

Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* and Jules Verne's *20,000 Leagues Under the Sea* provided Lu Xun and his vision of an "iron house" are exemplary studies. The attention that *Developmental Fairy Tales* gives to Lu Xun's essays, his understudied story "The Misanthrope" 孤獨者, and the relation of his work to Vasili Eroshenko's results in new insights among these rediscovered texts. In this way, *Developmental Fairy Tales* links some of the crassest features of the history of modern market culture in China to some of its finest moments of reflection. In arguing for the relevance of its topic to contemporary market society in China the book implies that for all the changes that have taken place there is still a place for the vision of genius it upholds in Lu Xun.

EDWARD M. GUNN  
Cornell University

*Stratifying Zhuangzi: Rhyme and Other Quantitative Evidence*. By David McCraw. Language and Linguistics Monograph Series 41. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, 2010. Pp. iv + 135. \$30.00.

Although the *Zhuangzi* 莊子 has been popularly regarded in both traditional and modern times as the work of a single author, Master Zhuang, Zhuang Zhou 莊周 (fourth century B.C.E.), overwhelming modern scholarly consensus is that it is a collective work compiled probably over at least two centuries. However, concerning the text, which except for fragments exists only in the thirty-three chapter recension of Guo Xiang 郭象 (d. 312 C.E.), divided into three sections, *Neipian* 內篇 (Inner Chapters), *Waipian* 外篇 (Outer Chapters), and *Zapian* 雜篇 (Miscellaneous Chapters), agreement has never been reached, either as to how its chronological layers should be stratified or who contributed to its compilation, either individually or as members of schools of thought. Different ways of approaching the text, based on textual analysis, have been proposed, resulting in the reassigning of some passages in the *Inner Chapters* to the *Outer* and *Miscellaneous Chapters*, moving passages in them to the *Inner Chapters*, and classifying all chapters in terms of both chronological layers and "school of thought" affiliations. Earlier modern scholars tended to accept that the *Inner Chapters* were largely authored by Master Zhuang in the fourth century B.C.E. and that the other two sections were product by later "schools" of Master Zhuang's followers, but eventually more sophisticated approaches appeared that resulted in more detailed conclusions, first significantly by Guan Feng 關鋒 in

*Zhuangzi neipian yijie he pipan* 莊子內篇譯解和批判 (Interpretation and Critique of the *Inner Chapters* of the *Zhuangzi*) and “Zhuangzi wai zapiian chutan” 莊子外雜篇初探 (Preliminary Investigation into the *Outer* and *Miscellaneous Chapters* of the *Zhuangzi*).<sup>1</sup> Guan’s work was developed further by A. C. Graham in *The Seven Inner Chapters and Other Writings from the Book Chuang Tzu* and “How Much of *Chuang Tzu* Did *Chuang Tzu* Write?”<sup>2</sup> Working independently of Graham, Liu Xiaogan 劉笑敢 covered similar ground but came to somewhat different conclusions in his Peking University doctoral dissertation (1985), directed by Professor Zhang Dainian 張岱年 (1909–2004), published as *Zhuangzi zhexue ji qi yanbian* 莊子哲學及其演變.<sup>3</sup> The first three chapters of Liu’s work (1st ed. pp. 3–98) were translated as *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*<sup>4</sup> with an afterword in which Liu contrasts his dating and classification scheme with Graham’s. Since McCraw refers to both Graham’s and Liu’s works, a brief comparison of their conclusions is appropriate:

Graham proposes six strata and kinds of authorship in the *Zhuangzi*: (1) The *Inner Chapters* (1–7) represent the actual writings of Master Zhuang, including some passages in the *Miscellaneous Chapters* in Guo Xiang’s recension that rightly belong in the *Inner Chapters*. (2) Chapters 8–10 and first part of 11 are authored by an individual “Primitivist” influenced by the *Laozi* (205 B.C.E.). (3) Parts of Chapter 11, Chapters 12–16 and 33 are composed by an early Han school of eclectic Daoists or “Syncretists” (early third century B.C.E.). (4) Chapters 17–22 expound on and further develop material in the *Inner Chapters* and as such are from the later “School of Master Zhuang” (third–second centuries B.C.E., perhaps into early Han). (5) Chapters 23–27 and 32 consists of heterogeneous fragments, including some early material that rightfully belong to the *Inner Chapters* (fourth–second centuries B.C.E.). (6) Graham attributes Chapters 28–31 to the “Yangists,” narratives supportive of Yang

<sup>1</sup> Guan Feng, *Zhuangzi neipian yijie he pipan* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1961); idem, “Zhuangzi wai zapiian chutan,” in *Zhexue yanjiu bianjibu* 哲學研究編輯部, ed., *Zhuangzi zhexue taolun ji* 莊子哲學討論集 (Collected Essays on the Philosophy of the *Zhuangzi*) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1961), pp. 62–98.

