorporated items conceptually or physically under control. Probably the most spectacular emblem of such a vision of bibliography under review is the "Yiwen zhi" of the *Hanshu*, a case in which the primary value did not rest within the specificity of every physical item once stored at particular locations and hence was recorded with particular information. Instead, the value of the "Yiwen zhi" rested within its overall mapping of the imagined archive of *wen* and its conceptual guidance of how to deal with the ever-growing texts and knowledge. The imagination of extending the individual mastery of *wen* was expressed in a broad spectrum of acts, thoughts, and discourses over the three centuries under review. This is shown, for a series of elaborated examples, in Yang Xiong and Liu Xin's analogical descriptions of the scholarly land for "plowing/cultivating" (*geng*) modeled after the "ancient" (*gu*); in Ban Gu's self-contained engagement in the realm of textual legacy in terms of *siwen*; in Wang Chong's projection of the curriculum of Kongzi and his followers beyond the scheme of the "Five Classics" (*wujing*); in Cai Yong's imaginary journey across the landscapes of tremendous texts and knowledge;

and in Xun Yue's metaphorical weaving of the network of "broad" learning in order to catch the "bird" of truth.

Pivotal to these imaginary configurations was a syncretic, integrative, and encompassing mode of literary learning and practicing. This mode was often rhetorically proposed in the name of *gu*, most frequently expressed in terms of *bo* and *tong*, and context-dependently entangled with a set of more specifically defined methods and techniques. The effects of the emblematic status of these scholarly values can be viewed and interpreted in an extensive range of sources across historiographic, biographic, philosophic, epitaphic, and poetic texts, which altogether constituted an ever-growing repository—not only in quantity but also in diversity and intensity—of ideas, utterances, and instantiations associated with the model of individual-of-erudition. It was along with the construction of the imaginary realm of personal "bibliography" that the human agency in dealing with texts and knowledge was presented as a process from outside toward inside—namely, the interiorization of various external sources into an inner archive under individual mastery and controls. It involved, consequently, a foundational re-orientation of individual practice from a comparatively narrow sphere to a broadened one, by transcending the boundaries between different texts and different traditions, and by liberating scholarly individuality from the imposition of personal affiliation to specific institutes, schools, tutors, and repositories external to one's own extending realm of erudition.

Such a self-oriented interest beyond sectarianism and institutionalization, therefore, leads to the second line of my inquiry—namely, an inquiry into the politics and rhetorics involved in the

re-orientation itself as both a practice of ideological criticism and an agenda seeking its own power and authority. This duality is embodied in two interrelated aspects of socio-cultural phenomena. First, how individual erudition constituted a source of power and authority for the formation of a sharable identity and hence an imagined community in their own rights, as especially presented in the collective remembrance and commemoration of specific exemplary figures across centuries. Second, the construction of that sharable identity once involved the production of specific otherness, such as the opposite, the different, or the inferior. What makes the second point particularly clear was a series of rhetorical expressions, such as Yang Xiong and others' discourses on the controversy between two modes of literary learning in terms of *gu* vis-à-vis *jin*, the Eastern Han criticism against the "vulgar" *ru* (*suru*), the winning voices of masters who dominated the hypothetical debates against their secular-minded interlocutors in the five Han *shelun*, and Wang Chong's hierarchical classification of a series of scholarly identities in terms of their literary proficiency and their relations to institutional authorities.

It was through these power-generating rhetorics that the disengagement from institutional power was reciprocally connected with the self-oriented interest in broadening one's literary business. To be precise, both sides were configured as alternative grounds—vis-à-vis the affiliation to institutionalization—to each other in a manner supplying the needs of authority, identity, and public recognition. In addition, my discussion also includes the societal, cultural, and economic foundations for a range of practical detachments from public powers and official positions, a phenomenon entangled with the physically changing deployments and movements of cultural resources

between centripetal and centrifugal modes. Though the materials under review involve a great deal of acts and thoughts related to "reclusion" or "eremitism," my inquiry is distinguishably focused on an area of intersection where the gesture of political resistance was tightly associated with a specific mode of intellectual living. Central to the latter was not its disengagement from power, but the power gained from that disengagement.

The third line of inquiry—which I consider as being into grammatology—does not aim at a comprehensive science of writing as a practical skill or a physical object but the notions of "writing" that were configured, transformed, and actualized over the period under review. In terms of "writing," I refer specifically to the composition and articulation of a verbal structure with an integrated body of contents and forms, instead of a physically written text or a mere gesture of writing-something-down. In conformity to the inside-outside paradigm, the exhibition of individual erudition was presented in a variety of utterances and discourses as a recycling process from inside toward outside, through which the interiorized erudition was exteriorized, realized, and performed by means of various media, especially that of "writing." The descriptions and configurations of literary productivity performed by writing transcended beyond a single authorial model. Instead, they fell into a spectrum of diverse possibilities between the mode of integration and that of innovation; a spectrum manifested in a growing vocabulary indicative of the concepts and realities of textual production, as well as a series of discourses, narrations, and exemplary cases. A writing as an individual product was, therefore, extensively recognized and presented as a "textual display of erudition"—which speaks well to the shifting conceptualization of the notion *wenzhang*, from its general

connotation as the "patterned display/manifestation" across a variety of phenomenal realms to it being increasingly associated with an imaginary connection between a text and a person that embody and manifest each other.

Such a complex notion of writing is showcased, most spectacularly, in the ambitious writing project of Yang Xiong, who integratively renovated the various traditions he inherited from the past and hence presented his own literary productivity as a legacy for the future. What makes this theoretically clearer is Wang Chong's construction of the internal hierarchy between different intellectual identities—which he defined in terms of one's erudition and, hence, literary productivity. In general, the presentation of individual credit and liability associated with literary production stands out as a constructive element inherently embedded in Chinese literary culture from the late Western Han through the early third century CE. Such an imaginary connection between a text and a person as a pair of identifiable properties, meanwhile, speaks well to another conceptual configuration of text as an entity toward its stabilized closure beyond variance, a notion that gained prominence along with the endless, inevitable proliferation of changeability and variability in manuscript culture. All these observations illustrate a point of view of seeing the increasingly prominent meanings of *wen* and *wenzhang*—in the specific sense of textualized manifestation—that, over the period under review, reached a status as the main emblem of individuals who explored their full potentials of literary cultivation and literary productivity. The individuals-of-erudition who displayed that erudition via writing were, correspondingly, an emblem of the elegance of *wen* in its broad sense as the perceivable pattern and manifestation of human-and-world across various media.

The inside-outside paradigm of literary learning and literary writing also works in concert with another conceptual foundation—namely, the notion of cross-media commensurability applicable to the phenomenal world of various human traces. Such a notion underwrote not merely the ways in which written words could be understood but also how to configure other media and forms—appearances, gestures, speeches, and beyond—that were hypothetically configured as the exteriorization of specific inner individuality. The imagined coherence within this framework, therefore, provides a unitary point of view alternative to the orality-versus-writing dichotomy and any particularism that prioritizes a specific medium, skill, or modality over the others. Simultaneously, the notion of "writing" within this scheme also downplays another prominent discourse of material determinism that periodizes Chinese literary culture in terms of the historical evolution of writing media, especially the spread of paper since the second century CE. As a negotiation with this discourse, this study draws attention to a more complex condition of mutually recycling and reciprocal interactions between orality, memory, and literacy across a wider time span: the three centuries before, during, and after the occurrence and spread of Cai Lun's paper. Paper, in this regard, is better considered as a catalyst—instead of a primary motivation—that participated in an already in-progress transition of Chinese literary culture: an overall surplus and proliferation of literary practices and literary products since the late Western Han.

What is gained from these three lines of inquiry is a complex and ever-changing repository of mutually connected manifestations of individual erudition across the boundaries between specific given archives, which are conventionally localized within particular categories of knowledge with

enclosed and often anachronistically constructed historical specificity. Correspondingly, it urges questioning and going beyond a series of conventional approaches of cultural periodization of early and medieval China based on essentializing categorization and over-simplified determinism, such as the *jinwen*-versus-*guwen* controversy applied to canonical studies; the discourse of "Self-consciousness" (*zijue*) applied to philosophy, aesthetics, and "literature" in a modern sense; the dichotomy of orality-versus-writing; and the material determinism in terms of the evolution of writing media. Instead, there are cases in which the transition of Chinese literary culture across three centuries can be grasped from a perspective, neither beyond nor below, but within a connective coded system of knowledge formation and meaning-production by means of the living powers of expressive language. The connectivity of this coded system can be observed, first, from various expressions and performances of the cultivation and exhibition of individual erudition in conformity to an inside-outside paradigm, one that connects the process of reception and that of production in dealing with *wen*. Second, it is manifested in the effects and correlations between different voices in a temporality where the new idea is often performed as a revisionary appropriation of the old, a practice that constitutes the basic data of communications between the living, the dead, and the not yet living.

The *imaginaire* of individual-of-erudition was, thereby, presented at the very heart of Han-Wei literary culture and realized in its plural forms of embodiments and manifestations. Meanwhile, there is another critical question that is inextricable to every single step of the foregoing inquiry into this *imaginaire*; namely, what exactly could be undermined, downplayed, or even left in oblivion

over the process of *reading* the enchantment of individual erudition? The proliferation of textual evidence for the model of individual erudition demonstrates exactly what that model internally contains—a motif or a desire to have that imagined individuality manifested and mediated in a literary form. Therefore, the accumulation of the enormity of textual evidence under review is inevitably entangled with the specificities and limits involved in the socio-cultural structures in which the evidence themselves emerged. There could have been a richer exchange and circulation of intellects, texts, and knowledge among the Han official academicians that was different from what was told by the intellectuals who acted and wrote against them. There was certainly a larger proportion of women equipped with education and refined literacy in comparison to the awfully short supply of exemplary female figures in transmitted sources. Finally, there was probably a specific notion of erudition that did not emphasize the value of writing as its own textual display and exteriorization and, therefore, was left in a condition of unremarkable silence and oblivion.

Aware of such epistemological limitations, my aim, to clarify, is not to offer an unbiased, all-inclusive account of the history of Han-Wei literary culture. Instead, the study aims at a reconstruction of the process of the emergence and proliferation of a constellation of concepts, values, and notions, which reached a degree of public significance and triumphed over the cultural conflicts with which they were confronted. Over the course of making the individual an emblematic construction of ideology for literary culture, as well as an image pivotal to an alternative mode of elitism and authority vis-à-vis the matrix of institutionalization, a literary culture was remarkably expanded and transformed into a new form that would continue to proliferate through the turmoil

and disunity after the decline of China's early empire. Such a transition cannot be disentangled from the complex intellectual labor, communicative practices, and socio-cultural logics during the three centuries under focus, which altogether empowered a sharable model that would become indispensable to early medieval and even later Chinese society and culture. There is grandeur in this view of literary culture that a variety of personal embodiments and verbal manifestations altogether constituted the aura surrounding a shared model, a model that exists beyond the boundaries between conventional disciplines or archives but dwells within an extended realm of communication and meaning-production. Equally important is a critical reflection, then, to be invited on the power of knowledge that makes such a point of view possible.

Appendix 1

Table 8
Lexical Items Related to *Bo* and *Tong* in the *Dongguan Hanji*

	Terms	Total	E. H.	E. H. C.
博學	*Boxue*	1	1	0
博覽	*Bolan*	7	7	1
博物	*Bowu*	1	1	1
博通	*Botong*	2	2	0
多聞	*Duowen*	1	1	0
洽聞	*Qiawen*	2	2	1
多識	*Duozhi*	1	1	0
兼通	*Jiantong*	4	4	0
通儒	*Tongru*	1	1	0
通人	*Tongren*	0	0	0

Table 9
Lexical Items Related to *Bo* and *Tong* in the *Sanguo zhi*

	Terms	Total	T. K.	T. K. C.
博學	*Boxue*	4	4	1
博覽	*Bolan*	6	6	1
博物	*Bowu*	4	2	2
博通	*Botong*	1	1	0
多聞	*Duowen*	5	5	1
洽聞	*Qiawen*	0	0	0
多識	*Duozhi*	3	3	0
兼通	*Jiantong*	4	4	0
通儒	*Tongru*	2	1	1
通人	*Tongren*	1	0	1

* These two tables are comparable to Tables 5–7 which present these lexical items in the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*. They employ the same formats: The numbers in the three columns mark the occurrences of a given term appearing in a given book (1) in total; (2) in contexts where that term refers to the practices or features of specific figures in the dynastic era that the book was primarily about ("E. H." as the abbreviation for "Eastern Han," "T. K." for "Three King-

doms," and "C." for "citation"); (3) identifiably cited or quoted from a person or a source dated to that era. In the case of *Dongguan Hanji*, every narrative from the compiler's perspective is self-evidently an Eastern Han voice; for clarity, it is not counted as a date applicable to column 3.

