

CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS



---

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Irene Bloom

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (1986), pp. 414-416

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [School of Oriental and African Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/618633>

Accessed: 05/01/2011 14:33

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Cambridge University Press and School of Oriental and African Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

his translation together. Also, the syntactical pattern is closely adhered to, preserving the original word order, techniques of parallelism, and so forth. Most importantly, the original metaphors are retained, no matter how awkward or embarrassing they might appear. In particular, Davis has hit upon the happy technique of using quotation marks for T'ao's citations or echoes of the classical tradition, thereby alerting the reader to allusive intent. Indeed, for a poet whose language is often labelled as 'simple' and 'easy', T'ao emerges as a profoundly learned, cultured, even academic poet. On the minus side of the literal approach, Davis's T'ao often sounds pedestrian and awkward, which the poet in his refined lyricism was not. Yet the preservation of T'ao's imagery, allusions, and phraseology by Davis more than compensates for that drawback.

It is in the area of literary analysis that this monograph falls short of the aim expressed in the subtitle. *Pace* the literary apparatus brought to bear on T'ao's opus, this reader at least reached the last pages of each volume with little *new* awareness of the poet's literary excellence or the reasons for his continued popularity. This may be due to the fact that the poet, especially when he assumes a mask of gravitas, is not my 'thing in the cup'. More likely the impression is due to the comparison one inevitably makes between Davis's analyses of the poems and Hightower's brilliant insights and fruitful exploration of such aspects of poetic art as irony, literary pose, and ambiguity.

Davis has clearly proved the futility of the attempts by many Chinese critics to insist on a 'decipherment of T'ao's supposed cryptograms'. A quite different, separate question from the pseudo-science of allegorizing literary commentary, however, is the significance and nature of T'ao's highly encoded form of art. Both Hightower and now Davis have revealed through their translations, annotations, and textual analyses the meaning of T'ao's encoded poetic language. As a result of Davis's exhaustive study the way has now been paved for a full-length literary examination of T'ao's poetic art, which discusses in expository essays such literary themes as fancy and imagination, traditional convention and creative innovation, nature imagery, versions of the pastoral, motifs and symbols (such as wine), irony and ambiguity. Ambiguity in T'ao is legion: the tension between his ideals of naturalness and historical exemplars, between the cult of life and death, between civic duty and reclusion.

Professor Davis's valuable monograph, full of pioneering literary research and painstaking scholarship, stands as an eloquent testament to his lifelong devotion to Chinese poetry.

ANNE M. BIRRELL

IRA E. KASOFF: *The thought of Chang Tsai (1020-1077)*. (Cambridge Studies in Chinese History, Literature and Institutions.) xiii, 209 pp. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1984. £30.

Ira Kasoff's study contains much of interest to students of eleventh-century Chinese thought. His book is one of the first by a Western scholar in this field who was able to spend an extended period at Beijing University in the years following the Cultural Revolution. While there in 1979-80, Kasoff worked with Zhang Dainian, a prominent scholar of Chinese philosophy described here as 'the world's leading authority on Chang Tsai'. Western readers will no doubt look forward to learning more about the current assessment of Chang in Chinese philosophical circles; in the present work, Kasoff's China associations are evident primarily in the new light on Chang's works reported in one of the appendices.

Following an introduction which adumbrates the background of the Neo-Confucian revival in the Sung, Kasoff provides chapters on 'The intellectual climate of the eleventh century' and on Chang Tsai's views of 'Heaven-and-earth', 'Man', and 'Sagehood'. In his conclusion he offers a general characterization of Chang's philosophy and an analysis of the salient differences between his school and that of the Ch'eng brothers. An epilogue places the history of the *tao-hsueh* movement in a political context and traces its vicissitudes during the period from 1069 to the fall of the Northern Sung and through most of the tortured course of the Southern Sung. The first appendix contains an account of Chang Tsai's works and the second a biographical note.

