

Wixted, John Timothy, “The Nature of Evaluation in the *Shih-p’in* (Gradings of Poets) by Chung Hung (A.D. 469-518),” in *Theories of the Arts in China*, Susan Bush and Christian Murck, eds. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), pp. 225-264. [*Shih-p’in* = *Shipin* 詩品; Chung Hung = Zhong Rong 鍾嶸]

The Nature of Evaluation in the *Shih-p'in* (Gradings of Poets) by Chung Hung (A.D. 469–518)¹

BY JOHN TIMOTHY WIXTED

The late fifth and early sixth centuries in South China mark a period of considerable ferment in literary criticism and theory. During the reign of Emperor Wu of the Liang dynasty (reg. 502–549), there appeared two major works of criticism, *Wen-hsin tiao-lung* (Elaborations on the Essence of Literature) by Liu Hsieh (465?–523),² and *Shih-p'in* (Gradings of Poets) by Chung Hung, as well as two major anthologies with prefaces of critical significance, *Wen hsüan* (Literary Selections) edited by Hsiao T'ung (501–531),³ and *Yü-t'ai hsün-yung* (New Songs from the Tower of Jade) compiled by Hsü Ling (507–583).⁴ The latest possible dates for their completion were, respectively, A.D. 507, 517, 527, and 537.⁵

The age was also one of social and political factions in which literary concerns were of great importance. The stage on which these interests were played out was the salon, both in the metropolitan area and in the provinces. As one scholar has recently written:

In the salon culture, literature was the prime interest. Clannish and snobbish, unwilling or unable to sully their hands with practical affairs or associate with lesser officials, the great nobles withdrew to their literary parlor games. The romantic folk songs indigenous to the south caught the fancy of the languid aristocrat poets. New poetic techniques involving a lately rationalized tonality were tried. Literary theory became the basis of court rivalries and factionalism, and the dynasty saw the completion of the most influential canons of Chinese literary criticism.⁶

Literary skill itself was of importance, and not only as a prerequisite for gaining entrée to salons and political circles; it was also of prime importance in securing official or social advancement. An attack on a man's literary work could be tantamount to a personal or political attack.⁷ This dimension to contemporary discussions of literature, though difficult to assess properly today, cannot be overlooked when examining Chung Hung's critical work.

This article will focus on the nature of evaluation in *Gradings of Poets*. In successive sections, there will be discussion of the background to Chung Hung's system of grading, the nature of the terminology he uses, the traits he focuses upon in his analyses, the standard of value implied in his criticism, the different means he employs for comparing poets, and the relationship between his work and valuation in the arts in general.

I

The biography of Chung Hung sheds some light on his background as a critic.⁸ While an imperial student (*kuo-tzu sheng*) in the Yung-ming period (483–493) of the Southern Ch'i dynasty, he specialized in the *I ching* (Book of Changes). The descendant of a Chin dynasty (317–420) imperial secretary (*shih-chung*), he was himself a secretary to princes, including Hsiao Kang (503–551), the future imperial sponsor of the *New Songs from the Tower of Jade*. One of Chung Hung's two official biographies relates that he received a personal slight from the poet Shen Yüeh (441–513), the prominent advocate of formal tonal regulation in poetry; because of this, he is said to have written *Gradings of Poets* to get even—a conclusion subject to much debate among later scholars.⁹

Chung Hung's public intentions as a literary critic are outlined in the three prefaces he wrote to *Gradings of Poets*. Therein he speaks of the need for a standard of evaluation in the world of letters:

As for officials who serve in the courts of noblemen, whenever time is left over from state discussions, they invariably turn to the topic of poetry. As each follows his individual predilections, the critique of one is at variance with that of another. The Tzu and Sheng flow indiscriminately; vermilion and purple, the pure and impure, each vies with the other. Discussions turn disputatious, and there is no reliable standard.^{a 10}

In the second preface to his work, Chung Hung cites earlier critical works and finds them mostly wanting:

Lu Chi's (261–303) *Wen fu* (Rhymeprose on Literature) is comprehensive but lacks unfavorable critiques.¹¹ Li Ch'ung's (fl. 323) *Han-lin lun* (Discourse on the Forest of Writing Brushes) is coherent but not incisive.¹² Wang Wei's (414–443) *Hung pao* (Vast Treasure) is tightly constructed but withholds judgments.¹³ Yen Yen-chih's (384–456) discussion of literature, though done with exactitude, is hard to grasp.¹⁴ Only Chih Yü's (d. 311) treatise on literature is detailed, yet broad and enriching; truly he is one whose words are penetrating.¹⁵ Although these authors all discuss writing in terms of literary style and form, they do not make clear the relative merits of writers.

The poetic anthologies edited by Hsieh Ling-yün (385–433) adopt whatever poems he happened upon.¹⁶ Chang Chih's (Chin dyn.) *Wen-shih chuan* (Biographies of Literary Men) records the prose pieces he happened to have seen.¹⁷ With the recordings of these outstanding men,

^a 觀王公搢紳之士，每博論之餘，何嘗不以詩爲口實，隨其嗜欲，商榷不同。溜

灑并泛，朱紫相奪；喧議競起，準的無依。

their concern always lay in [transmitting] the literary text; no gradings were ever made.^{b 18}

Although there are significant omissions from this list, Chung Hung is correct in his basic argument that earlier works either dealt with literature theoretically, making little reference to specific writings, or were concerned with the problems of anthologizing: selecting texts and classifying them according to genre.¹⁹

From his remarks concluding the discussion of earlier critics, it is clear that Chung Hung will concern himself with gradings in his work. The idea for such a critique of earlier poets did not originate with him; the proximate stimulus came from an older contemporary:

The late Liu Hui of P'eng-ch'eng (*tzu*: Shih-chang) (458–502), a man of high critical acumen, became exasperated at this confusion and intended to compile a “Gradings of Poets” for his generation. In conversation he set forth its general outline, but the work itself was never completed. Accordingly, I have been moved to write such a work.^{c 20}

Chung Hung's work is distinctive for its classification of writers into three evaluative grades: “upper, middle, and lower” (*shang-*, *chung-*, *hsia-p'in*). More than one hundred twenty poets are assigned to one of these grades.²¹ Specific sources for this classification system are noted by Chung Hung:

In former times there were evaluations of men ranking them into nine categories. And the *Ch'i lüeh* (Seven Summaries) arranged scholars [into seven divisions]. Yet if one compares reputations with facts, these evaluations quite often were inappropriate.^{d 22}

Chung Hung is here citing earlier nine-part and seven-part categories of arrangement or evaluation. *Seven Summaries*, the earliest bibliography in China, was compiled by Liu Hsiang (77–6 B.C.) and completed by his son Liu Hsin (d. A.D. 22). This work, extant today only in fragments, was a classified listing of books in the imperial library and contained short introductions and critiques. Pan Ku (A.D. 32–92) drew upon it for his “I-wen chih” (Monograph on Literature) when compiling the *Han shu* (History of the Han Dynasty).²³

Another chapter of Pan Ku's history, entitled “Ku-chin jen-piao” (A Table of Men Past and Present), assigned historical and semihistorical figures to a nine-part

^b 陸機文賦，通而無貶；李充翰林，疎而不切；王微鴻寶，密而無裁；顏延論文，精而難曉；摯虞文志，詳而博瞻，頗曰知言。觀斯數家，皆就談文體，而不顯優劣。至于謝客集詩，逢詩輒取，張騫文士逢文即書。諸英志錄，並義在

文，曾無品第。

^c 近彭城劉士章，俊賞之士，疾其淆亂，欲為當世詩品，口陳標榜，其文未遂，感而作焉。

^d 昔九品論人，七略裁士，校以賓實，誠多未值。

grading scheme: “upper, middle, and lower” categories each in turn being subdivided into three parts (“upper-upper, middle-upper, lower-upper,” etc.). In his short preface to the table, Pan Ku alludes to an earlier precedent for such classificatory terms in Confucius’ *Lun-yü* (Analects), and he explains the moral criteria employed in assigning figures to categories (the highest rank being reserved for those incapable of doing evil, the lowest for those incapable of doing good).²⁴

From A.D. 220 onward there was instituted a system for rating all officials according to nine gradings. Office holders, termed “equitable rectifiers” (*chung-cheng*), were selected at the provincial and prefectural levels “to rate the achievements, talents, conduct, and abilities of officials from ducal ministries down to the lower officials” and to “grade them into [nine] ranks.”²⁵

It is no coincidence that the institution of this grading system occurred during the reign of Emperor Wen of the Wei dynasty, Ts’ao P’i (187–226), whose *Tien-lun Lun-wen* (“Essay on Literature” in *Classical Treatises*) reflected similar contemporary concerns.²⁶ As one modern scholar has noted: “His interest in genres was only a by-product of the typical third-century pastime of evaluating and categorizing people. The primary interest was in determining the fitness of a person for office in terms of his ability and knowledge as against the specific demands made by the office on its incumbent.”²⁷

