East Asian History

史 CONTENTS

Cover calligraphy   Yan Zhenqing 顔眞卿, Tang calligrapher and statesman

Cover illustration   Front endpaper (right-hand leaf), by Aō Tokei, "Nihon kokugun
                     sōzu" (Map of Japan), from *Kokugun zenzu* (Atlas of Provinces and
                     Counties) (1828) (source: Yamashita Kazumasa, *Japanese Maps of the
                     Edo Period*, trans. Charles de Woolf [Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō, 1998])

DERIVATION, INTERTEXTUALITY AND AUTHORITY: NARRATIVE AND THE PROBLEM OF HISTORICAL COHERENCE

史 *Brian Moloughney*

用人若已
古來無憺

To be able to use the words of others as if they were one's own creation
Is to have perfect understanding of the past[1]

At the beginning of his Mellon lectures, published under the title *Ten Thousand Things: Module and Mass Production in Chinese Art*, Lothar Ledderose tells how as a child he was given a distinctive jigsaw puzzle, one quite different from all others he had seen. He states that "the pieces in this puzzle did not have curved edges or interlocking shapes," but rather were all simple rectangles, tall and thin, and at first sight seemed the basis for a rather uninteresting puzzle. But as soon as he arranged the pieces on the table, Lodderose realised that there was no fixed position for each piece. Unlike all other puzzles, where the pieces can be assembled in only one way, where each piece has only one place in the puzzle, what distinguished this new puzzle was the variety of ways in which it could be put together.

> The mountains could go into the middle of the landscape or to the right; the tower would as easily fit between the peaks as on the plain, and the rider could be placed heading toward the hills or returning. A coherent panorama invariably emerged. … The trick in completing this puzzle was that, on every single piece, the horizon crossed the left and right edges exactly at midpoint. The pieces could thus be put together in ever new combinations, thousands of them, yet the continuous horizon always guaranteed an intelligible composition.[2]

This intriguing jigsaw puzzle had been made in China, and Ledderose uses it to introduce his discussions of the modular nature of Chinese art and the

[1] Liu Xie 劉勰, *Wenxin diaolong* 文心雕龍 [The literary mind and the carving of dragons], *shilei* 事類 [Factual allusion and textual refeence]: see Vincent Yu-chang Shih, trans. and annot., *The literary mind and the carving of dragons*, bilingual edition (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1983), pp.400–1.

[2] Lothar Ledderose, *Ten thousand things: module and mass production in Chinese art* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), p.vi.

3 Similar concerns about narrative coherence had also influenced developments in Chinese fiction from the late-Ming period onwards. There is a large literature on this but see, for instance, David Roy's translation of Mao Zonggang's 毛宗崗 guide to reading *Sanguo yanyi* 三國演義 [The romance of the Three Kingdoms] in *How to read the Chinese novel*, ed. David L. Rolston (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), pp.146–95; Duncan M. Campbell, "The techniques of narrative: Mao Tsung-kang (fl.1661) and *The romance of the Three Kingdoms*," *Tamkang Review* 16.2 (Winter 1985): 139–61; and Andrew H. Plaks, "Towards a critical theory of Chinese narrative," in *Chinese narrative: critical and theoretical essays*, ed. Andrew H. Plaks (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977), pp.329–39.

Chinese aesthetic. I would like to borrow it and use it as a way to help conceptualize the distinctive formal structures of some Chinese historical narratives.

For the sake of argument, I want to suggest that the contrast between these two types of jigsaw is similar to the contrast between two forms of historical narrative Chinese historians were faced with at the turn of the twentieth century. On the one hand there was the modular, flexible nature of the standard dynastic histories (*zhengshi* 正史), which were composed of a multitude of essays that a reader could approach in any particular order. There was no prescribed route through the text and, just as the Chinese jigsaw allowed or encouraged a variety of readings, so too did the format of the standard histories. On the other hand there was the model of Western historical narrative, with an emphasis on sequence and consequence. In such narratives there was to be a clear sense of beginning, middle and end, and the latter parts of the text only made sense if approached in the appropriate order. The concern with establishing causal relationships meant the component parts of such texts could fit together in only one way, just as the pieces in the Western jigsaw did.

This is obviously a simplistic contrast which ignores the diversity of forms in both Chinese and Western historical practice, but nonetheless I think it a useful contrast in that it helps us understand the kind of challenges Chinese historians were faced with at the turn of the twentieth century. The spatial advance of modernity, with history enlisted to serve the needs of the nation state, encouraged some Chinese historians to question the foundations of inherited historical practice. These advocates of change called for a 'new history', or the 'renewal of history' (*xin shixue* 新史學), and although there was no consensus about what this new history should be, in contesting inherited practice they were not just criticising the standard histories because they focused only on the affairs of the administrative elite of society. They were also concerned that the format of these histories undermined the achievement of the kind of narrative coherence apparent in both the Western histories they were reading and the new Japanese histories modeled upon them.[3]

This concern with coherence was central to the reformulation of historical practice throughout the world in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as historians grappled with the problems associated with a heightened appreciation of the diversity of the world, its many cultures and different historical periods. How do you give shape to this diversity in order to provide a coherent account of the past that is truthful yet also has meaning for people in the present, and how do you do this in a world that is changing so very quickly? There were divergent views about how to respond to these issues, but it is important to remember that much of what the new history involved in China was similar to developments occurring throughout the world as historians everywhere were confronted by the same issues: by the professionalization of the discipline, the attempt to establish new, more

scientific methodologies, and by debates over the veracity of historical knowledge.[4] The origins of these developments lay in nineteenth century Germany, but they soon spread to the rest of Europe, North America, Japan and China.[5] Fundamental to all these developments was the question of historical meaning, or what also might be called the problem of *coherence*.[6]

Chinese historians thus shared much with historians elsewhere, but the distinctive particularities of the Chinese context and the nature of the inherited historiographical tradition shaped their responses to these issues. It was the fracturing of the institutions of state and society in the wake of the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-5, and the frustrating attempts to build new viable institutions following the 1911 revolution, that provided the impetus for the new history. The very framework that had provided coherence was shattered and required rebuilding. And while Chinese historians undoubtedly drew much stimulus from what Meiji historians were doing, in Japan new forms of historical practice emerged in conjunction with a strengthening of the state, whereas in China the opposite occurred; new historical practice emerged in a context of state breakdown and revolution.[7] Thus, the problem of coherence was particularly acute for Chinese historians and they would spend much of the century grappling with it.

The search for new narrative structures with which to present historical knowledge was a consequence of this concern with coherence. Advocates of the new history believed that not only was it necessary to create a new historical 'subject', the nation, but that there needed to be a new way of presenting this subject. Behind these arguments also lay the increasing influence of theories about evolutionary change that played such an important part in undermining the authority of Confucianism. These ideas led to a questioning of the notion of historical atrophy (*lishi tuihua* 歷史退化), the falling away from a Golden Age in the past, and of the cyclical view of dynastic change (*zhiluan xunhuan* 治亂循環).[8] If history was to be concerned with the evolution of a society then historians must employ narrative techniques that facilitated such a project. Inherited historical practice was thus called into question, particularly the standard or dynastic histories. These were increasingly seen as little more than compilations of *benji* 本紀 ('basic annals') and *liezhuan* 列傳 ('categorized biographies'), all "scattered and confused like stones upon a beach."[9] There was, critics argued, no pattern or purpose to it all. The problem here was the segmented nature of this historical writing. Texts such as the standard histories were collections of interrelated yet independent essays, each exploring a particular aspect of a topic, whether it be the reign of an emperor, the operation of a particular institution or the biography of an individual.[10]

In a discussion of Chinese historical narrative, Andrew Plaks notes that not only does the *jizhuan* ('annals and biographies') "format of the dynastic histories serve to militate against any sense of continuous narration of discrete units," but even in *biannian* 編年 ('chronological') texts like Sima

[4] Yu Danchu, *Aiguo zhuyi yu Zhongguo jindai shixue* [Patriotism and modern Chinese historiography] (Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue, 1996); Zhou Yutong, "Wushi nian lai Zhongguo zhi xinshixue" [Fifty years of China's new historical studies], *Xuelin yuekan* (Feb. 1941): 1–36; and Q. Edward Wang *Inventing China through history: the May Fourth approach to historiography* (New York: SUNY, 2001).

[5] On the German origins of these developments see George Iggers, *The German conception of history: the national tradition of historical thought from Herder to the present* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1968).

[6] Excellent discussions of these issues can be found in both Jeffery Barash, *Martin Heidegger and the problem of historical meaning* (Dordrecht, Holland: Martinus Nijhoff, 1988) and Charles R. Bambach, *Heidegger, Dilthey, and the crisis of historicism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995). But see also Thijs Pollman, "Coherence and ambiguity in history," *History and Theory* 39.2 (May 2000): 167–80.

[7] On Meiji historiography see Ōkubo Toshiaki, *Nihon kindai shigaku no seiritsu* [The establishment of modern Japanese historiography] (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1986), and Margaret Mehl, *History and the state in nineteenth-century Japan* (London: McMillan, 1998).

[8] Du Weiyun, "Xifang shixue shuru Zhongguo kao" [A study of the introduction of Western historiography to China], in *Yu Xifang shijia lun Zhongguo shixue* [Western historians and Chinese historiography], reprint ed. (Taipei: Dongda Tushu Gufen Youxian Gongsi, 1988), pp.287–335; Satō Shin'ichi, "Ten'en ron izen ni shinkaron: shinmatsu chishikilin no rekishi ishiki o megutte" [Views on evolution before *Tianyan lun* : historical consciousness among intellectuals in the late Qing], *Shisō* 6 (1990): 241–54; and Hao Chang, *Chinese intellectuals in crisis: search for order and meaning (1890–1911)* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1987), pp.50–3.