* I save these two tables for appendixes, as explained in Chapter 2, because of the nature and feature of the extant *Dongguan Hanji* and the *Sanguo zhi* in particular. My argument for the diachronic changes of acts, thoughts, and traces related to individual erudition is made clear in my analyses of Tables 5–7 with a focus on the *Hanshu* and the *Houhan shu*.

* The highly incomplete extant version of the *Dongguan Hanji* presents a comparatively small number of lexical indicators related to the recognition of individual erudition. Many of them have parallel accounts in the *Houhan shu*. Proportionally, the term *bolan* stands out as it recurs way more often than other *bo*-related terms in comparison with the *Houhan shu*, in which the most often recurring terms are *boxue* and *botong*. Proportionally too, and in comparison, with the *Houhan shu* again, the *Dongguan Hanji* rarely contains the terms *tongru* and *tongren*. This is probably because the text was a court-sponsored compilation that was reluctant in praising these two titles that gained their authority primarily outside of the Han imperial system of scholarship.

Appendix 2

Table 10
Literary Scholars Gathered by Cao Regime in the Early Third Century CE

Figures	Primary References	Scholarly Indebtedness	Previous Affiliations	Positions in Cao Regime
Wang Can	*Sanguo zhi* 21	Cai Yong	Liu Biao	[Jian'an]丞相掾；軍謀祭酒；侍中（Wei*）
Xu Gan	*Sanguo zhi* 21		No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]軍謀祭酒掾屬；五官將文學
Chen Lin	*Sanguo zhi* 21		Yuan Shao	[Jian'an]軍謀祭酒
Ruan Yu	*Sanguo zhi* 21	Cai Yong	No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]軍謀祭酒
Ying Yang	*Sanguo zhi* 21	Ying Feng; Ying Shao	No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]丞相掾屬；平原侯庶子；五官將文學
Liu Zhen	*Sanguo zhi* 21	Liu Liang	No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]丞相掾屬；五官將文學
Po Qin	*Sanguo zhi* 21		No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]丞相主簿
Lu Cui	*Sanguo zhi* 21	Cai Yong	No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]軍謀祭酒；秘書令
Wu Zhi	*Sanguo zhi* 21		No Clear Affiliation	[Wei]振威將軍
Wei Ji	*Sanguo zhi* 21		No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]司空掾屬；茂陵令；尚書郎；侍中（Wei*）；尚書（Wei*）；侍郎 [Wei]尚書
Liu Yi	*Sanguo zhi* 21		Liu Biao	[Jian'an]丞相掾屬；五官將文學；黃門侍郎（Wei*）；侍中（Wei*）
Liu Shao	*Sanguo zhi* 21		No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]太子舍人；秘書郎 [Wei]尚書郎；散騎侍郎
Wei Dan	*Sanguo zhi* 21		No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]郎中；侍中中書監；光祿大夫
Sun Gai	*Sanguo zhi* 21		No Clear Affiliation	[Wei]郎中
Du Zhi	*Sanguo zhi* 21		No Clear Affiliation	[Wei]郎中
Fu Gu	*Sanguo zhi* 21		No Clear Affiliation	[Wei]司空掾；尚書；黃門侍郎
Yang Xiu	*Sanguo zhi* 19	Yang Ci; Yang Biao	No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]郎中；倉曹屬主簿
Ding Yi 儀	*Sanguo zhi* 19		No Clear Affiliation	
Ding Yi 廙	*Sanguo zhi* 19		No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]黃門侍郎
Wang Lang	*Sanguo zhi* 13	Yang Ci	Sun Ce	[Jian'an]諫議大夫；參司空軍事；魏郡太守（Wei*）；御史大夫（Wei*）； [Wei]司空；司徒
Dong Yu	*Sanguo zhi* 13		No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]黃門侍郎 [Wei]侍中；大司農
Jia Hong	*Sanguo zhi* 13		No Clear Affiliation	[Wei]白馬王相 [Wei]秘書丞

Handa Chun	*Sanguo zhi* 21	Liu Biao	[Wei]博士給事中
Xue Xia	*Sanguo zhi* 13	No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]軍謀掾 [Wei]秘書丞
Wei Xi	*Sanguo zhi* 13	Liu Biao	[Jian'an]軍謀掾 [Wei]譙王郎中
Su Lin	*Sanguo zhi* 21	No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]五官將文學 [Wei]博士給事中
Yue Xiang	*Sanguo zhi* 16	No Clear Affiliation	[Jian'an]河東郡文學祭酒 [Wei]博士；騎都尉
Du Kui	*Songshu* 19	Liu Biao	[Jian'an]軍謀祭酒

* This table offers an incomplete survey of several scholars (column 1) known for their literary talents and intellectual achievements who were gathered and employed by the Cao regime during the early third century (mostly before 220 CE).

* Column 2 (Primary References) offers the reference guides to the historiographic repositories where the figures in column 1 were recorded, mostly in the *Sanguo zhi* (either by Chen Shou or other sources cited by Pei Songzhi in his commentary).

* Column 3 (Scholarly Indebtedness) offers the background information about one's indebtedness to family education, private teaching, or scholarly patrons.

* Column 4 (Previous Affiliations) indicates the condition of bureaucratic employment or disengagement of every specific figure before he was factually employed by the Cao regime. The marker "No Clear Affiliation" incorporates a variety of possibilities including those specified as reclusion.

* Column 5 (Positions in Cao Regime) provides the official positions in chorological sequence held by respective figures after they were factually employed by the Cao regime before or after the establishment of the Wei dynasty. The marker "[Jian'an]" indicates that the position(s) listed thereafter was/were held during the Jian'an period, that is, before the Han-Wei dynastic transition in 220 CE. The marker "(Wei*)" indicates that the position to which it is attached was held within the bureaucratic system of Wei as a duchy and later a kingdom (213–220 CE) nominally affiliated to the imperial Han dynasty. The marker "[Wei]" then indicates that the position(s) listed thereafter was/were held in the Wei imperial system after the formal dynastic transition in 220 CE. Most positions held by these literary scholars were advisory specialists, documentary secretaries, archive keepers, and tutors of literary education that served the interests of the Cao family in particular. I choose to keep all official titles untranslated in order to avoid unnecessary ambiguity, considering that the bureaucratic system during the early third century CE was undergoing a transitional period with political and institutional instabilities.

Appendix 3

Table 13b
Wenzhang in Four Historiographic Compilations
(with contextual information)

Hanshu

Contexts	Specified Subjects	Meanings	Specified Sources
1. （武帝）紹周後，號令文章，煥焉可述。	[W. H.] Emperor Wu	Ritual/Political Order	
2. 鸞鳳又集長樂宮東闕中樹上，飛下止地，文章五色，留十餘刻，吏民並觀。		Ornamental Pattern	
3. 孝道隨世，我署文章。		Ritual/Political Order Ornamental Pattern	[W. H.] "Anshi fangzhong ge" 安世房中歌
4. 紫壇有文章采鏤黼黻之飾及玉、女樂，石壇、僊人祠，瘞鸞路、騂駒、寓龍馬，不能得其象於古。		Ornamental Pattern	[W. H.] Kuang Heng
5. 孝武之世，文章爲盛，太初改制，而兒寬、司馬遷等猶從臣、誼之言，服色數度，遂順黃德。		Ritual/Political Order Ornamental Pattern	Ban Gu*
6. 後有王褒、嚴遵、揚雄之徒，文章冠天下。	[W. H.] Wang Bao; [W. H.] Yan Zun; [W. H.] Yang Xiong	Writing/Literary Production	
7. 戰國從衡，真偽分爭，諸子之言紛然殽亂。至秦患之，乃燔滅文章，以愚黔首。		Writing/Literary Production	
8. 然則常玉不琢，不成文章；君子不學，不成其德。		Ornamental Pattern	[W. H.] Dong Zhongshu

9.	明年當封禪，式又不習文章，貶秩爲太子太傅，以兒寬代之。		Ritual/Political Order	
10.	文章則司馬遷、相如。	[W. H.] Sima Qian; [W. H.] Sima Xiangru	Writing/Literary Production	Ban Gu*
11.	孝宣承統，纂修洪業，亦講論六藝，招選茂異，而蕭望之、梁丘賀、夏侯勝、韋玄成、嚴彭祖、尹更始以儒術進，劉向、王褒以文章顯。	[W. H.] Liu Xiang; Wang Bao	Writing/Literary Production	Ban Gu*
12.	調五聲使有節族，雜五色使有文章。		Ornamental Pattern	[W. H.] Yan An
13.	然其俊桀指世陳政，言成文章，質之先聖而不繆，施之當世合時務，若此者，亦亡幾人。		Ritual/Political Order Ornamental Pattern	[W. H.] Mei Fu
14.	然子贛猶云“夫子之文章可得而聞，夫子之言性與天道不可得而聞”已矣。	Kongzi	Ritual/Political Order	Zigan (Zigong)
15.	臣聞諸侯朝聘，考文章，正法度，非禮不言。	“enfeoffed lords” (*zhuhou* 諸侯)	Ritual/Political Order	[W. H.] Wang Feng
16.	大哉，堯之爲君也！唯天爲大，唯堯則之。巍巍乎其有成功也，煥乎其有文章也！	Yao	Ritual/Political Order Ornamental Pattern	Kongzi
17.	臣謹案詔書律令下者，明天人分際，通古今之誼，文章爾雅，訓辭深厚，恩施甚美。	[W. H.] Emperor Wu	Ritual/Political Order Writing/Literary Production	[W. H.] Gongsun Hong
18.	上長楊賦，聊因筆墨之成文章，故藉翰林以爲主人，子墨爲客卿以風。	[W. H.] Yang Xiong	Writing/Literary Production	[W. H.] Yang Xiong
19.	（揚雄）實好古而樂道，其意欲求文章成名於後世。	[W. H.] Yang Xiong	Writing/Literary Production	Ban Gu*
20.	王舜、王邑爲腹心，甄豐、甄邯主擊斷，平晏領機事，劉歆典文章，孫建爲爪牙。	[W. H.] Liu Xin	Ritual/Political Order	
21.	故曰：“巍巍乎其有成功，煥乎其有文章	Yao	Ritual/Political Order Orna-	“It is said in an old

也！”		mental Pattern	saying” (“Gu yue” 故曰)

Dongguan Hanji

Contexts	Specified Subjects	Meanings	Specified Sources
1. 其時論者以爲（韓）稜淵深有謀，故得龍泉。（致）壽明達有文章，故得文劍。	[E. H.] Zhi Shou	Writing/Literary Production Ornamental Pattern	[E. H.] “the commentors at that time” (其時論者)
2. 明當尊用祖宗之故文章也。	“ancestors” (*zu-zong* 祖宗)	Ritual/Political Order	[E. H.] Du Lin

Houhan shu

Contexts	Specified Subjects	Meanings	Specified Sources
1. 每尋前世舉人貢士，或起甽畝，不繫閥閱。敷奏以言，則文章可採；明試以功，則政有異跡。	“men promoted and tributed in previous ages” 前世舉人貢士	Writing/Literary Production	Emperor Zhang
2. 初，臨邑侯（劉）復好學，能文章。	[E. H.] Liu Fu	Writing/Literary Production	
3. 班固、傅毅之徒，皆置幕府，以典文章。	[E. H.] Ban Gu; [E. H.] Fu Yi	Writing/Literary Production	
4. （竇章）少好學，有文章，與馬融、崔瑗同好，更相推薦。	[E. H.] Dou Zhang	Writing/Literary Production	
5. （桓譚）博學多通，遍習五經，皆詁訓大義，不爲章句。能文章，尤好古學，數從劉歆、楊雄辯析疑異。	[E. H.] Huan Tan	Writing/Literary Production	
6. （致壽）善文章。	[E. H.] Zhi Shou	Writing/Literary Production	
7. （劉龔）作記誨篇及文章傳於世。	[E. H.] Liu Gong	Writing/Literary Production	
8. （鄭）興數言政事，依經守義，文章溫雅，然以不善讖故不能任。	[E. H.] Zheng Xing	Writing/Literary Production Ritual/Political Order	