Furthermore, at about this time the classification of Buddhist believers into “upper, middle, and lower” categories, as well as into nine-category subdivisions, is found in canons of Pure Land Buddhism, including the *Fo-shuo ta wu-liang-shou ching* (Aparimitayūḥ Sūtra), translated into Chinese by Saṅghavarman in 252.²⁸

The interest in classifying talent for pragmatic ends gave rise to a range of works. The *Jen-wu chih* (Treatise on Personalities) by Liu Shao (190?–265), completed about 235, was a practical handbook of personality types written in an attempt to match talent with political function.²⁹ The later standard statement dealing with the same concerns was Chung Hui’s (225–264) *Ssu-pen lun* (Treatise on the Four Basic Relations [between Natural Ability and Human Nature]).³⁰ By the fourth century, characterological discussion “lost much (though not all) of its political significance, and became a kind of rhetorical sport.”³¹ Yet parts of *Shih-shuo hsin-yü* (A New Account of Tales of the World) by Liu I-ch’ing (403–444), especially the chapter, “P’in-tsao” (Classification According to Excellence) (as well as the chapters “Shih-chien” [Insight and Judgment] and “Shang-yü [Appreciation and Praise]), provide numerous examples of traditional interest in the evaluation of character.³²

Such earlier seven- and nine-part classification schemes, including the important tradition of characterizing and grading men of affairs, formed the background to the systems of grading and classification in the arts that became the vogue in Chung Hung’s time. The earliest such examples appear to be in the field of chess. There were separate *Ch’i-p’in* (Gradings of Chess Players) by Shen Yüeh and by Liu

Hui (465–517) that predated *Gradings of Poets*.³³ Other such works in Chung Hung's general period include *Ku hua-p'in lu* (Old Record of Gradings of Painters) by Hsieh Ho (fl. 500–535),³⁴ *Shu-p'in* (Gradings of Calligraphers) by Yü Chien-wu (487–500),³⁵ and *Ku-chin shu-p'ing* (Critiques of Calligraphers Ancient and Modern) by Yüan Ang (d. 540), dated 523.³⁶

Having mentioned the seven- and nine-part antecedents to his classification scheme, Chung Hung in the same preface proceeds to state something of the nature of poetic evaluation:

As for poetic expertise, this is easier to ascertain. To draw an analogy, it is virtually the same as “sixes” or chess.^{e 37}

There are shared metaphysical, social, and artistic associations between poetry and the boardgames of sixes and chess that should be pointed out in explicating the comparison Chung Hung draws in this passage.

Both chess and sixes have early associations with Chinese astronomy-astrology. Pan Ku, in his *I chih* (Essay on Chess), states the following concerning the game:

Its significance is profound. The board must be square and true, for it acts as a simulacrum of the earth's shape; and its pathways must be true and straight, for it manifests bright virtue. Pieces are white and black, differentiating the Yin and the Yang. Spread out in their array, they aspire to the pattern of the heavens (*t'ien-wen*).^{f 38}

The game of “sixes” (*[liu-]po* or “the six learned ones,” referring to the number of pieces on each side) is a boardgame traceable to pre-Han times which also had early astronomical-astrological associations, “each piece being marked with one of the four animals symbolizing the four directions of space. There seems to have been a central belt of water, like the Milky Way in later systems, and when a piece arrived there it was promoted to be a ‘leading piece’ with greater powers.”³⁹ The boards on which both games were played were related to the diviner's board (*shih*), upon which pieces representing heavenly bodies were thrown for prognostication.⁴⁰

The relationship between heavenly configurations and the arrangement of their earthly counterparts in the form of pieces on game boards is analogous to that said to exist between the patternings of the cosmos (*t'ien-wen*) and their representations in writing (i.e. *wen*, “patterns”). Such concepts derive from the *I ching* (Book of Changes) and reflect the basic unitary nature of early Chinese thought, which was holistic in its view of the natural world, the latter's artistic patternings (in the form of music, writing, etc.), and the relation of both to man. In reference to literature, it

e 至若詩之爲技，較爾可知，以類推之，殆均博弈。

f 厥義深矣。局必方正，象地則也。道必

正直，神明德也。棊有白黑，陰陽分也。駢羅列布，效天文也。

was given its most eloquent expression in the first chapter of Liu Hsieh's *Elaborations on the Essence of Literature*, "Yüan-tao" (On Tracing the *Tao*).⁴¹ But even in that great work, literature is treated largely in terms which, in comparison with earlier views, are distinctly secular and nondidactic; and the metaphysical significance of a term like *wen* is carefully redirected in Liu Hsieh's formulation to serve more expressive literary concerns.⁴²

Chung Hung in the opening words of his first preface pays homage to the tradition which sees the cosmic function of literature:

It is life-breath (*ch'i*) which moves the external world, and the external world that moves us. Our sensibilities, once stirred, manifest themselves in dance and song. This manifestation illumines heaven, earth, and man and makes resplendent the whole of creation. Heavenly and earthly spirits depend on it to receive oblation, and ghosts of darkness draw upon it for secular reports. For moving heaven and earth and for stirring ghosts and spirits, there is nothing better than poetry.^{g 43}

But these words, which are essentially a truncated version of the *Ta hsü* (Great Preface) to the *Shih ching* (Book of Odes) (written most probably by Wei Hung early in the first century A.D.),⁴⁴ are but a passing introductory nod to the metaphysical origins of poetry. Chung Hung's remaining prefatory remarks are distinctly nonmetaphysical in nature, and in the body of his work he takes up the task he is really concerned with, that of characterizing and grading poets.

The analogy drawn between poetry and boardgames like chess is instructive in still another respect, for by Chung Hung's time chess had become the pastime of cultivated men, being performed with no less conscious style and poise than that adopted when writing a poem. References in *A New Account of Tales of the World* show chess to be completely secular in function, the style of one player being taken as an indication of additional talent on his part, and the imperturbable demeanor of other players suggesting self-control.⁴⁵ Such anecdotes were in the tradition of characterizing and classifying one's contemporaries.

The already secularized view of poetry and chess, which surely did not lessen in the salon culture of the early sixth century, no more precluded Emperor Wu of the Liang dynasty, Chung Hung's sovereign, from opening his *Wei-ch'i fu* (Rhyme-prose on Encirclement Chess) with the statement, "The encirclement box forms a simulacrum of heaven, / Its square board patterns the earth,"^{h 46} than it kept Chung Hung from speaking of poetic song as an oblation to heaven and earth and a means of communicating with spirits. Such statements were not to be taken as literal

^g 氣之動物，物之感人，故搖蕩性情，形諸舞詠。照燭三才，輝麗萬有；靈祇待之以致饗，幽微藉之以昭告；動天地，

感鬼神，莫近于詩。
^h 圍匱象天，方局法地。

statements of belief, but rather as allusions, rich in metaphorical implication, to the sources of their traditions.

Chung Hung probably had an additional worldly concern in mind when using the chess analogy. None of Chung Hung's commentators, in discussing the question of whether he wrote *Gradings of Poets* to settle a score with Shen Yüeh, notes the fact that Shen Yüeh had a few years previously written the work, *Gradings of Chess Players*. Figures on the contemporary scene would certainly have been aware of the possible personal implication to Chung Hung's statement, which might be paraphrased as follows: No less than Shen Yüeh, who could grade chess players, I, Chung Hung, am capable of judging the relative merits of poets (including Shen Yüeh himself).

Chess and poetry, moreover, form an analogy in that they involve skill; as such, they depend upon technique (i.e. *technē*, the kind of knowledge that is absorbed in practice).⁴⁷ Furthermore, chess and sixes, like all games, have internally structured rules and relationships, as does poetry. The analogy between writing skill and chess playing had been drawn by Chung Hung's contemporary, Liu Hsieh, in *Elaborations on the Essence of Literature*: "To have control of literary composition, its technique firmly in hand, is akin to a master chess player's being thoroughly versed in its principles."⁴⁸ In words consciously drawing a parallel between the two, Liu Hsieh describes the work of a writer who writes as well as a good chess player plays chess:

As for the writing of a grand master,
its technique has definite principles,
and its composition is well-ordered;
awaiting the culmination of feelings,
it adapts its mechanisms to accord with circumstances,
and though it shifts, what is correct is not lost.
If its underlying principles reach the ultimate,
and its key mechanisms enter upon the skillful,
then meaningful flavor, full of life, will be born,
and words having life-breath will appear in droves.⁴⁹

Literature, like chess, is thus said to have its own underlying principles; it is a system of structures and relations, the disposition of whose elements must be carefully ordered, and whose key mechanisms must be managed with great flexibility and skill; furthermore, it is neither set apart from human sentiment, nor is it immutable. As such, it is what we would call an art.

