

honest, sincere, patriotic, and pragmatic is warranted and is developed in a number of other specialist works (e.g., articles and texts by Goran Hyden and Mark Seldon). Mass mobilization and voluntarism were more than simply products of Mao's manipulation of the Chinese people; these followed from historical events.

In this respect, the author's decision to omit such events as the Taiping Rebellion and the Boxer Rebellion are unfortunate. These events historically prefigured and loomed large in the popular perceptions of China's populace throughout the twentieth century (ably demonstrated in Paul A. Cohen's *History in Three Keys* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1997] among others). The rebellions were key elements of the rising tide of Chinese nationalism and social awareness that led to the nationalist *and* communist revolutions. The author's purposes might be better served by mentioning these events early in the book, considering the importance of nationalism and social awareness (through the ideological and practical application of Chinese Marxism) in his concluding remarks. This would help to explain in a more positive light the popularity of the communists among rural and urban Chinese in the first twenty years of CCP rule (*vis-à-vis* Chiang Kai-shek's GMD).

In conclusion, this is a fine and original introductory text for students and general readers interested in twentieth-century Chinese political history. I would also recommend this book, with supplementary articles or texts, for more specialized courses on modern China.

Jack Patrick Hayes

Jack Patrick Hayes is a visiting instructor at The Colorado College and is currently researching late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century political and economic developments in China based on numismatic texts and economic treatises.



Charles Le Blanc. *Le Wen zi à la lumière de l'histoire et de l'archéologie*.
Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2000. xiii, 175 pp.
Paperback EUR22.87, ISBN 2-7606-1783-1.

Le Wen zi à la lumière de l'histoire et de l'archéologie by Charles Le Blanc contains a detailed study of the *Wen zi* 文子 (Master Wen, or, in Le Blanc's wording, "le maître raffiné"). This Taoist text was composed more than two thousand years ago and underwent major revisions in the third or fourth century C.E., after which the original version (Le Blanc: "*Wen zi* ancien") was no longer trans-

mitted. Much of the content of the revised and transmitted version (Le Blanc: “*Wen zi moderne*”) can be found in other texts, most notably the *Huainan zi* 淮南子. In fact, no less than three quarters of the transmitted *Wen zi* text corresponds to phrases or even entire paragraphs in the *Huainan zi*. In the eighth century this unusual phenomenon led to a long-term discussion as to the historical priority of the two texts. Many scholars throughout the centuries have favored the historical priority of the *Huainan zi*, while others, especially since the archaeological discovery of an original *Wen zi* manuscript in 1973, believe that the *Wen zi* predates the *Huainan zi* and, as a consequence, that the latter is copied from the former. Le Blanc’s important study puts an end to this centuries-old discussion by showing not only the direction of borrowing, but also, and more importantly, the nature of the borrowing process.

The two main objectives of Le Blanc’s study are to analyze the relationships (1) between the original *Wen zi* and the transmitted *Wen zi* and (2) between the transmitted *Wen zi* and the *Huainan zi*. The first objective is expounded in the Introduction. The second objective, expounded in chapter 2, is preceded by and based on the author’s translation of chapter 5 of the *Wen zi* and followed by his translation of writings on the *Wen zi* by Chinese scholars.

In the Introduction, the reader is introduced to the only extant example of the original *Wen zi* to date: the bamboo slips discovered at Bajiaolang in Ding County (Hebei Province) in 1973. Le Blanc first discusses the dates of the bamboo manuscript (i.e., when it was copied onto the slips and when the slips were buried), then compares the manuscript with the transmitted *Wen zi* with regard to their structure, ideas, style, and historical context. The remarkable outcome of this comparison is that the original *Wen zi* and the transmitted *Wen zi*, despite the fact that the latter was based on the former, are nevertheless two different texts. This conclusion has far-reaching consequences, for we can now no longer speak of “the” *Wen zi* as a single text. This, of course, also influences our understanding of the *Wen zi*–*Huainan zi* relationship.