9.	（陳堅卿）有文章。	[E. H.] Chen Jianqing	Writing/Literary Production Ritual/Political Order	
10.	及至中宗，亦令劉向、王褒、蕭望之、周堪之徒，以文章儒學保訓東宮以下，莫不崇簡其人，就成德器。	Liu Xiang; Wang Bao; Xiao Wangzhi; Zhou Kan	Writing/Literary Production Ritual/Political Order	[E. H.] Ban Biao
11.	及肅宗雅好文章，（班）固愈得幸，數入讀書禁中，或連日繼夜。	[E. H.] Emperor Zhang	Writing/Literary Production	
12.	時論者爲之說：以（韓）棱淵深有謀，故得龍淵；（致）壽明達有文章，故得漢文；寵敦朴，善不見外，故得椎成。	[E. H.] Zhi Shou	Writing/Literary Production Ornamental Pattern	[E. H.] "the commentors at that time" (時論者)
13.	故仲尼嘉唐虞之文章，從周室之郁郁。	Yao; Shun	Ritual/Political Order	[E. H.] Chen Zhong
14.	其二十六，博採古今瑰瑋之士，文章煥炳，德義可觀。	"outstanding men from the past through the present" 古今瑰瑋之士	Writing/Literary Production	[E. H.] Ying Shao
15.	（章）帝雅好文章，自見（崔）駰頌後，帝嗟歎之，謂侍中竇憲曰："卿寧知崔駰乎？"	[E. H.] Emperor Zhang	Writing/Literary Production	
16.	文章煥以粲爛兮，美紛紜以從風。		Ornamental Pattern	[E. H.] Zhang Heng
17.	桓焉、楊厚以儒學進，崔瑗、馬融以文章顯。	[E. H.] Cui Yuan; [E. H.] Ma Rong	Writing/Literary Production	Fan Ye*
18.	（延篤）又從馬融受業，博通經傳及百家之言，能著文章，有名京師。	[E. H.] Yan Du	Writing/Literary Production	
19.	其後黃巾遂盛，朝野崩離，綱紀文章蕩然矣。		Ritual/Political Order	
20.	（曹丕）募天下有上（孔）融文章者，	[E. H.] Kong	Writing/Literary Production	

	輒賞以金帛。	Rong	
21.	又錢無輪郭文章，不便人用。		Ornamental Pattern
22.	鴻都諸藏典策文章，競共剖散，其縑帛圖書，大則連爲帷蓋，小乃制爲縢囊。		Writing/Literary Production
23.	（王隆）能文章，所著詩、賦、銘、書凡二十六篇。	[E. H.] Wang Long	Writing/Literary Production
24.	王莽末，沛國史岑子孝亦以文章顯，莽以爲謁者，著頌、誄、復神、說疾凡四篇。	[E. H.] Cen Zixiao	Writing/Literary Production
25.	及（竇）憲遷大將軍，復以（傅）毅爲司馬，班固爲中護軍。憲府文章之盛，冠於當世。	[E. H.] Ban Gu; [E. H.] Fu Yi	Writing/Literary Production
26.	（黃香）遂博學經典，究精道術，能文章，京師號曰“天下無雙江夏黃童”。	[E. H.] Huang Xiang	Writing/Literary Production
27.	（李尤）少以文章顯。	[E. H.] Li You	Writing/Literary Production
28.	（崔琦）少遊學京師，以文章博通稱。	[E. H.] Cui Qi	Writing/Literary Production
29.	（邊韶）以文章知名，教授數百人。	[E. H.] Bian Shao	Writing/Literary Production
30.	（高彪）病卒於官，文章多亡。	[E. H.] Gao Biao	Writing/Literary Production
31.	劉表及荊州士大夫先服其（禰衡）才名，甚賓禮之，文章言議，非衡不定。	[E. H.] Mi Heng	Writing/Literary Production Ritual/Political Order
32.	（禰）衡時年二十六，其文章多亡云。	[E. H.] Mi Heng	Writing/Literary Production
33.	夫煥乎文章，時或乖用；本乎禮樂，適末或疏。		Ritual/Political Order
34.	織成文章如綾錦。		Ornamental Pattern
35.	守邊之術，李牧善其略，保塞之論，嚴尤申其要，遺業猶在，文章具存，循二子之策，守先帝之規，臣曰可矣。	Li Mu; Yan You	Writing/Literary Production Ritual/Political Order

Contexts	Specified Subjects	Meanings	Specified Sources
1. 見其好書疏文章，巽可成濟。	[T. K.] Cao Mao	Writing/Literary Production	Empress Dowager Guo
2. 更鑄爲小錢，大五分，無文章，肉好無輪郭，不磨鑢。		Ornamental Pattern	
3. （曹袞）凡所著文章二萬餘言，才不及陳思王而好與之侔。	[T. K.] Cao Gun	Writing/Literary Production	
4. 吾家書籍文章，盡當與之。	Cai Yong	Writing/Literary Production	Cai Yong
5. （陳）琳避難冀州，袁紹使典文章。	[T. K.] Chen Lin	Writing/Literary Production Ritual/Political Order	
6. （應）瑒弟璩，璩子貞，咸以文章顯。	[T. K.] Ying Qu; [T. K.] Ying Zhen	Writing/Literary Production	
7. （王象）亦與（衛）覬並以文章顯。	[T. K.] Wang Xiang; [T. K.] Wei Ji	Writing/Literary Production	
8. 文章之士愛其著論屬辭。	[T. K.] "(contemporary) men with literary productions" 文章之士	Writing/Literary Production	[T. K.] Xiahou Hui
9. 青龍四年，詔"欲得有才智文章，謀慮淵深……		Ornamental Pattern Ritual/Political Order Writing/Literary Production	[T. K.] Emperor Ming of Wei
10. 離爲文章，則吏之候也。		Writing/Literary Production	[T. K.] Guan Lu
11. 雖有文章，蔚而不明，非虎非雉，其名曰狸。		Ornamental Pattern	[T. K.] Guan Lu
12. 觀嚴（君平）文章，冠冒天下，由、夷逸操，山嶽不移，使楊子不歎，固自昭	Yan Junping	Writing/Literary Production	[T. K.] Qin Mi

	明。			
13.	諸子文章非心所存，不悉徧視也。	"the many masters" (*zhuzi* 諸子)	Writing/Literary Production	
14.	（郤正）而尤耽意文章，自司馬、王、楊、班、傅、張、蔡之儔遺文篇賦，及當世美書善論，益部有者，則鑽鑿推求，略皆寓目。	Sima Xiangru; Wang Bao; Yang Xiong; Ban Gu; Fu Yi; Zhang Heng; Cai Yong	Writing/Literary Production	
15.	（薛）瑩涉學既博，文章尤妙，同寮之中，瑩爲冠首。	[T. K.] Xue Ying	Writing/Literary Production	
16.	（張溫）英秀之德，文章之采，論議之辯，卓躒冠羣，煒曄曜世，世人未有及之者也。	[T. K.] Zhang Wen	Writing/Literary Production	[T. K.] Luo Tong

* This table, corresponding to Table 13a, offers more detailed accounts for the occurrence of *wenzhang* in four historiographic compilations with contextual information.
* Column 1 (Contexts) offers the original contexts where the term *wenzhang* occurs. I keep my citations highly excerpted but indicative enough to guide the readers to the full context of every single instance.
* Column 2 (Specified Subjects) offers the subject—if any—to whom a specific instance of *wenzhang* was attributed.
* Column 3 (Meanings) offers my tentative explanation of every single instance of *wenzhang* in conformity to one or more of the following aspects—namely, "ritual/political order," "ornamental pattern," and "writing/literary production." I made every single decision according to the contextual information that is shown in column 1 (Contexts). There is no absolute, unambivalent distinction between the three possible meanings, and there are a lot of cases in which *wenzhang* can be certainly understood in more than one way. The context-dependent commensurability between these three possible meanings supports my general undertaking of *wenzhang* as the perceivable manifestation of specific figures or entities that is open to various forms of instantiations.
* Column 4 (Specified Sources) offers the specified source—if any—from which every passage consisting of an instance of *wenzhang* was quoted or cited. In doing this, I incorporate only those that were *specified* (like, with a citation marker) by the compilers of the respective historiographic compilations. I also include those marked as a part of the compilers' own "appraisals" (*zan*) or "comments" (*lun*) and hence should be treated differently from the unspecified narrations throughout the texts. In such cases, a "*" marker is attached to the compiler's name.
* A dynastic time marker is attached ahead of a specific "subject" or "specified source" if it is datable to the dynastic era that the respective historiographic compilation was primarily about. That is, "[W. H.]" for the *Hanshu*, "[E. H.]" for the *Dongguan Hanji* and the *Houhan shu*, and "[T. K.]" for the *Sanguo zhi*.

Appendix 4

A Selected Vocabulary of Disyllabic Terms
Related to the Ethos of Individual Erudition

Lexical Items	Suggested Translations	Related Figures	Samples	Sources
畢覽 *bilan*	completely view/read	Cao Pi	及長而備歷五經、四部、史、漢、諸子百家之言，靡不畢覽。	Cao Pi (*Dianlun*)
遍治 *bianzhi*	all-inclusively study/master	Huan Tan	少好學，遍治五經。	*Dongguan Hanji*
博採 *bocai*	broadly collect/select	Ying Shao	博採古今瑰瑋之士，文章煥炳，德義可觀。	Ying Shao (cited in the *Houhan shu*)
博觀 *boguan*	broadly view/perceive	Emperor Ming (Han)	博觀群書，以助術學，無所不照。	*Dongguan Hanji*
博貫 *boguan*	broadly learn through	Ban Gu	既長，博貫載籍，九流百家之言，無不窮究。	*Dongguan Hanji*
博覽 *bolan*	broadly view/read	Yang Xiong	雄少而好學，不爲章句，訓詁通而已，博覽無所不見。	Yang Xiong (cited in the *Hanshu*)
博洽 *boqia*	broad and rich (in learning)	Ma Rong	馬融才高博洽，爲通儒。	*Dongguan Hanji*
博通 *botong*	broadly comprehend/penetrate	Yin Zhou	治公羊春秋經，博通書傳。	Tombstone Inscription of Yin Zhou
博聞 *bowen*	broadly informed	Emperor Guang-wu	陛下愍學微缺，勞心經蘇，情存博聞，故異端競進。	Fan Sheng (cited in the *Houhan shu*)

博物 *bowu*	broadly learned about things	Mengzi; Xunzi; Dong Zhongshu; Sima Qian; Liu Xiang; Yang Xiong	博物洽聞，通達古今，其言有補於世。	*Hanshu*
博學 *boxue*	broadly learned	"*ru* in antiquity" 古之儒者	古之儒者，博學虖六藝之文。	*Hanshu*
多識 *duozhi*	extensively know/understand	Sima Xiangru	多識博物，有可觀采。	*Hanshu*
多聞 *duowen*	extensively informed		多聞則守之以約，多見則守之以卓。	Yang Xiong (*Fayan*)
古學 *guxue*	ancient studies/ancient model of learning		是以治古學貴文章者謂之俗儒。	He Xiu ("*Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan* jiegu xu")
貫綜 *guanzong*	thoroughly synthesize	Wu Rong	廣學甄微，靡不貫綜。	Tombstone Inscription of Wu Rong
好古 *haogu*	be fond of antiquity	Yang Xiong	實好古而樂道，其意欲求文章成名於後世。	*Hanshu*
鴻儒 *hongru*	grand *ru*		能精思著文連結篇章者爲鴻儒。	Wang Chong (*Lunheng*)
會集 *huiji*	bring together and collect		文者，會集眾綵以成錦繡，會集眾字以成辭義，如文繡然也。	Liu Xi (*Shiming*)
集合 *jihe*	collect and combine	Liu Xiang	向乃集合上古以來歷春秋六國至秦漢符瑞災異之記。	*Hanshu*
兼覽 *jianlan*	integratively view/read	Xia Cheng	兼覽群藝，靡不尋暢。	Tombstone Inscription of Xia Cheng
兼通 *jiantong*	integratively compre-	Zhang Xuan	其學兼通數家。	*Dongguan Hanji*

	hend/penetrate			
兼綜 *jianzong*	integratively synthesize	Zhang Shou	兼綜六藝，博物多識。	Tombstone Inscription of Zhang Shou
洽通 *qiatong*	compatibly connected	Ban Gu	綜其行事，旁貫五經，上下洽通。	*Hanshu*
洽聞 *qiawen*	richly informed	Zhou Ju	姿貌短陋，而博學洽聞，爲儒者所宗。	*Dongguan Hanji*
強/彊記 *qiangji*	great at memorization	Kong Rong	博聞彊記，奇逸卓犖，吾敬孔文舉。	Chen Deng (cited in the *Sanguo zhi*)
強/彊識 *qiangshi*	great at information		博聞強識，世間多有；著書表文，論說古今，萬不耐一。	Wang Chong (*Lunheng*)
強/彊志 *qiangzhi*	great at memorization	Liu Xiang; Liu Xin	父子俱好古，博見彊志，過絕於人。	*Hanshu*
窮究 *qiongjiu*	fully inquiry	Zheng Gu	初受業於歐陽，遂窮究于典籍。	Tombstone Inscription of Zheng Gu
窮綜 *qiongzong*	fully synthesize	Wu Liang	廣學甄徹，窮綜典[?]。	Tombstone Inscription of Wu Liang
屬文 *zhuwen*	compose/make connections of *wen* (as writing)	Ban Gu	年九歲，能屬文誦詩賦。	*Dongguan Hanji*
通博 *tongbo*	comprehensive and broad (in learning)	Wu Zhi	以才學通博，爲五官將及諸侯所禮愛。	Yu Huan (*Weilüe*)
通才 *tongcai*	man with comprehensive talent		夫文本同而末異，蓋奏議宜雅，書論宜理，銘誄尚實，詩賦欲麗。此四科不同，故能之者偏也。唯通才能備其體。	Cao Pi (*Dianlun*, "Lun wen")