<sup>2</sup> A. C. Graham, *The Seven Inner Chapters and Other Writings from the Book Chuang-tzu* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981); idem, “How Much of *Chuang Tzu* Did *Chuang Tzu* Write?” in *Studies in Classical Chinese Thought*, ed. Henry Rosemont, Jr. and Benjamin I. Schwartz (Chico, CA: American Academy of Religion, 1979), pp. 459–502.

<sup>3</sup> Liu Xiaogan, *Zhuangzi zhexue ji qi yanbian* (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe 中國社會科學出版社, 1987; rev. ed., Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe 中國人民大學出版社, 2010).

<sup>4</sup> Liu Xiaogan, *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, trans. William E. Savage (Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1994).

Zhu's 楊朱 (370–319 B.C.E.) ethical egoism and can be dated to the same time as the “Primitivists” (205 B.C.E.); and (7) the “Syncretists”: a collection of passages, probably all of early Han date, that synthesize Confucian, Legalist, and Daoist thought found in Chapters 12, 13, and 14.

Liu proposes four divisions for the *Zhuangzi*: (1) *Inner Chapters* (1–7) (mid-Warring States period, fourth century B.C.E.), records of Master Zhuang's own teachings; (2) Group I *Outer Chapters* 17–22, *Miscellaneous Chapters* 23–27 and 32, are composed and compiled by “Transmitters and Expositors of Master Zhuang” (Late Warring States period before 235 B.C.E.), who explain/develop thought from the *Inner Chapters* as well as initiate thought of their own different from that of the *Inner Chapters* and essentially tried to transcend the conflicts between Confucians and Mohists; (3) Group II *Outer Chapters* 11B, 12–16 and 33 (Late Warring States period before 235 B.C.E.) represent the “Huang-Lao School” and assimilate and accommodate several Confucian and Legalist points of view, emphasizing the arts of the ruler and expounding the principle that he should be inactive while his ministers are active; (4) Group III *Outer Chapters* 8–11A, *Miscellaneous Chapters* 28–31 (Late Warring States period before 235 B.C.E.) represent “The Anarchists” who reject “reality” as illusory, seek the freedom of human nature, and promote the idea that in the society of highest virtue neither distinction of ruler and subjects nor class consciousness exists. Liu also insists that all of the *Zhuangzi* was complete by 241 B.C.E. and that none of it dates from as late as the early Han. In the meantime, Harold Roth in “Who Compiled the *Chuang Tzu*?”<sup>5</sup> largely follows Graham's scheme but also argues, agreeing with Guan Feng, that the compilation of the *Zhuangzi*, which contains material composed and transmitted for about two centuries (fourth–second centuries B.C.E.) should be attributed to Liu An 劉安 (179–122 B.C.E.), the King of Huainan 淮南王 and the Huainan scholars and that the actual date of compilation can be narrowed down to c.130 B.C.E.<sup>6</sup>

It is beyond the scope of this review to analyze and evaluate the methodologies used and conclusions arrived at by these scholars,<sup>7</sup> but all of them employ a wide spectrum of philological tools required for textual and philosophical criticism to identify and date: (1) the contextual use of idioms, especially philosophical/technical terminology, (2) use of function words or grammatical particles (*xuzi* 虛字), (3)

<sup>5</sup> Harold Roth, “Who Compiled the *Chuang Tzu*?” in *Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts: Essays Dedicated to Angus C. Graham*, ed. Henry Rosemont, Jr. (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1991), pp. 79–128.

<sup>6</sup> Roth also compares the findings of Guan Feng and Graham; see pp. 80–82.

<sup>7</sup> For a comprehensive critique of Graham's, Liu's, and Roth's work, among others, as well as new perspectives and conclusions of his own, see Brian H. Hoffert, “*Chuang Tzu*: The Evolution of a Taoist Classic” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2001).

phonetic loan characters (*jiajie* 假借) including taboo characters (*bihui* 避諱), (4) distinctive phraseology (multi-word lexical units), (5) literary style, (6) themes or subject-matter, especially philosophical concepts, (7) textual borrowings, “quotations,” (8) distinguishing modes of argument, and (9) historical references—to name the most significant scholarly devices. However, it must be noted that (3) is used by them only very rarely; in fact, phonological considerations in general play no significant role in any of their attempts to date parts of the *Zhuangzi* or identify possible authors, and as for rhyme, except for occasionally noting simply that it sometimes occurs in the *Zhuangzi*, nothing more is said about it. Therefore, McCraw’s *Stratifying Zhuangzi*, which focuses on rhyme in the *Zhuangzi*, is clearly a genuine pioneering effort.