Yet, although all of the elements discussed above—the metaphysical, social, and

i 執術馭篇，似善奕之窮數。

j 若夫善奕之文，則術有恆數，按部整伍，以待情會，因時順機，動不失正。

數逢其極，機入其巧，則義味騰躍而生，辭氣叢雜而至。

artistic—have bearing on his use of the analogy between boardgames and poetry, Chung Hung's remarks basically concern evaluation. He is saying that it is easier to grade poets than to grade men; it is virtually the same as grading chess players. Now chess playing can be graded by results: that is, by the clear-cut distinction between winning and losing. Or it can be viewed as a matter of skill or technique, and thus be judged according to how well it is performed as such. Furthermore, as a skill it can be narrowly defined, or it can be viewed in terms of more general style: that is, in terms of the way it is accompanied (or accomplished) by poise, panache, and the like. Chung Hung seems to be making the point that poetry is like chess in that it can be evaluated in terms of how well it is performed as a skill; for the most part, his actual evaluations are couched in these terms. But the personality of the poet, like the style of the chess player, can also be seen as playing a role in his work; that this is sometimes the case in Chung's critiques results almost inevitably from the kind of terminology he uses to characterize a poet's traits.

II

In describing literary traits, Chung Hung was necessarily compelled to employ expressions that were current (or would at least be comprehensible) in the language of his day. To this end, the vocabulary of terms descriptive of human nature which had been developed in the earlier characterological tradition was extended to discussions of literature by Chung Hung in *Gradings of Poets* and by Liu Hsieh in *Elaborations on the Essence of Literature*, as it was also to discussions of chess, calligraphy, and painting by critics of the age writing about them. Such works of evaluation and criticism in the arts were heirs to Liu Shao's *Treatise on Personalities*, Chung Hui's "Treatise on the Four Basic Relations [between Natural Ability and Human Nature]," and Liu I-ch'ing's *A New Account of Tales of the World*. In many passages of the latter, especially, men of social standing are shown making displays of ingenuity in trying to characterize contemporaries "in a few well-chosen, preferably abstruse and poetic words. It is in these and comparable works dealing with characterology, social intercourse, refined conversation and serious or playful 'characterization,' that we find the constant use of key terms such as *ch'i*, *ku*, *yiiin*, *feng*, and an elaborated, more or less technical terminology consisting of bisyllabic expressions (*sheng-ch'i*, *feng-liu*, *shen-i*, etc.). Although it is in most cases impossible to find a satisfactory English equivalent, these terms are, in general, well defined and understandable if we keep in mind that they were applied to human beings: to their 'temper,' 'air,' 'pith,' 'esprit,' 'emotionality,' and 'style,'" ⁵⁰

When applied to the arts, there was no clear-cut distinction between a man's character and his works in the usage of such terms. A man and his works had been considered inseparable in earlier Chinese thought.⁵¹ Chung Hung's work displays

this dual referential quality in many of its characterizations. (Indeed, such terms can at times refer not only to the artist and his work but also to the feeling or impression they prompt in the beholder.) Note, for example, the statement that Liu Chen's (d. 217) "true bones (*chen ku*) defy frost, while his noble air (*kao feng*) surpasses the common run."^{k 52} Jen Fang (460–508) "in the extension of his [poetic] frame (*t'i*) is profound and correct; he succeeds in having the air (*feng*) of a man of affairs."^{l 53} "Talent" (*ts'ai*) is a particularly rich word in these contexts, as it had been a supreme concern in the characterological tradition. Hsieh Hui-lien (397–433) "was rich in talent (*ts'ai*), incisive in thought."^{m 54} Kuo P'u (276–324), "using his supreme talent (*ts'ai*), renovated the form (*t'i*) of [earlier] poetry, while Liu K'un (270–317), drawing on his pure and firm spirit (*ch'i*), consummated its beauty."^{n 55} "Untrammelledness" (*i*) appears as an element in compound terms which can refer to both writer and work. Hsieh Ling-yün is described as having "surpassed [Chang Hsieh (fl. 295)] in being unrestrained (*i-tang*)."^{o 56} And Yen Yen-chih, through excessive use of allusion, is said to have "gone contrary to what is distinguished (*hsiu-i*)."^{p 57} The term *ch'i* ("spirit," "vital force," "life-breath," "humour"), in particular, had associations not only with earlier characterological and critical works but also with philosophical writings dating back still earlier.⁵⁸ Chung Hung uses the term when speaking of Liu K'un and Lu Ch'en (284–350): they "excelled at fashioning heart-rending language and had a pure and outstanding spirit (*ch'i*)."^{q 59} And of Liu Chen, he says: "his spirit (*ch'i*) excelled his language";^{r 60} "relying on his spirit (*ch'i*), he was fond of originality."^{s 61}

In view of the terminology used, Chung Hung's discussions of poets are in large measure "characterizations." What is remarkable about them, the above examples to the contrary notwithstanding, is the degree to which they are focused on aspects of the poets' actual works. It should be borne in mind, however, that Chung Hung was much indebted to the earlier characterological tradition when specifying and describing a writer's traits in terms that in context are value-significant.

III

Chung Hung confers value both when he describes the specific characteristics of poets and when he assigns poets to overall categorical gradings. Before focusing on

^k 真骨凌霜，高風跨俗。

^l 拓體淵雅，得國士之風。

^m 才思富捷。

ⁿ 仗清剛之氣，贊成厥美。

^o 逸蕩過之。

^p 乖秀逸。

^q 善爲悽戾之詞，自有清拔之氣。

^r 氣過其文。

^s 仗氣愛奇。

the specific traits he describes in value terms, it would be useful to say something first of the nature of valuation.

Value in the arts is relational. "Something that 'has value' must be actually or potentially worth something to somebody in some respect; outside of that relationship, it cannot have that value."⁶² Or stated somewhat differently, for "an object to have value, a relation with something other than itself is needed. Value must include valuer as well as thing valued."⁶³

Moreover, valuation is of particulars—relevant particulars. The more indeterminate the particulars or the more inclusive the category of particulars is upon which value is being conferred in a proposition, the less validatable it becomes; the less correspondence (i.e. truth) value it has. For example, of the two propositions, The phrasing in this line is apt, and The poetic phrasing of this poet is apt, the latter is considerably more indeterminate and difficult to validate in terms of its potential applicability. Furthermore, of the two propositions, The poetic phrasing of this poet is apt, and This is a top-grade poet, the latter is a general summary judgment that has rhetorical rather than analytical value: for example, as a prompting to readers to assign certain priorities in their reading, or as a prompting to current and future poets to write in certain ways.

There is a hierarchy of subjects found in a value proposition—a hierarchy in the inclusiveness or grossness of the subject being characterized and in the determinacy of the variables determinant of that subject. Note the differences between the following:

This phrase is good.

The phrasing in this stanza is good.

The diction in this work is good.

This work is well written.

The diction in this work is better than in that work.

This work is better written than that work.

The works by this author are well written.

The works by this author are better written than that author's works.

The writings of this period are better written than those of the period that comes after it.

Similarly, the description-valuations in Chung Hung's *Gradings of Poets* are remarkable for the differing degree of inclusiveness of their subjects. Note the range in the following:

In Juan Chi's (210–263) work, "the words are those of everyday sights and sounds."⁶⁴

Ying Chü (190–252) was "good at using plain, archaic language."⁶⁵

^t 言在耳目之內。

^u 善爲古語。

“Yüan Hung’s (328–376) ‘Poems on History,’ though not fully developed in literary style, are nevertheless fresh and taut.”^{v 66}

Pao Chao’s (405–466) “bone-joints (i.e. the poetic spirit or life force forming the basis of his work) are stronger than Hsieh Hun’s (d. 412?).”^{w 67}

Of Tai K’ai (Liu-Sung dyn.): “He is rich and strong in literary capability.”^{x 68}

Hsi K’ang (223–262) is “excessively severe and sharp.”^{y 69}

“Lu Chi’s talent can be likened to the sea, P’an Yüeh’s (247–300) to the Yangtze.”^{z 70}

“Lu Ch’en looked up to [Liu K’un], but did not quite reach him [in stature].”^{aa 71}

Writing of the Yung-chia era (307–313) “was insipid and had little flavor”;^{ab 72} it had a “flat and insipid style.”^{ac 73}

Note that there are very few description-valuations in Chung Hung’s work of the order “This phrase is good” or “This stanza is good.” Specific poems are sometimes referred to as being good. But most description-valuations are made at the level of the third through fifth examples cited immediately above.

Also, one should note the relative determinacy of the qualifying predicates in Chung Hung’s propositions. Some are more indeterminate than others. Compare, for example, the statement, Ts’ao Chih’s (192–232) “diction is flowery and luxuriant,”^{ad 74} with the one that the diction of Chang Han (258–319) and P’an Ni (d. 311) is “loftily beautiful.”^{ae 75} Or compare it with the statement that Hsi K’ang “is excessively severe and sharp.” The latter examples seem more indeterminate.