通達 *tongda*	comprehensive and open-minded	Liu Xiang	更生以通達能屬文辭，與王褒、張子僑等並進對，獻賦頌凡數十篇。	*Hanshu*
通覽 *tonglan*	comprehensively/thoroughly view/read		初爲章句者，非通覽之人也。	Wang Chong (*Lunheng*)
通人 *tongren*	comprehensive man		博覽古今者爲通人。	Wang Chong (*Lunheng*)
通儒 *tongru*	comprehensive *ru*	Ban Gu; Jia Kui; Zheng Xing; Zheng Zhong	古文科斗，近於爲實，而厭抑流俗，降在小學。中興以來，通儒達士班固、賈逵、鄭興父子，並敦悅之。	Lu Zhi (cited in the *Houhan shu*)
文人 *wenren*	literary man		采掇傳書以上書奏記者爲文人。	Wang Chong (*Lunheng*)
文儒 *wenru*	literary *ru*		文儒之業，卓絕不循。	Wang Chong (*Lunheng*)
文學 *wenxue*	literary learning	Zheng Gu	膺游夏之文學，襄冉季之政事。	Tombstone Inscription of Zheng Gu
文章 *wenzhang*	patterned manifestation; literary production; textual display	Lu Jia; Sima Qian; Liu Xiang; Yang Xiong	漢世文章之徒，陸賈、司馬遷、劉子政、楊子雲，其材能若奇，其稱不由人。	Wang Chong (*Lunheng*)
周覽 *zhoulan*	encompassingly view/read	Xie Gai	博通群藝，周覽古今。	Kong Rong (cited in the *Houhan shu*)
著辭 *zhuci*	manifest/produce verbalized pieces	Zhou Xing	屬文著辭，有可觀採。	Chen Zhong (cited in the *Houhan shu*)
著書 *zhushu*	manifest/produce literary	Ying Yang	其才學足以著書，美志不遂，	Cao Pi

	compositions (in the form regarded as *shu*)		良可痛惜。	(Letter to Wu Zhi)
著述 *zhushu*	manifest and transmit; produce literary compositions (in general)	Sima Qian; Yang Xiong; Liu Xin; Zheng Zhong; Jia Kui; Ban Gu; Ma Rong; Zheng Xuan	漢興，博物洽聞著述之士，前有司馬遷、揚雄、劉歆，後有鄭衆、賈逵、班固，近則馬融、鄭玄。	Ying Rong ("*Chunqiu shili* xu")
著文 *zhuwen*	manifest/produce *wen* (as writing)	Liu Xiang; Liu Xin; Yang Xiong; Huan Tan	夫通覽者，世間比有；著文者，歷世希然。近世劉子政父子、楊子雲、桓君山，其猶文、武、周公並出一時也。	Wang Chong (*Lunheng*)
著作 *zhuzuo*	manifest/produce and create		著作者爲文儒，說經者爲世儒。	Wang Chong (*Lunheng*)
撰集 *zhuanji*	compose/compile and collect		宜令太史撰集，以傳來世。	Emperor Guangwu's Officials (cited in the *Houhan shu*)
撰錄 *zhuanlu*	compose/compile and record/make copy of		撰錄植前後所著賦頌詩銘雜論凡百餘篇。	Cao Rui (cited in the *Sanguo zhi*)
綴集/輯 *zhuiji*	compose/make connections of and collect	Ban Gu	故探篹前記，綴輯所聞。	*Hanshu*
綴文 *zhuiwen*	compose/make connections of *wen* (in general)	"men who composed/made connections of *wen*" 綴文之士 (in following passage, referring to Mengzi, Xunzi, Dong Zhongshu, Sima Qian, Liu Xiang, and Yang Xiong)	自孔子後，綴文之士眾矣。	*Hanshu*

* This vocabulary incorporates 50 disyllabic terms from a greater repository of expressions and utterances during and after the Han. The vocabulary in general indicates the society's growing awareness and possession of the concepts and ideas related to the cultivation of individual erudition and its various forms of manifestation. A considerable number of lexical items in this vocabulary had occurrence(s)—in some cases, famous ones—in pre-Han contexts as well. My samples and explanations, to clarify, reflect their usages in Han-Wei period only.

* Many of these lexical items have been mentioned and analyzed in previous chapters.

* All terms are put in alphabetic sequence according to their *pinying* romanizations.

* Column 2 (Suggested Translations) offers my tentative translations of these terms that are often, grammatically and semantically, appropriated in a flexible manner of usage.

* Column 3 (Related Figures) offers the figure(s)—if any—mentioned as the subject of a given term within a given context.

* Column 4 (Samples) offers 50 different samples (one for each term) that I selected from a variety of sources datable to the period from the late Western Han through Three Kingdoms. All instances in the *Sanguo zhi* and the *Houhan shu* are selected from the narrators' citations of specific figures who died before the end of the Three Kingdoms.

* The readers might be impressed by the close relations between several recurring terms under review, as well as the highly condensed, formulaic, and interlocking structures of expression by which disyllabic terms were often combined into longer phrases or densely employed in a cluster of utterances. Consequently, there are a lot of cases in which a given sample that I selected consists of more than one of the 50 terms. Nevertheless, the overall rich evidence of Han-Wei utterances under review have enabled me to avoid repetition and, simultaneously, to remain highly selective with my samples so as to provide a diverse, comprehensive overview of the vocabulary in general.

* In general, I tend to keep balance between the following principles of selecting my samples: 1) for a given term, to give priority to the sample in which that term was used as a key word or an element of making definition; 2) for a given term, to give priority to the sample in which that term was used to characterize more than one exemplary figure; 3) for the entire vocabulary, to cover a wide time span and a diverse range of sources and genres. The samples are eventually selected from a variety of sources that cover historiographic and biographic narrations, self-narratives, philosophic writings, letters, memorials, edicts, and tombstone inscriptions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Ban, Gu 班固. *Hanshu* 漢書. annot. Yan Shigu 顏師古. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962.

Cai, Yong 蔡邕. *Cai zhonglang ji* 蔡中郎集. *Sibu beiyao* 四部備要, Fasc. 67.

Cao, Xu 曹旭, annot. *Shipin jizhu* 詩品集注. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1994.

Chen, Shou 陳壽. *Sanguo zhi* 三國志. annot. Pei Songzhi 裴松之. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959.

Cheng, Shude 程樹德, annot. *Lunyu jishi* 論語集釋. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

Cui, Shi 崔適. *Shiji tanyuan* 史記探源. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986.

Duan, Yucai 段玉裁, annot. *Shuowen jiezi zhu* 說文解字注. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988.

Fan, Wenlan 范文瀾, annot. *Wenxin diaolong zhu* 文心雕龍注. Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1958.

Fan, Xiangyong 范祥雍, annot. *Zhanguo ce jianzheng* 戰國策箋證. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006.

Fan, Ye 范曄. *Houhan shu* 後漢書. annot. Li Xian 李賢. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2000.

Fang, Xuanlin 房玄齡 et al. *Jinshu* 晉書. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.

Gao, Wen 高文, annot. *Hanbei jishi* 漢碑集釋. Kaifeng: Henan daxue chubanshe, 1997.

Hong, Shi 洪適, comp. *Lishi · lixu* 隸釋·隸續. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985.

Hong, Xingzu 洪興祖, annot. *Chuci buzhu* 楚辭補注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

Huang, Hui 黃暉 and Liu Pansui 劉盼遂, annots. *Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

Huang, Rucheng 黃汝成, annot. *Rizhi lu jishi* 日知錄集釋. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006.

Huang, Xingzeng 黃省曾 and Sun Qizhi 孫啟治, annots. *Shenjian zhu jiaobu* 申鑒注校補. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2012.

Jiao, Xun 焦循, annot. *Mengzi zhengyi* 孟子正義. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.

Li, Jingde 黎靖德, comp. *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類. Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1997.

Liu, Shao 劉劭. *Renwu zhi* 人物志. *Sibu congkan chubian* 四部叢刊初編, Fasc. 429.

Liu, Wendian 劉文典, annot. *Huainan honglie jijie* 淮南鴻烈集解. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989.

Lou, Yulie 樓宇烈, annot. *Laozi Daode jing zhu jiaoshi* 老子道德經注校釋. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008.

Lu, Qinli 逯欽立, comp. *Xian Qin Han Wei Jin Nanbeichao Shi* 先秦漢魏晉南北朝詩. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

Ma, Ruichen 馬瑞辰, annot. *Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi* 毛詩傳箋通釋. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989.

Ouyang, Xun 歐陽詢, comp. *Yiwen leiju* 藝文類聚. ed. Wang Shaoying 汪紹楹. Shanghai:

Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1982.
Pi, Xirui 皮錫瑞. *Jingxue lishi* 經學歷史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008.
Pu, Qilong 浦起龍, annot. *Shi tong tongshi* 史通通釋. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1978.
Ren, Jifang 任继昉, annot. *Shiming huijiao* 釋名匯校. Jinan: Qilu shushe, 2006.
Ruan Yuan 阮元, ed. *Shisanjing zhushu* 十三經注疏. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.
Sima, Qian 司馬遷. *Shiji* 史記. annot. Pei Yin 裴駰, Sima Zhen 司馬貞, and Zhang Shoujie 張守節. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982.
Shen, Yue 沈約. *Songshu* 宋書. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.
Shi, Guangying 石光瑛, annot. *Xinxu jiaoshi* 新序校釋. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001.
Shi, You 史游. *Jijiu pian* 急就篇. *Guyi congshu* 古逸叢書, Fasc. 22.
Sun, Qizhi 孫啟治, annot. *Zhonglun jiegu* 中論解詁. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2014.
Tang, Yan 唐晏. *Liang Han Sanguo xue'an* 兩漢三國學案. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008.
Wang, Liqi 王利器, annot. *Fengsu tongyi jiaozhu* 風俗通義校注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981.
——. annot. *Yantie lun jiaozhu* 鹽鐵論校注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1992.
Wang, Rongbao 汪榮寶, annot. *Fayan yishu* 法言義疏. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.
Wang, Shuming 王樹民, annot. *Nian er shi zhaji jiaozheng* 廿二史劄記校證. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1984.
Wang Tianhai 王天海 and Wang Ren 王韌, annots. *Yilin jiaoshi* 意林校釋. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2014.
Wang, Xianqian 王先謙, annot. *Shi sanjia yi jishu* 詩三家義集疏. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.
——. annot. *Xunzi jijie* 荀子集解. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988.
——. annot. *Zhuangzi jijie* 莊子集解. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.
Wang, Xianshen 王先慎, annot. *Hanfeizi jijie* 韓非子集解. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998.
Wei, Zheng 魏徵 et al. *Suishu* 隋書. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997.
Wu, Shuping 吳樹平, annot. *Dongguan Hanji jiaozhu* 東觀漢記校注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008.
Wu, Yujiang 吳毓江, annot. *Mozi jiaozhu* 墨子校注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1993.
Xiang, Zonglu 向宗魯, annot. *Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 說苑校證. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.
Xiao, Tong 蕭統, comp. *Wenxuan* 文選. annot. Li Shan 李善. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1986.
Xu, Kai 徐鍇, annot. *Shuowen jiezi xizhuan* 說文解字繫傳. *Sibu congkan chubina*, Fasc. 72.
Xu, Weiyu 許維遹, annot. *Hanshi waizhuan jishi* 韓詩外傳集釋. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.
Xu, Yuli 徐玉立, ed. *Hanbei quanji* 漢碑全集. Zhengzhou: Henan meishu chubanshe, 2006.
Yan, Kejun 嚴可均, comp. *Quan Shanggu Sandai Qin Han Sanguo Liuchao wen* 全上古三代秦漢三國六朝文. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1958.
Yang, Bojun 楊伯峻, annot. *Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.
Yao, Zhenzong 姚振宗, comp. *Qilüe bielu yiwen · Qilüe yiwen* 七略別錄佚文·七略佚文. Macao: University of Macao, 2007.
Ye, Ying 葉瑛, annot. *Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu* 文史通義校注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985.
Yu, Shaochu 俞紹初, comp. *Jian'an qizi ji* 建安七子集. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005.

