

Also most worthwhile are analyses of literary forms and strategies such as Hilde de Weerd's contribution to this volume, "Neo-Confucian Philosophy and Genre: The Philosophical Writings of Chen Chun and Zhen Dexiu," which not only allows us to gain perspective on Chen Chun 陳淳 and Zhen Dexiu 真德秀 but opens up a promising line of inquiry into other texts including Korean, Japanese, and Vietnamese Neo-Confucian writings. The contributions of Korean philosophers came particularly to mind after reading Chung-yi Cheng's fascinating discussion of Liu Zongzhou 劉宗周 on the four feelings and seven desires, a topic that fascinated Korean thinkers. *Dao Companions* on Korean and Japanese philosophy are eagerly awaited.

Huang Yong, the series editor, in his essay on Cheng Yi writes "what is crucial is not only to do things according to moral principles, but to find joy in doing so" (p. 62). This *Companion* is hard on the bank account but gives joy to the mind.

CONRAD SCHIROKAUER
Columbia University

The Huainanzi: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Government in Early Han China. Translated and edited by John S. Major, Sarah A. Queen, Andrew Seth Meyer, and Harold D. Roth. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010. Pp. xi + 986. \$75.00.

This first complete English-language translation of the *Huainanzi* 淮南子 is the product of a collaboration that lasted over a decade. Any such translation of this encyclopaedic text, one of the richest sources of information on pre-imperial and early imperial intellectual history, early text formation, and, as the subtitle notes, nascent formulations of a theory of imperial administration, would be welcome. In this case, the collaborative translation team decided not just to produce a lucid translation but also to graft onto it what is, between its introduction, informative footnotes, and useful appendices, effectively a scholarly monograph on this rich work. Following on Knoblock and Riegel's translation of the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋,¹ suddenly two of the most challenging textual ascents in Early China have been completed, quite a bit earlier than many of us would ever have imagined.

The "Introduction" not only situates the *Huainanzi* historically but proposes a method of reading the text by starting from the last chapter's summaries of the

¹ John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel, *The Annals of Lü Buwei: A Complete Translation and Study* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000).

other chapters. The historical overview encompasses the production of the text at the Huainan court of Liu An 劉安 during a time when the texts of the “Yellow Emperor and Laozi” (i.e., Huang-Lao 黃老) were in ascendance in the capital of Chang’an 長安, to his presentation of the text in 139 B.C.E. and subsequent disgrace during a reign of Emperor Wu 武 in which intellectual fashion had changed. Because Emperor Wu “set about purging the court of figures favored by the late Empress Dowager and her son Emperor Jing, men whose views, like Liu An’s *Huainanzi*, privileged the canonical status of the *Laozi*” (p. 12), Liu An’s political fortunes went south. The authors present a convincing and concise narrative that links intellectual affiliations with the political machinations of the Western Han imperial court.

It is in that context of the *Huainanzi*’s composition and presentation that the authors of the “Introduction” explain the text’s organization. The section outlining its basic “root and branch” structure (pp. 14–22) provides a succinct overview that masterfully elucidates how the text can be read as “a carefully constructed curriculum for a would-be sage-ruler” (p. 19). In particular, the authors convincingly defend a division of the text into a bipartite structure, with the first eight chapters devoted to more abstract “principles of the Way” and the next twelve to “applications and illustrations of the Way.” Elsewhere, I have referred to this as the *dao* 道 / *shu* 術 structure in the context of the early Western Han. The introduction then locates the text with respect to other works such as the five classics (p. 26) before providing a very even-handed overview of the thorny question of the work’s intellectual or philosophical affiliation (pp. 27–32). With respect to the former, the fascinating way that the “five classics” of the Han are each associated with particular chapters of the text raises the question of why two of the classics are in the “principles of the Way” part of the text (the *Changes* and *Spring and Autumn*) while the others are associated with its “applications and illustrations.” More generally, to what degree did the textual affiliations of different chapters fit with the bipartite model? With respect to the latter, it should be said that the historical considerations of the early part of the “Introduction” to some degree render moot the discussions of with which “philosophical school” the text should be associated. That is to say, if the text was designed to curry favour with Emperor Jing 景 it might best be seen as an imperial digest of the kind that Lu Jia 陸賈 had once prepared for the founder of the dynasty, attempting to weave together the distilled lessons of a variety of textual traditions that had come before it. The “Introduction” closes with an account of the genesis of the translation and the conventions that the collaborators used (pp. 32–39).