[9] Liang Qichao, "Xin shixue" [New historical studies] (1902), in *Yinbingshi heji* 飲冰室合集 [The complete works from the Ice-Drinker's Studio], reprint ed. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1989), vol.1, p.3.

[10] For the use of the term 'segmented' histories to describe the narrative structure of the *zhengshi* see Jaroslav Prusek, "History and epics in China and the West," *Diogenes* 42 (Summer 1963): 20–43. This issue is also discussed by David Der-wei Wang in "Fictional history/historical fiction," *Studies in language and literature* 1 (March 1985): 64–76.

11 Plaks, "Towards a critical theory of Chinese narrative," pp.315–16.

12 See Kenneth J. Gergen, "Narrative, moral identity and historical consciousness: a social constructivist account" (2000), <http:// www. swarthmore.edu/SocSci/kgergen1/text3. html>. See also Frank Kermode, *The sense of an ending: studies in the theory of fiction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), especially pp.35–64.

13 While a draft Qing history was first published in 1928, the project has never been brought to completion. See Zhao Erxun 趙爾巽 et al., *Qing shigao* [Draft history of the Qing dynasty], reprint ed., 4 vols (Beijing: Xinhua Shuju, 1998).

Guang's 司馬光 (1019–86) *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government) the "listing of items may mask a greater emphasis on documentary inclusiveness than selective sequentiality, thus reducing actual narrative presentation to a relative inconspicuousness."[11] From the perspective of the advocates of a new history it was clear that this segmented narrative was not suitable for emplotting, in terms of continuous, linear development, the story of the Chinese nation. They argued the segmented structure needed to be abandoned in favour of narrative forms that would allow a more unified and cohesive account of the Chinese past.

This is, of course, a very particular way to read the format of the standard histories. There is a tendency to reduce understandings of narrative to an overriding emphasis on linear sequentiality, but narratives can take many forms. If we accept Kenneth Gergen's argument that the primary criterion for establishing an intelligible narrative is the formulation of a valued endpoint, which introduces a strong cultural component into any story, and where the selection and ordering of material relates to that endpoint, then the individual essays that make up a standard history were coherent narratives.[12] They may have been more exemplary or bureaucratic in character than sequential, yet they were nonetheless good narratives. However, each essay was only one small part of the overall text, and the diversity that resulted from the collation of all these essays troubled those Chinese historians who, at the turn of the twentieth century, were looking for a narrative vehicle which would give their accounts of the Chinese past the same degree of overall coherence as they observed in Western historical writing.

Thus while the standard dynastic histories might have been an appropriate vehicle for accounts of a multifarious, multi-ethnic empire, they were called into question once people began imagining China not as an empire but as a nation state. The format of the dynastic histories certainly had its own particular attractions and sophistication, something we are prone to forget nowadays, but the production of these histories was an integral part of the institutional fabric of the imperial state and with the collapse of that state so too went the dynastic histories. We know, of course, that the *jizhuan* form of historical writing did not completely disappear, remaining fundamental to the Qing history project, for instance, but it was soon overshadowed by attempts to find new forms of historical writing.[13] In other words, to return to the analogy I have borrowed from Ledderose, driven by a heightened concern with narrative coherence, the wonderful flexibility of the Chinese jigsaw was becoming less appealing to Chinese historians than the integrated nature of the Western one.

If the *jizhuan* and *biannian* forms were unsuitable for the new history, what of the other types of Chinese historical writing? Did the *jishi benmo* 紀事本末 ('record of events from beginning-to-end') texts come closer to the demand for an integrated narrative? In the various essays that comprised a *benmo* text, particular social, political and economic developments were traced over time, each essay displaying a greater narrative coherence than was usually possible with the *jizhuan* or *biannian* histories. And this form

had certainly become more popular in the late imperial period. As Edward Wang notes, Wei Yuan 魏源 was one of those who sought to develop this form of historical writing in the nineteenth century. Others, like Wang Tao 王韜, explored alternative methodologies to help achieve greater narrative coherence.[14] Nevertheless, the perceived problems with lack of sequentiality and inadequate focus on causality remained. For instance, Liang Qichao 梁啟超 argued that while the *benmo* texts came closest to Western narrative, "there was no clear attempt to establish relationships between the events described nor to inquire into the reasons for things."[15]

It was another form of historical writing, the category of *tongshi* (通史, 'general' or 'comprehensive' histories) which offered the most potential for developing the new history. The form was far from new and its value had long been recognised. For instance, in the preface to the *Tongzhi* 通志 (Comprehensive Treatises) the Song historian Zheng Qiao 鄭樵 (1104–62) argued for the significance of *huitong* 會通, or synthesis, as the principle criterion for all good historical writing.[16] Similarly, the great eighteenth-century historiographer Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠 (1738–1801) indicated the various merits of this form of historical writing in his essay "Shitong" 釋通 (Understanding 'Comprehensive'):

> The advantages of the *tongshi* format are sixfold: first, the avoidance of duplication and repetition; second, the balancing of general categories and specific examples; third, the facilitation of evaluation and ordering [of records]; fourth, the assessment of right and wrong; fifth, the elimination of inconsistencies and contradictions; and sixth, the detailing of the affairs of neighbouring states. [The format] has two additional benefits: firstly, the eradication of the extraneous and, secondly, the establishment of the author's own style.[17]

Contrasting the *tongshi* format with that of the *zhengshi*, or standard histories, Zhang Xuecheng emphasised its great advantage was that it allowed the treatment of a subject as "an integrated whole rather than as a collection of discrete parts."[18] Unfortunately, Zhang argued, some historians had used the format to produce texts that were simply collections of data, without showing any synthetic understanding of the material collected. But the potential remained to revive the synthetic aspect of the *tongshi* format and this is what the proponents of the new history sought to do.[19]

The value of the *tongshi* form of historical writing was reinforced through the late Qing reforms. Under these reforms, primary and secondary schools were required to provide students with an integrated account of the whole of the Chinese past and not just focus attention on one particular dynastic period. The transition from the segmented narratives of traditional historiography towards the more unified historical monographs that gradually came to dominate twentieth-century historical writing can thus be seen most clearly in the general histories of Chinese civilisation, the new 'national' histories, which began to appear as the new history took hold around the turn of the century and which were written specifically for use in the new schools and

[14] Wang, *Inventing China*, pp.31–40.

[15] Liang, "Xin shixue," p.6.

[16] Zheng Qiao and Wang Shumin 王樹民, *Tongzhi ershi lüe* 通志二十略 [The twenty summaries of the *Comprehensive Treatises*], reprint ed. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1995), *zongxu* 總序 [preface], p.1.

[17] Zhang Xuecheng and Ye Ying 葉瑛, *Wen shi tongyi jiaozhu* [An annotated edition of *General principles of literature and history*], reprint ed. (Beijing: Gujie Chubanshe, 1985), p.375.

[18] David Nivison, *The life and thought of Chang Hsüeh-cheng (1738-1801)* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1966), p.219.

[19] For a later attempt to recast understandings of *tongshi* within the framework of Western social science see He Bingsong 何炳松, *Tongshi xinyi* [New principles for general history] (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1930).

[20] Wong Kam Cheong, "Chinese history textbook writing in late Ch'ing China," M.Phil. diss. (University of Hong Kong, 1986), pp.35–6.

[21] For discussion of this, see Brian Moloughney, "Nation, narrative and China's New History," in *Asian nationalism in an age of globalization*, ed. Roy Starrs (London: Curzon Press, 2001), pp.205–22.

[22] Yu Danchu, *Aiguo zhuyi yu Zhongguo jindai shixue*, pp.45–6, and Wong, "Chinese history textbook writing in late Ch'ing China," pp.45–94.

[23] Publication details for all the general histories referred to in this essay can be found in the Appendix, pp.138–9.

[24] See Appendix, nos 15 and 16. For analysis of the histories by Xia Zengyou and Zhang Yinlin, see Moloughney "Nation, narrative and China's New History."

[25] Lü Simian, *Baihua benguo shi* (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1923), preface, pp.1–4.

universities.[20] But when we examine these texts it is clear that this transition was neither as immediate nor as extensive as is sometimes imagined.