McCraw states the purpose of his work right at the beginning of the monograph (pp. 1–51) which, as he says, is the “backbone” of his book:

Lately experts have gradually moved away from a “book-author” paradigm to a recognition that many diverse, short texts proliferated between -350 and -200, but most of them neither match with received “books” nor have any identifiable author. Yet you still see most writers on *Zhuangzi* (hence, *Zz*) attributing large parts to one “Zhuang Zhou” and speaking as if large parts of the *Zz* have textual integrity. Plenty of evidence exists to falsify such notions, but students of lexical measures have lacked statistical expertise, and no one has examined *Zz*’s abundant rhyming evidence to help unravel the text. . . . Neither a phonologist nor a statistician, I had to spend much time in remedial training; even now, you can anticipate that critics will find ways in which this monograph fails to solve those difficulties. But if the attempt leaves us closer to accurately understanding the structure and evolution of *Zz*, surely it has proved worth the writing.

For phonology, McCraw admits that for the phonetic reconstruction of Old Chinese (OC) and its rhyme-classes he depends on a combination of William H. Baxter’s *Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology* and “Axel Schuessler’s (2006) *Minimal Old Chinese*,” which is not listed in either of his two bibliographies (pp. 52–57 and p.101) and should be: Axel Schuessler and Bernhard Karlgren, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa*.<sup>8</sup> McCraw’s findings are essentially based on the statistical analysis of mixed rhymes (*heyun* 合韻) or cross-

<sup>8</sup> William H. Baxter, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992); Axel Schuessler and Bernhard Karlgren, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009).

rhymes, that is, non-canonical rhymes across the rhyme classes/categories established for the *Classic of Poetry/Book of Odes* (*Shijing* 詩經), that appear in fourteen Warring States texts, including the *Zhuangzi*. By examining the frequency of the same cross-rhyme occurrences in all these texts, he concludes that the *Zhuangzi* is most similar to the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 (Annals of Master Lü) and the *Guanzi* 管子 (Sayings of Master Guan), but, comparing the *Zhuangzi* to the *Jiuge* 九歌 (Nine Songs) and *Chuci* 楚辭 (Songs of Chu or “the South”), he finds no common distinctive rhyming pattern among them, which surprisingly argues against linking the *Zhuangzi* to Chu 楚 literary culture, a long held assumption of many scholars.

However, it is at this point, the account of his methodology and the plethora of complicated graphs and charts (some inserted in the monograph and some relegated to the appendixes) to support his argument, that McCraw’s work becomes opaque to the point of incomprehensibility, particularly his narratives that describe statistical experiments. Baxter’s “A Statistical Method for Analyzing Rhyme Data,” which appears in “Rhymes as Evidence in Historical Phonology,” the third chapter of *Minimal Old Chinese*, is, by contrast, clear, succinct, amply illustrated by sample text excerpts, transcriptions, and translations, and easy to follow—would that McCraw had followed his example—even better, if he had just used Baxter’s system of analysis as model for his own work, for they share similar source materials, methods of analysis, and goals.

McCraw then goes on to consider which of three ways to organize the *Zhuangzi* is the best: the traditional three-part organization, *Neipian* (Inner Chapters), *Wai-pian* (Outer Chapters), *Zapian* (Miscellaneous Chapters), Liu Xiaogan’s four-part division, or Graham’s six layers, and concludes that Graham’s model best suits the rhyming evidence that he claims to have discovered. Graham’s findings are also supported, McCraw asserts, by evidence from his statistical analysis of “lexical-grammatical measures,” by which he seems to mean datable technical terminology and function words. Such evidence provided in this part of the monograph seems thin and unconvincing—McCraw’s interests are obviously elsewhere. The monograph concludes with consideration of Graham’s view of the “Inner Chapters,” which McCraw concludes can be classified into two groups, whose authors seem to represent two different geographic regions, perhaps the ancient states of Qi 齊 and Lu 魯, and perhaps belong to two different generations.

The monograph is immediately followed by a “List of Sources Mentioned” (pp. 52–57), then by Appendix 1: 莊子韻讀 (pp. 59–85), which reproduces in Chinese all passages in the *Zhuangzi* that according to McCraw’s analysis seem to contain rhyming. Appendix 2: A Speculative Account of the *Zhuangzi* Text (pp. 87–100) addresses all thirty-three chapters essentially as a critique of Graham’s layering of the text—agreeing with him here, disagreeing there, and remaining “puzzled” more

often than one might expect, given all the analytical statistic effort made so far. This has its own bibliography, an “Additional References” (p. 101). Next comes Appendix 3: *Zhuangzi* Innerlinks (pp.103–8), which lists sixty-four common linking words/phrases, (or “traits”) “lexical, grammatical, or idiomatic” that link at least two of the seven *Inner Chapters*; this evidence oddly seems to run counter to McCraw’s analysis of cross-rhymes(!) (see p. 42 and Chart 16). Appendix 4: Phonological Constraints on Cross-Rhymes (pp. 109–14) begins with a caveat:

