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Definition of the Field

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

History of the Field and Current Trends

Shijing

The academic study of Chinese literature began with European translations of the Shijing. Of these, the three most influential works of the late nineteenth and then the twentieth century were written in English and created in Europe. The first was James Legge’s (Oxford University) study, translation, and philological annotation of the Shijing, published in 1871 as part of his rendering of the Five Classics, the Four Books, and other philosophical texts from early China. Legge broadly consulted the classical commentaries from the Han through the Qing but was particularly inclined to follow Zhu Xi’s readings. The second major translation of the Shijing, also created in England, was Arthur
Waley’s (School of Oriental Studies, London), published in 1937. Waley’s translation, influenced by the French sociologist Marcel Granet’s study of the guofeng 國風, *Fêtes et chansons anciennes de la Chine* (1919), minimized the philological apparatus and presented an eminently readable rendering of the *Shijing* in which the ancient songs appeared fresh and charming, ancient poetry in the best sense of the word. The third influential translation was Bernhard Karlgren’s (Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm), published in 1944–45 in the *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* in Sweden, and accompanied by Karlgren’s meticulous *Glosses on the Shijing* between 1942 and 1946 in the same journal. To this day, these are the three constantly cited English translations of the *Shijing*; more than half a century after Karlgren’s work, no subsequent translations, including Ezra Pound’s extremely free poetic rendering in *The Classic Anthology Defined by Confucius*, have ever replaced them. Both Legge and Karlgren still serve as indispensable reference works for the philological study and historical scholarship of the *Shijing*. Karlgren and Legge approached the *Shijing* primarily from the perspective of jingxue 經學 (Karlgren’s translations especially are utterly disinterested in poetic beauty), but Waley, in addition to his unquestioned scholarly competence in philology and anthropology, treated the *Shijing* as ancient poetry that modern readers can not only study but also enjoy.

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

Over the following two decades, a number of important studies explored the nature of the *Shijing* from comparative perspectives, sometimes reaching quite different conclusions. In 1969, Chen Shih-hsiang’s 陳世驤 (University of California, Berkeley) seminal essay “The *Shih Ching*: Its Generic Significance in Chinese Literary History and Poetics” looked at the *Shijing* from the perspective of both comparative literature and anthropology, discussing the origins of the songs in the musical culture of high antiquity. C. H. Wang (University of Washington), in his 1974 book *The Bell and the Drum: Shih Ching as Formulaic Poetry in an Oral Tradition*, attempted to apply the Parry-Lord theory of oral folk composition to the guofeng. A similar approach was employed by Hans H. Frankel (Yale University) in his 1969 and 1974 studies of the yuefu “Kongque dongnan fei” 孔雀東南飛. While these ideas about formulaic oral poetry were popular around 1970, few scholars since then have followed up on reading Chinese poetry this way; more recently, Charles H. Egan (San Francisco State University) has convincingly rejected the “folk” and “oral” paradigms for early Chinese poetry. C. H. Wang’s collection of essays *From Ritual to Allegory: Seven Essays in Early Chinese Poetry* continued the comparative approach through six inspiring studies of the ya 雅 and song 頌 sections of the *Shijing*, proposing, among other original ideas, to read a series of daya 大雅 hymns as the “epic” of King Wen, which could be compared to the Homeric epics. By contrast, in her essay published in 1983, “Allegory, Allegoresis, and the *Classic of Poetry*,” Pauline Yu (president of the American Council of Learned Societies,
formerly of the University of California, Los Angeles) forcefully rejected the direct application of the critical terminology of the classical West—in this case, “allegory”—to poetry of classical China, showing instead how ancient Chinese philosophical and religious thought differed profoundly from its counterpart in the Mediterranean world and hence led to fundamentally different modes of poetry and poetic exegesis. Since then the comparative interpretation of early Chinese poetics in relation to the *Shijing* has led to studies of considerable theoretical and philosophical ambition: Haun Saussy’s (Yale University) 1993 book *The Problem of a Chinese Aesthetic*; Ming Dong Gu’s (Rhodes College) 2005 book on hermeneutics, especially with regard to *Shijing* and *Yijing*; Gu’s discussion of the poetic principles of *fu*, *bi*, and *xing*; and Wei-qun Dai’s (formerly University of Alberta) article on *Xing*. In 2006, Tamara Chin (University of Chicago), wrote a comparative paper on mimesis in the *Shijing*.