The appendix to this essay contains a list of some of these new general histories (see pp.139–40). The list is not exhaustive. It simply represents some of the prominent histories produced during this period which I have been able to locate and examine. What is immediately obvious from this list is that the transition to this form of general history really began in Japan. The histories by Naka Michiyo 那珂通世 and Kuwabara Jitsuzō 桑原騭蔵 mark the emergence of the new form of *tongshi* writing. Naka Michiyo divided each volume of his history into *pian* 篇, 'parts', and *zhang* 章, 'chapters', with the chapters further sub-divided into *jie* 節 'sections'. This is the *zhangjie* 章節 ('chapter/section') narrative structure that was to become standard in Chinese historical texts in the twentieth century.[21] These Japanese histories provided the models which Chinese historians either translated or imitated in the first decade of the twentieth century. In 1901 the Ministry of Education sent a delegation to Japan to study the compilation of historical textbooks and then in 1903 published a list of texts deemed suitable for use in schools. Of the ten books listed, eight were translations of Japanese works, and while the translators often adapted the Japanese text, the powerful influence of the Japanese models in the reformulation of the *tongshi* format is clear.[22]

Xia Zengyou 夏曾佑 was the first Chinese historian to adopt the 'chapter/section' format pioneered by Naka Michiyo and, like other historians at the time, he was drawn to this form of historical writing because it seemed to offer the best vehicle for the kind of integrated narrative he sought.[23] The increasing popularity of this form of historical writing in the early twentieth century was, in part, a consequence of a widespread belief that this new form of *tongshi* provided the best means to achieve greater narrative coherence. Not all of the histories listed in the appendix follow this format closely and they vary considerably in the degree to which they can be said to achieve coherence. Perhaps the most successful in this regard were the histories by Zhang Yinlin 張蔭麟 and Qian Mu 錢穆, both of whom had given careful attention to the process of writing *tongshi*.[24] But most of these general histories did not achieve a similar degree of narrative coherence. For instance, Lü Simian's 呂思勉 text, *Baihua benguo shi* 白話本國史 (A Vernacular History of China) (1923), was one of the first to use vernacular Chinese and he argues strongly that a successful general history should develop sequentially, based upon clearly established causal relationships.[25] To some extent he achieves this, but the narrative flow of his vernacular is constantly interrupted by extensive quotations from source materials, all of which are in classical Chinese. This is common to many of the general histories produced during the early twentieth century, where the text of the history is largely or partially composed through source quotation. Zhang Yinlin's refusal to quote from source materials marks his history, *Zhongguo shigang* 中國史綱 (An Outline History of China) (1940), as distinctive in this regard. All the other histories listed quote from source materials, and some

do so extensively. Whereas in most modern Western historical writing the evidential basis for the narrative is largely confined to the footnotes, distinguished from the narrative itself by the slash in the page that separates notes from text, in many of these Chinese texts the evidential basis becomes the text.[26] The quotation from source materials is often so extensive that it dominates; the evidence becomes the foundation of the narrative. Here authority is established not by originality and argument but through derivation and intertextuality. In other words, while the format of these general histories is partially new, much of the compositional technique within the texts reflects past practice. It is the tension between the desire for coherence and the reliance upon extensive quotation from source materials that I wish to explore in the remainder of this essay.

* * *

To write history thus means to *cite* history.[27]

Intertextuality (*wenben hushe* 文本互涉) has always played an important part in Chinese historiography. Let me give one example to illustrate this. It doesn't come from a dynastic history, but is reflective of a general compositional technique used in pre-twentieth century Chinese historical narratives. I came across it when examining the post-1949 debates over the role of the individual in history and, in particular, the re-evaluation of the great late-Han–Three Kingdoms figure Cao Cao 曹操 (155–220), which took place in 1959. Along with Sima Qian's 司馬遷 (c.100 BCE) history, the Three Kingdoms period is one of the great seedbeds for Chinese literature. And Pei Songzhi's 裴松之 (372–451) commentary to the Three Kingdoms history, *Sanguo zhi* 三國志, is a wonderfully rich source for variant interpretations of particular events and particular individuals. The debate itself was, of course, more about contemporary politics than any attempt to re-evaluate a particular historical figure.[28] But once I began looking at the 1959 debate I quickly realised I had to become familiar with the source of the materials the participants in the debate were quoting in order to advance their views (although they rarely indicated the exact source of the material quoted). This involved looking at a variety of histories and literatures about the Three Kingdoms period, and I was particularly looking for idiosyncratic interpretations of Cao Cao that participants in the debate might have drawn upon.

This led me to the biography of Cao Cao by the famous late-Ming iconoclast Li Zhi 李贄 (1527–1602) in his *Cangshu* 藏書 (A Book to be Hidden Away).[29] I thought that if anyone would provide a radical, distinctive view of Cao Cao, then it would be Li Zhi, a man famous for his individuality and iconoclasm. But as soon as I began to read this biography I had the feeling I had seen it all before. And indeed I had. After checking I found that not one column of characters, indeed, not one character, was original. It was all cut and paste, mostly from different texts in Pei Songzhi's commentary.

[26] For discussion of this aspect of Western historical practice, see Michel de Certeau *The writing of history*, translated by Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp.94–5, and Roger Chartier, *On the edge of a cliff: history, language, and practices*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), p.17. And for an extended discussion of the use of the footnote in the Western tradition see Anthony Grafton, *The footnote: a curious history* (London: Faber & Faber, 1997)

[27] Walter Benjamin *The arcades project*, trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLuaghlin (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), convolute N 11-3, p.476.

[28] For more on this, see Brian Moloughney, "Redefining the past: Chinese perceptions of the role of the individual in history," *New Zealand Journal of East Asian Studies* 4.1 (June 1996): 81–103.

[29] Li Zhi, *Cangshu*, reprint ed. (Taipei: Xuesheng Shuju, 1974), pp.56–63.

30 R. G. Collingwood, *The idea of history*, reprint ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), p.257.

31 Ibid, pp.257–8.

32 Jörn Rüsen, "Rhetoric and aesthetics of history: Leoplod von Ranke," *History and Theory* 29 (1990): 190–204. For a study of the rhetorical nature of medieval Western historical writing, see Ruth Morse, *Truth and convention in the Middle Ages: rhetoric, representation, and reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

33 There are others, however, who see much greater continuity in Western historiography, arguing that the epistemology and methodology of modern 'professional' history cannot be so clearly demarcated from earlier practice. See, for instance, Donald R. Kelley, *Faces of history: historical inquiry from Herodotus to Herder* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998).

34 Jack Plumb, *The death of the past* (London: Macmillan, 1969). In his critical exploration of these issues Dipesh Chakrabarty notes that "Historicism—and even the modern, European idea of history—one might say, came to non-European peoples in the nineteenth century as somebody's way of saying 'not yet' to somebody else." See *Provincializing Europe: postcolonial thought and historical difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), p.8. And for an interesting discussion of how these ideas influenced Japanese historical practice, see Sebastian Conrad, "What time is Japan? problems of comparative (intercultural) historiography," *History and Theory* 38 (1999): 67–83.

Perhaps if I had had more exposure to the nature of Chinese historical texts this would not have surprised me. But at the time I was surprised; and the reason was that my training in history had taught me to believe that this kind of cut and paste methodology was exactly what a historian should not do.

For instance, R. G. Collingwood argues that this practice is antithetical to acceptable modern historical practice: "There is a kind of history which depends altogether upon the testimony of authorities. As I have already said, it is not really history at all, but we have no other name for it."[30] In his attack on this methodology Collingwood argues that historical texts of this kind, constructed by "excerpting and combining the testimony of different authorities," cannot be considered "true" history because they do "not satisfy the necessary conditions of science."[31] This understanding of historical methodology is fundamental to modern Western historical practice. For Collingwood, as for Leopold von Ranke, the aim of modern 'scientific' historical methodology was originality and argument. Ranke's criticism of the resort to rhetorical devices, such as the use of fabricated dialogue to enliven historical prose, a practice widely employed since the time of Thucydides, was similar to Collingwood's concern with an appeal to authority constructed through the textual tradition.[32] While *The Idea of History* is a strongly philosophical exploration of the foundations of this enterprise, the same view can be found in a multitude of other works.[33] Collingwood was primarily concerned to distinguish the modern profession of history form earlier forms of Western historiography, but others sought to draw the distinction between Western and non-Western practice. For instance, Jack Plumb argues in his book, *The Death of the Past*, that while many societies, such as the Chinese, had a strongly developed concern with the past, this was not the same thing as history. The term 'History' should be reserved only for the modern Western practice, with its emphasis on originality and argument.[34] And, of course, while 'scissors and paste' might be an appropriate methodology for those just concerned with the past, it cannot be for the modern historian. Hence, how can Li Zhi be considered a historian, let alone an original and iconoclastic thinker, if he employs a methodology such as this? Of course, the cut and paste methodology does not preclude a critical perspective, and what is left out from the precursor text is often as revealing as what is extracted, but we would not normally consider it the methodology of an iconoclast.

But this was a methodology that survived the rise of the 'new history' in early twentieth century China. If we look at another of the new general histories, this time Liu Yizheng's 柳詒徵 *Zhongguo wenhuashi* 中國文化史 (A Cultural History of China) (1932), what we find is that Liu builds his text through extensive quotation from other texts, nearly ninety of them all told (see Figure 1). Are we again dealing with this same so-called 'scissors and paste' methodology? We know that Liu was considered a conservative who consciously resisted many of the new historiographical developments of the time. He was one of the central figures behind the journal *Xueheng* 學衡 (Critical Review), which came out of the Nanjing-based Southeastern

第二章 西教之东来

西教之入中国也久矣。在唐为景教，

《大秦景教流行中国碑》(唐僧景净)："三一妙身、无元真主、阿罗诃，判十字以定四方，鼓元风而生二气。""神天宣庆，室女诞圣于大秦，景宿告祥，波斯睹耀以来贡。""大秦国有上德曰阿罗本，贞观九祀，至于长安。帝使宰臣房玄龄宾迎入内，翻经书殿，问道禁闱，深知正真，待令传授。贞观十有二年秋七月，诏曰：大秦国大德阿罗本，远将经像来献上京，详其教旨，玄妙无为，济物利人，宜行天下。所司即于京义宁坊造大秦寺一所，度僧二十一人。""高宗大帝，于诸州各置景寺，仍崇阿罗本为镇国大法主。""玄宗天宝三载，大秦国有僧佶和、瞻星向化，翌日朝禮。诏僧罗含、僧普论等一七人，与佶和于兴庆宫修功德。""肃宗皇帝于灵武等郡重立景寺。大唐建中二年，岁在作噩太蔟月七日大耀森文日建立。……时法主僧宁恕，知东方之景众也。"《金石录补》(叶奕苞)："右碑下及东西三面，皆以彼国文字。字皆左转，弗能译也。此即天主教初入中国，自唐迄今，其教遍天下矣。"《来斋金石志》(林侗)："明嘉祯间，西安守晋陵笔静长，卜葬幼子于长安崇仁寺之南，掘数尺，得一石，乃景教流行碑也。今在西安城西金胜寺内。"《景教考》(钱大昕)："万历间，长安民锄地，得唐建中二年景教碑。士大夫之西学者，相矜谓有唐之世，其教已流行中国。"