In deciding what traits to focus on when evaluating a work (or when comparing works), it is crucial to focus on traits that are relevant to the analysis.⁷⁶ Are the traits that Chung Hung perceives in poets’ works the essential ones? It would be necessary to conduct intensive analyses of the complete works of several of the poets treated by Chung Hung in order to confirm or deny that the traits recorded by him are indeed the ones most significant, essential, or revelatory of those poets’ work. (And large parts of the corpus of many of the writers he refers to are no longer extant.)⁷⁷ One can note in partial support of his views, however, that later critics versed in the early poetic tradition often discern the same traits in the authors he treats as being the significant ones (and often come to the same conclusions concerning them).⁷⁸

When focusing on the traits that Chung Hung identifies and the valuation he confers on each, it is important to keep in mind that these traits are not perceived in

v 彥伯詠史，雖文體未適，而鮮明緊健。

w 骨節強于謝混。

x 才章富健。

y 過爲峻切。

z 陸才如海，潘才如江。

aa 中郎仰之，微不逮者矣。

ab 淡乎寡味。

ac 平淡之體。

ad 詞采華茂。

ae 文采高麗。

isolation; they are treated as significant features interrelating as constituent parts of a whole. It is rare, if ever, that these traits are identified in terms that are wholly free of valuational significance (i.e. are purely descriptive).⁷⁹ They are almost always predicated in language which explicitly (or in context) confers value. Yet the degree of value assigned a specific trait by Chung Hung varies from case to case, for the more or less significant features of poetic works differ from author to author.

“Spirit” (*ch’i*), “talent” (*ts’ai*), and “untrammelledness” (*i*) are qualities upon which Chung Hung conferred different values in different contexts. Like all value statements in the arts, these are comprised of “a descriptive proposition which has as its subject the sensible form [of what is being described] or some part of it, and some perceptible trait as its predicate.”⁸⁰ That the terminology used in the above instances might be referential not only to the sensible form of a poet’s work but also to the poet himself (or even his audience) does not make the statements in which they appear any less propositions of value, nor does it render them less validatable in terms of their reference to the poet’s actual work, albeit their level of abstraction renders such validation quite difficult.

Other important aspects focused upon by Chung Hung, such as language and style, are more clearly referential to a poet’s work, or at least to qualities perceived specifically through his work. About poetic expression, Chung Hung notes that Wang Ts’an’s (177–217) is “outstanding”,^{af 81} Pan Chieh-yü’s (48?–6? B.C.) “delicate”;^{ag 82} and that of the Old Poems (*ku shih*) “genial and beautiful.”^{ah 83} Moreover, Lu Chi is said to be “rich in phrasing,”^{ai 84} and Chang Hua (232–300) “clever at using words.”^{aj 85}

In terms of literary style, T’ao Ch’ien’s (365–427) is said to be “spare and limpid, with scarcely a surplus word”;^{ak 86} Kuo P’u’s is “resplendent—scintillating and enjoyable”;^{al 87} and that of Ts’ao Chih “has both refinement and substance.”^{am 88} By way of comparison, the style of Chang Hua is “florid.”^{an 89} And Kuo P’u is spoken of as having “transformed the flat, insipid style of the Yungchia (307–313) period.”^{ao 90}

Chung Hung attaches importance to the thought conveyed by the poet. The Old Poems are “sorrowful and far-reaching in thought.”^{ap 91} And Yen Yen-chih is said to be never frivolous: “to every word, every phrase, he conveys his intent.”^{aq 92} Yet of Hsieh T’iao (464–499) it is noted, “His thoughts are keen but his talents weak.”^{ar 93}

af 文秀。

ag 文綺。

ah 文溫以麗。

ai 詞贍。

aj 巧用文字。

ak 文體省淨，殆無長語。

al 文體相輝，彪炳可翫。

am 體被文質。

an 其體華豔。

ao 始變永嘉平淡之體。

ap 意悲而遠。

aq 一句一字，皆致意焉。

ar 意銳而才弱也。

Poetic figures are mentioned, but not in terms of the “evocative image” (*hsing*), “comparison” (*pi*), and “description” (*fu*) of the first preface (to be cited below).⁹⁴ Of Hsi K'ang it is said, “His poetic figures are clear and far-reaching.”^{as 95} And of Yen Yen-chih, Chung Hung states, “The figures he uses to express feeling are deep and profound.”^{at 96}

Straightforward expression is prized by Chung Hung. The poetry of Juan Chi is implicitly contrasted with the “patched and borrowed” phrases of highly allusive poets: “His words are those of everyday sights and sounds, yet the feelings he expresses go above and beyond the universe. So expansive, his poetry is at one with the spirit of the *Book of Odes*.”^{au 97} This is not to say that simple straightforwardness, unmediated by art, is considered an unqualified plus. Chung Hung says of Ts'ao P'i:

His more than one hundred compositions are generally common and direct, like ordinary dialogue. Only with the ten or so poems including “North and west there are floating clouds,”⁹⁸ which are ample in excellence and enjoyable, does his real skill come to the fore.^{av 99}

Hsi K'ang, moreover, is said to have been “unduly direct in expressing his talent.”^{aw 100} And Hsieh Ling-yün, “who writes down whatever strikes his eye,”^{ax 101} is found guilty of prolixity.

One could go on with citations referring to other traits. But the above examples include some of Chung Hung's most recurrent concerns and serve to illustrate the nature of his statements of descriptive valuation. As one can see, most of these propositions are formulated at a fairly high level of abstraction or inclusiveness, which makes them difficult to validate. One senses that this level of statement, toward which so many of Chung Hung's description-valuations tend, is intended to communicate the nature of its subject, much in the earlier characterological tradition to which it was heir.

The traits Chung Hung notes when characterizing an individual poem or a writer's corpus have valuational significance, but it would be a mistake to rephrase them as normative statements. For example, to take Chung Hung's assertion, laudatory in context, that Hsi K'ang's “poetic figures are clear and far-reaching,” and change it to the proposition, Figures in poetry *should be* clear and far-reaching, would be unwarranted. One can only rephrase Chung's statement as, Metaphors in poetry that are clear and far-reaching are generally conducive to (but by no means necessary to) good poetry. Given the wide range of traits noted with descriptive-*cum*-valuative predicates by Chung Hung, one cannot but be struck by the flexibility of his approach. It reflects the attitude of one who is willing to justify his gradings by

^{as} 託諭清遠。

^{at} 情喻淵深。

^{au} 言在耳目之內，情寄八荒之表，洋洋乎會於風雅。

^{av} 所計百許篇，率皆鄙質如偶語。惟西北

有浮雲十餘首，殊美贍可翫，始見其工矣。

^{aw} 評直露才。

^{ax} 寓目輒書。

identifying and characterizing traits (which others may examine, and either validate or reject).¹⁰²

Normative statements concerning what poetry should be like are found only in the prefaces to *Gradings of Poets*, not in the specific critiques. The implicit standard of value employed by Chung in his actual characterizations stands in an important relationship to the general, normative statements made in the prefaces.

IV

Chung Hung's characterizations implicitly depend upon a standard of evaluation. He himself spoke of the need for such a standard when saying of the contemporary anarchy of taste, "Discussions turn disputatious, and there is no reliable standard"; by implication, he set himself the task of fulfilling the need.

Although Chung Hung's general statements about the nature of poetry and about what constitutes good poetry, which are found in the prefaces to *Gradings of Poets*, are not applied as an explicit standard of measure in his actual characterizations, they form an important backdrop to his system of description-valuations and gradings. The general, normative statements of the prefaces contribute to his definition of poetry; the valuations of poetic traits in the body of the work are generally measured in terms of how well they perform as poetry: poetry being defined in large measure, but not entirely, by the general statements of the prefaces.

In the first of his three prefaces to *Gradings of Poets*, Chung Hung offers a definition of what he considers to be the "perfect poetry":

Poetry has three aspects: evocative image (*hsing*), comparison (*pi*), and description (*fu*). When meaning lingers on, though writing has come to an end, this is an "evocative image." When an object is used to express a sentiment, this is "comparison." And when affairs are recorded directly, the objective world being put into words, this is "description." If one expands these three aspects and uses them judiciously, backing them up with lively force and lending them beauty of coloration, so that those who read from one's work find it inexhaustible and those who hear it are moved, this is the perfect poetry.^{ay 103}

Chung Hung proceeds to stress the need for balance among the above aspects:

If only "comparison" and "evocative image" are used, writing will suffer from density of thought; and when ideas are dense, expression stumbles. If only "description" is employed, writing will suffer from superficiality; and

^{ay} 詩有三義焉：一曰興，二曰比，三曰賦。文已盡而意有餘，興也；因物喻志，比也；直書其事，寓言寫物，賦

也。宏斯三義，酌而用之，幹之以風力，潤之以丹采，使味之者無極，聞之者動心：是詩之至也。

when thought is superficial, language becomes diffuse. Further, if one carelessly drifts back and forth among these, one's writing will be without anchoring and will suffer from prolixity.^{az 104}

This makes for an interesting enough statement of the criteria that make for superlative poetry. But inasmuch as Chung Hung almost never refers to them in the body of his work, where his critiques of individual poets are contained, it is clear that he is not looking to their balanced use as an overt standard of judgment. Rather, in his prefaces he seems in large part to be paying deference to received opinion about what constitutes poetry, specifically to the aforementioned "Great Preface" to the *Book of Odes*.