Yu, Yuan 郁沅 and Zhang Minggao 張明高, eds. *Wei Jin Nanbeichao wenlun xuan* 魏晉南北朝文論選. Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1996.

Zhao, Youwen 趙幼文, annot. *Cao Zhi ji jiaozhu* 曹植集校注. Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1984.

Zhu, Qianzhi 朱謙之, ed. *Xinjiben Huan Tan Xinlun* 新輯本桓譚新論. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2009.

Secondary Sources

Allen, Joseph. *In the Voice of Others: Chinese Music Bureau Poetry*. Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, The University of Michigan, 1992.

An, Zuozhang 安作璋. "Handai de xuanguan zhidu" 漢代的選官制度. *Shandong shifan daxue xuebao* 山東師範大學學報, Nos. 1–2 (1981): 11–21; 14–24.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. London & New York: Verso, 2006.

Asselin, Mark. *A Significant Season: Cai Yong (ca. 133–192) and His Contemporaries*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2010.

Assmann, Aleida. "Canon and Archive." in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*. ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 97–108.

——. *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Assmann, Jan. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Toward a Methodology for the Human Science." in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. trans. Vern W. McGee. ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 159–72.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." in *Image, Music, Text*. ed. & trans. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana Press, 1977), 142–48.

——. "From Work to Text." in *Image, Music, Text*, 155–64.

Baxter, William. "Zhōu and Hàn Phonology in the *Shījīng*." in *Studies in the Historical Phonology of Asian Language*. ed. William G. Boltz and Michael C. Shapiro (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991), 1–34.

——. "Situating the Language of the *Lao-tzu*." in *Lao-tzu and the Tao-te-ching*. ed. Livia Kohn and Michael LaFargue (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998), 231–53.

Beecroft, Alexander. *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China: Patterns of Literary Circulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

——. "Blindness and Literacy in the 'Lives' of Homer." *The Classical Quarterly* 61 (2011): 1–18.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. trans. Harry Zohn. ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken Books, 1999), 69–82.

Berkowitz, Alan. "Reclusion and the 'Chinese Eremitic Tradition'." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 113.4 (1993): 575–84.

——. *Patterns of Disengagement: The Practice and Portrayal of Reclusion in Early Medieval China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Boltz, William G. "Why So Many *Laozi*-s?" in *Studies in Chinese Manuscripts: From the Warring States Period to the 20th Century*. ed. Imre Galambos (Budapest: Institute of East Asian Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, 2013), 1–32.

——. "The Composite Nature of Early Chinese Texts." in *Text and Ritual in Early China*. ed. Martin Kern (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2005), 50–78.

Brashier, K. E. "Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Stelae." in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 249–84.

——. "Eastern Han Commemorative Stelae: Laying the Cornerstone of Public Memory." in *Early Chinese Religion, vol. 1*. ed. John Lagerwey and Mark Kalinowski (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 1027–60.

——. *Public Memory in Early China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014.

Cai, Danjun 蔡丹君. "Xi Han fu jia de langguan shenfen dui qi fuzuo de yingxiang" 西漢賦家的郎官身份對其賦作的影響. *Wenxue yichan* 文學遺產, No. 5 (2013): 27–37.

Cai, Zongqi 蔡宗齊. "A Study of Early Chinese Concepts *Qing* 情 and a Dialogue with Western Emotion Studies." *Prism: Theory and Modern Chinese Literature* 17 (2020): 399–429.

Cerquiglini Bernard. *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*. trans. Betsy Wing. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Chang, Kang-i and Stephen Owen, eds. *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature, vol. 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Chen, Jack. "On the Act and Representation of Reading in Medieval China." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129 (2009): 57–71.

——. and David C. Schaberg, eds. *Idle Talk: Gossip and Anecdote in Traditional China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

Chen, Mengjia 陳夢家. "Handai zhangju xue de shishi" 漢代章句學的試釋. in *Wuwei Hanjian* 武威漢簡 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1964), 35–39.

Chen, Qiyun 陳啟雲. *Ruxue yu Handai lishi wenhua* 儒學與漢代歷史文化. Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 2007.

——. "Guanyu Donghan shi de jige wenti: qingyi danggu yu huangjin" 關於東漢史的幾個問題：清議、黨錮與黃巾. in *Ruxue yu Handai lishi wenhua*, 197–214.

Ch'en, Ch'i-yün (Chen Qiyun). "A Confucian Magnate's Idea of Political Violence: Hsün Shuang's (128–190) Interpretation of the *Book of Changes*." *T'oung Pao* 54 (1968): 73–115.

——. *Hsün Yüeh (A. D. 148–209): The Life and Reflections of an Early Medieval Confucian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

——. "Confucian, Legalist, and Taoist Thoughts in Later Han." in *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 1: The Ch'in and Han Empires, 221 B. C.–A. D. 220*. ed. Denis Twitchett and Michael Loewe

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 766–807.

Chen, Shih-Hsiang 陳世驤. "Zhongguo 'shi' zi zhi yuanshi guannian shilun" 中國"詩"字之原始觀念試論. in *Zhongguo wenxue de shuqing chuantong* 中國文學的抒情傳統 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2015), 83–100.

Chen, Suzhen 陳蘇鎮. *Chunqiu yu handao: liang Han zhengzhi yu zhengzhi wenhua yanjiu* 春秋與漢道：兩漢政治與政治文化研究. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2011.

Chen, Tongsheng 陳桐生. "Xian Qin duihua ti sanwen yuanliu" 先秦對話體散文源流. *Xueshu yanjiu* 學術研究, No. 8 (2017): 159–64.

Chen, Yinke 陳寅恪. "Shu *Shishuo xinyu* wenxue lei Zhong Hui zhuan *Siben lun* shi bi tiao hou" 書世說新語文學類鍾會撰四本論始畢條後. in *Jinmingguan conggao chubian* 金明館叢稿初編 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2001), 47–54.

——. "Tao Yuanming sixiang yu qingtan zhi guanxi" 陶淵明思想與清談之關係, in *Jinmingguan conggao chubian*, 201–29.

Chen, Yuan 陳垣. *Shihui juli* 史諱舉例. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1956.

Chen, Zhi 陳直. "Han Jin ren dui *Shiji* de chuanbo ji qi pingjia" 漢晉人對史記的傳播及其評價. *Sichuan daxue xuebao* 四川大學學報, No. 3 (1957): 41–57.

Cheng, Anne. "What Did it Mean to Be a Ru in Han Times?" *Asia Major* 14 (2001): 103–04.

Cheng, Sudong 程蘇東. "Xihan zhongqianqi wujing boshi shifa wenti huikao" 西漢中前期五經博士師法問題匯考. *Guoxue yanjiu* 國學研究, No. 2 (2015): 115–59.

——. "Xiechaoben shidai yizhixing wenben de faxian yu yanjiu" 寫鈔本時代異質性文本的發現與研究. *Beijing daxue xuebao* 北京大學學報 53, No. 2 (2016): 148–57.

——. "Ye tan Zhanguo Qin Han shiqi zuozhe wenti de chuxian" 也談戰國秦漢時期"作者"問題的出現. *Wenyi pinglun* 文藝評論, No. 8 (2017): 4–10.

——. "Shuxie wenhua de xinbian yu shiren wenxue de xingqi: yi *Chunqiu* ji qi zaoqi chanshi wei zhongxin" 書寫文化的新變與士人文學的興起：以《春秋》及其早期闡釋爲中心. *Zhongguo shehui kexue* 中國社會科學, No. 6 (2018): 134–58.

Cherniack, Susan. "Book Culture and Textual Transmission in Sung China." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54 (1994): 5–125.

Clanchy, Michael T. *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*. 3rd Ed. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Coleridge, Samuel T. *Aids to Reflection*. ed. John Beer. London: Routledge, 1994.

Crespigny, Rafe de. *Fire over Luoyang: A History of the Later Han Dynasty, 23–220 AD*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Csikszentmihalyi, Mark. *Readings in Han Chinese Thought*. Indianapolis & Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2006.

——. and Michael Nylan. "Constructing Lineages and Inventing Traditions through Exemplary Figures in Early China." *T'oung Pao* 90 (2003): 59–99.

Cutter, Robert Joe. "The Incident at the Gate: Cao Zhi, the Succession, and Literary Fame." *T'oung Pao* 71 (1985): 228–62.

Dagenais, John. *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Damrosch, David. *What Is World Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Declercq, Dominik. *Writing against the State: Political Rhetorics in Third and Fourth Century China*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Denecke, Wiebke, Wai-yee Li, and Xiaofei Tian, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature (1000 BCE–900 CE)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. trans. Gayatri C. Spivak. Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Drège, Jean-Pierre. "La lecture et l'écriture en Chine et la xylographie." *Etudes chinoises* 10.1–2 (1991): 77–111.

Du, Heng 杜恆. "The Author's Two Bodies: The Death of Qu Yuan and the Birth of *Chuci zhangju*." *T'oung Pao* 105 (2019): 259–314.

Dubs, Homer. *The History of the Former Han Dynasty, vol. 2*. Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1941.

Durrant, Stephen. *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writing of Sima Qian*. Albany: State University of New York, 1995.

——. "The Place of *Hou Hanshu* in Early Chinese Historiography." *Monumenta Serica* 67:1 (2019): 165–81.

Ebrey, Patricia. "Later Han Stone Inscriptions." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 40 (1980): 325–53.

——. "The Economic and Social History of Later Han." in *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 1*, 608–48.

——. "Toward a Better Understanding of the Later Han Upper Class." in *State and Society in Early Medieval China*. ed. Albert E. Dien (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 49–72.

Egan, Charles. "Were Yueh-fu Ever Folk Songs? Reconsidering the Relevance of Oral Theory and Balladry Analogies." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 22 (2000): 31–66.

Eliot, T. S. "Tradition and the Individual Talent." in *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*. ed. Frank Kermode (New York: Harcourt, 1975), 37–44.

Ess, Hans van. "The Apocryphal Texts of the Han Dynasty and the Old Text/New Text Controversy." *T'oung Pao* 85 (1999): 29–64.

——. "Hou Han shu." in *Early Medieval Chinese Texts: A Bibliographic Guide*. ed. Cynthia Chennault et al. (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 2015), 112–18.

——. "Literary Works and Allusion in Three Biographies of the *Hou Hanshu* and Their Purpose." *Monumenta Serica* 67:1 (2019): 111–26.

Falkenhausen, Lothar von. "Issues in Western Zhou Studies: A Review Article." *Early China* 18 (1993): 139–226.

——. "Antiquarianism in East Asia." in *World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives*. ed. Alain Schnapp (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2013), 35–66.

Fang, Yixin 方一新. *Donghan Wei Jin Nanbeichao shishu ciyu jianzhi* 東漢魏晉南北朝史書詞語箋釋.

Hefei: Huangshan shushe, 1997.
Feng, Shengli 馮勝利. "Prosodic Structure and Compound Words in Classical Chinese." in *New Approaches to Chinese Word Formation: Morphology, Phonology and the Lexicon in Modern and Ancient Chinese*. ed. Jerome Packard (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998), 197–260.
Feng, Shuxun 馮樹勛. "Shi moni hai shi chuangxin: fanshi chongtu nei de Yang Xiong" 是摹擬還是創新：範式衝突內的揚雄. *Guoli zhengzhi daxue zhexue xuebao* 國立政治大學哲學學報 30 (2013): 27–71.
Feng, Youlan 馮友蘭. *Zhongguo zhexueshi xinbian* 中國哲學史新編. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1964.
Feng, Yujie 馮渝傑. "Cong huangjin bai Zheng Xuan kan Han mo yinyi yu difang zhixue de chongjian" 從黃巾拜鄭玄看漢末隱逸與地方秩序的重建. *Wenshizhe* 文史哲, No. 2 (2017): 141–54.
Finkelstein, David and Alistair McCleery, *An Introduction to Book History*. New York & London: Routledge, 2005.
Fischer, Paul. "Authentication Studies Methodology and the Polymorphous Text Paradigm." *Early China* 32 (2008–2009): 1–43.
——. "Intertextuality in Early Chinese Master-Texts: Shared Narratives in Shi Zi." *Asia Major* 22 (2009): 1–34.
Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.
Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" trans. Robert Hurley et. al. in *Essential Works of Foucault (1965–1984), vol. 2: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. ed. James D. Faubion (New York: The New Press, 1998), 205–22.
Frankel Hans. "The Formulaic Language of the Chinese Ballad 'Southeast Fly the Peacocks'." *Academic Sinica* 39 (1969): 219–44.
——. "T'ang Literati: A Composite Biography." in *Critical Readings on Tang China, vol. 2*. ed. Paul Kroll (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 545–65.
Fu, Gang 傅剛. "Lun *Wenxuan* nan ti" 論《文選》難體. *Zhejiang xuekan* 浙江學刊, No. 6 (1996): 86–89.
——. "Lun Jian'an wenxue piping de fasheng" 論建安文學批評的發生. *Wenxue pinglun* 文學評論 No. 1 (2019): 174–81.
Fukui, Shigemasa 福井重雅. "Rikukei rikugei to gokei: Kandai ni okeru gokei no seiritsu" 六経六藝と五經：漢代における五經の成立. *Chūgoku shigaku* 中國史學 4 (1994): 139–64.
——. "Shin Kan jidai ni okeru hakase seido no tenkai: gokei hakase no secchi o meguru gigi sairon" 秦漢時代における博士制度の展開：五經博士の設置をめぐる疑義再論. *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 東洋史研究 54 (1995): 1–31.