在宋为一赐乐业教，

《开封重建清真寺记》："夫一赐乐业立教祖师阿无罗汉，乃盘古阿耽十九代孙也。……道教相传授受有自来矣。出自天竺，奉命而来，有李、俺、艾、高、穆、赵、金、周、张、石、黄、李、聂、金、张、左、白七十二姓等，进贡西洋布于宋。帝曰：'归我中夏、遵守祖风、留遗汴梁。'宋孝宗隆兴元年癸未，小辫五思达领掌其教，俺都剌始建寺焉。元至元十六年己卯，五思达重建古刹清真寺。……大明太祖以是导不可无典守者，俾李诚、李实、

俺乎徒、艾端、李贵、李节、李升、李纲、艾敬、周安、李荣、李良、李智、张浩等，正经晓熟，功人为善，呼为满喇。……弘治二年，清真后人宁夏金瑛、祥符金礼并立。"《开封一赐乐业教考》(陈垣)。"赐乐业，或翻以色列(Israel)犹太民族也。清真寺与回教寺同名，乃犹太教而非回教。道经，《摩西五经》也。……七十姓，或疑为十七姓之讹，因碑中所列迪十七姓。而教众之知名者，又无在十七姓之外也。……咸丰初，有教士购得开封犹太人谱牒一本，中有希伯来名，亦有汉名。弘治碑谓李、俺、艾等姓进西洋布于宋，俺都剌始建寺者，必谱牒所传，故能言之凿凿。当其始至，尚沿犹太民族，历元迄明，乃改汉姓。"

在元为也里可温教，

《元史·世祖纪》："至元七年九月，敕僧道也里可温有家室不科[]戒律者，占籍为民。"《泰定纪》："泰定元年二月，宣谕也里可温各如其教具戒。"《世祖纪》："至元十九年九月，扬廷璧招抚海外南番，寓俱蓝国。也里可温主兀咱儿撒里马，亦遣使奉表，进七宝项牌一、药物二瓶。"《至顺镇江志》："大兴国寺在夹道巷，至元十八年，本路副达鲁化赤薛里吉思建，伏学教授梁相记其略云：薛迷思贤在中原西北十万余里，乃也里可温行教之地，恩问其所教者，云天地有十字令十二、内一寺佛殿四柱高四十尺，皆巨木，一柱悬空尺余。祖师麻儿也里牙灵迹千五百余岁，今马薛里吉思是其徒也；教以礼东方为主，与天竺寂天之教不同。"《至顺镇江志校勘记》(刘文淇)曰："此志达侨寓之户口，所谓也里可温者，西洋人也。卷九'大兴国寺'条，载梁相记云云。据此则薛迷思贤乃西洋之地面也，而也里可温即天主教矣。"《元史译文证补·元也各教名考》(洪钧)曰："也里可温之为天主教，有镇江北固山下残碑可证。自唐时景教入中国，支裔孤传，历久未绝，也里可温当即景教之遗绪也。"

是皆在中国书籍碑版，信而可征者。外史载元代耶教人之入中国者尤多，

《正教奉褒》(黄伯禄)："定宗时，宗室延臣多有奉教者，定宗之母昭慈太后信教甚诚，殿前建有圣堂，每值教中礼期，昭慈太后暨奉教王公大臣，诣堂瞻礼。教士柏朗嘉宾回自朝觐教宗，太后赐猞猁皮绒袍以壮行色。宪宗六年，法兰西国王类思，遣教士罗柏鲁奉国书东来通问，责赠锦帱一顶，帱上绣绘教中圣像。罗柏鲁驻京敷教，释氏群起攻讦。帝令

856　657

Figure 1

A page from Liu Yizheng's Zhongguo wenhua shi (A Cultural History of China), reprint ed. (Shanghai: Dongfang Chubanshe, 1996). Apart from the chapter title and the one-line introductions to each quotation, the bulk of the text comprises extracts from source materials

University (later, 1927, the National Central University). This journal served as a major counter to the predominantly Beijing-based New Culture Movement and most of the articles that were published in *Xueheng* were written in classical Chinese. Like others involved in the journal, Liu Yizheng opposed the vernacular literature movement, arguing that the consequence of this would be to cut the connection with China's past and it was that past which provided the most important foundation for the future. Thus, there was certainly a political aspect to a methodology that involved extensive quotation from source materials in classical Chinese. But at the same time Liu's book was very much a product of the period in which it was produced, reflecting many of the developments of the new history. In its overall structure and in many of the topics discussed it represents a significant break with past practice.[35] Nevertheless, the narrative methodology employed by Liu is remarkably similar to that used by Li Zhi in his biography of Cao Cao. Liu Yizheng does at least give the title of the works from which he quotes, but little more than that. Like Li Zhi he builds his text from other texts.

[35] Ni Lai'en 倪來恩 (Brian Moloughney), "Liu Yizheng shixue zhuzuo zhong de wenhua yu rentong" [Culture and identity in the historical writing of Liu Yizheng], *Renwen luncong* (2000): 114–19.

[36] Hu Shi, "Review of *Zhongguo wenhua shi*," in *Qinghua xuebao* 8.2 (June 1933), *shuji pinglun* 書籍評論 (Book reviews), pp.1–5.

[37] Feng Youlan, *Sansongtang zixu* 三松堂自序, reprint ed. (Beijing: Sanlian Shudian, 1984), pp.215–16; and *The Hall of Three Pines: an account of my life*, trans. Denis C. Mair (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000), p.224.

[38] Ibid.

[39] For a wide-ranging discussion of the broader context for this development, see the final chapter in John B. Henderson, *Scripture, canon, and commentary: a comparison of Confucian and Western exegesis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991).

[40] Chen Yinque, "Feng Youlan *Zhongguo zhexue shi* shangce shencha baogao" [A report on the first volume of Feng Youlan's *History of Chinese philosophy*], in *Jinmingguan conggao erbian* [Collectged drafts from Jinming Hall, 2nd volume] (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1980), pp.247–8.

Do we simply follow Collingwood and Plumb and dismiss this kind of historical writing as bad history, as nothing more than plagiarism and therefore of no significance? To do so requires that we ignore the fact that Liu's work was not received in this way at the time it was published. It was widely read and highly valued as the first significant modern cultural history of China. Even those who were critical of the perspective taken in the book, such as Hu Shi 胡適, recognised it as a work of great significance.[36] Nobody criticised its methodology. And the reason for this, of course, was that it remained a widespread practice at the time.

For instance, Feng Youlan 馮友蘭 argued that one of the things that marked Hu Shi's *History of Chinese Philosophy* (Zhongguo gudai zhexue shi 中國古代哲學史, 1919) out as distinctive was that "Hu Shi's words were the main text."[37] Whereas in the past writers had expressed their thoughts through commentaries on the classics, and it was those classical texts that featured prominently while the author's own words were presented in smaller characters, with Hu Shi's book his own words dominated: "They were printed in large characters going all the way up to the top of the page, while his quotations of ancient authors were indented and in smaller characters."[38] In other words, this reversed what Feng Youlan believed to be the normal order of things. Feng was not necessarily opposed to this methodology and would later adopt it himself, but he did see it as a significant departure from past practice.[39]

Similarly, when Feng published the first part of his own magnum opus, the *History of Chinese Philosophy* (Zhongguo zhexue shi 中國哲學史, 1931), Chen Yinque 陳寅恪 praised the book for the opposite reason. He argued that the histories of Chinese philosophy written in recent years, such as Hu Shi's, were really nothing more than histories of the author's own thoughts and opinions. Chen believed Feng Youlan's book was valuable precisely because he did not fall into this trap of thinking that his own opinions were more important than the intellectual tradition itself nor that coherence should take precedence over continuity: "The more orderly the presentation of their arguments, the further they depart from the ancients ... If we are looking for a history of Chinese philosophy which can correct these failings, and which possesses sympathetic understanding, this work of Mr. Feng's comes fairly close."[40] In other words, Feng Youlan developed his ideas through the textual tradition, not in opposition to it, and in doing so he relied heavily upon the textual legacy of the past in constructing his narrative.

* * *

子曰。述而不作。信而好古
The Master said: "I transmit, I invent nothing. I trust and love the past.[41]

[41] Simon Leys, *The Analects of Confucius* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997), p.29.