Chung Hung's standard of judgment is informed most basically by his view of the nature of poetry. His conception of poetry is essentially an expressive one: namely, poetry is the direct and sincere expression of feelings personally experienced:

Vernal breezes and springtime birds, the autumn moon and cicadas in the fall, summer clouds and sultry rains, the winter moon and fierce cold—these are what in the four seasons inspire poetic feeling. At an agreeable banquet, through poetry one can make friendship dearer. When parting, one can put one's chagrin into verse.

When a Ch'u official [Ch'ü Yüan (343–277 B.C.)] is banished—

When a Han consort [Pan Chieh-yü or Wang Chao-chün (fl. 33 B.C.)]
has to leave the palace—

When white bones are strewn across the northern plain,

And souls go chasing tumbleweed—[as in poems by Ts'ao Ts'ao (155–220), Wang Ts'an, and Hsieh Chan (387–421)]

When arms are borne in frontier camps,

And a savage spirit overflows the border—[as in a poem by Chiang Yen (444–505)]

When the frontier traveler has but thin clothing,

And all tears are spent in the widow's chambers—[as in the Old Poems and in Ho Yen's (190–249) verse]

When the ornaments of office are divested and one leaves the court,

Gone, no thought of returning—[as in poems by Chang Hsieh, Yüan Shu (408–453), and Shen Yüeh]

When by raising an eyebrow a woman [Lady Li in Li Yen-nien's (140–87 B.C.) poem] wins imperial favor,

And with a second glance topples the state—

^{az} 若專用比興，患在意深，意深則詞躓。
若但用賦體，患在意浮，意浮則文散，

嬉成流移，文無止泊，有蕪漫之累矣。

These various situations all stir the heart and move the soul. If not put into poetry, how can such sentiments be expressed? If not put into song, how can these emotions be vented? "Poetry teaches the art of sociability; it shows how to regulate feelings of resentment."¹⁰⁵ For giving solace to those in extreme circumstances, and for relieving the distress of those living retired from affairs, there is nothing better than poetry. So it is that among men of letters, there is none who does not take pleasure in it.^{ba 106}

The expressive view of poetry manifested here by Chung Hung is only tempered by the concerns enumerated at the end of his statement and by the pragmatic ends he mentions elsewhere.¹⁰⁷

It is in the same vein that Chung Hung argues forcefully against the use of allusions in poetry, their use being deemed more properly the province of non-belletristic literature:

It has become the standard view that in writing one should use topical allusions. It is true that documents dealing with the ordering of the state should draw upon extensive erudition about ancient matters; and in making known virtuous conduct and in writing point-counterpoint arguments and memorials to the throne, one should explore past accomplishment thoroughly. But when it comes to expressing human feeling and emotion in verse, what is praiseworthy about the use of allusion? [The line by Hsü Kan (170–217)] "Thinking of you is like flowing water" merely relates what struck the eye.¹⁰⁸ [Ts'ao Chih's line] "The high terrace—much sad wind" simply states what was seen.¹⁰⁹ [The line by Chang Hua] "In the clear morning I climb Lung Peak" makes no use of allusion.¹¹⁰ And as for [Hsieh Ling-yün's line] "The bright moon shines on the piled snow,"¹¹¹ could this have been derived from a canonical or historical text? Examine the best expressions past and present; the majority of them are not patched or borrowed. They all derive from the direct pursuit of the subject.

Yen Yen-chih and Hsieh Chuang (421–466), who were especially prolix and dense in the use of allusion, set the temper of their time. No wonder that during the Ta-ming and T'ai-shih reign-periods (457–464 and 465–471) writing virtually became a copybook exercise. More recently, Jen Fang, Wang Jung (467–493), and company did not value originality in diction but were given to outdoing each other in the use of

ba 若乃春風春鳥，秋月秋蟬，夏雲暑雨，冬月祁寒：斯四候之感諸詩者也。嘉會寄詩以觀，離羣託詩以怨。至于楚臣去境，漢妾辭宮；或骨橫朔野，或魂逐飛蓬；或負戈外戍，殺氣雄邊；塞客衣單，孀閨淚盡；或士有解佩出朝，一去

忘返；女有揚蛾入寵，再盼傾國。凡斯種種，感蕩心靈，非陳詩何以展其義，非長歌何以騁其情？故曰：「詩可以羣，可以怨。」使窮賤易安，幽居靡悶，莫尚於詩矣。

novel allusions. From their time on, writers have increasingly made it accepted practice, so that there is not a single plainly worded line and not a single plainly worded phrase; they are all constricted and patched up with allusions. The bane to writing has been great indeed.

A writer with the high-minded goal of artlessness is seldom met with. His language devoid of elevation, a poet feels he might as well pile on allusions. Even then, if he lacks talent, he can at least display his learning. Perhaps this explains the phenomenon.^{bb 112}

Chung Hung's prefatory statement of deep-seated aversion to codified tonal regulations in poetry (regardless of to what extent it may reflect personal animus toward Shen Yüeh, who was closely associated with their formulation) can be seen in the same light.¹¹³ Namely, formalized prosodic regulations are said to interfere with the direct expression of feeling.

In his specific critiques of poets, however, except for the use of allusion, Chung Hung makes no reference to these general, normative criteria of judgment. Even regarding the use of allusion, the normative statement of Chung's preface is not applied deductively as a standard; in his actual critiques the trait is treated as one among many that affect poetic performance. Yen Yen-chih, who is characterized as having "enjoyed allusions,"^{bc 114} and Jen Fang, who is said to have "used allusions at every turn,"^{bd 115} are assigned by Chung Hung to the middle grade of poets. And to judge from his statements in the prefaces about the merit of "direct pursuit [of the subject] (*chih hsün*)" on the part of the author and the violence done to poetry by the dense use of allusion, one would expect Chung Hung to find Hsieh Ling-yün's poetry most wanting, since the opposite traits are discerned in his works. Yet, ascertaining that these traits are part of a greater whole and are in balance with other characteristics, Chung places Hsieh in the upper grade of poets at this higher level of valuation:

Hsieh's poetic origins go back to Ts'ao Chih. Because he mixes in the style of Chang Hsieh, he sets much store on clever resemblance, while surpassing Chang in being unrestrained. Hsieh really suffers from prolixity.

I myself feel that for such a man, whose poetic inspirations are many

^{bb} 夫屬詞比事，乃為通談。若乃經國文符，應資博古；撰德駁奏，宜窮往烈。至乎吟詠情性，亦何貴於用事？「思君如流水，」既是即目；「高臺多悲風，」亦惟所見；「清晨登隴首，」羌無故實；「明月照積雪，」詎出經史。觀古今勝語，多非補假，皆有直尋。顏延，謝莊，尤為鱗密，于時化之。故大明泰始中，文章殆同書

抄。近任昉王元長等，詞不貴奇，競須新事，爾來作者，寢以成俗。遂乃句無虛語，語無虛字，拘攣補衲，蠹文已甚。但自然英旨，罕值其人。詞既失高，則宜加事義。雖謝天才，且表學問，亦一理乎！

^{bc} 喜用古事。

^{bd} 動輒用事。

and whose talent is lofty and extensive—who writes down whatever strikes his eye in such a way that, internally, it is never lacking in thought, and externally, nothing is left out—for such a man, lavishness is quite all right.

To be sure, wonderful strophes and superb couplets do appear here and there, and beautiful allusions and new sounds do incessantly converge. It is like green pines towering out from thick bushes or white jade shining amid dirt and sand—yet they cannot detract from his loftiness and purity.^{bc 116}

The characterization of Hsieh Ling-yün illustrates an important feature of Chung Hung's critical approach. He is apparently willing to see a greater good (in terms of poetic performance) obtaining in a whole composed to a significant degree of parts to which he is not at all well disposed.

The normative statements of the prefaces can be seen as a backdrop to the stage on which Chung Hung carries out actual critiques and gradings of poets. They reflect his general concerns and inevitably play a role in his evaluations. What is striking about the body of *Gradings of Poets* is the degree to which they are absent as explicit criteria of judgment. Even more striking is the degree to which Chung Hung sought to identify specific traits (of the sort indicated earlier in this article) that would justify his general impressions of a writer. These traits are assayed in terms of the degree to which they contribute to making a poem good as poetry: poetry being defined largely by the selfsame general statements of the prefaces, but also in good measure by the characteristics identified in the critiques which were not in those formulations, or which go counter to them, yet in context are deemed contributory to poetic quality.¹¹⁷ This standard of value was suggested in Chung Hung's prefatory statement that poetic expertise can be ascertained as easily as expertise in boardgames like chess. And it is borne out in the body of *Gradings of Poets*—in the characterizations and evaluations of individual poets, and in the comparisons made between poets.