Galambos, Imre. *Orthography of Early Chinese Writing: Evidence from Newly Excavated Manuscripts (490–221 BC)*. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, Department of East Asian Studies, 2006.
Gao, Ming 高敏. "*Sanguo zhi* Pei Songzhi zhu yingshu kao" 《三國志》裴松之注引書考. *Henan*

keji daxue xuebao 河南科技大學學報, No. 3 (2007): 5–21.

Ge, Zhaoguang 葛兆光. *Zhongguo sixiangshi* 中國思想史. Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2014.

Genette, Gérard. P*aratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Gentz, Joachim. "Ritual Meaning of Textual Form: Evidence from Early Commentaries of the Historiographic and Ritual Traditions." in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 124–48.

——. and Dirk Meyer, eds. *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Goh, Meow Hui. "Artful Remembrance: Reading, Writing, and Reconstructing the Fallen State in Lu Ji's "Bian wang." in *Memory in Medieval China: Text, Ritual, and Community*. ed. Wendy Swartz and Robert Company (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 10–35.

Goldin, R. Paul. "Xunzi and Early Chinese Philosophy." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 67 (2007): 135–66.

Gong, Kechang 龔克昌. "Han fu: wenxue zijue shidai de qidian" 漢賦：文學自覺時代的起點. *Wenshizhe* 5 (1988): 67–75.

Goody, Jack. *The Interface between the Written and the Oral*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

——. *The Power of the Written Tradition*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.

Graham, A. C. *Disputers of the Tao: Philosophical Argument in Ancient China*. La Salle: Open Court, 1989.

Gu, Yacheng 谷亞成 and Zhang Fangmei 張芳梅. "Qin Han sijia cangshu lüeshu" 秦漢私家藏書略述. *Xibei daxue xuebao* 西北大學學報 22 (1992): 114–19.

Gu, Yixin 顧一心. "Speaking with the Learning of Odes: Cao Zhi's Representation of the *Shijing* and Its Hermeneutic Traditions in the Contexts of Han-Wei China." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 141.2 (2021): 299–328.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *The Social Frameworks of Memory*. in *On Collective Memory*, trans. Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Henry, Eric. "'Junzi Yue' versus 'Zhongni Yue' in *Zuozhuan*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59 (1999): 125–61.

Hightower, James R. "The *Han shih wai chuan* and the *San chia shih*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 11 (1948): 241–310.

Hsing, I-t'ien 邢義田. "Qin Han pingmin de duxie nengli: shiliao jiedu pian zhi yi" 秦漢平民的讀寫能力：史料解讀篇之一. in *Di si jie guoji hanxue huiyi lunwenji: Gudai shuming shehui* 第四屆國際漢學會議論文集：古代庶民社會. ed. Hsing I-t'ien and Liu Zenggui 劉增貴 (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan, 2013), 241–88.

——. *Hua wai zhi yi: Handai Kongzi jian Laozi huaxiang yanjiu* 畫外之意：漢代孔子見老子畫像研究. Taipei: Sanmin shuju, 2018.

Hu, Baoguo 胡寶國. "Zhishi zhishang de Nanchao xuefeng" 知識至上的南朝學風. *Wenshi* 文史, No. 4 (2009): 151–70.

——. *Han Tang jian shixue de fazhan* 漢唐間史學的發展. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2014.
Hu, Dalei 胡大雷. "Yexia wenxue jituan lun" 鄴下文學集團論. *Guangxi shifan daxue xuebao* 廣西師範大學學報, No. 2 (1991): 52–57.
——. "Lun 'yuti' ji wenti de qian 'wenti' zhuangtai" 論"語體"及文體的前"文體"狀態. *Wenxue yichan*, No. 1 (2012): 17–24.
Hua, Rende 華人德. *Zhongguo shufa shi: liang Han juan* 中國書法史：兩漢卷. Nanjing: Jiangsu jiaoyu chubanshe, 1999.
Hunter, Michael J. *Confucius Beyond the Analects*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
——. "The 'Yiwen zhi' [Treatise on Arts and Letters] Bibliography in Its Own Context." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 138 (2018): 763–80.

Jiang, Bo 蔣波. *Qin Han yinyi wenti yanjiu* 秦漢隱逸問題研究. Changsha: Xiangtan daxue chubanshe, 2014.
Jiang, Wenyan 蔣文燕. "Handai danan ti fuzuo zhong 'Zhanguo qingjie' de neihan ji bianhua" 漢代答難體賦作中"戰國情結"的內涵及變化. *Nandu xuetan* 南都學壇, No. 6 (2007): 63–66.

Kaizuka, Shigeki 貝塚茂樹. "Rongo no seiritsu" 論語の成立. in *Chūgoku kodai no denshō* 中國古代の傳承, *Kaizuka Shigeki chosaku shū* 貝塚茂樹著作集, vol. 5 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1976), 273–90.
——. "Kokugo ni arawareta setsuwa no keishiki" 国語に現れた説話の形式, in *Chūgoku kodai no denshō*, 291–312.
——. "Kodia ni okeru rekishi kijutsu keitai no hensen" 古代における歴史記述形態の変遷. in *Chūgoku no shigeku* 中國の史學, *Kaizuka Shigeki chosaku shū*, vol. 7 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1977), 201–30.
Kao, Yu-kung 高友工. "The Nineteen Old Poems and Aesthetics of Self-Reflection." in *The Power of Culture: Studies in Chinese Cultural History*. ed. Willard J. Peterson, Andrew H. Plaks and Ying-shih Yu (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1994), 80–102.
Kawakatsu, Yoshio 川勝義雄. *Rikuchō kizokusei shakai no kenkyū* 六朝貴族制社会の研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1982.
Ke, Mading 柯馬丁 (Martin Kern). "*Shiji* li de zuozhe gainian" 史記裡的作者概念. in *Shijixue yu shijie hanxue lunji xubian* 史記學與世界漢學論集續編. ed. Li Jixiang 李紀祥 and Ke Mading (Taipei: Tangshan chubanshe, 2016), 23–61.
Kern, Martin. *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih-huang: Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Imperial Representation*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2000.
——. "*Shijing* Songs as Performance Texts: A Case Study of "Chu ci" (Thorny Caltrop)." *Early China* 25 (2000): 49–111.
——. "Ritual, Text, and Formation of the Canon: Historical Transitions of 'Wen' in Early China." *T'oung Pao* 87 (2001): 43–91.
——. "Methodological Reflections on the Analysis of Textual Variants and the Modes of Manu-

script Production in Early China." *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 4 (2002): 143–81.
——. "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the 'Fu'." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 63 (2003): 383–437.
——. "The Poetry of Han Historiography." *Early Medieval China* 10 (2004): 23–65.
——. ed. *Text and Ritual in Early China*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2005.
——. "The Odes in Excavated Manuscripts." in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 149–93.
——. "The Performance of Writing in Western Zhou China." in *The Poetics of Grammar and the Metaphysics of Sound and Sign*. ed. Sergio La Porta and David Shulman (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 109–176.
——. "Offices of Writing and Reading in the *Rituals of Zhou*." in *Statecraft and Classical Learning: The Rituals of Zhou in East Asian History*. ed. Benjamin Elman and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 64–93.
——. "Early Chinese Literature: Beginning through Western Han." in *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature, vol. 1*, 1–115.
——. "Bronze Inscriptions, the *Shijing* and the *Shangshu*: The Evolution of the Ancestral Sacrifice during the Western Zhou." in *Early Chinese Religion, vol. 1*, 143–200.
——. "Creating a Book and Performing It: The "Yao lüe" Chapter of the *Huainanzi* as a Western Han *Fu*." in *The Huainanzi and Textual Production in Early China*. ed. Sarah A. Queen and Michael Puett (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 124–50.
——. "Masters in the *Shiji*." *T'oung Pao* 101 (2015): 335–62.
——. and Dirk Meyer, eds. *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy: Studies in the Composition and Thought of the Shangshu (Classic of Documents)*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
——. "Kongzi as Author in the Han." in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*. ed. Michael J. Hunter and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 268–307.
——. "The Formation of the *Classic of Poetry*." in *The Homeric Epics and the Chinese Book of Songs: Foundational Texts Compared*. ed. Fritz-Heiner Mutschler (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2018), 39–71.
——. "'Xi shuai' 蟋蟀 ('Cricket') and Its Consequences: Issues in Early Chinese Poetry and Textual Studies." *Early China* 42 (2019): 39–74.
Kinney, Anne. "The Theme of the Precocious Child in Early Chinese Literature." *T'oung Pao* 81 (1995): 1–24.
Klein, Esther and Colin Klein. "Wang Chong's Epistemology of Testimony." *Asia Major* 29 (2016): 115–46.
Knechtges, David R. *The Han Rhapsody: A Study of the Fu of Yang Hsiung (53 B. C.–A. D. 18)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
——. *The Han shu Biography of Yang Hsiung (53 BC–AD 18)*. Tempe: Arizona State University, Center for Asian Studies, 1982.
——. trans. *Wen xuan, or Selections of Refined Literature, vol. 1*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

——. "To Praise the Han: The Eastern Han Capital *Fu* of Pan Ku and His Contemporaries." in *Thought and Law in Qin and Han China*. ed. W. L. Idema and E. Zürcher (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 118–39.

——. "Culling the Weeds and Selecting Prime Blossoms: The Anthology in Early Medieval China." in *Culture and Power in the Reconstitution of the Chinese Realm, 200–600*. ed. Scott Pearce, Audrey Spiro, and Patricia Ebrey (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001), 200–41.

——. "From the Eastern Han through the Western Jin (AD 25–317)." in *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature, vol. 1*, 116–98.

Kramers, Robert. "The Development of the Confucian Schools." in *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 1*, 747–65.

Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 3rd Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

LaCapra, Dominick. *History and Reading: Tocqueville, Foucault, French Studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Lagerwey, John and Mark Kalinowski, eds. *Early Chinese Religion, vol. 1*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Ledderose, Lothar. *Ten Thousand Things: Module and Mass Production in Chinese Arts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Lewis, Mark Edward. *Writing and Authority in Early China*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999.

Li, Feng 李峰 and David Branner, eds. *Writing and Literacy in Early China*. Settle & London: University of Washington Press, 2011.

Li, Jia 李佳. "*Wenxuan* nan ti yu xian Qin yu ti: jianlun duiwen shelun de wenti suyuan" 《文選》"難"體與先秦"語"體：兼論"對問""設論"的文體溯源. *Anhui daxue xuebao* 安徽大學學報, No. 4 (2019): 43–49.

Li, Ling 李零. *Jianbo gushu yu xueshu yuanliu* 簡帛古書與學術源流. Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2008.

Li, Nailong 李乃龍. "Lun *Wenxuan* shelun lei de wenti tezheng" 論《文選》"設論"類的文體特征. *Changjiang xueshu* 長江學術, No. 4 (2008): 25–32.

Li, Ruiliang 李瑞良. *Zhongguo gudai tushu liutong shi* 中國古代圖書流通史. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 2000.

Li, Wai-yee Li 李惠儀. "The Idea of Authority in the *Shih chi*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54 (1994): 345–405.

——. "*Shishuo xinyu* and the Emergence of Aesthetic Self-Consciousness in the Chinese Tradition." in *Chinese Aesthetics: The Ordering of Literature, the Arts, and the Universe in the Six Dynasties*. ed. Zong-qi Cai (Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004), 237–76.

——. "Concepts of Authorship." in *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature (1000 BCE–900 CE)*. ed. Wiebke Denecke, Wai-yee Li, and Xiaofei Tian (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 360–76.