Work devoted to ancient literary thought in relation to the *Shijing* began to become visible especially in the 1970s. Around the time of James J. Y. Liu’s (Stanford University) classic 1975 book *Chinese Theories of Literature*, Chow Tse-tsung (University of Wisconsin) authored two essays on the relation of early poetry to ancient music and philosophy. Donald Holzman, an American teaching in Paris, wrote “Confucius and Ancient Chinese Literary Criticism” in 1978. Thereafter, a number of studies on early aesthetic ideas—especially in relation to the “Great Preface”—have focused on the “Record of Music” 樂記 chapter of the *Liji* 礼记 and the “Discussion of Music” 樂論 chapter in *Xunzi* 荀子. Stephen Owen’s (Harvard University) *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought* contains a useful chapter on Warring States literary criticism.

At the same time, the field of *Shijing* studies has produced a series of fine studies but no clear trends. In 1989 Joseph R. Allen (University of Minnesota) wrote perceptively on narrative poetry in the *Shijing*. Steven Van Zoeren’s (formerly Stanford University) 1991 book *Poetry and Personality: Reading, Exegesis, and Hermeneutics in Traditional China* is a thoughtful study of the reception and interpretation of the *Shijing* from Han through Song times, while William H. Baxter III’s (University of Michigan) *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology* has greatly advanced the understanding of ancient Chinese phonology and the *Shijing* rhyme system, finally replacing the framework that Karlgren had erected during the first half of the twentieth century. Both Stephen Owen (Harvard University) and John Timothy Wixted (Arizona State University) have produced insightful discussions of the “Great Preface,” Mark Laurent Asselin (formerly University of Washington) has shown how an Eastern Han *fu* reflects the Lu School reading of “Guanju,” and essays by Haun Saussy (Yale University), Stephen Owen, and Dore J. Levy (Brown University) have examined the functions of rhyme and repetition in *Shijing* language, as well as the poetic principle of *fu* 賦, respectively. David R. Knechtges (University of Washington) has written a short but eye-opening essay on the linguistic difficulties of the *Shijing* that should once and for all disabuse us of the common yet ignorant idea of “naturally reading” a *Shijing* song by choosing selectively whatever traditional or modern glosses one finds convenient. Joseph R. Allen (University of Minnesota), in the postface to his 1996 edition of Arthur Waley’s *The Book of Songs*, has published a very useful “literary history” of the *Shijing*; likewise, Michael Nylan’s (University of California, Berkeley) 2001 book *The Five “Confucian” Classics* includes a long chapter on the *Shijing* in the history of classical Chinese learning. Peter Flueckiger (Pomona College), a scholar of Japanese literature, has recently written an insightful article, “The *Shijing* in Tokugawa Ancient Learning,” extending our research on *Shijing* reception history to Japan.
If there is any particular trend, it might be that in recent years much (though not all) of *Shijing* studies has shifted to scholars of early China. The historian Edward L. Shaughnessy (University of Chicago) has proposed to interpret certain linguistic and literary differences in the *ya* and *song* hymns as reflections of the ritual changes during the Western Zhou. Jeffrey K. Riegel (formerly University of California, Berkeley; now University of Sydney) has published an influential essay on the interpretation of “Guanju” 閩雎 and “Yanyan” 燕燕 in the Mawangdui “Wuxing” 五行 manuscript. Mark Edward Lewis (Stanford University), in his 1999 book *Writing and Authority in Early China*, has written an important chapter on the uses of *Shijing* songs during the Eastern Zhou period; in a way complementary to Lewis, Zhou Yiqun (Stanford University) has published a study on the practice of *fu shi* 賦詩 by women in early historiography. Paul R. Goldin (University of Pennsylvania) has authored “Imagery of Copulation in Early Chinese Poetry,” largely devoted to the *Shijing*, as well as “The Reception of the *Odes* in the Warring States Era.” Finally, Martin Kern (Princeton University) has written a series of studies, published both in English and in Chinese, on the role of the *ya* and *song* in the formation of early Chinese ritual and cultural identity, on the appearance of *Shijing* quotations in excavated manuscripts, and on the early interpretation of the *guofeng*. In addition to further studies on the *Shijing* in its early cultural context, Kern is preparing a new complete translation of the *Shijing*.