What both Feng Youlan and Chen Yinque observe being challenged here is the commitment to transmission rather than invention, that commitment

enshrined in the notion 'shu er buzuo' (述而不作, *Analects* 7.1).[42] This commitment was continually reiterated throughout the tradition. As Martin Huang notes, both Sima Qian and Zhu Xi (朱熹, 1130–1200) restated the notion, but theirs are only two of the more famous expressions of an idea that lay at the heart of the Confucian textual tradition.[43] More recently, Tu Weiming has given a late-twentieth-century reformulation of it:

> 余所謂述故事，整齊其世傳，非所謂作也，而君比之於春秋謬矣
> My narrative is only a classification of the materials that have been preserved. Thus it is not an innovation and it is a mistake to compare my work with *Chunqiu* [Spring and Autumn Annals].[44]

> 夫子蓋集群聖之大成而折衷之，其事雖述而功則倍於作矣
> Therefore the master achieved a great synthesis of what various sages had done and struck a mean. Thus his work is twice as valuable as that of a creator, even though it is transmission.[45]

> Profundity in thought is thus understood in terms of one's ability to penetrate the bedrock of one's given tradition, which necessarily involves a strong sense of history. However, far from being bound to the past as a fixed entity, to have a historical consciousness is to develop the power of creativity not in isolation but in a dialogue with those great historical personalities by whom one's own work is meaningfully judged and properly appreciated … . The success of a creative act does not signify a departure from the past. Rather, it is a new realization of what has long been intended … .[46]

There is, of course, a deceptiveness about this. As Frederick Mote has argued, the disclaimer of originality turns out to be a special rhetorical means to claim originality: "the greater the aesthetic and technical achievement, the more the creative individual was thought to be in command of the past, or under command of the past—for they were the same thing."[47] This is the thrust of Liu Xie's (c.465–522) chapter on factual allusion and textual reference, *shilei*, in the *Wenxin diaolong* from which the ◀quotation at the beginning of this essay is taken. But this particular conception of creativity, a creativity based on the notion of transmission and modelling, means Chinese texts, historical as well as literary, are characterised by a distinct kind of intertextuality. New texts feed off and build upon older texts. Much of their substance is derivative, produced through a dialogue with precursor texts that provide the foundations for the new text. But, as Karl Kao has noted, the Chinese practice of intertextuality is distinctive. It involves:

> a reference to some, often canonical, texts with a spirit of modelling and emulation; it is a continuous activity in which the new text transmits a living tradition and maintains its vitality by transformation and renovation. In this activity, a new text finds its own identity only by assimilating and identifying with the model before transmitting it.[48]

[42] In challenging this practice, perhaps Hu Shi would have liked to see the expression reversed, so that it read "zuo er bushu" 作而不述: "I create, I do not transmit."

[43] See Martin Weizong Huang's discussion of 'the anxiety of precedents' in "Dehistoricization and intertextualization: the anxiety of precedents in the evolution of the traditional Chinese novel," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 16 (1994): 46–9.

[44] Sima Qian, *Shiji* 史記 [Historical records] reprint ed., 10 vols (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1959): 10, pp.3299–300.

[45] Zhu Xi, *Sishi jizhu* 四書集註 [Collected commentaries to the *Four Books*], reprint ed. (Hong Kong: Taiping Shuju, 1964), p.41.

[46] Tu Weiming, "'Inner experience': the basis of creativity in Neo-Confucian thinking," in *Uses of the past in Chinese culture: artists and traditions*, ed. Christian F. Murck (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), pp.14–15.

[47] Frederick W. Mote, "The arts and the 'theorizing mode' of the civilization," in ibid., p.7. See also the discussion of these issues in James Cahill, *The compelling image: nature and style in seventeenth-century Chinese painting* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), pp.47–62.

[48] Karl S. Y. Kao, "Aspects of derivation in Chinese narrative," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 7 (1985): 1. See also the essays in Stephen Owen, *Remembrances: the experience of the past in classical Chinese literature* (Cambrige, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986).

[49] Laurent Jenny, "The strategy of form," in *French literary theory today,* ed. Tzvetan Todorov (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp.34–63.

[50] As well as the above-mentioned article by Karl Kao, see David Palumbo-Liu, *The poetics of appropriation: the literary theory and practice of Huang Tingjian* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993); Martin Weizong Huang, "Dehistoricization and intertextualization," and "Author(ity) and reader in traditional Chinese *xiaoshuo* commentary," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 12 (1990): 41–67; Anthony C. Yu, "History, fiction and the reading of Chinese narrative," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 10 (1988): 1–19, and *Rereading the stone: desire and the making of fiction in the* Dream of the Red Chamber (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Prtess, 1997); and Chen Anfeng, "Li Bihua "Qingshe" zhong de 'wenben hushe'" [Intertextuality in Lillian Lee's *Green Snake*], *Ershiyi shiji* 65 (June 2001): 74–81.

[51] Grant Hardy, *Worlds of bronze and bamboo. Sima Qian's conquest of history* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999). E. G. Pulleyblank briefly mentions this aspect of Chinese historical narrative but does not explore it in any depth: see 'The historiographical tradition', in Raymond Dawson ed., *The legacy of China* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), p.150.

[52] Sheldon Hsiao-Peng Lu, *From historicity to fictionality: the Chinese poetics of narrative* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1994), p.6.

[53] Zhang Xuecheng, "Yu Chen Guanmin gongbu lun shixue" [Discussing historical questions with Chen Guanmin of the Ministry of Works], in *Zhang Xuecheng yishu* [The remaining writings of Zhang Xuecheng], reprint ed. (Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe, 1985), *juan* 14, p.126. This translation is by Anthony Yu: see "History, fiction and the reading of Chinese narrative," p.8.

While this kind of intertextuality can take many forms, such as allusion, adaptation, montage, parody and pastiche, in historical texts it primarily involved quotation and could incorporate both archival or published material.[49] Some literary scholars have begun to explore this aspect of Chinese narrative, but until recently it has largely been ignored by students of Chinese historiography.[50] One of the reasons that Grant Hardy's recent book on Sima Qian is significant is that it begins to explore this aspect of Chinese historical narrative.[51]

There is also a powerful notion of authority at work in this practice of intertextuality. The incorporation of seemingly unprocessed data and documents into historical texts gives an impression of authenticity and factuality: a 'reality effect'. As Sheldon Lu notes, "Readers of such histories are left with an impression of the authenticity of the historical materials and the factuality of the recorded events. Official historiography is made to appear to be a record and transcription of the real."[52] Rather than authority coming from interpretation and argument, as is the case in modern Western historiography, it is associated with reference to the textual tradition. It was believed that a true account of the past could be reached through the textual tradition. Even when that textual tradition was called into question, as it was in the early twentieth century, historians still engaged with it in an active and productive way. They did so because intertextuality was associated with an authoritative account of the past. This does not mean that there is no originality, no innovation, in Chinese historical writing, just that it takes a particular form. And the form it takes is especially demanding of modern readers. As we all know, we do not have the same familiarity with the textual tradition that was once common for a well-educated Chinese reader. Zhang Xuecheng draws a distinction between plagiarism and creative usage which is quite useful here:

文士勦襲之弊與史家運用之功相似而實相天淵
勦襲者帷恐人知其所本運用者帷恐人不知其所本

The flaw of plagiarism in the literati and the merit of the creative usage in the historian may appear similar, but they are, in fact, irreconcilably different. The plagiarist fears only that people would know of his source; the creative user, that they would be ignorant of it.[53]

Whereas the plagiarist tries to disguise the debt to the past, the creative user expects of the reader an intimate familiarity with it. There is no attempt to disguise the debt. Liu Yizheng, like Li Zhi before him, expected of readers this intimate familiarity with the textual tradition. And while Hu Shi may have wished to see more emphasis on 'creation' rather than 'transmission', the transformation from 'shu er buzuo' to 'zuo er bushu' was not as widespread as might be imagined. The persistence of the appeal to authority through intertextuality in the new *tongshi* is clear evidence of this.

* * *

文史不分
Literature and history are inseparable[54]

古人事見於言 言以為事 未嘗分事言為二物也
The ancients illustrated events through words and considered words through events, never separating words and events into two things.[55]

With the emergence of the new history in the early twentieth century methodological practices such as a reliance on intertextuality were called into question, yet they did not disappear. Similarly, the new history also challenged received understandings about the relationship between literature and history. The professionalization of historical practice, and the concentration of that practice in the new universities, encouraged many historians to see their activity as distinct from literature. The attempt to separate history from biography was one manifestation of this.[56] A similar attempt to separate historical practice from literary endeavour was part of the professionalization of the historical discipline in the West and one product of this was an increasing concern with plagiarism. As Thomas Mallon has argued, "Originality—not just innocence of plagiarism but the making of something really and truly new—set itself down as a cardinal literary virtue sometime in the middle of the eighteenth century and has never gotten up."[57] Thus, this concern with plagiarism is only of fairly recent origin. It didn't really become an issue in Western scholarship until writers increasingly began to earn their living from writing. In other words, once writers thought of writing as their trade they began to take a dim view of others using or appropriating their words. Concern over plagiarism thus emerges in the wake of professionalism, and presupposes a common ideological foundation in the Enlightenment ideal of the creative, original, individual as the source of all communication.[58] Similarly, it was also around the same time that plagiarism emerges as an issue, that the author(ity) of an author, to use Martin Huang's formulation, begins to be drawn less from cultural precedents and religious institutions and to depend more on "verbal inventiveness."[59] And, of course, this was the period when historians began to see themselves as professionally distinct

---

[54] While this is a common saying, I have been unable to locate the source of it. I thank Yeh Wen-hsin for suggesting its relevance. Qian Zhongshu 錢鍾書 addresses the inter-relationship between historical and literary composition, albeit briefly, in *Tan yilu* 談藝錄 [On the art of poetry], revised ed. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1984), pp.38–9, although the nature of this relationship is also fundamental to many of the essays in his *Guanzhui bian* /管錐編 [Limited views: essays on ideas and letters] (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1979–80).