Kasoff emphasizes the uniqueness of Chang Tsai's metaphysical thought and its parallelism with his conception of man. He suggests that Chang redefined the concept of *ch'i* from the *Book of Changes*, along with its notion of the succession of yin and yang as constituting the Way, so as to 'assert the reality of the phenomenal world and thereby refute Buddhist ontology' and to 'account for everything in the cosmos in terms of one overriding principle.' Chang is characterized as a 'systematic thinker' and an ontological monist. Kasoff's distillation of Chang's view of heaven is that, for him, heaven was 'a spontaneous process of production and reproduction', which, while 'not humane', because it was 'not conscious', was none the less good. Chang 'rejected the idea that heaven acted consciously, but he retained the belief in an ethical cosmos, and in the idea that heaven and man were linked' (p. 60).

The chapter on 'Man' turns on the idea that Chang's famous contribution to Neo-Confucian thinking about human nature—the bifurcation between a 'heaven nature' and the 'physical nature'—represents an elaboration of the Mencian position that the nature is potentially good. Chang's original contribution to this view is the idea that the 'heaven nature' derives from the nature of the Great Harmony or the Great Void, whereas the 'physical nature' derives from the condensed *ch'i* which is the concrete reality of discrete individuals. The former is 'the same yin-yang polarity that brings about the morally good processes of heaven-and-earth.' The latter is the individual's allotment of *ch'i* which is associated with his desires and emotions. Moral evil is the result of 'obscurance' or 'blocking' of the

universal 'heaven-nature' by the particular 'physical nature'. The problem of cultivation is to accord with one's larger Nature through refinement of one's physical *ch'i* and to pursue sincerity or 'perfect authenticity'.

Some of Kasoff's judgements seem difficult to follow because not a few of the most arresting statements go largely unexplained. The repeated assertion that Chang Tsai's writings represent 'a systematic, consistent philosophy', he tells us, 'need not be justified'. The use of the word 'systematic' is unusual, however, and in light of much of the literature on Chang Tsai, would seem somewhat controversial. Kasoff argues that apparent inconsistencies in Chang's thought are based on misunderstandings. He proposes to clarify key passages by employing an orthographical distinction between *Ch'i* ('the undifferentiated primal substance'), *ch'i* ('condensed tangible matter') and *qi* ('when both meanings are intended or when it is not possible to distinguish which meaning is implied'). Some readers may find this device helpful; others may find it as alien to the spirit as to the letter of the original texts.

Another question concerns Kasoff's interpretation of Chang Tsai's theory of human nature, for it is here and in his philosophy of mind that Chang's thought was most significant for the Neo-Confucian movement as a whole. One problem involves the extent to which Chang was following or, alternatively, departing from Mencius on the issue of human nature. Kasoff's view is that Mencius 'held that human nature is inherently good, but that this good nature is blocked by human desires and emotions' (p. 66). Again, 'Mencius held that man's physical desires stifle the development of these four "seeds" [or "four beginnings" of virtue], and that therefore man does not fulfil the potential of his nature' (p. 72). Chang's role, on this view, was to extend the Mencian conception by tracing out the origin of these 'physical desires'.

It might be argued, on the contrary, that while Mencius spoke of 'making the desires few', this is not equivalent to saying that the nature is 'blocked' by human desires and emotions. While Mencius set a priority on thinking, there is little evidence that he saw thought and emotion as strictly opposed or that he conceived of the 'physical desires' as 'stifling' the development of the 'four seeds'. Such notions follow directly from Chang's distinction between an ideal and a physical nature but are quite foreign to Mencian psychology. This point may appear subtle, but it is of utmost consequence for the interpretation of Chang's philosophy. Many scholars have seen his view of human nature as revealing a fundamental dualism in his thought. Likewise, his depreciation of the physical nature and of sense perception appears to have profoundly influenced Neo-Confucian epistemology and modes of cultivation down through the mid-Ming.