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

**Chuci**

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

The only other book-length study of the *Chuci* also focused on the Nine Songs but from a radically different perspective: in 1985, Geoffrey R. Waters (formerly Indiana University) offered an introduction to the traditional political interpretation of the songs as it was first formulated in Eastern
Han times by the Wang Yi commentary. No other scholar in North America has since pursued this reading, but it has remained an important reminder that the modern focus on “shamanism” was not always the way the ancient songs were interpreted.

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

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

Han fu

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

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

The published work of David R. Knechtges in both English and Chinese already spans more than four decades, beginning with Two Han Dynasty Fu on Ch’ü Yüan: Chia I’s “Tiao Ch’ü Yüan” and Yang Hsiung’s “Fan-sao,” in 1968, the year of Knechtges’s dissertation on Yang Xiong and the rhetoric of the Western Han fu. This was followed by a translation of Yang Xiong’s Hanshu biography, as well as two authoritative studies on Mei Sheng’s “Qi fa 七發,” and on the rhetoric of Yang Xiong’s “Yulie fu” 羽獵賦, before the publication of what to this day remains the best introduction to the Western Han fu, the monograph The Han Rhapsody: A Study of the Fu of Yang Hsiung (53 B.C.-A.D. 18). In the
ensuing more than thirty years, Knechtges has written on virtually every aspect of the Han *fu* and its related topics, including on the pre-Han *fu* in *Xunzi* and on the *fu* in the Six Dynasties and the Tang (not to mention Knechtges’s many publications on other topics). Most notable are the first three (of projected eight) volumes of his magisterial *Wenxuan* translation, which provide meticulously annotated translations of the complete *fu* section in the *Wenxuan* (chapters 1–19). In addition, Knechtges is the editor and principal translator of Gong Kechang’s *Studies on the Han *fu*, which combines Gong Kechang’s Chinese volume *Han *fu* Yanju* 漢賦研究 with the lectures he gave during his year as a visiting professor at the University of Washington.

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

**Qin-Han Poetry and Literary Court Culture**

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

Much of Qin and Han poetry is closely related to the imperial court. An important essay in this context is Hellmut Wilhelm’s (University of Washington) “The Bureau of Music of Western Han,” published in 1978. From the Qin, the only surviving poetic works are the stele inscriptions created during the reign of the Qin First Emperor; they have been the subject of a monograph by Martin Kern (Princeton University), who is also the author of a book on the Western Han “Anshi fangzhong ge” and “Jiaosi ge” from the reigns of Han Gaozu and Han Wudi, respectively. In addition, Kern wrote on the use of poetry in Shiji and Hanshu. David R. Knechtges (University of Washington) has published several articles on Han poetry and court literature: on the literary production at the court of Han Wudi, on court criticism in Han literature, and on the poetry of Ban Jieryu 班婕妤. Donald Holzman, an American working in Paris, studied the beginnings of pentasyllabic poetry in the Han. Finally, Kenneth E. Brashier (Reed College) has contributed several careful literary and historical studies on Eastern Han stele inscriptions, which were often composed in the tradition of the Shijing. All these studies are primarily defined by their strictly philological and historical approach. In addition, Brashier’s work is thoroughly informed by the theory of memory, an important new subfield in Western cultural studies.