[Warring States and Han texts] do not rhyme consistently according to *Songs* [Classic of poetry] categories. Why? Does deviation stem from change over time, dialect differences, or do these texts simply rhyme so sloppily and haphazardly that we can extract very little useful information from them? . . . [But] we can indeed find some logic in their apparent disorder. . . [which] involves examining under which conditions and which phonological constraints these texts cross-rhyme. Intelligible patterns emerge (class by class). . . . (p. 109)

However, these “patterns” emerge only by comparing and contrasting difference among findings of scholars who address early rhyming classes: Laurent Sagart, *The Roots of Old Chinese*; Wolfgang Behr, “The Extent of Tonal Irregularity in Pre-Qin Inscriptional Rhyming”; Baxter, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*; Gilbert Mattos, “Tonal ‘Anomalies’ in the *Kuo Feng Odes*”; E. G. Pulleyblank, “Some New Hypotheses Concerning Word Families in Chinese”; and Luo Changpei 羅常培 and Zhou Zumo 周祖謨, *Han Wei Jin Nan-Bei Chao yunbu yanbian* 漢魏晉南北朝韻部演變研究 (Research on the Development of Rhyme Classes during the Han, Jin, and Southern and Northern Dynasties), vol. 1.<sup>9</sup> As McCraw promises, since he can find support somewhere among the findings of these seven scholars, everything seems to fit—if only at times with much speculation. Appendix 5: Vowelchart, which visualizes “one possible interpretation of intervocalic movements” for thirteen Warring States

<sup>9</sup> Laurent Sagart, *The Roots of Old Chinese* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999); Wolfgang Behr, “The Extent of Tonal Irregularity in Pre-Qin Inscriptional Rhyming,” in *Essays in Chinese Historical Linguistics: Festschrift in Memory of Professor Fang-Kuei Li on His Centennial Birthday*, ed. Pang-Hsin Ting and Anne O. Yue (Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica; Seattle, WA: University of Washington, 2005), pp. 111–45; Gilbert L. Mattos, “Tonal ‘Anomalies’ in the *Kuo Feng Odes*,” *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, n.s., 9, nos. 1–2 (September 1971), pp. 306–25; E. G. Pulleyblank, “Some New Hypotheses Concerning Word Families in Chinese,” *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 1, no. 1 (1973), pp. 111–25; Luo Changpei and Zhou Zumo, *Han Wei Jin Nan-Bei Chao yunbu yanbian yanjiu*, vol. 1 (Beijing: Kexue chubanshe 科學出版社, 1958).

texts plus the three sections of the *Zhuangzi*, schematically charts changes in the direction of vowels, but since it is presented without any explanation or context, its purpose is a mystery. Appendix 6: 脂微 in the *Songs* argues against Baxter's claim to have improved on Wang Li's 王力 (1900–1986) splitting of the 脂 and 微 categories,<sup>10</sup> but it is unclear how this adds significantly to his general analysis of cross-rhyme in the *Zhuangzi*. Appendix 7 consists of “Raw data from Cluster analysis and Multi-dimensional scaling experiments” and contains ten pages of charts and databases presented completely without explanation or any indication how the data presented relates to or supports his arguments in the monograph.

Whereas I am convinced that many gems of valuable information and critical insight are hidden in McCraw's *Stratifying Zhuangzi*, hidden they surely are, for the work is badly organized, lacks clarity in explaining methods and conclusions, and suffers from a real disjunction between charts/graphs on the one hand and narratives on the other. Instead of a monograph of fifty-one pages and seventy-six pages of appendixes, McCraw's thesis and the arguments that support it would have been better served if he had employed a continuous narrative, divided into chapters, illustrated as issues were explored by the data in the appendixes appropriately inserted with cogent explanations. Moreover, the work is permeated throughout by a sense of speculation and uncertainty. Perhaps this is intrinsic to the subject, for as McCraw warns (p. iii): “. . . our current state of knowledge about early Chinese phonology does not allow us to assign specific phonetic values to the rhyme groups.” Nevertheless, informed and thoughtful speculation can lead to real advances in our appreciation of how the *Zhuangzi* was composed and compiled. It is a pity that McCraw did not present his arguments about this in a more coherent and convincing way.

RICHARD JOHN LYNN  
*University of Toronto*

<sup>10</sup> See *Wang Li wenji* 王力文集 (Collected Writings of Wang Li) (Ji'nan 濟南: Shandong jiaoyu chubanshe 山東教育出版社, 1984), vol. 6: *Shijing yundu* 詩經韻讀 (Rhymes in the *Classic of Poetry*) and vol. 15: *Chuci yundu* 楚辭韻讀 (Rhymes in the *Songs of Chu*).