V

Discussion is in order concerning the ways Chung Hung compares one poet with another. There are four general types of comparative valuation in *Gradings of Poets*. First, there is the comparison of two poets in which a shared trait is described in language of a descriptive-valuative nature of the sort cited repeatedly above.

^{bc} 其原出於陳思，雜有景陽之體。故尚巧似，而逸蕩過之，頗以絀富爲累。嶸謂若人興多才高，寓目輒書，內無乏思，外無遺物，其絀富宜哉！然名章迴句，

處處間起，麗典新聲，絡繹奔會。譬猶青松之拔灌木，白玉之映塵沙，未足貶其高絜也。

Where specified, the sensible forms of shared traits are yet at quite a high level of inclusiveness or abstraction. For example, Shen Yüeh's "phrasing is more compact than Fan Yün's (451–503)";^{bf 118} Lu Chi's "expression is inferior to that of Wang Ts'an";^{bg 119} and Lu Chi's "spirit falls short of Liu Chen's."^{bh 120} Where unspecified, sensible forms of a shared trait are referred to only by suggestion, propositions being formulated simply by using a descriptive-valuative predicate; such statements in particular lend themselves to broadly interpreted reference, although in context they normally refer to a writer's work. For example, Chang Hsieh is said to be "more vigorous than P'an Yüeh,"^{bi 121} and Tso Ssu (d. 306?) is characterized as being "more unrefined than Lu Chi."^{bj 122} The most common comparison of this latter sort, however, is the one that X-poet is "less profound" than Y-poet: P'an Yüeh is thus compared unfavorably with both Lu Chi and Tso Ssu,¹²³ and Fan Yün and Ch'iu Ch'ih (464–508) are found wanting beside Chiang Yen.¹²⁴

Secondly, there is comparison of poets by metaphor or simile. The poems of a writer like Ch'iu Ch'ih are said to be "quilted patches charmingly bright, like fallen petals lying on the grass."^{bk 125} This follows directly Chung Hung's characterization of Fan Yün, who is treated in the same critique: "Fan Yün's poems are bracingly nimble and smooth-turning, like a flowing breeze swirling snow."^{bl 126} Aspects of two poets' work can be compared to different objects sharing some class similarity: Lu Chi's talent is likened "to the sea" and P'an Yüeh's "to the Yangtze."¹²⁷ Or two poets' work can be compared to different objects sharing little apparent similarity. Two of the most famous comparisons that appear in *Gradings of Poets*, both of which are quotes from other writers, are of this sort. One is by Hsieh Hun:

P'an Yüeh's verse is resplendent, like embroidery being spread out; it is everywhere beautiful. Reading Lu Chi's writing is like sifting sand to find gold; here and there a gem appears.^{bm 128}

The other is by T'ang Hui-hsiu (fl. 464):

Hsieh Ling-yün's poetry is like lotus flowers coming out of the water; Yen Yen-chih's is like a mix of colors with inlays of gold.^{bn 129}

Although invalidatable as value propositions, such statements are most suggestive. It is probably best to think of them—so popular in the Chinese tradition—as vague concrete approximations, poetically expressed, of traits perceived in a writer's work.¹³⁰

bf 當詞密于范。

bg 文劣於仲宣。

bh 氣少於公幹。

bi 雄於潘岳。

bj 野於陸機。

bk 丘詩點綴映媚，似落花依草。

bl 范詩清便宛轉，如流風迴雪。

bm 潘詩爛若舒錦，無處不佳；陸文如披沙簡金，往往見寶。

bn 謝詩如芙蓉出水，顏如錯采鑲金。

A third type of comparison is that implied by contrasting the lineages ascribed to poets in terms of their style. Chung Hung begins many of his characterizations by stating the putative sources of the writer. Poetic writing is found to derive either directly from the *Book of Odes* or the *Ch'u tz'u* (Songs of the South), or indirectly from one or the other through a family tree of inheritances.¹³¹ Thus, for example, the poetry of Yen Yen-chih is said to derive from that of Lu Chi, which is identified as going back to that of Ts'ao Chih, which in turn is said to be heir to the Kuo-feng (Airs of the States) section of the *Book of Odes*. Usually the farther removed from the founts of the poetic tradition a writer is identified as being, the poorer the grading he is likely to be assigned.¹³² Thus, Ts'ao Chih and Lu Chi are included among the upper-grade poets; Yen Yen-chih is assigned to the middle grade; and Hsieh Chao-tsung (d. 483), who is said to be heir to Yen Yen-chih, is placed in the lower grade. The better the pedigree ascribed to a poet, the better his comparative position vis-à-vis other poets.

There is finally the implicit comparative valuation of poets reflected in their assignment to one of Chung Hung's three grades. Clearly, an upper-grade poet is deemed better than a middle-grade one, and both are held superior to one of the lower grade. Yet too much can be made of these grosser categories as critical tools. As has been repeatedly stressed in this article, the higher the level of abstraction, inclusiveness, or indeterminacy in a value proposition, the less force as a proposition of value it has, and the more diffuse it becomes. Rather, gradings are summary value judgments that serve other ends: e.g. those of trying to persuade the reader as to what priorities to assign in his reading and which authors to emulate in his own writing.

VI

The fact that one can disagree with the assignment of an author to one of Chung Hung's three grades while agreeing with the specifics in his critique of that writer serves only to underscore the value, *qua* criticism, of Chung Hung's approach. Let us take the example of his critique of Hsieh Ling-yün. Should we perceive and validate the same traits in Hsieh Ling-yün's work that Chung Hung found, we are not prohibited from coming to a different conclusion concerning the assignment of the writer to one of the grosser valuative categories. As is the case with any of the poets, the assignment of a grade necessarily depends upon the relative weights one gives the traits found in a writer's work, compared with other such constellations of traits in the writings of other authors. This is underscored in the case of Chung Hung's critique of T'ao Ch'ien. Later critics were dismayed at his being assigned to the middle grade of poets in *Gradings of Poets*;¹³³ yet few disagreed with Chung's specific characterization of the poet:

T'ao's poetry derives from that of Ying Chü, and he shares in the lively forcefulness of Tso Ssu.

His literary style is spare and limpid, with scarcely a surplus word. His earnestness is true and traditional, his verbalized inspirations supple and relaxed. When one reads his works, the fine character of the poet himself comes to mind. Ordinary men admire his unadorned directness. But lines of his like "With happy face I pour the spring-brewed wine,"¹³⁴ and "The sun sets, no clouds are in the sky,"¹³⁵ are pure and refined in the beauty of their air. How can these be merely the words of a farmer? He is the father of recluse poetry past and present.^{bo 136}

One can agree with the characterization while disagreeing with the grade assignment.

Perception and valuation of significant traits is of greater value as criticism than is assignment to a gross value-fraught category, for "general summary judgments are practical in nature, and not instruments of analysis and knowledge."¹³⁷ Yet the practical, rhetorical value of summary judgments cannot be overlooked. The assignment of writers to an upper, middle, or lower grade can serve as an endorsement to insure the survival of works by certain authors; it can act as an incitement to further critical discussion of them; or it can be a prompting to readers and writers to follow certain rankings in their reading and emulation of earlier poets. Chung Hung's *Gradings of Poets* is very much a manifesto of the lattermost sort.

Yet, the assignment of past poets to grosser-level gradings can additionally serve not only as a commendation or criticism of the writers themselves, but also as a commendation or criticism of those among one's contemporaries who emulate or advocate the emulation of their writings. This, too, was surely operative in *Gradings of Poets*.

The question of contemporary implications of the work brings us back to the literary scene of the time, with its social and political factions wherein literary concerns were very much an issue. Much of the import of Chung Hung's work at this level of analysis is now lost. The reader will recall that Chung Hung found earlier seven- and nine-part evaluation schemes wanting when one compared reputations with facts. Yet, in terms of the social and literary history of his own time, it is difficult to assess the degree to which Chung Hung was himself influenced by the current reputations of the poets he graded, or to what extent the favor or disfavor they enjoyed among his powerful contemporaries affected his gradings of them. One suspects that his placement of Hsieh Ling-yün in the upper grade of poets was in large measure owing to the latter's reputation in his age. Moreover, the whole

^{bo} 其原出於應璩，又協左思風力。文體省淨，殆無長語。篤意真古，辭興婉愜；每觀其文，想其人德，世嘆其質直。至

如「歡言酌春酒，」「日暮天無雲，」風華清靡，豈直爲田家語耶！古今隱逸詩人之宗也。

matter of Chung Hung's assigning pedigrees to the poets he treats—of the kind, Hsieh Ling-yün's "poetic origins go back to Ts'ao Chih," or T'ao Ch'ien's "poetry derives from that of Ying Chü"—suggests by implication that the grading assigned an earlier poet is being associated with his latter-day epigones among Chung Hung's contemporaries.