Li, Zehou 李澤厚. *Mei de licheng* 美的歷程. Shanghai: Sanlian shudian, 2009.

Liu, Lydia. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China:*

1900–1937. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.
Liu, Rulin 劉汝霖. *Han Jin xueshu bianian* 漢晉學術編年. Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2010.
Liu, Ruoyu 劉若愚. *Zhongguo wenxue lilun* 中國文學理論. trans. Du Guoqing 杜國清. Taipei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1981.
Liu, Shipei 劉師培. *Zhongguo zhonggu wenxue shi* 中國中古文學史. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2010.
Liu, Yuejin 劉躍進. *Qin Han wenxue dili yu wenren fenbu* 秦漢文學地理與文人分佈. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2012.
——. "Cai Yong de shengping chuangzuo yu Han mo wenfeng de zhuanbian" 蔡邕的生平創作與漢末文風的轉變. *Wenxue pinglun*, No. 3 (2004): 138–46.
Loewe, Michael. *Crisis and Conflict in Han China*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1974.
——. *Faith, Myth and Reason in Han China*. Indiana: Hackett, 1982.
——. "The Religious and Intellectual Background." in *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 1*, 649–725.
——. "Liu Xiang and Liu Xin." in *Chang'an 26 BCE: An Augustan Age in China*. ed. Michael Nylan and Griet Vankeerberghen (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2015), 367–89.
Lu, Xun 魯迅. "Wei Jin fengdu ji wenzhang yu yao ji jiu zhi guanxi" 魏晉風度及文章與葯及酒之關係. in *Lu Xun quanji* 魯迅全集 (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 2005), vol. 3, 523–53.
Lü, Simian 呂思勉. *Lü Simian du shi zhaji* 呂思勉讀史札記. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2005.

MacDonald, M. C. A. "Literacy in an Oral Environment." in *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour of Alan R. Millard*. ed. Piotr Bienkowski, Christopher Mee, and Elizabeth Slater (New York & London: T & T Clark, 2005), 45–114.
MacKenzie, D. F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Masubuchi, Tatsuo 増淵龍夫. "Go Kan tōko jiken no shihyō ni tsuite" 後漢黨錮事件の史評について. *Hitotsubashi Ronsō* 一橋論叢 44.6 (1960): 727–46.
Meng, Xiangcai 孟祥才. "Ping Donghan shiqi de yinzhe qun" 評東漢時期的隱者群. *Liaocheng shifan xueyuan xuebao* 聊城師範學院學報, No. 6 (1999): 13–21.
Meyer, Dirk. *Philosophy on Bamboo: Text and the Production of Meaning in Early China*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
Most, Glenn W. "What is a Critical Edition?" in *Ars Edendi Lecture Series, vol. IV*. ed. Barbara Crostini, Gunilla Iversen, and Brian M. Jensen (Stockholm: Stockholm University Press), 162–180.

Nagy, Gregory. *Homeric Questions*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.
Nugent, Christopher. *Manifest in Words, Written on Papers: Producing and Circulating Poetry in Tang Dyn-*

asty China. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2010.
Nylan, Michael. "The Chin Wen/Ku Wen Controversy in Han Times." *T'oung Pao* 80 (1994): 83–145.
——. "Han Classicists Writing in Dialogue with Their Own Tradition." *Philosophy East and West* 47 (1997): 133–88.
——. "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han." *Early China* 25 (2000): 252–53.
——. "Toward an Archaeology of Writing: Text, Ritual, and the Culture of Public Display in the Classical Period (475 B. C. E.–220 C. E.)." in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 3–49.
——. *Yang Xiong and the Pleasures of Reading and Classical Learning in China*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2011.
——. "Classics without Canonization: Learning and Authority in Qin and Han." in *Early Chinese Religion, vol. 1*, 721–76.
——. trans. *Exemplary Figures/Fayan*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2013.
——. "Manuscript Culture in Late Western Han, and the Implications for Authors and Authority." *Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture* 1 (2014): 155–85.
——. "A Note on Logical Connectives in the *Huainanzi*." in *The Huainanzi and Textual Production in Early China*, 225–65.

Ong, Walter J. *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1977.
——. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Routledge, 2002.
Owen, Stephen. *Traditional Chinese Poetry and Poetics: Omens of the World*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.
——. *Remembrance: The Experience of the Past in Classical Chinese Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.
——. *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
——. *The Making of Early Chinese Classical Poetry*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006.
——. "Postface: 'Believe It or Not.'" in *Idle Talk: Gossip and Anecdote in Traditional China*, 217–23.

Pan, Jixing 潘吉星. *Zhongguo zaozhi shi* 中國造紙史. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 2009.
Pan, Xianghui 潘祥輝. "Gumeng chuansong: Xian Qin 'mangmei' de chuanbo kaoguxue yanjiu" 瞽矇傳誦：先秦"盲媒"的傳播考古學研究. *Xibei shida xuebao* 西北師大學報, No. 2 (2019): 14–23.
Petersen, Jens Østergård. "Which Books Did the First Emperor of Ch'in Burn? On the Meaning of *Pai Chia* in Early Chinese Sources." *Monumenta Serica* 43 (1995): 1–52.
Peterson, Willard J. "Making Connections: 'Commentary on the Attached Verbalizations' of the *Book of Change*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 42 (1982): 67–116.
——. "Squares and Circles: Mapping the History of Chinese Thought." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49 (1988): 47–60.
——. "Ssu-ma Ch'ien as Cultural Historian." in *The Power of Culture*, 70–79.

Pines Yuri. "Intellectual Change in the Chunqiu Period: The Reliability of the Speeches in the 'Zuo Zhuan' as sources of Chunqiu Intellectual History." *Early China* 22 (1997): 77–132.

——. *Envisioning Eternal Empire: Chinese Political Thought of the Warring States Era*. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.

——. "Chinese History Writing between the Sacred and the Secular." in *Early Chinese Religion, vol. 1*, 327–32.

Pinner, H. L. *The World of Book in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1958.

Plaks, Andrew H. "Beyond Parallelism: A Rethinking of Patterns of Coordination and Subordination in Chinese Expository Prose." in *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*, 67–86.

Plato. *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*. trans. Harold N. Fowler. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Polnarov, Anatoly. "Looking Beyond Dichotomies: Hidden Diversity of Voices in the *Yantielun*." *T'oung Pao* 104 (2018): 465–95.

Puett, Michael. *The Ambivalence of Creation: Debates Concerning Innovation and Artifice in Early China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.

——. "The Ethic of Responding Properly: The Notion of *Qing* 情 in Early Chinese Thought." in *Love and Emotions in Traditional Chinese Literature*. ed. Halvor Eifring (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 37–68.

——. "Listening to Sages: Divination, Omens, and the Rhetoric of Antiquity in Wang Chong's *Lunheng*." *Oriens Extremus* 45 (2005–06): 271–81.

——. "The Temptations of Sagehood, or: The Rise and Decline of Sagely Writing in Early China." in *Books in Numbers: Seventh-fifth Anniversary of the Harvard-Yenching Library Conference Papers*. ed. Wilt Edema (Cambridge: Harvard-Yenching Library, 2007), 23–47.

Qian, Mu 錢穆. *Liang Han jingxue jinguwen pingyi* 兩漢經學今古文平議. Taipei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1998.

——. "Liang Han boshi jiafa kao" 兩漢博士家法考. in *Liang Han jingxue jinguwen pingyi*, 181–261.

——. *Qin Han shi* 秦漢史. Taipei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1998.

Qian, Zhongshu 錢鍾書. *Guan zhui bian* 管錐編. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1979.

Qiao, Xiuyan 喬秀巖 (Hashimoto Hidemi 橋本秀美). "Zhengxue diyi yuanli" 鄭學第一原理. in *Beijing dujing zaji* 北京讀經雜記 (Taipei: Wanjuan lou, 2013), 229–50.

Qiu, Luming 仇鹿鳴. *Wei Jin zhiji de zhengzhi quanli yu jiazu wangluo* 魏晉之際的政治權力與家族網絡. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2012.

Qiu, Xigui 裘錫圭. *Wenzi xue gaiyao (xiuding ben)* 文字學概要（修訂本）. Beijing: Shangwu yinshu guan, 2013.

Queen, Sarah A. and Michael Puett, eds. *The Huainanzi and Textual Production in Early China*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Raft, Zeb. "The Beginning of Literati Poetry: Four Poems from First Century BCE China." *T'oung Pao* 96 (2010): 74–124.

Richter, Antje. *Letter and Epistolary Culture in Early Medieval China*. Washington: University of Washington Press, 2013.

Richter, Matthias L. "Faithful Transmission or Creative Change: Tracing Modes of Manuscript Production from the Material Evidence." *Asiatische Studien/Etudes Asiatique* 63 (2009): 889–908.

——. *The Embodied Text: Establishing Textual Identity in Early Chinese Manuscripts*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Sanft, Charles. *Literate Community in Early Imperial China: The Northwestern Frontier in Han Times*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2019.

Saussy Haun. "Repetition, Rhyme, and Exchange in *The Book of Odes*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57 (1997): 519–542.

Schaberg, David C. "Remonstrance in Eastern Zhou Historiography." *Early China* 22 (1997): 133–79.

——. "Song and the Historical Imagination in Early China." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59 (1999): 305–61.

——. *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

——. "Platitude and Persona: Junzi Comments in *Zuozhuan* and Beyond." in *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture from a New Comparative Perspective*. ed. Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 1–20.

——. "Word of Mouth and the Sources of Western Han History." in *Idle Talk: Gossip and Anecdote in Traditional China*, 17–37.

——. "Speaking of Documents: *Shu* Citations in Warring States Texts." in *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy: Studies in the Composition and Thought of the Shangshu (Classic of Documents)*. ed. Martin Kern and Dirk Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 320–59.

——. "Classics." in *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature (1000 BCE–900 CE)*, 170–83.

Shao, Yipin 邵毅平, *Lunheng yanjiu* 論衡研究, 2nd Ed. Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2009.

Shaughnessy, Edward L. "Unearthed Documents and the Question of the Oral Versus Written Nature of the *Classic of Poetry*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 75 (2015): 331–375.

Shigezawa, Toshiro 重沢俊郎. "Kinko bungaku no honshitsu" 今古文學的本質. *Shinagaku* 支那學 9-4 (1939): 669–97.

Shimizu, Shigeru 清水茂. "Kami no hatsumei to Gokan no gakukaze" 紙の發明と後漢の學風. *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 79 (1990): 1–13.

Skinner, Quentin. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas." *History and Theory* 8 (1969): 3–53.

——. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, vol. 1: The Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Song, Zhiming 宋治民. *Zhanguo Qin Han kaogu* 戰國秦漢考古. Chengdu: Sichuan daxue chubanshe, 1994.

Su, Jui-Lung 蘇瑞隆. "Patterns and Changes of Literary Patronage in the Han and Wei." in *Inter-*

pretation and Literature in Early Medieval China. ed. Alan Chan and Lo Yuet-Keung (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010), 41–62.

Sun, Ji 孫機. *Handai wuzhi wenhua ziliao tushuo* 漢代物質文化資料圖說. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2011.

Sun, Mingjun 孫明君. "Jian'an shidai wen de zijue shuo zai shenshi" 建安時代"文的自覺"說再審視. *Beijing daxue xuebao*, No. 6 (1996): 43–51.

——. *Han Wei wenxue yu zhengzhi* 漢魏文學與政治. Beijing: Shangwu yinshu guan, 2004.

Suzuki, Torao 鈴木虎雄. *Shina shilon shi* 支那詩論史. Tokyo: Kōbundō Shobo, 1927.

Tan, Huicun 譚慧存. *Qin Han shiren yinyi sixiang yanjiu* 秦漢士人隱逸思想研究. Chengdu: Sichuan daxue chubanshe, 2015.

Tang, Yongtong 湯用彤. *Wei Jin xuanxue lungao* 魏晉玄學論稿. Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2009.

Tanigawa, Michio 谷川道雄. *Chūgoku chūsei shakai to kyōdotai* 中国中世社会と共同体. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1976.

Taniguchi, Hiroshi 谷口洋. "Fu ni jijo o tsukeru koto: RyōKan no majiwari ni okeru sakusha no mezame" 賦に自序をつけること：両漢の交における作者のめざめ. *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 119 (2010): 22–39.

Tian, Xiaofei 田曉菲. *Tao Yuanming and Manuscript Culture: The Record of a Dusty Table*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005.

——. "The Twilight of the Masters: Masters Literature (Zishu) in Early Medieval China." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 126 (2006): 465–86.

——. "Tales from Borderland: Anecdotes in Early Medieval China." in *Idle Talk: Gossip and Anecdote in Traditional China*, 38–54.