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

Philosophical and Historical Prose

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

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

The one text that even those who read the Zuo zhuan as factual history accept as a collection of historically unreliable anecdotes is the Zhanguo ce. This is due largely to the work, over four decades, by James I. Crump Jr. (University of Michigan) who has shown the Zhanguo ce anecdotes to be examples of rhetorical persuasion. Following his critical studies, Crump published his revised translation of the entire text in 1996. In 1989, Yumiko Fukushima Blanford wrote a massive dissertation on the Zhanguo ce fragments and related rhetorical texts in the Mawangdui silk manuscripts.

The literary and rhetorical analysis of the Zuo zhuan began with two influential essays by Ronald C. Egan (University of California, Santa Barbara) and John C. Y. Wang (Stanford University), both published in 1977. In 1999 Eric Henry (University of North Carolina) analyzed the “Junzi yue 君子曰” and “Zhongni yue 仲尼曰” comments in the text. However, the scholar who has done most for the analysis of the Zuo zhuan since the late 1990s is David Schaberg, who has published an outstanding book, A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography, and a series of essays on various aspects of the text. To this, Wai-yee Li has now added another impressive book on the construction and readability of meaning in the Zuo zhuan, titled The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography. Schaberg, Li, and Stephen W. Durrant (University of Oregon) have also, in a joint effort, completed a new translation of the Zuo zhuan.

Even more attention has been given to the Shiji than to the Zuo zhuan. Here studies are devoted to the authenticity and textual problems of individual chapters, to the interpretation of Sima Qian’s intentions, to the structure of the text, and, perhaps most importantly, to the reading of the Shiji as a reflection of Sima Qian’s fate and thought. The serious study of the Shiji in North America began with Burton Watson’s (Columbia University) 1957 Ssu-ma Ch’ien: Grand Historian of China. At the
same time, Watson, drawing much on Japanese scholarship, prepared translations of some eighty-five chapters of the text, which were published in 1961 and 1969. Since then numerous studies have appeared on the Shiji, with two scholars leading the field: William H. Nienhauser Jr. (University of Wisconsin) and Stephen W. Durrant (University of Oregon). Nienhauser, in addition to his many articles on the text, including reviews of its study in both China and the West, has assembled a team of translators to finally, for the first time, produce a complete translation of the Shiji in English. So far, six of nine projected volumes have been published. Moreover, while other scholars have sometimes questioned the authenticity of certain Shiji chapters, Nienhauser has been a strong defender of Sima Qian’s authorship. While most of Nienhauser’s detailed work is focused on the Shiji, Durrant has largely concentrated on the persona of Sima Qian, giving perceptive interpretations of Sima’s worldview and motivations. The culmination of Durrant’s efforts is his 1995 book The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian.

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

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

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

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

Deborah Lynn Porter (University of Utah), in her essay on Mu Tianzi zhuan, and her 1996 book From Deluge to Discourse: Myth, History, and the Genesis of Chinese Fiction, has taken a somewhat more
literary (but especially psychoanalytical) approach to early mythology. In 2002, Richard E. Strassberg (University of California, Los Angeles) published his thorough study and partial translation of the Shanhai jing. Whalen Lai (University of California, Davis) has compiled a useful account of Chinese scholarship on myths, and Paul R. Goldin (University of Pennsylvania) has written “The Myth That China Has No Creation Myth.” Many more articles on individual myths have been published over the years, although the boundaries of the study of early Chinese religion—another large field of research—are fluid. Remarkably, however, the myth-and-ritual (including myth-and-sacrifice) theory, which has been extremely influential in the study of ancient Greece, has never been adopted in any significant way by Western sinologists.

Conclusion

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

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

At the same time, the field has moved decidedly beyond the sometimes naïve and anachronistic ideas inherited from traditional beliefs and certain uncritical scholarship of the past. Simple assumptions about the purported folk origins of the guofeng, about early Western Zhou dates for any part of the Shijing, or about Qu Yuan’s authorship of much of the Chuci are no longer tenable, nor are the unquestioned acceptance of the Zuo zhuan as a factual account of Chunqiu period history, the pious idea that the
songs recorded in early historiography were indeed composed by heroes at the very moment of their demise, or the belief that the early anonymous *yuefu* can be faithfully dated to Han times.

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

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