[55] Zhang Xuecheng, *Wen shi tongyi jiaozhu*, p.31.

[56] Brian Moloughney, "From biographical history to historical biography: a transformation in Chinese historical writing,' *East Asian History* 4 (1992): 1–30.

[57] Thomas Mallon, *Stolen words: forays into the origins and ravages of plagiarism* (New York: Ticknor Fields, 1989), p.24. For a superb send-up of the obsession with originality, see Roland de Chaudenay's *Dictionnaire des plagiares* (Paris: Perrin, 1990), which has the following as a subtitle: "a dictionary where one finds classed in alphabetical order writers in French who, by means of borrowings which they appear to have made from the works of other authors, are, or could be considered to be systematic or occasional pillagers, sly copiers, labourious compilers, shameless imitators, conceited literary pretenders, in a word, plagiarists." I came to Chaudenay through Marilyn Randell, *Pragmatic plagiarism: authorship, profit, and power* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001). For a related discussion of these issues in the Chinese context, but from the perspective of intellectual property law, see William P. Alford, *To steal a book is an elegant offense: intellectual property law in Chinese civilization* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995).

[58] Ron Scollon, "Plagiarism and ideology: identity in intercultural discourse," *Language in Society* 24 (1995): 1–28. Scollon argues that the concept of plagiarism is based on an "oversimplified model of communication" which assumes that all discourse is conducted by "autonomous, rational, individuals who behave as originators of their own discourses" (p.1). It is worth noting also that plagiarim's inversion, forgery, does not rest on such an ideological foundation and has been around for a much longer time. See, for instance, Giles Constable, "Forgery and plagiarism in the Middle Ages," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 29 (1983): 1–14, and the five volumes of conference papers on this topic published as *Fälschungen im Mittelalter* (Hannover: M.G.H. Schriften, 1988). I would like to thank Paul Hayward for bringing these works on forgery to my attention.

[59] Huang, "Author(ity) and reader," p.42. For a sociological analysis of the community, both artistic and academic, that came to depend on the virtues of inventiveness and originality, in other words, you and me, see Pierre Bourdieu, *The rules of art*, trans. by Susan Emanuel (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996). As Bourdieu notes: "God is dead, but the uncreated creator has taken his place. The same person who announced the death of God seizes all his properties" (p.189).

[60] For a good discussion of this, see Hans Kellner, *Language and historical represent-ation: getting the story crooked* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).

[61] Liang Qichao, "Xin shixue," but see also the earlier essay "Zhongguo shi xulun" 中國史敍論 [Introduction to Chinese history] (1901) in *Yinbingshi heji*, vol.1, pp.1–12.

[62] Axel Schneider, *Wahrheit und Geschichte: zwei chinesische Historiker auf der Suche nach einer modernen Identität für China* (Weisbaden: Harassowitz Verlag, 1997), pp.68–73, 100–8, and Tang Xiaobing, *Global space and the nationalist discourse of modernity: the historical thinking of Liang Qichao* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996), pp.205–33.

[63] Anthony Grafton, "A passion for the past," *New York Review of Books* 48.4 (2001), p.47.

[64] Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing history from the nation: questioning narratives of modern China* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

from writers. With this went the re-fashioning of the historical discipline and an increasing emphasis on methodological approaches to evidence rather than on the rhetorical aspects of writing and literary presentation.[60]

It was this new, more methodological, more 'scientific' notion of history that gained increasing influence in China during the early twentieth century, altering not only the way historians went about their work but also the way they viewed inherited practice. But as the evidence of the new general histories shows, the transition away from past practice was neither as immediate nor as far reaching as the polemical arguments for the new history put forward by the likes of Liang Qichao in his famous 1902 essay "The New History" might suggest.[61] Too often the new history is considered simply an enactment by historians of Liang Qichao's agenda. We cannot ignore Liang's agenda for radical change, but we must place it in context. Even more importantly, we need to consider what historians were actually doing as they attempted to establish new forms of practice, not just their proclamations regarding the need for change.

It is also important to remember that the one of the central characteristics of the new history was its great diversity. Liang Qichao himself produced a range of views on what it should be, his later ideas differing markedly from those he had expressed in 1902.[62] This change is indicative, in part, of the wide range of historiographical developments influencing Chinese historians in the early twentieth century and the diversity of responses to those develop-ments. Anthony Grafton has noted recently that "The German world's pervasive passion for the past did not create anything like a consensus about its meaning."[63] This is as true of the historiography of early twentieth century China as it is of nineteenth century Germany. The chaotic and contested nature of the Republican era was reflected in its historical writing, which cannot be reduced, as Prasenjit Duara would have us believe, to the single strand of 'Enlightenment History'. Duara is undoubtedly correct to emphasise the powerful ways history was brought into the service of the nation-state, but there was never any singular view of what the nation should be nor of how history should serve it.[64] Just as we should resist attempts to assess Chinese historiography solely from the prespective of a Western epistemology and methodology, ascribing to that an imagined coherence and singularity, so we also should be wary of attempts to reduce the diversity of early twentieth century Chinese historiography to a single, dominant strand.

As in so much else, there is a teleology of Westernisation that tends to govern assessments of modern Chinese historiography. Importance is attached to a rising rationalism and objectivity, while those things that do not fit this narrative of transformation are seen as problematic. These are things that are most visibly non-Western, and they are simply ignored or dismissed with the label 'conservative'—things such as a historiographical methodology that privileges intertextuality and tradition rather than argument and originality. But instead of conceiving of this in terms of flawed methodology, of plagiarism, producing second-rate texts of no significance, it might be more useful to

understand intertextuality as a sophisticated method by which readers can engage with an inherited archival and textual tradition. Thus readers of Liu Yizheng's cultural history are able to experience not just Liu's own view of the past, but also a network of textual fragments that are used to construct that view. This is certainly not simple-minded didactic history. In fact, such a methodology allows readers to engage with and interpret directly the materials of the past in a way that is not the case with historical writing which is dominated by the prescriptive interpretation of the author, with the evidential basis for that interpretation hidden away beyond the coded world of footnotes.

As Harry Harootunian and Dipesh Chakrabarty have argued, we live still in a world largely shaped by the dominance of a particular locality; the Euro-American, or Western, world-view provides the lens through which we look not only at the present but also the past. And the marginalization of alternative world-views is especially prominent in "the way in which historians have envisioned their discipline and its modes of knowing."[65] Historians of South Asia have been to the fore in challenging this parochialism, but often with the result that it is Bengal, rather than Euro-America, that becomes the lens through which the rest of the world is viewed. There are substantial problems with this for historians of China, particularly if, as Vinay Lal argues, much of the recent work by South Asian historians suggests that the various attempts "to furnish India with historical narratives of its own kind are pointers to the increasing encroachment of history upon the fundamental and deliberate ahistoricity of the Indian sensibility."[66] The contrast with China could not be greater. Here, historians are faced not with an absence of historical writing before the intrusion of modern Western practice, but with a surfeit. Indeed, in terms of volume and diversity, Chinese historical writing is second to none. The challenge, then, is not to see how a modern historical world-view was imposed over non-historical modes of thought and being, but to be attentive to the ways in which past practice shaped the reception of imported methodologies. Too often the introduction of the new history is portrayed as little more than a new set of clothes which Chinese took to with alacrity, the old garments being abandoned and the new taken up immediately.[67] But if the narrative techniques employed in the new *tongshi* are any indication, this was far from the case. When we move beyond the polarisations of the polemical arguments about what a new history *should* be and examine the kinds of history historians *actually wrote* what we find is a rich amalgam of past practice and new methodologies.

* * *

Historians are the professional custodians of pattern, and our writing expresses more single-mindedly than any other use of prose the relentless human demand, in the face of all contrary evidence including our strongest fears, that time have form so that life have meaning. Story is our essential mode of explanation because it turns the unmeaning 'and next, and next, and next ...' of reality into significant sequence.[68]

[65] Harry Harootunian, *History's disquiet: modernity, cultural practice, and the question of everyday life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), p.7, and Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe.* See also Naoki Sakai, "Modernity and its critique: the problem of universalism and particularism," *South Atlantic Quarterly* (1988): 475–504.

[66] Vinay Lal, "Subaltern studies and its critics: debates over Indian history," *History and Theory* 40 (Feb. 2001): 148. See also Roy W. Perrett, "History, time and knowledge in ancient India," *History and Theory* 38.3 (Oct. 1999): 307–21. And for an interesting discussion of the way South Asian historians are contributing to the formation of new modes of historical practice, see Tony Ballantyne, "Archive, discipline and state: power and knowledge in South Asian historiography," *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 3.1 (June 2001): 87–105.

[67] In 1928 Zhou Zuoren 周作人 remarked that "Those of shallow learning are reckless with distinctions, [arguing] that the twentieth century, or the success of the Northern Expedition, or the rise of the peasant army marks a new period, a new world, which brings forth enormous change and is completely different from what went before. It is as if the people of old die in the blink of an eye, while new people drop from the heavens, rise up out of the ground and leap from hollow mulberry trees, [people as distinct from those who went before] as two completely different types of animal. This really is the consequence of a lack of understanding." See Zhou Zuoren, "Bihu dushu lun" [Reading behind closed doors], in *Zhou Zuoren wenxuan* [Selected works of Zhou Zuoren] (Guangzhou: Guangzhou Chubanshe, 1996), vol.1, p.562.