Regardless of the current influences Chung Hung was subject to or the nature of his own biases, *Gradings of Poets* was to survive as a critical work enjoying great prestige long after most of its contemporary implications became obscure. This fact underscores its usefulness as a critical statement read simply in terms of its own argument. One suspects that, when setting about the task of writing *Gradings of Poets*, Chung Hung cast about for categories and descriptive terms to reflect and justify his own intuitive reactions to individual poets. It was to this end that he drew upon the terminology of the earlier characterological tradition. What is significant is that he did not simply discuss poets in terms of his ultimate conclusions about them. Rather, he was intent on putting into words those elements in the poet that led to his reactions; his gradings are justified by the characterizations resulting from these description-valuations. It is this that makes Chung Hung a literary critic.

1. The author wishes to thank the Faculty Grant-in-Aid program of Arizona State University for a summer stipend to complete research on this study, as well as its Center for Asian Studies for assistance in preparing the manuscript. He also wishes to thank Dr. Achilles Fang for prior assistance with the text of the *Shih-p'in*; Dr. Ronald Egan for substantive suggestions for improving an earlier draft of this article, as well as the participants in the 1979 conference on Theories of the Arts in China, especially Dr. Susan Bush; and Dr. Hoyt Tillman, Ms. Gail Gray, Dr. Timothy Wong, Dr. David Knechtges, and Dr. Donald Gibbs for later, mostly editorial, suggestions for improvement.

The text of the *Shih-p'in* cited here is from the edition edited by Ch'en Yen-chieh, *Shih-p'in chu* (*Gradings of Poets Annotated*) (1927; rpt. Taipei, 1958 and 1960). The following additional studies and translations of the *Shih-p'in*, in particular, were consulted in the preparation of this article:

Takamatsu Takaaki (Kōmei), *Shihin shōkai* (Detailed Explication of *Gradings of Poets*) (Hirosaki, 1959).

Kōzen Hiroshi, "Shihin" (*Gradings of Poets*), in *Bungaku ronshū* (A Collection of Discussions of Literature), by Arai Ken and Kōzen Hiroshi (Tokyo, 1972), pp. 1–260 (hereafter cited as Kōzen).

Okamura Shigeru, "Shihin no jo" (The Prefaces to *Gradings of Poets*), in *Bungaku geijutsu ronshū* (A Collection of Discussions of Literature and the Arts), ed. Mekada Makoto (Tokyo, 1974), pp. 221–233.

Takagi Masakazu, *Shō Kō Shihin* (Chung Hung, *Gradings of Poets*) (Tokyo, 1978).

Hellmut Wilhelm, "A Note on Chung Hung and His *Shih-p'in*," in *Wen-lin: Studies in the Chinese Humanities*, ed. Chow Tse-tung (Madison, Wisc., 1968), pp. 111–120.

E. Bruce Brooks, "A Geometry of the Shī Pin," in *ibid.*, pp. 121–150. (hereafter cited as Brooks).

Cha Chu Whan, "On Enquiries for Ideal Poetry: An Instance of Chung Hung," *Tamkang Review* (October, 1975–April, 1976), 6(2) and 7(1): 43–54.

Yeh Chia-ying and Jan W. Walls, "Theory, Standards, and Practice of Criticizing Poetry in Chung Hung's *Shih-p'in*," in *Studies in Chinese Poetry and Poetics*, vol. 1, ed. Ronald C. Miao (San Francisco, 1978), pp. 43–79.

The three prefaces and two of the three sections of gradings in the *Shih-p'in* are translated in full by John Timothy Wixted, "The Literary Criticism of Yüan Hao-wen (1190–1257)," D.Phil. Dissertation, Oxford, 1976, pp. 462–491 (q.v. for an earlier version of translations offered in this study).

All translations of the *Shih-p'in* and other works cited here are by the author, unless otherwise noted.

2. The *Wen-hsin tiao-lung* appears in a complete translation by Vincent Yu-cheng Shih, *The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons* (New York, 1959) (hereafter cited as Vincent Shih), and in a partial translation (five chapters) by Yang Hsien-yi and Gladys Yang, "Carving a Dragon at the Core of Literature," *Chinese Literature*, June, 1962, pp. 58–71.

Western-language studies of the work include the following:

Donald A. Gibbs, "Literary Theory in the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*, Sixth Century Chinese Treatise on the Genesis of Literature and Conscious Artistry," Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington, 1970.

Vincent Y. C. Shih, "Classicism in Liu Hsieh's 'Wen-hsin tiao-lung,'" *Asiatische Studien/Etudes Asiatiques* (1953), 7: 122–134.

Liu Shou-sung, "Liu Hsieh on Writing," *Chinese Literature*, June, 1962, pp. 72–81.

Donald A. Gibbs, "Liu Hsieh, Author of the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*," *MS* (1970–1971), 29: 117–141.

Ferenc Tökei, *Genre Theory in China in the 3rd–6th Centuries* (Budapest, 1971), pp. 81–177.

Chi Ch'iu-lang, "Liu Hsieh as a Classicist and His Concepts of Tradition and Change," *Tamkang Review* (April, 1973), 4(1): 89–108.

Vincent Y. C. Shih, "Liu Hsieh's Conception of Organic Unity," *Tamkang Review* (October, 1973), 4(2): 1–10.

James J. Y. Liu, *Chinese Theories of Literature* (Chicago and London, 1975), *passim*.

Discussion of the title of this work and how it should be translated into English is found in James R. Hightower's review of Vincent Shih's translation, *HJAS* (1959), 22: 284–286; in Achilles Fang's unsigned review of the same work, *The Times Literary Supplement* (London), 4 December 1959, p. 713; in Gibbs, "Literary Theory in the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*," pp. 84–85; and in James J. Y. Liu, *Chinese Theories of Literature*, pp. 146–147. Suggested translations of the title, in addition to those in the titles of the works by Vincent Shih, Yang Hsien-yi and Gladys Yang, and Donald Gibbs cited above, include the following:

E. R. Hughes, "The Literary Mind and Its Carving of Dragons" in *The Art of Letters: Lu Chi's "Wen fu," A.D. 302* (New York, 1951), p. 235.

Chen Shih-hsiang, "Anatomy of the Literary Mind," or "The Carving of the Dragon of the Literary Mind" ("In Search of the Beginnings of Chinese Literary Criticism," in *Semitic and Oriental Studies, A Volume Presented to William Popper on the Occasion of His*

Seventy-fifth Birthday, ed. Walter J. Fischel [University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, 11] [Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951], p. 57).

James R. Hightower, "A Serious and Elegant Treatise on (the Art or Secret of) Literature" (rev. of Vincent Shih, pp. 284, 286).

Achilles Fang, "Dragon-carving on the Core (or Heart) of Literary Art," or "An Elaborate Presentation of the Quintessence of Literature" (rev. of Vincent Shih, p. 713).

Ch'en Shou-yi, "The Carved Dragon of the Literary Mind" (*Chinese Literature: A Historical Introduction* [New York, 1961], p. 227).

James J. Y. Liu, "Dragon Carvings of a Literary Mind" (*The Art of Chinese Poetry* [London, 1962], p. 71).

Donald Gibbs, "The Genesis and Artistry of Literature" ("Literary Theory in the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*," p. 85).

James J. Y. Liu, "The Literary Mind: Elaborations" (*Chinese Theories of Literature*, pp. 21, 146-147).

The discussions by James R. Hightower, Achilles Fang, and James J. Y. Liu (in his latter work) are most apropos; hence the title is here rendered "Elaborations on the Essence of Literature."

3. Hsiao T'ung's preface to the *Wen hsüan* is discussed and translated by James R. Hightower, "The *Wen hsüan* and Genre Theory," *HJAS* (1957), 20:512-533; rpt. in *Studies in Chinese Literature*, ed. John L. Bishop (Harvard-Yenching Institute Series 21) (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), pp. 142-163. An abridged form of the article (including the complete translation) appears as the "Introduction" to Erwin von Zach, *Die Chinesische Anthologie*, ed. Ilse Martin Fang (Harvard-Yenching Institute Series 18) (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), pp. xiii-xvii.

4. Hsü Ling's preface to the *Yü-t'ai hsün-yung* is translated by James R. Hightower, "Some Characteristics of Parallel Prose," in *Studia Serica Bernhard Karlgren Dedicata*, ed. Søren Egerod and Else Glahn (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 77-87; rpt. in *Studies in Chinese Literature*, ed. John L. Bishop, pp. 125-135.

5. Brooks, p. 122. The date of the compilation of the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung* is problematic.

6. John Marney, *Liang Chien-wen Ti* (Boston, 1976), p. 14. For discussion of literary groups or cliques of the Liang period, see Morino Shigeo, "Ryōsho no bungaku shūdan" (Literary Groups of the Early Liang), *Chūgoku bungaku hō* (October, 1966), 21:83-108; and Morino Shigeo, "Ryō no bungaku shūdan—Taishi Kō no shūdan o chūshin to shite" (Literary Groups in the Liang Period: Chiefly Prince Kang's Group), *Nihon Chūgoku Gakkai hō* (1968), 20:109-124.