In addition to the “Introduction” the work also supports the translation with three appendices. This is the clearest illustration of its attempt to be useful to both readers with no knowledge of Chinese and to specialists. The first two appendices are aimed at the general reader, “Key Chinese Terms and Their Translations” and

“Categorical Terms.” While some of the terms and charts in these two appendices put a new spin on Han dynasty terms of art or present information in novel ways, the reason for their inclusion is to provide a map of the important categories and terms used in the translation. Of particular interest to Sinologists working with the text are the lucid summaries of traditional commentaries and ancient and modern editions of the work in the third appendix, “A Concise Textual History of the *Huainanzi* and a Bibliography of *Huainanzi* Studies.” The translations, too, attempt to hit the same Tuvan overtone effect with clear prose and a minimum of footnotes for the general reader, but also with scholarly introductions that generally engage the thornier questions needed to properly situate each chapter in its intellectual context.

For many, however, the work’s chief utility will be as a reference to be consulted, and for those people the value of the book will boil down to the quality and ease of use of its translation. Generally speaking, many of the final project’s strengths and its few weaknesses derive from the fact that the work is a joint production of no fewer than four experts on Han dynasty literature and thought. Each of the *Huainanzi*’s 21 chapters are translated by one or more of the collaborators, either John S. Major (translator: 3–6, 8; co-translator: 9–10, 13, 16–17, 19–20), Sarah A. Queen (translator: 12, 14; co-translator: 9–10, 13, 16–17, 19–21), Andrew Seth Meyer (translator: 11, 15, 18; co-translator: 2), or Harold D. Roth (translator: 1, 7; co-translator: 2). Additionally, Michael Puett is credited as co-translator of chapter 13 and Judson Murray is credited as co-translator of chapter 21. Each chapter (or in one case, two chapters treated as a single unit) is preceded by generally very good short introductions by the translator that treats four topics: chapter title, summary and key themes, sources, and the chapter in the context of the whole work.

The translations are reliably deft and clear, leaving little ambiguity about the reading the translators intend. Rhyme and formal structure are two elements that have been generally underappreciated in previous Western-language translations, but which inform every page of this version of the text. Building on previous scholarship such as Zhang Shuangdi’s 張雙棣 *Huainanzi jiaoshi* 淮南子校釋,² the translation team has done a superb job of breaking up the text into discrete discursive units such as essays, exegeses, and illustrative anecdotes. They have also made the choice to set off lines that probably rhymed, which to the eye makes them read like poetry even though the original Chinese lines do not observe many of the metrical rules that many Han poems did. Using this translation in an early texts seminar this fall, I found only a very few instances where this edition did not provide a more convincing account

² Zhang Shuangdi, *Huainanzi jiaoshi* (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe 北京大學出版社, 1997).

than previous partial translations. The only additional feature that might have been helpful for making the work useful as a resource, given the enumeration of sections within chapters, would have been a conversion table that went from page numbers of major editions to the chapter and section number of the translation.

The advantage of a comprehensive approach to the text and a collaboration between scholars like this one is that the perspective gained allows a better understanding of the formal characteristics of each chapter within the entire text that greatly enriches the translation of its individual sections. For example, it doesn't make sense to approach chapters 10, 14, 16, and 17 unless one understands their nature as collections of compact expressions, while other chapters are essentially Han "waizhuan" 外傳 style exegeses of works like *Laozi* 老子 or even the *Shijing* 詩經. A disadvantage of the approach is that different translators inevitably make different choices about certain phrases or translations. An example is the term *po* 魄 that appears as "earthly soul," "corporeal soul," or "substantive soul," depending which chapter one is reading. It is even, once, "ethereal soul" (p. 469) which is elsewhere the translation for *hun* 魂.³ Nevertheless, at the word level this lack of coordination is rare, although sometimes the same paraphrase or quotation of another work is translated rather differently across chapters. In short, the advantages of the collaborative approach far outweigh the disadvantages.

Having summarized the different parts of this monumental translation and study, and, I hope, made clear its exceptional qualities, it is difficult to proceed to an overall assessment. After all, the author of the work is Liu An, and reviewing this interpretation of his work leaves me wanting to tackle both the interpretation as well as the trickier topic of its relationship to the original work. In order to do so, let me briefly shift to the mode of personal anecdote. I still remember the day, twenty-five years ago, when I was reading John Major's 1973 dissertation on the advice of my undergraduate advisor at Harvard. Major's annotated translation of the fourth chapter of the *Huainanzi* revealed a text that was at once completely systematic and yet deeply opaque to me, because while Major had convincingly laid out the content and structure of the text, nothing I had read could prepare me to answer the question of *why* anyone would attempt to organize information in the way that Liu An and his collaborators had. The chapter was like an atlas organized according to a set of principles whose utility I could not fathom, a geography that seemed to

³

As long as I am pointing out mistakes, it behoves me to mention that one of the book's collaborators is credited on page 238 as author of a chapter that I wrote. I will take this as a form of compliment, while admitting it is more likely due to a misreading of a galley correction during the editing process.

derive from combining bits and pieces of other geographies. Major's 1993 book translated chapters 3–5, and the work as a whole attempted to situate those chapters by explaining why an encyclopaedic work like the *Huainanzi* sought to recreate the cosmos in the way that it did.⁴ With *The Huainanzi: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Government in Early Han China*, Major and his collaborators have created the crowning achievement of his forty years of work on the *Huainanzi*. From my perspective, it has also gone much further in addressing my fundamental confusion about the work.

