

philanthropy in China. Whether we agree with them or not about the PUMC legacy as they remember it, they deserve to be heard.

Works on philanthropic foundations are voluminous. Philanthropies and their impact on society and culture will continue to be scrutinized and debated. *The Oil Prince's Legacy* is a welcome addition to this literature. By looking at the Rockefeller philanthropies across the twentieth century's *longue durée*, particularly with the much-heralded China's rise in the foreground, Bullock has offered us a study that compels us to look beyond case studies and think in long terms. History moves on, and so are our perspectives.

YUNG-CHEN CHIANG
DePauw University

The Dynamics of Masters Literature: Early Chinese Thought from Confucius to Han Feizi. By Wiebke Denecke. Harvard-Yenching Institute Monographs 74. Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Asia Center, 2011. Pp. viii + 370. \$39.95/£29.95.

The Dynamics of Masters Literature is a study of early Chinese non-historical “masters” prose literature in a new key. However, when the title of the books seems to refer to a person called Han Feizi 韓非子 (Master Han Fei) it has to be said that Han Fei was the name of the man, and *Han Feizi* was the name of the book. (*Hanzi* 韓子 is first attested, as far as I know, in *Huainanzi* 淮南子 chapter 11, and nowhere in pre-Han times. And one notes by the way that *Huainanzi* seems never to be used a personal name of Liu An 劉安.)

It is true that we have plenty of early Zengzi 曾子 (Master Zeng), Mengzi 孟子 (Master Meng), and Mozi 墨子 (Master Mo). But even Xunzi 荀子 is not called by that name anywhere in the book which today bears his name. In chapter 15 of that book he is indeed persistently referred to as Sun Qingzi 孫卿子, elsewhere three times in the adjacent chapter 16, and in addition there is one stray example in chapter 8. The personal name Xunzi is attested in the Eastern Han *Zhong lun* 中論 chapter 18, but still absent in *Hanshu* 漢書, “Yiwenzhi” 藝文志 (Treatise of Arts and Letters) which only tells of the book *Sun Qingzi* 孫卿子 which on this matter observes an imperial taboo.

Han Fei is referred to as Han Fei and not as Han Feizi, just as Gongsun Long 公孫龍 seems to be referred to as Gongsun Long and the eponymous book as the *Gongsunlongzi* 公孫龍子. *Zisizi* 子思子 seems to refer to a book attributed to Zisi,

not to the man; *Deng Xizi* 鄧析子 seems always to refer to a book by Deng Xi, not to the man.

Xunzi chapter 21 plays on the historically very important use of *zi* 子 that is of such great interest to the Wiebke Denecke's book. By induction the following famous passage seems to introduce a notion of *zhu zi* 諸子 (various masters) that came to be so influential in later times:

墨子蔽於用而不知文。
宋子蔽於欲而不知得。
慎子蔽於法而不知賢。
申子蔽於勢而不知知。
惠子蔽於辭而不知實。
莊子蔽於天而不知人。

Master Mo was beclouded by usefulness and did not understand elegant culture;

Master Song was beclouded by desire and did not understand success;

Master Shèn was beclouded by law and did not understand talent;

Master Shēn was beclouded by tactics and did not understand knowledge;

Master Hui was beclouded by formulations and did not understand realities;

Master Zhuang was beclouded by Nature and did not understand man.

That curious word *zi*, as well as such classical Chinese expressions as *zishu* 子書 (Master's literature) and *zhuzi* would seem to deserve more detailed philological attention than they get in this book on "Masters Literature." Are they found anywhere in pre-Han or pre-*Hanshu* literature, and particularly: are they found anywhere in excavated texts? Do they represent late Western Han bibliographic categories only, as far as we know? These are important questions that Denecke's book serves usefully to bring to the reader's attention.

What is generally taken to be the history of Chinese philosophy is read in her book as thoughtful "Masters Literature" rather than as philosophical discourse in any modern sense.

Denecke begins with the story how it came about that what where the *zhuzi* came to be not only regarded as but importantly read as philosophy.

Denecke provides an entertaining survey of the origins of the notion of "Chinese philosophers." Already Aleni (艾儒略, 1582–1649) had transcribed the word philosophy into Chinese and applied it to these old masters. In the seventeenth century the translators of *Confucius, Sinarum Philosophus* firmly established the *zishu* as works of philosophy.

The Japanese Buddhologist Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎 presented a treatment of the *zishu* as *tetsugaku* 哲學 in 1890. The interesting question remains to just what extent Matsumoto's way of looking at the Chinese Masters Books was influenced by Western literature.

Denecke concurs enthusiastically with ubiquitous current complaints of “the Eurocentric and chauvinistic character of most modern Western philosophy” (p. 17). Reading *Xunzi* from this biased Western point of view, she finds, has made everyone neglect such parts of the book as the Rhapsodies section and the Working Songs. Denecke undertakes to do justice to these apparently non-philosophical parts of philosophical texts.

Again, the narrative parts of the *Han Feizi* have been largely neglected in the context of “histories of Chinese philosophy,” and Denecke sets out to spell out their crucial function in Han Fei's thought.

The project of writing a “World Philosophy” she finds “an important and admirable project” (p. 19), the danger being, in her view, that this will end up as “a mixture of Enlightenment-era practices of cultural translation with more recent post-colonial apologetics” (p. 19). She maintains that “we need to find better ways to conceive of a paradigm for world thought or philosophy that is global, worldly, and reconciliatory and at the same time culturally specific, locally relevant, and excitingly different” (pp. 20–21).