[68] Nancy F. Partner, "Making up lost time: writing on the writing of history," *Speculum* 61.1 (1986): 93–4.

[69] This association of language and hermen-
eutics is central to the argument developed
by Hans-Georg Gadamer in *Truth and
method*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Continuum,
1998). But see also the recent collection of
essays in Frank Ankersmit and Hans Kellner
eds, *A new philosophy of history* (Chicago,
Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

[70] Excellent discussions of Dilthey's contrib-
ution to historiography and hermeneutics
can be found in Gadamer, *Truth and method*,
pp.218–42; Barash, *Martin Heidegger and
the problem of historical meaning*, pp.54–
72; Bambach, *Heidegger, Dilthey, and the
crisis of historicism*, pp.127–85; and Jacob
Owensby, *Dilthey and the narrative of
history*(Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press,
1994).

[71] David Carr, "Narrative and the real world:
an argument for continuity," *History and
Theory* 25 (1986): 117. See also his *Time,
narrative and history* (Bloomington, Ind.:
Indiana University Press, 1986).

[72] Owensby, *Dilthey and the narrative of
history*, p.6. Some social scientists have
been developing this concept in recent years,
arguing that narrative is not representational
but an ontological condition of social life.
See, for instance, Margaret R. Somers, "The
narrative constitution of identity: a relational
and network approach," *Theory and Society*
23 (1994): 605–49.

[73] Louis O. Mink, "History and fiction as
modes of comprehension," *New Literary
History* 1 (1970): 541–8, and Hayden White,
*Metahistory: the historical imagination in
nineteenth-century Europe* (Baltimore, Md.:
Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973). For
a condensed version of White's argument,
including a response to criticisms of
Metahistory, see his essay "Literary theory
and historical writing," in *Figural realism:
studies in the mimesis effect* (Baltimore,
Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999),
pp.1–26.

[74] Mink, "History and fiction as modes of
comprehension," p.557.

What, then, might these reflections on the narrative structures employed in Chinese historiography contribute to our understanding of the nature of narration and hermeneutics?[69] This is a major issue, well beyond the scope of this essay, and I will confine myself to suggesting possible avenues for further investigation.

Interpretations of the relationship between the lived experiences historians attempt to describe and the linguistic methods they employ in those descriptions can be broadly divided into two main groups. On the one hand there are those who argue the case for continuity, what might be called the Dilthey-Carr position. It was Wilhelm Dilthey, around the turn of the twentieth century, who argued that life unfolds like a story and that narrative coherence, as developed through historical explanations, is not imposed on life experience but develops naturally from it.[70] More recently, David Carr has been to the fore in developing this position, and although he draws mostly on Husserl and phenomenology, the influence of Dilthey in his work is clear. Carr argues that

> Narrative is not merely a possibly successful way of describing events; its structure inheres in the events themselves. Far from being a formal distortion of the events it relates, a narrative account is an extension of one of their primary features.[71]

While there are differences between Dilthey and Carr, both argue that not only do humans understand individual experience in terms of a story, with a clear sense of beginning, middle and end, but that we also interpret the social and communal dimensions of our lives in this way. In other words, "literary and historical narratives are themselves rooted in the temporal structures of our everyday lives and action," both individual and social.[72]

If this were the case, and for this argument for continuity to be valid, we would expect all historical accounts of human lives and human communities, irrespective of cultural context, to be integrated, coherent narratives with a clear sense of beginning, middle and end. But as we have seen, much of Chinese historical writing does not conform to this pattern. It is certainly true that around the turn of the twentieth century, with the rise of the new history movement, many historians sought greater coherence in their accounts of the past, yet inherited practice continued to influence the way the Chinese experience of the world was transformed into textual form. The modification of the *tongshi* format might suggest support for the argument for continuity, but the way Chinese historians developed this format does not.

The alternative position, the argument for discontinuity, would seem to have more potential to accomodate the diverse and distinctive nature of Chinese historical writing. This might also be called the Mink-White position, named again after its most well-known advocates. Louis Mink is often described as the first to articulate clearly the argument for discontinuity, while Hayden White did most to popularise it through the success of *Metahistory*.[73] The essence of the argument for discontinuity is that "stories are not lived but told."[74] Both Mink and White argue for the representational value of narra-tive; a form imposed upon the chaos of reality in order to give coherence but not related in any direct way to that reality. In *Metahistory*, White developed

this argument for discontinuity by showing, through an emphasis on emplotment, how some classic nineteenth-century historical narratives were constructed not out of the fabric of the real world but in accordance with the properties of the realist novel. However, as Harry Harootunian has argued, in doing so White provided a "powerful defense of history's identification with a specific historical-cultural endowment produced under the sign of a particular Western modernity." Further, Harootunian argues that,

> By using a formalist tactic that supresses context to account for the production of classic narratives, White manages not only to canonize them but also to identify the histories' specific narrative form of emplotment. Yet this is a strange 'history' that eschews the contextual reflexivity that robs the narratives of their own historical condition of production. Although White persuasively argues that different story lines are possible, depending on the steering strategy selected by tropic choice, this plurality of possible plots is far less important than the preservation of a continuist, successive, and progressive movement from a past to a present ...[75]

This cultural specificity implicit in White's analyses limits the value of his work for those seeking understanding of the distinctive forms historical writing takes in different cultural contexts.[76]

Paul Ricoeur's work is far more fruitful in this regard. In his magisterial three-volume study *Time and Narrative*, Ricoeur moves beyond the polarisation of these two positions and presents the most sophisticated discussion to date of the relationship between lived experience and narrative structuring.[77] While generally supportive of the discontinuity thesis, Ricoeur does not argue for a radical disjuncture between narrative presentation and human action in the way that both Mink and White do. Instead, Ricoeur believes there are aspects to human action that lend themselves to narrative configuration. He argues that his claim about the fundamental narrative character of all history should not be confused with a defense of narrative history, but insists that there is a correlation between the activity of narrating a story and the temporal character of human experience, a correlation "that is not merely accidental but presents a transcultural form of necessity."[78] Thus while Ricoeur is attentive to the complex nature of the relationship between real events and narrative depictions of them, he does not tie these to the particular integrated or 'coherent' narrative structuring associated with Western modernity. In acknowledging this flexibility, Ricoeur opens the way for trans-cultural analysis, something that is not the case with most Western discussions of historical narration.[79]

From the perspective of the structural flexibility and methodological intertextuality of the Chinese historical writing discussed here, however, the one Western historical text that offers the most potential for comparison is Walter Benjamin's *The Arcades Project*.[80] This work provides a concerted challenge to the narrative conformity and coherence of modern Western historical writing. The book consists essentially of extracts quoted from more than 850 sources, largely culled from the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. In essence Benjamin presents a montage of quotations from, and reflections

[75] Harootunian, *History's disquiet*, pp.13–14.

[76] Jörn Rüsen has also developed a general theory of historical narrative, but an attempt to apply this to Chinese historical writing suggests it too has its limits. See Rüsen, "Historical narration: foundation, types, reason," *History and Theory*, Beiheft vol.27 (1987): 87–97, and Axel Schneider, *Wahrheit und Geschichte: zwei chinesische Historiker auf der Suche nach einer modernen Identität für China* (Weisbaden: Harassowitz Verlag, 1997), pp.210–14.

[77] Paul Ricoeur, *Time and narrative*, trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer, 3 vols (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1984–88).

[78] Ibid, vol.1, p.52. See also pp.91–2.

[79] Kenneth Gergen's recent work on narrative is also fruitful in this regard. See n.12.

[80] While originally entitled *Das Passagen-Werk*, I have used the English translation by Eiland and McLuaglin recently published as *The arcades project*. See n 27.

[81] I would like to thank Lewis Mayo for this observation. The role of sampling in much recent music is another example of the way practices considered anathema in textual form are embraced in other areas.

[82] For discussion of this method of mutual illumination, see Li Wai-yee, "The idea of authority in the *Shih chi* (*Records of the Historian*)," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 4.2 (Dec. 1994): 345–405. In the early twentieth century, writers seeking to transform Chinese biographical writing attacked this methodology for the very reason that it undermined the coherence they argued was necessary for good biography: see Brian Moloughney, "Recreating Chinese biography: Zhu Dongrun and the transition from *liezhuan* to *zhuanji*," *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 25 (2001): 45–81.

[83] Benjamin, *The arcades project*, p.883.

[84] This is not to say that the potential significance of the English translation of the *Passagen-Werk* is unappreciated. See, for instance, the recent essay by Vanessa R. Schwartz, "Walter Benjamin for historians," *American Historical Review* 106.5 (Dec. 2001): 1721–43. For reviews of *The arcades project*, see T. J. Clark, "Reservations of the marvellous," *The London Review of Books*, 22 June 2000, pp.3–9, and George Steiner, "Work in progress: shops, sewers, boredom, barricades: Walter Benjamin's mappings of Paris above and below ground," *Times Literary Supplement*, 3 Dec. 1999, pp.4–5.