Chapters 1 and 2 form the first part of Le Blanc’s book. This part, titled “textual studies,” starts with an annotated translation of *Wen zi* chapter 5, based on the edition of Xu Lingfu 徐靈府 (fl. 810–816). The choice of this chapter is anything but arbitrary, for it is the only chapter of which a substantial part corresponds to the bamboo manuscript and of which we have a version on paper from the eighth century, discovered at Dunhuang in 1908. In the Chinese text printed alongside Le Blanc’s translation, those phrases that also appear on the bamboo slips are underlined, whereas differences between the Dunhuang and Xu Lingfu editions are mentioned in footnotes. Another reason for choosing this chapter is that it contains large portions of text corresponding to the *Huainan zi*, which provides ideal material for a critical comparison of the two texts.

The underlying assumption of the critical comparison is that chapter 5 of the transmitted *Wen zi* is a composite text that can be divided into three mutually exclusive parts: about one third is based on the original *Wen zi* and another third on the *Huainan zi*, and the remainder is either by the hand of the editor(s) of the transmitted *Wen zi* or copied from other texts, including the *Lao zi*, *Guan zi*, *Meng zi*, *Zhuang zi*, and *Xun zi*. This assumption is supported by the key feature of the methodology used by Le Blanc in his critical comparison, namely the distinction between dialogic and non-dialogic sections in the transmitted *Wen zi*. Dialogic sections start with a question by Master Wen (in one case by King Ping 平王) followed by an answer ascribed to the Old Master 老子 (in King Ping's case the answer is ascribed to Master Wen). The non-dialogic sections lack the introductory question and consist entirely of lengthy statements preceded by the phrase "The Old Master said" 老子曰. Using this methodology Le Blanc establishes not only that dialogic and non-dialogic sections in nearly all cases alternate with each other, but also that the relationship with other texts is different for dialogic and non-dialogic sections. All non-dialogic sections are copied verbatim from the *Huainan zi*; they contain no text corresponding to the bamboo *Wen zi*. The text of the bamboo manuscript, on the other hand, is found only in the dialogic sections.

The careful arrangement of the transmitted *Wen zi* indicates the conscious effort of its editor(s). This effort already suggests that it was the *Wen zi* that was copied from other texts, and not vice versa. However, the direction of borrowing between the *Wen zi* and *Huainan zi* becomes even clearer when we take the *Huainan zi* as the starting point, as does Le Blanc in chapter 2. By regarding all *Huainan zi* sections as literary units and placing the corresponding *Wen zi* passages alongside them, he shows unmistakably that the *Wen zi* copied sentences and paragraphs from these literary *Huainan zi* units and collated them into a loosely coherent text.

The second part of the book (chapters 3–6), titled "Historical Studies," contains Le Blanc's annotated translation of writings on the *Wen zi* by ancient and modern scholars. The translated notes and essays by ancient scholars, including Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773–819) and Huang Zhen 黃震 (1213–1280), constitute a useful historical overview of opinions on the *Wen zi* through the ages. One discovers that the literati of the past were mainly interested in the following problems: the nature of the text (authentic work or forgery?), the identity of its author (who was Master Wen?), and the identity of King Ping (was Master Wen advisor to King Ping of Zhou 周平王 [r. 770–720 B.C.E.] or King Ping of Chu 楚平王 [r. 528–516 B.C.E.]?). The "historical studies" end with Le Blanc's translation of "Some notes on the bamboo *Wen zi* from Bajiaolang" 試論人角廊簡文子, an article by Li Xueqin 李學勤 that enumerates questions raised by the 1973 dis-

covery and proposes new paths for research made possible by the official publication of this discovery in 1995.

Some critical remarks can be made concerning Le Blanc's treatment of the original *Wen zi*. According to Le Blanc, the initial creation of the original *Wen zi* took place "possiblement" in the sixth century B.C.E. (p. xiii), while the unearthed version of this text also dates from the pre-Qin era (p. 2). These datings are rather vague. The (tentative) overall dating of the original *Wen zi* is based neither on the Ding County discovery nor on clues in other pre-Qin texts, but rather on a statement by Ban Gu 班固 (32–92) in his *Book of the Han* 漢書, which attributes the *Wen zi* to a disciple of the Old Master, the patriarch of Taoism, who was thought to have lived during the sixth century B.C.E. For his dating of the unearthed bamboo manuscript, Le Blanc simply follows "plusieurs exégètes" without offering exact references or explaining their reasons for a pre-Qin dating of the manuscript. Thus, the reader is left wondering why the text could not have been copied onto the slips during the 166 years that bridge the beginning of the Qin (221 B.C.E.) and the burial of the manuscript (55 B.C.E.).