Recent attempts to read the Masters as literature she finds insufficiently radical, and in any case she aspires to go further: “In short, we need to find more creative ways to capture the symbiosis of rhetorical strategies with intellectual claims.” (p. 22)

Dismissing readings of the Masters both as “Literature” and as “Philosophy” Denecke aspires to focus quite open-mindedly on the on the rhetorical devices found in these texts: “We are thus granted a most intimate view of the internal historical development of the genre of ‘Masters Literature’ through the rhetorical maneuvers of the authors themselves.” (p. 24) These she explores in ways that are quite openly very much inspired by Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of “speech genres.”

Denecke recognizes the importance of excavated texts, of course, but while using them occasionally on specific points at issue, in general she chooses to concentrate on what she calls “the received texts” (p. 29), and inevitably she can only focus on a selection of these.

Denecke is engaged in a highly ambitious thought experiment: “What happens if we scrape away as much as possible of the disciplinary and conceptual overlay that has accrued on the surface of the Masters Texts, the interpretive barnacles of the last half millennium since the Jesuit mission? Which neglected parts, problems, particular moves, concepts, and strategies of the Masters Texts will come to light?” (p. 326)

And this is not all. Denecke's ultimate concern is indeed with global intellectual history in particular with a proper assessment of the Greek intellectual experience: "And can those parts, problems, moves, concepts, and strategies help us see the history of Greek philosophy and its progeny in a different light, or move us into a new cosmopolitan future for philosophy and intellectual inquiry?" (p. 29)

These are the general reflections that suffuse and inspires the treatment of our well-known texts of Chinese philosophy in the rest of the book.

Denecke does get off to a refreshing start: "The Birth of Masters Literature: Polemics between Warring States Masters. Throwing the First Stone: Mozi's 'Against Confucians.'" There is indeed an interesting thought here. Supposing for a moment, with Kidder Smith and writers like Czikezentmihalyi and Nylan, that there was no such thing as Confucianism in Warring States times, one would indeed like to know who exactly it was that was criticized in "Fei Ru" 非儒. Perhaps these were indeed simply classicists and experts in ritual and not really followers of Confucius as all. Perhaps, that is, the traditional reading of *ru* 儒 as "Confucian" was always mistaken. Denecke does not provide strong arguments either way.

Mohists, Denecke suggests, establishes its identity through their very opposition to the *ru*, just as Xunzi establishes "his position" through his very contraposition of the twelve masters in his "Fei shi er zi" 非十二子 (Criticizing the Twelve Masters). Philosophical position is articulated as contraposition. What she does not describe is how Confucius defines his intellectual position in counter-distinction to the glib-tongued more diffuse group of the *ning* 佞 (glib-tongued). And again, Mencius finds his own intellectual position in battling the Mozi's and the Yangzhu's 楊朱 of his world: again, finding his identity is by a process of counter-distinction.

Denecke goes on to consider the last chapter in the *Zhuangzi* which surveys a wide range of masters. She very properly dwells on the point that Zhuang Zhou 莊周 himself gets his own little portrait. Denecke summarizes this as follows, assuming very boldly, to put it mildly that the author of this chapter of the *Zhuangzi* was Zhuang Zhou himself: "Zhuangzi judges his own writings as absurd, harmless, and unconventional, yet commendable." (p. 51)

Denecke surveys in great detail the critical re-evaluation and deconstruction of the notion of *jia* 家 in recent literature, but fails to acknowledge the two seminal works by J. L. Krol', "*O ponjatii 'jia (shkola) v drevnem Kitae*" (On the concept of *jia* "school" in ancient China),¹ followed by "*Rassuzhdenie Sima o 'šesti shkolach*" (Sima Qian's judgement on the "Six Schools"),² which first drew my attention to these matters in considerable detail.

¹ NKOGK. Tezisy i doklady (Moscow, 1977), Part 1, pp. 79–87.

² *Kitaj: istorija, kul'tura i istoriografija* (Moscow, 1977), pp. 131–57.

Against the background of her general reflections it is indeed entertaining to follow Denecke's reading of Sima Qian's account of the Masters as well as his apparent attitude towards the Masters Literature. It is as if she is in something of a hurry at this stage in the book: clearly aware of the crucial importance of recent reappraisals of the Jixia 稷下 academy (p. 77). She does not enter into the necessary historical detail so as to enter a substantial discussion of the relations between intellectuals in late Warring States times. Just as she also disregards the important question to what extent there ever were found any school-specific tombs. For it does appear that text finds in tombs have a strong tendency to cut across the traditional division into schools everywhere. And if a detailed survey of all textual finds does support this generalization then this will clearly have important consequences for our appraisal of the social division between the "schools" in ancient China.

Most of Denecke's book is richly illustrated with primary sources for which she gives the Chinese texts she translates. This is particularly welcome when she reminds us of some statements concerning the history of philology in China that one does need to be reminded of. Thus Ban Gu 班固 (32–92) complains that 說五字之文至於二三萬言 (In explaining five characters one would get to use twenty to thirty thousand words!) The situation got so bad, in Ban Gu's view that the student 白首而後能言 (had to be white-haired before he could pronounce [on these matters]) (p. 78). Her survey in the following pages reads like a judiciously chosen annotated anthology of passages relevant to Wang Chong's 王充 (27 B.C.–c. A.D. 100) rhetoric. On the *Lunheng* 論衡 we now have Marc Kalinowski's extensive introduction and selective translation *Balance des discours: Destin, Providence et Divination*.³ Wang Chong is famous for his philosophy and practice of transparent rhetoric which made his book so readable as to lose respect among the literati. On this matter of Wang Chong's philosophy of rhetoric one is delighted to compare Denecke's readings with the original because this subject matter is indeed germane to Denecke's primary concern which is with the "philosophy" that is inherent in discourse strategies.

These discourse rules define what Denecke calls the "discourse space." The exploration of the topology of this discourse space remains the red thread throughout her book.

CHRISTOPH HARBSMEIER
University of Oslo

³ Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2011.