[85] Ciaran Carson, *Last night's fun: in and out of time with Irish music* (New York: North Point Press, 1997), p.61. Like Benjamin's *Passagen-Werk* and the Chinese texts cited above, Carson also constructs chapters of this book exclusively through quotation from different sources.

upon, the sources that comprise the text. This term 'montage' suggests the powerful influence that film had on Benjamin and it is interesting that the same criteria of originality and argument that have had such an influence in shaping modern notions of good historical writing are not generally applied to presentations of the past through film. It is seen as quite legitimate in film to present accounts of the past in a way that intersperses evidence with interpretation, the archive and the commentary.[81]

Benjamin arranges his montage of quotations under thirty-six categories, with descriptive rubrics such as 'fashion', 'boredom' and 'construction'. In other words, this methodology is very similar to the 'method of mutual illumination', or *hujian fa* 互見法, pioneered by Sima Qian in *Shiji* and subsequently used widely in Chinese historical texts. This method encourages the placement of material not in any particular sequential or chronological order but in a topical way, to highlight, or illuminate, particular issues.[82] Similarly, Benjamin compiles his montage of quotations in such a way that the particular quotations are meant to illuminate each other. In other words, what we have with *The Arcades Project* is a text in which the methodology and structure are similar to that employed by Liu Yizheng in his *Cultural History of China*. I am not trying to suggest that Benjamin and Liu Yizheng shared a similar understanding of the world; far from it. But it is interesting that in seeking to undermine the teleological assumptions implicit in modern Western historical writing, Benjamin should produce a text so similar in nature to Liu Yizheng's. Like Liu Yizheng, Benjamin saw the collection of these textual fragments from the past as a form of practical memory.[83] Not surprisingly, however, this work has been received with some consternation by Western critics, many of whom are unsure how to read it.[84] That consternation suggests the kinds of challenges that need to be confronted in order to achieve a truly trans-cultural understanding of historical thought and writing.

* * *

All great musicians recognise their ancestry and pay respect to it, and they know the thing is greater than the sum of individuals.[85]

To conclude I would like to return to the analogy about different types of jigsaws which I borrowed from Lothar Ledderose. The Chinese jigsaw, which allowed multiple combinations, was similar I suggested to the framework of the Chinese dynastic histories. But this framework for historical writing was abandoned in the early twentieth century, in part because its flexibility was believed to contribute to a lack of coherence, and the concern with coherence was uppermost in the minds of those who wished to make Chinese historiography modern and thus contribute towards making the Chinese state a nation. Increasingly nowadays, however, we find discussions of a single modernity breaking down. Instead, scholars are talking more and more of 'multiple modernities'—whole volumes of the journal *Daedalus* have been devoted to these discussions.[86] This concept is preferable to the many

proclamations about the arrival of post-modernity and I would contest attempts to characterise the perspectives developed in this essay as postmodern for the simple reason that this concept, even in its very terminology, enshrines the teleological assumptions I am critical of. Throughout the twentieth century Chinese historians struggled to fit the particularities of the Chinese past into the Western teleological periodizations of 'ancient, medieval, modern (and post-modern)' and 'slave, fuedal, capitalist, socialist'. For instance, Alexander Woodside notes how, in grappling with this issue, Liang Shuming 梁漱溟 came to the conclusion that China was "outside historical time, as Western thinkers defined it."[87] The concept of multiple, or alternate, modernities helps escape these teleological assumptions and offers the potential for more fruitful trans-cultural analysis.

But these developments also create methodological problems for historians, and perhaps the rise in popularity of the edited collection of essays, including a diversity of perspectives within a single volume, is a reflection of our attempts to overcome these problems. In one of his contributions to these discussions of multiple modernities, Alexander Woodside has suggested that "we may need to abandon any hope of a unified analytical narrative with an omniscient narrator in looking at the rise of the politically modern."[88] Stimulated by Grant Hardy's work on Sima Qian, Woodside suggests that we might do well to revive the structure of the dynastic histories in order to accommodate this need for multiple viewpoints, and that the method of mutual illumination, or *hujian fa*, used in those histories will be particularly useful for handling discussions of multiple modernities. Perhaps, then, the overriding concern with coherence which has been fundamental to modernity is giving way to a greater acceptance of diversity, and, if this is the case, then we may not have seen the end of the form of historical writing pioneered by Sima Qian more than 2000 years ago. Whether or not this will come to be, and whether or not such histories will incorporate intertextual methodologies, remains to be seen. But even if this does not occur, our awareness of multiple modernities may encourage us to look in a more interested way at the diversity of narrative strategies employed in Chinese historiography, and that would be a very good thing.

[86] See, for instance, S. N. Eisenstad, "Multiple mod-ernities," *Daedalus* 129.1 (Winter 2000): 1–29, and also the essays on 'alternative' modernities by Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar and others in *Public Culture* 11.1 (1999). It is a concept that is also beginning to generate some attention from Chinese scholars: see, for instance, the articles included in the section entitled "Multiple modernities and globalisation" in *Ershi yi shiji* 66 (Aug. 2001).

[87] See Woodside, "Territorial order and collective-identity tensions in Confucian Asia: China, Vietnam, Korea," *Daedalus* 127.3 (Summer 1998): 192. These issues are also addressed by Shu-mei Shih in her essay "Time, modernism and cultural power: local constructions," in *The lure of the modern: writing modernism in semicolonial China, 1917–1937* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2001), pp.49–72. For a good discussion of how the whole network of ideas about the postmodern remains fundamentally within the parameters of modernity, see Peter Osborne, *The politics of time: modernity and the avant-garde* (London: Verso, 1995).

[88] Ibid, p.214.

APPENDIX: GENERAL HISTORIES

1. Naka Michiyo, *Shina tsūshi* 支那通史 [A general history of China] (Tokyo: Dai Nihon Tosho, 1888–90). Naka's book was written in classical Chinese and published between 1888 and 1890. A new edition was published in China in 1899, by Dongwen Xueshe 東文學社, with an endorsement from Luo Zhenyu 羅振玉. It was translated into classical Japanese by Wada Sei 和田清 and published in 3 volumes by Iwanami Shoten (Tokyo, 1975).

2. Kuwabara Jitsuzō, *Chūtō Tōyō shi* 中等東洋史 [A history of the Orient for secondary schools] (1898), reprinted in *Kuwabara Jitsuzō zenshu* [The complete works of Kuwabara Jitsuzō], 5 vols (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1968): 4, pp.1–290. This book was also published under the title *Tōyō shi yō (Dongyang shi yao)*

東洋史要 [An outline history of the Orient] in 1899. In 1899 Dongwen Xueshe 東文學社 released a Chinese translation (by Fan Bingqing 樊炳清), with an introduction by Wang Guowei 王國維. A number of other translations appeared in the early years of the twentieth century, for instance, by Chen Qingnian 陳慶年 (see no.4 below)

3.   Liu Yizheng, *Lidai shilüe* 歷代史略 [A brief chronological history] (Nanjing, 1902). A reworking and extension of Naka's *Shina tsūshi*. While Naka ended his study with the Song period (960–1269), Liu re-worked some of the earlier sections and brought the story up to the end of Ming (1368–1644)

4.   Chen Qingnian, *Zhongguo lishi jiaokeshu* 中國歷史教科書 [A Chinese history textbook] (preface 1903) (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1910) is a slightly modified translation of Kuwabara's text, which ends with the Ming rather than continuing on into the twentieth century

5.   Xia Zengyou, *Zuixin zhongxue Zhongguo lishi jiaokeshu* 最新中學中國歷史 教科書 [The most recent Chinese history textbook for secondary schools], 3 vols (1904–6), reprinted as *Zhongguo gudai shi* 中國古代史 [A history of traditional China] (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1933)

6.   Liu Shipei 劉師培, *Zhongguo lishi jiaokeshu* 中國歷史教科書 [A Chinese history textbook], (1905–06). Reprinted in Liu Shipei, *Liu Shipei quanji* 劉師培全集 [The complete works of Liu Shipei], 4 vols (Beijing: Zhonggong Zhongyang Dangxiao, 1997), 4: pp.275–370

7.   Lü Ruiting 呂瑞廷 and Zhao Chengbi's 趙澂璧 *Zhongxue xinti Zhongguo lishi* 中學新體中國歷史 [A new-style history of China for secondary schools] (Shanghai, 1907). This is a modified translation of Ichimura Sanjirō 市村瓚廬朗 and Takigawa Kametarō 瀧川亀太朗, *Shina shi* 支那史 [A history of China] (1897?)

8.   Lü Simian 呂思勉, *Baihua henguo shi* [A vernacular history of China] (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1923)

9.   Wang Tongling 王桐齡, *Zhongguo shi* [A history of China] (Beiping: Wenhua Xueshe, 1928–33)

10. Liu Yizheng, *Zhongguo wenhua shi* [A Chinese cultural history] (Nanjing: Zhongshan Shuju, 1932)

11. Zhang Qin 張嶔, *Zhongguo tongshi* 中國通史 [A general history of China] (Shanghai, 1934)

12. Deng Zhicheng 鄧之誠, *Zhonghua erqinnian shi* 中華二千年史 [A two thousand year history of China] (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1934)

13. Miao Fenglin 繆風林, *Zhongguo tongshi gangyao* 中國通史綱要 [An outline general history of China] (Nanjing: Zhongshan Shuju, 1932)

14. Jin Zhaofeng 金兆豐, *Zhongguo tongshi* 中國通史 [A general history of China] (Kunming: Zhonghua Shuju, 1937)

15. Qian Mu, *Guoshi dagang* 國史大綱 [An outline of the nation's history] (Hong Kong: Commercial Press, 1940)

16. Zhang Yinlin, *Zhongguo shigang* 中國史綱 [An outline history of China] (Chongqing, Zhonghua Shuju, 1940)

Brian Moloughney

Department of History
University of Otago
PO Box 56, Dunedin
New Zealand
brian.moloughney@
stonebow.otago.ac.nz