To me, the aspect of the work under review that clears up the *Huainanzi*'s opaqueness is the attention that is paid to way that the Han text uses other sources. The patterns of citations outlined in the "Introduction" make it clear that the work itself is an attempt to synthesize the important texts—classics, but also other diverse genres of the day—into a cosmologically-inspired whole that was in its way a simulacrum of the empire. The attention paid to the order in which sources are used, and to what end they are used, bolsters the case that the text is in some sense a rearrangement and repurposing of the material available in Huainan to that end. Chapter 4 is in a real sense a geography made up of other geographies, because the work itself was more like a Brookings Institute study aggregating information relevant to a particular area of administrative policy than it was to an authored monograph describing a particular phenomenon.

This makes the *Huainanzi* and this study and translation of it very valuable for those interested in Chinese thought even before the Han. It can effectively function as annotated *leishu* 類書 that was compiled in the Western Han. For example, chapter 12 takes key quotations from the *Laozi* and glosses them with narratives, in much the same way that the roughly contemporary *Hanshi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳 did for the *Shijing*. Sarah Queen notes that they both "instruct through the use of anecdotes linked to suitable quotations. For the *Hanshi waizhuan*, the *Odes* has the same function as the *Laozi* does for chapter 12 of the *Huainanzi*" (p. 437). It is interesting how this form reappears in the third and second centuries B.C.: in the *Han Feizi*'s 韓非子 chapters illustrating the *Laozi* (and of course we see numerous passages in the *Shiji* 史記 where Han Fei and Laozi are linked), in some of the "Zisi" 子思 chapters of the *Liji* 禮記 (strange that so many *Zisizi* 子思子 fragments from Tang and Song compendia appear in the *Huainanzi*, and that there are continuities between the Zisi corpus and *Hanshi waizhuan*) and in sections of the *Xunzi* 荀子. Finally, a further similarity between the two works is that these are the first to repurpose lengthy

⁴ John S. Major, *Heaven and Earth in Early Han Thought: Chapters Three, Four and Five of the Huainanzi* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993).

narratives from the *Zhuangzi* as part of their anecdotes—chapter 12 of the *Huainanzi* tells the story of wheelwright Bian 扁 to illustrate the opening lines of the *Laozi*, while chapter 5 of the *Hanshi waizhuan* presents a significantly different version of story to illustrate lines from Mao 235 (“Wen wang” 文王) of the *Shijing*. Long story short, that one chapter of the *Huainanzi* is an important document in both the history of early classical hermeneutics and the text formation of the *Zhuangzi* 莊子. And there are twenty other chapters.

Improving access to the *Huainanzi* in the way that this new book does is important for research in those two areas, as well as for a host of others including history, history of science, musicology, religion, and virtually every disciplinary window onto Western Han life and society. It is a major accomplishment in every sense of the term.

MARK CSIKSZENTMIHALYI
University of California, Berkeley

Developmental Fairy Tales: Evolutionary Thinking and Modern Chinese Culture. By Andrew F. Jones. Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press, 2011. Pp. 259. \$49.95/£36.95.

A rich text in its style, range of sources and observations, and its themes, *Developmental Fairy Tales* offers a series of studies in literature and the media of late Qing and Republican China on what it terms the “vernacularization” of evolution-inspired developmental thought. The book explores the role of Western science fiction “evolutionary adventure tales” in inspiring Chinese “narratives of national development,” from the late Qing dynasty novel *New Story of the Stone* 新石頭記 by Wu Jianren 吳趸人 to a selection of Lu Xun’s 魯迅 short stories and essays. Yet Jones aims to reveal the complex role of big ideas in less ambitious texts as much as literary works. To that end, the book calls attention to the scope and pervasiveness of developmental discourse throughout the media and educated élite. Hence, there are studies of the psychology of art education in the 1930s as disciplining and narrowing children’s perceptions toward a goal of realism, of animal fables instructing children in the invincibility of modern, Western civilization, and the celebrated 1930s film *Xiao wanyi* 小玩意 (Playthings), depicting the sacrifice of a female toy maker and her cottage industry that is unable to offer survival to others or to survive itself, as well as bourgeois Chinese children appearing in the illustrations of children’s magazines interacting with compliant animals as they practise music lessons to show