——. "Encyclopedias and Epitomes." in *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature (1000 BCE–900 CE)*, 132–46.

——. "Collections." in *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature (1000 BCE–900 CE)*, 219–34.

——. *The Halberd at Red Cliff: Jian'an and the Three Kingdoms*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018.

Tjan, Tjor Som 曾珠森, trans. *Po Hu T'ung: The Comprehensive Discussions in the White Hall*. Leiden: Brill, 1949.

Tomiya, Itaru 冨谷至. *Monjo gyosei no Kan teikoku: mokkan, chikukan no jidai* 文書行政の漢帝国：木簡、竹簡の時代. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppansha, 2010.

Tsien, Tsuen-hsuin 錢存訓. "Paper and Printing." in *Science and Civilisation in China*. ed. Joseph Needham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), vol. 5, part I, 1–123.

——. *Written on Bamboo and Silk: The Beginnings of Chinese Books and Inscriptions*. 2nd Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Twitchett, Denis and Michael Loewe, eds. *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 1: The Ch'in and Han Empires, 221 B. C.–A. D. 220*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Van der Loon, Piet. "On the Transmission of Kuan-tzŭ." *T'oung Pao* 41 (1952): 357–93.
Vervoorn, Aat. *Men of the Cliffs and Caves: The Development of the Chinese Eremitic Tradition to the End of the Han Dynasty*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1990.

Wagner, Rudolf G. *The Craft of a Chinese Commentator: Wang Bi on the Laozi*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.
——. "A Building Block of Chinese Argumentation: Initial *Fu* as a Phrase Status Marker." in *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*, 37–66.
Waley, Arthur. *The Analects of Confucius*. New York & London: George Allen and Unwin, 1938.
Wang, C. H. *The Bell and the Drum: Shih Ching as Formulaic Poetry in an Oral Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
Wang, Chunhong 汪春泓. "Lun Liu Xiang Liu Xin he *Hanshu* zhi guanxi" 論劉向、劉歆和《漢書》之關係. *Lingnan xuebao* 嶺南學報, No. 1 (2015): 303–35.
Wang, Guowei 王國維. "Han Wei boshi kao" 漢魏博士考. in *Guantang jilin* 觀堂集林 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), 174–217.
Wang, Jilu 王記錄. "*Hanshu* gujin ren biao zhuanshu zhiqu xintan" 《漢書·古今人表》撰述旨趣新探. *Shangxi shida xuebao* 山西師大學報, No. 2 (1996): 67–71.
Wang, Liqi 王利器. *Zheng Kangcheng nianpu* 鄭康成年譜. Jinan: Qilu shushe, 1983.
Wang, Shumin 王叔珉. "Ban Gu lun Sima Qian shifei po miu yu shengren bian" 班固論司馬遷是非頗謬於聖人辨, in *Shiji lunwen xuanji* 史記論文選集. ed. Huang Peirong 黃沛榮 (Taipei: Chang'an chubanshe, 1982), 65–94.
Wang, Yao 王瑤. *Zhonggu wenxue shilun* 中古文學史論. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1998.
Wang, Yonghao 汪湧豪. "Zuowei zongti shi de Zhongguo wenxue shi ji qi guannian queli: jianlun xuyao zenyang de Zhongguo wenxue piping shi" 作爲"總體史"的中國文學史及其觀念確立：兼論需要怎樣的《中國文學批評史》, *Fudan xuebao* 復旦學報, No. 5 (2007): 113–16.
Wang, Yunlu 王雲路. *Zhonggu hanyu cihui shi* 中古漢語詞彙史. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2010.
Wang, Yunxi 王運熙. "Wen zhi lun yu Zhongguo zhonggu wenxue piping" 文質論與中國中古文學批評. *Wenxue yichan*, No. 5 (2002): 4–10.
Wang, Zijin 王子今. *Handai ertong shenghuo* 漢代兒童生活. Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe, 2012.
Weingarten, Oliver. "Intertextuality and Memory in Early Chinese Writings: A Case Study from *Huainanzi*." *Early China* 42 (2019): 201–36.
White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
——. "Historical Text as Literary Artifact." in *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 81–100.
——. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality." in *The Content of the Form* (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 1–25.
Wogan-Browne, Jocelyn, Nicholas Watson, Andrew Taylor and Ruth Evans, eds. *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280–1520*. Exeter: University of Ex-

eter Press, 1999.

Wu, Anqi 吳安其. "Yueren ge' jiedu" 《越人歌》解讀. *Nankai yuyan xuekan* 南開語言學刊, No. 2 (2008): 16–22.

Wu, Chengxue 吳承學 and He Shihai 何詩海. "Cong zhangju zhi xue dao wenzhang zhi xue" 從章句之學到文章之學. *Wenxue pinglun*, No. 5 (2008): 21–31.

——. and Sha Hongbing 沙紅兵. "Shenfen de jiaolü: Zhongguo gudai duiyu wenren de rentong yu qidai" 身份的焦慮：中國古代對於"文人"的認同與期待. *Fudan xuebao*, No. 1 (2020): 20–39.

Wu, Hung 巫鴻. *The Wu Liang Shrine: The Ideology of Early Chinese Pictorial Art*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989.

Wu, Yiyun 吳沂澐. "Cong *Wenxuan* shelun san pian lun wenren zhushu guannian de chansheng" 從《文選》設論三篇論文人著述觀念的產生. *Jiangsu shifan daxue xuebao* 江蘇師範大學學報, No. 3 (2015): 75–84.

Xia, Hanyi 夏含夷 (Edward L. Shaughnessy). "Zheng wengong wen taibo yu Zhongguo gudai wenxian chaoxie de wenti"《鄭文公問太伯》與中國古代文獻抄寫的問題. *Jianbo* 簡帛 14 (2017): 11–15.

Xiao, Gongquan 蕭公權, *Zhongguo zhengzhi sixiang shi* 中國政治思想史. Beijing: Xinxing chubanshe, 2005.

Xu, Fuguan 徐復觀. "Yang Xiong lunjiu" 揚雄論究. in *Liang Han sixiang shi* 兩漢思想史 (Beijing: Jiuzhou chubanshe, 2014), vol. 2, 400–512.

——. "Wang Chong lunkao" 王充論考. in *Liang Han sixiang shi*, vol. 2, 513–85.

——. "*Hanshi waizhuan* de yanjiu" 韓詩外傳的研究. in *Liang Han sixiang shi*, vol. 3, 1–45.

Xu, Gongchi 徐公持. "Handai wenxue de zhishihua tezheng: yi Han fu bowu quxiang wei zhongxin de kaocha" 漢代文學的知識化特徵：以漢賦"博物"取向爲中心的考察. *Wenxue yichan*, No. 1 (2014): 17–30.

Xu, Jianwei 徐建委. *Shuoyuan yanjiu: yi Zhanguo Qin Han zhijian de wenxian leiji yu xueshushi wei zhongxin* 《說苑》研究：以戰國秦漢之間的文獻累積與學術史爲中心. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2011.

——. "Zhanguo Qin Han jian de gongong sucai yu Zhou Qin Han wenxueshi xushi" 戰國秦漢間的"公共素材"與周秦漢文學史敘事. *Zhongshan daxue xuebao* 中山大學學報, No.6 (2012): 1–9.

——. *Wenben geming: Liu Xiang, Yiwen zhi yu zaoqi wenben yanjiu* 文本革命：劉向、《藝文志》與早期文本研究. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2017.

Xu, Jie 許結. "Lun Yang Xiong yu Donghan wenxue sichao" 論揚雄與東漢文學思潮. *Zhongguo shehui kexue*, No. 1 (1988): 157–74.

Xu, Licheng 徐儷成. "Nanchao shiren qunti you zhuwen xianxiang de liuxing yu wenlun zhong caizhu xuefu guannian de queli" 南朝士人群體"幼屬文"現象的流行與文論中"才主學輔"觀念的確立. *Wenyi lilun yanjiu* 文藝理論研究, No. 1 (2019): 146–53.

Xu, Xingwu 徐興無. *Liu Xiang pingzhuan* 劉向評傳. Nanjing: Nanjing daxue chubanshe, 2005.

Xu, Zhengkao 徐正考. *Lunheng tongyici yanjiu* 《論衡》同義詞研究. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2004.

Yan, Buke 閻步克. *Chaju zhidu binqian shi gao* 察舉制度變遷史稿. Shenyang: Liaoning daxue chubanshe, 1991.

——. *Shidafu zhengzhi yansheng shi gao* 士大夫政治演生史稿. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2015.

Yao, Mingda 姚名達. *Zhongguo muluxue shi* 中國目錄學史. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002.

Yao, Zhuming 姚竹銘. "Voice of Textuality: Speech, Genre, and Speech Genres in Early China." Ph. D. Diss., Princeton University, forthcoming.

Yu, Jiaxi 余嘉錫. *Gushu tongli* 古書通例. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985.

——. *Mulu xue fawei* 目錄學發微. Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 1991.

——. *Siku tiyao bianzheng* 四庫提要辨證. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.

——. "*Taishigong shu* wangpian kao" 太史公書亡篇考. in *Yu Jiaxi wenshi lunji* 余嘉錫文史論集 (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1997), 1–99.

Yu, Pauline 余寶琳. "Poems in Their Place: Collections and Canons in Early Chinese Literature." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 50 (1990): 163–96.

Yu, Su 于溯. "Xingzou de shulu: zhonggu shiqi de wenxian jiyi yu wenxian chuanbo" 行走的書籠：中古時期的文獻記憶與文獻傳播. *Wenshizhe*, No. 1 (2020): 154–64.

Yu, Yingchun 于迎春. "Yi tongren tongru wei tixian de Handai jingshu xinbian" 以"通人"、"通儒"爲體现的漢代經術新變. *Zhongzhou xuekan* 中州學刊, No. 4 (1996): 123–28.

Yu, Yingshi 余英時. *Shi yu Zhongguo wenhua* 士與中國文化. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1987.

——. "Gudai zhishi jieceng de xingqi yu fazhan" 古代知識階層的興起與發展. in *Shi yu Zhongguo wenhua*, 1–83.

——. "Handai xunli yu wenhua chuanbo" 漢代循吏與文化傳播. in *Shi yu Zhongguo wenhua*, 129–216.

——. "Han Jin zhi ji shi zhi xin zijue yu xin sichao" 漢晉之際士之新自覺與新思潮. in *Shi yu Zhongguo wenhua*, 287–400.

Yu, Ying-shih (Yu Yingshi). "Individualism and the Neo-Daoist Movement in Wei-Jin China." in *Chinese History and Culture, vol. 1* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 134–65.

Zhang, Hanmo 張瀚墨. *Authorship and Text-making in Early China*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.

Zhang, Hequan 張鶴泉. "Donghan shidai de youxue fengqi ji shehui yingxiang" 東漢時代的遊學風氣及社會影響. *Qiushi xuekan* 求是學刊, No. 2 (1995): 104–09.

Zhang, Shunhui 張舜徽. *Hanshu yiwenzhi tongshi* 漢書藝文志通釋. Huhan: Hubei jiaoyu chubanshe, 1990.

Zhao, Guohua 趙國華. "Handai xueshu zhuti pinglun yanjiu" 漢代學術主體評論研究. *Nandu xuetan*, No. 1 (2007): 1–6.

Zhao, Lu 趙璐. *In Pursuit of the Great Peace: Han Dynasty Classicism and the Making of Early Medieval Literati Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2019.

Zheng, Yuyu 鄭毓瑜. "Wen de fayuan: cong tianwen yu renwen de leibi tanqi" "文"的發源：從"天文"與"人文"的類比談起. *Zhengda zhongwen xuebao* 政大中文學報 15 (2011): 113–42.

Zhengzhang, Shanfang 鄭張尚芳. "Decipherment of Yue-Ren-Ge (Song of the Yue Boatman)." *Cahiers de linguistique: Asie orientale* 20 (1991): 159–68.

Zhou, Liuxi 周流溪. "'Yueren ge' jiedu yanjiu" 《越人歌》解讀研究. *Waiyu jiaoxue yu yanjiu* 外語教學與研究, No. 3 (1993): 1–15.

Zhou, Yutong 周予同. *Jing jinguwen xue* 經今古文學. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1926.

Zufferey, Nicolas. *To the Origins of Confucianism: The Ru in Pre-Qin Times and during the Early Han Dynasty*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2003.

Zumthor Paul. *Toward a Medieval Poetics*. trans. Philip Bennett. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.

Zürn, Tobias Benedikt. "The Han *Imaginaire* of Writing as Weaving: Intertextuality and the *Huainanzi*'s Self-Fashioning as an Embodiment of the Way." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 79 (2020): 367–402.