A more problematic issue, however, is Le Blanc's claim that none of the parallel texts of the transmitted *Wen zi* and *Huainan zi* (i.e., the non-dialogic sections) appears in the unearthed bamboo *Wen zi* (p. xi), which suggests that there is no relationship between the bamboo *Wen zi* and the *Huainan zi*. This has recently been challenged by Ho Che Wah 何志華, who has showed that the text on bamboo slip 0198 of the unearthed *Wen zi* actually does correspond to one of the non-dialogic sections of *Wen zi* 5 and, as a consequence, also to the *Huainan zi*. Ho furthermore has pointed out that the text on slips 1181, 0792, 2376, and 2252 is found in the dialogic sections of *Wen zi* 5, also corresponds to the *Huainan zi*.¹ Ho's textual analysis thus shows that a relationship between the bamboo *Wen zi* and the *Huainan zi* indeed exists. Based on this analysis, Ho concludes that the bamboo *Wen zi* may have been based on the *Huainan zi*, just as the transmitted *Wen zi* is. This conclusion, though not supported by many scholars, is certainly worth more investigation.

The remarks above should not distract the reader from the fact that *Le Wen zi à la lumière de l'histoire et de l'archéologie* is an important contribution to the studies in this field. It is the first monograph in a Western language devoted to the *Wen zi* in more than twenty-five years and contains the first French translation of a *Wen zi* chapter since the end of the nineteenth century.² That the academic world (outside China and Japan, where the 1973 discovery led to a proliferation of scholarly articles) had to wait decades for this new study indicates how strongly scholars still adhere to the idea of the *Wen zi* as an uninteresting forgery and how reluctant they are to tackle the problems involved with this text. Le Blanc's study shows that this reluctance is undue, for the *Wen zi* is

one example in “une série de ces estimables faux qui, loin d’imiter des oeuvres authentiques, inventent un art” (p. 13). Le Blanc has documented this art of the *Wen zi* in a remarkable and stimulating way.

Paul van Els

Paul van Els is a Ph.D. student at Leiden University in the Netherlands. His research focuses on intertextual aspects of the Wen zi and citation strategies used in this text.

NOTES

1. See Ho Che Wah, “New verifications from the excavated *Wen zi*.” 出土文子新證, *Sino-Humanitas* 人文中國學報 5 (1998): 151–187. In the final footnote to this article, Ho offers the hypothesis that the original *Wen zi* was a politically correct version of the *Huainan zi*, created after Liu An, the Master of Huainan, had been prosecuted and his book had been banned.

2. The last monograph devoted to the *Wen zi* was Barbara Kandel’s Ph.D. thesis, “Wen Tzu—Ein Betrag zur Problematik und zum Verständnis eines taoistischen Textes” (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1974). Her work was published before the news of the Ding County discovery became known. The only existing translation of the entire *Wen zi* in French can be found in C. de Harlez’ *Textes Tâoïstes* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1891).



Leo Ou-fan Lee. *Shanghai Modern: The Flowering of a New Urban Culture in China, 1930–1945*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999. 416 pp. Hardcover \$49.95, ISBN 0–6748–0550–X. Paperback \$24.95, ISBN 0–6748–0551–8.

This book is a much-anticipated major publication in the field of Chinese studies. As a leading scholar of modern Chinese literature and culture since the 1970s, Leo Ou-fan Lee has been defining the research agendas on Lu Xun, fictional realism, and cultural modernity, and now *Shanghai Modern* has been released to enthusiastic acclaim.¹ Wen-hsin Yeh regards it as “cultural history from inside out and from ground up,” while Charles Taylor judges it to be “immensely rich in theoretical insights” (back cover).

In many ways, *Shanghai Modern* is neither groundbreaking (for scholarship on Shanghai has increased spectacularly since the 1980s) nor definitive (for many claims remain tentative or speculative), but is rather a work that brings together the cutting-edge research on urban modernity while directing the reader to explore further avenues. The book contains a wealth of primary information and