Another, more complex problem is just what it means to have conception of heaven as devoid of consciousness and yet 'good'. What, in fact, is an 'ethical cosmos'? Kasoff suggests that, '... just as the spontaneous pro-

cesses of heaven-and-earth are morally good because they are productive, nurturing, reliable, and impartial, so too the yin-yang Nature which governs these processes is also morally good' (p. 70). In Western philosophy it is usual to distinguish between moral and non-moral goods, and it is by no means clear that productivity, nurturing, reliability, and impartiality, while obviously good, are necessarily *moral* goods. If they are to be so considered, one would like a fuller elucidation of the distinctively Chinese sense in which these goods are moral.

When, as is frequently the case, Kasoff disagrees with other scholars, one would appreciate a fuller elaboration of his reasons. For example, he takes issue with A. C. Graham over the reading of a passage from the 'Ch'eng-ming' section of the *Cheng-meng* concerning human nature, basing his reading on an emendation of the text in the *Chang Tsai chi*, edited by Zhang Dainian *et al.* (Beijing: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1978). No justification is adduced for this emendation. It may be noted that the older text followed by Graham is also the one accepted by Kao P'an-lung (1562-1626) for his commentary and Wang Fū-chih (1619-92) for his. Other readers may join me in requiring more evidence before relinquishing an interpretation which has both traditional textual authority and ample philosophical sophistication.

The same might be said of the dismissal of the interpretations by Mou Tsung-san and Fung Yu-lan of Chang's statement in the 'T'ai-ho' section of the *Cheng-meng* that, 'In the unity of Void and *ch'i*, there is the nature,' or, as Kasoff renders it, 'In the unity of Void and *qi*, there is the name nature'. Problems attributed by Kasoff to 'considerable confusion among scholars' might better be ascribed to legitimate differences of opinion. Fung, for example, is considered to have 'missed the point' in describing Chang's statement as 'tautological', the point being that '*qi* here has to be taken as physical *ch'i*, which is not the same as the Great Void'. Yet Fung's view has not only considerable weight behind it, but a history, for many Confucian scholars have found the passage problematical and if they have been confused, it has been at a very high level.

Finally, earlier Chinese and Japanese scholarship on Chang Tsai appears to have been incorporated relatively little into this study except in the appendices on Chang's life and works. The analysis of Chang's thought which is still the most subtle and cogent that I know—that by Yamashita Ryūji in his *Yōmeigaku no kenkyū*, vol. 2 (1971)—differs markedly from Kasoff's. Yamashita sees a dualism lingering behind the apparent monism of *ch'i*. As he reads Chang Tsai, concrete things are regarded as less perfect than the undifferentiated Great Void, with Chang's notion of the Great Void serving as a functional equivalent to the Ch'eng-Chu conception of *li* or principle. Chiang Kuo-chu in his *Chang Tsai ti che-hsüeh ssu-hsiang* (1982) approaches Chang's thought from a Marxist perspective. He also sees Chang as a dualist, as do Jung Chao-tsu and Ch'iu Han-sheng, who

contributed prefaces for the volume. None of them would accept Kasoff's assertion that Chang was a 'systematic' thinker and a monist. Neither Yamashita's work nor Chiang's is discussed in Kasoff's book or included in the bibliography, and there is no way of judging how he might respond to their views.

I welcome Kasoff's book. At the same time it seems important that Western scholars of Chinese philosophy recognize the achievements and opinions of serious Chinese and Japanese scholars, some of whom may hold different views. This is part of the challenge of working in this vital field and one of the requirements for a trenchant analysis of significant philosophical issues. I hope that Kasoff will continue to write about Chang Tsai. With his unique experience, his continued contributions should do much to enliven contemporary discussions of a figure whose ideas have elicited such divergent interpretations.

IRENE BLOOM

BONNIE S. McDOUGALL (ed.): *Popular Chinese literature and performing arts in the People's Republic of China 1949-1979*. (Studies on China, No. 2). xvi, 341 pp. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press. 1984. £26.

The idea that the arts not only express but also create and regulate a common culture goes back in China to Confucius. Spurred by the need to reshape and reinvigorate the nation, it has been very much to the fore again in the twentieth century. Three great promotional waves are manifest: at the turn of the century, the advocacy by Liang Qichao and friends of fiction and drama as a way of encouraging social awareness, inspired in part by Victorian novels and plays; the May Fourth (1919) humanist vision, still foreign-inspired, of a morally healthy and compassionate society nurtured on a literature saturated with exactly those qualities; and the communist programme of popularization from the bottom up, that is, spreading proletarian consciousness by elevating plebian forms of entertainment to the leading position in the cultural life of the nation. Of these three, only the communist architects had the managerial resources to implement their scheme. This book looks at how they made out.

The strong cast of contributors to the volume, by name Paul Clark, Michael Egan, Edward Gunn, Robert Hegel, David Holm, Kai-yu Hsu, T. D. Hutters, Perry Link, Wai-fong Loh, Isabel Wong, and Bell Yung, who were brought together at a Harvard workshop organized by Bonnie McDougall in 1979, deal with the spheres they have made their own. David Holm rightfully leads off with the *yangge*, a mixture of dance and skit native to northern China, for the *yangge*, which belonged to the rural phase of Party history when its cultural corps rewrote the words and renovated the symbols of rustic entertainments in order to dye red the sea of peasants in which it, the Party, was the fish (to use Mao Zedong's

metaphor), is a classic example of effective recruitment of local talent and mass participation in an existing form of recreation appropriated for political purposes. One gets the impression that at its height party and people united to twist the nights away.

After the whole country was taken over, however, the *yangge* was left to revert gradually to its old ways and old festival role, and attention was turned to national types of entertainment, some traditional (the opera and minor performing arts), some relatively new (the cinema and the modern stage play), and others both old and new (fiction and poetry): in other words, the whole range of leisure pursuits followed variously or together by the cultured and the illiterate. This was a vastly more complex situation in which to operate a cultural policy. Those entertainments whose main attraction lay in the style of performance worked according to so rigid and minutely detailed a formula that gross interference would have brought their whole edifice down. The opera is the chief example. Feudal as was its content, it was enjoyed by all classes, and was unquestionably one of the glories of the national heritage of which the communist government was now the custodian. After some abortive attempts at reform it was left alone till the Cultural Revolution. The irreverent comic dialogue or recitation called the *xiangsheng* (dealt with by Perry Link) was more susceptible to intervention, to ensure that the satire was turned away from the Party and its works. As for songs (Isabel Wong), they could be, and were, written around inspired lyrics like 'Socialism is good', the singer's gaze directed beatifically to a point somewhere above the audience where loomed some unseen source of radiance; tunes need not vary very much either, not any more than they vary in the Eurovision Song Contest. But what strategy was to be followed with regard to the written word? Readability varies greatly according to the education of the reader, and the demands of the city sophisticates were bound to be different from those of people who read only for the sake of a good story.

Something approaching consistency nevertheless prevailed. In her concluding essay which gathers together threads from the cloths woven by the specialists in all the fields mentioned, Bonnie McDougall remarks that 'one of the most notable features about the literary and performing arts in contemporary China is that the cultural authorities have insisted on postulating a single, mass, homogeneous audience for cultural products' (p. 280). Basically that audience was envisaged as consisting of 'workers, peasants and soldiers', and to suit their tastes the top of the range of literary works was shorn off, structures and themes simplified, and the idiom of the man in the street or on the collective farm borrowed, where it was not native to the writers. There indeed was the rub, for the professional writers were the intellectuals of old, and they tended to assimilate those new writers to whom the desired idiom *was* natural. In writing down to the masses they created a literature that was neither fish nor fowl. The literary magazines were filled with stuff designed for the