7. Marney, *Liang Chien-wen Ti*, p. 76.

8. *Liang shu* (History of the Liang Dynasty) 49, pp. 694-697, and *Nan shih* (History of the Southern Dynasties) 72, pp. 1778-1779. (All citations of the dynastic histories are to the Chung-hua shu-chü ed. [Peking, 1959-].) Chung Hung's biography, except for a memorial on the position of military officials and quotation of the first preface to the *Shih-p'in*, is translated in full by Wilhelm, "A Note on Chung Hung," pp. 111-114. Note the suggested corrections to his translation by J. D. Jonker, rev. of *Wen-lin: Studies in the Chinese Humanities*, ed. Chow Tse-tsung, *TP* (1973), 59:279-281.

9. *Nan shih* 72, p. 989. Discussion of the charge is found in Takamatsu, pp. 182-186;

Wilhelm, pp. 114–115; Brooks, pp. 147–148; Kōzen, pp. 17–18; Takagi, p. 298; and Ch'ai Fei-fan, "Chung Hung Shih-p'in yü Shen Yüeh" (Chung Hung's *Gradings of Poets* and Shen Yüeh), *Chung-wai wen-hsiieh* (1975), 3(10): 58–65.

10. *Shih-p'in chu*, pp. 5–6; Takamatsu, pp. 16–17; Kōzen, pp. 56–57; Okamura, p. 225; and Takagi, pp. 86–87. Cf. the translation (complete) by Brooks, pp. 124–125, and (partial) by Yeh and Walls, pp. 44–45.

For the Tzu and Sheng rivers, see A. C. Graham, trans. *The Book of Lieh-tzu* (London, 1960; rpt. 1973), p. 84.

Purple vying with vermilion is an allusion to the *Lun-yü* (Analects): *Lun-yü yin-te* (A Concordance to the Analects of Confucius) (Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series 16) (Peking, 1940; rpt. Taipei, 1966), 17:16, p. 36. Cf. the translations by James Legge, *Confucian Analects*, in *The Chinese Classics*, 5 vols. (rev. ed. Oxford, 1893–1895; rpt. Hong Kong, 1960). 1:326; and by Arthur Waley, *The Analects of Confucius* (London, 1938; rpt. New York, n.d.), p. 214.

11. This work appears in complete Western-language translations by five different scholars:

Georges Margouliès, *Le "Fou" dans le Wen-siuan: étude et textes* (Paris, 1926), pp. 82–97 (cf. Erwin von Zach, "Zu G. Margouliès' Uebersetzung des Wen-fu," *TP* [1928], 25: 360–364). A considerably revised version appears in the author's *Anthologie raisonnée de la littérature chinoise* (Paris, 1948), pp. 419–425.

B. M. Alexéiev's Russian rendition appears in the *Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS* (Classe des sciences littéraires et linguistiques) (1944), 3(4): 143–164.

Chen Shih-hsiang, "Essay on Literature," in *Literature as Light against Darkness* (National Peking University Semicentennial Papers 11) (Peking, 1948), pp. 46–71. A later version appears in *Essay on Literature, Written by the Third-Century Chinese Poet Lu Chi, Translated by Shih-hsiang Chen in the Year MCMXLVIII (Revised 1952)* (Portland, Maine, 1953), pp. xix–xxx; rpt. in *Anthology of Chinese Literature, From Earliest Times to the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Cyril Birch (New York, 1965; rpt. Harmondsworth, 1967), pp. 222–232.

Hughes, *Art of Letters*, pp. 94–108 (cf. the review by Achilles Fang, *HJAS* [1951], 14: 615–636).

Achilles Fang, "Rhymeprose on Literature: The *Wen-fu* of Lu Chi (A.D. 261–303)," *HJAS* (1951), 14: 527–566; rpt. in *Studies in Chinese Literature*, ed. John L. Bishop, pp. 3–42.

(The best translations are those by Chen Shih-hsiang and Achilles Fang.)

Note also the following four Western-language articles on the *Wen fu*:

Chen Shih-hsiang, "Lu Chi's Life and the Correct Date of His 'Essay on Literature'" and "Some Discussion of the Translation," in *Literature as Light against Darkness*, pp. 1–21, 22–45 (not reprinted).

Chou Ju-ch'ang "An Introduction to Lu Chi's *Wen Fu*," *Studia Serica* (1950), 9: 42–65.

Sister Mary Gregory Knoerle, "The Poetic Theories of Lu Chi, with a Brief Comparison with Horace's 'Ars Poetica,'" *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* (Winter, 1966), 25(2): 137–143.

12. Takagi (p. 106) is followed here for the interpretation of *shu* 疎 in this passage.

Li Ch'ung's *Han-lin lun* survives only in fragments. It is referred to in the "Ching-chih" (Monograph on Literature) of the *Sui shu* (History of the Sui Dynasty) (35, p. 1082) as

being a three-*chüan* work in the Sui, but as having been a 54-*chüan* work in the Liang. See Yen K'o-chün, *Ch'üan Shang-ku San-tai Ch'in Han San-kuo Liu-ch'ao wen* (Complete Prose Writing of Ancient Antiquity, the Three Dynasties, the Ch'in and Han Dynasties, the Three Kingdoms, and the Six Dynasties) (1894; Peking, 1958; rpt. 1965), p. 1767 (*Ch'üan Chin wen* [Complete Prose Writing of the Chin Dynasty], 53:9a-b); these passages are reprinted, with additional fragments and sources, in Hsü Wen-yü, *Wen-lun chiang-su* (Essays on Literature Explicated) (Nanking, 1937), pp. 59-65.

For studies of the work, see Toda Kōgyō, "Ri Chū no *Kanrinron* ni tsuite" (Concerning Li Ch'ung's *Discourse on the Forest of Writing Brushes*), *Daitō bunka* (July, 1937), 16:78-85; and Ch'eng Hung, "Han-lin lun tso-che chih-i" (An Inquiry into the Author of the *Discourse on the Forest of Writing Brushes*), *Wen shih* (October, 1962), 1:44.

13. Although a certain *Hung pao* is mentioned as being a ten-*chüan* work in the "Monograph on Literature" of the *Sui shu* (34, p. 1008), it is no longer extant.

For an early ninth-century critic's citation of a Sui dynasty work which, in turn, cites a sixth-century author's comments on the *Hung pao*, see Richard Wainwright Bodman, "Poetics and Prosody in Early Medieval China: A Study and Translation of Kūkai's *Bunkyo hifuron*," Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell, 1978, p. 254.

14. The parallelism of this passage strongly suggests that Yen Yen-chih's "discussion of literature" is in fact the title of a work, "On Literature"; but no piece by this title exists. Perhaps Chung Hung is referring to Yen Yen-chih's *T'ing kao* (Household Announcements), fragments of which having literary interest can be found in the following: *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* (Imperial Readings from the T'ai-p'ing Period) (Nan-hai Li shih ed., 1892) 586:2b-3c, 608:4b-5a, and 609:7a; Yen K'o-chün, pp. 2634-2637 (*Ch'üan Sung wen* [Complete Prose Writing of the Liu-Sung Dynasty] 36:4a-10b); and Ma Kuo-han, *Yü-han shan-fang chi-i-shu* (Lost Books Restored in Fragments at the Yü-han Mountain Studio) (1871 ed.; rpt. Taipei, 1967), pp. 2326-2328.

Yen Yen-chih's literary criticism is referred to by Liu Hsieh in the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*: Wang Li-ch'i, ed., *Wen-hsin tiao-lung hsin-shu fu t'ung-chien* (Index du *Wen sin tiao lung*, avec texte critique) (Centre franco-chinois d'études sinologiques 15) (Peking, 1952; rpt. Taipei, 1968), 44, p. 114 (ll. 6ff.) (hereafter cited as *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*). Cf. the translations by Vincent Shih, p. 230; Kōzen Hiroshi, *Bunshin chōryū* (Elaborations on the Essence of Literature) (the second part of a double volume, the first part being by Ikkai Tomoyoshi, *Tō Emmei* [T'ao Yüan-ming]) (Tokyo, 1968), p. 416; Mekada Makoto, "Bunshin chōryū" (Elaborations on the Essence of Literature), in *Bungaku geijutsu ronshū*, ed. Mekada Makoto, p. 181; and Li Ching-jung, *Wen-hsin tiao-lung hsin-chieh* (New Explication of *Elaborations on the Essence of Literature*) (Tainan, 1968), p. 358.

15. Chih Yü's "treatise on literature" refers to the *Wen-chang liu-pieh chih lun* (Discussion and Notes for Literature Divided by Genre), drawn from material appended to his now lost anthology, the *Liu-pieh chi* (A Collection [of Literature] Divided by Genre): see the "Monograph on Literature" of the *Sui shu* (35, pp. 1081-1082).

Fragments of the work are assembled and their sources identified by Hsü Wen-yü, pp. 67-84. These are translated by Joseph Roe Allen III, "Chih Yü's *Discussion of Different Types of Literature*: A Translation and Brief Comment," in *Two Studies in Chinese Literary Criticism*, by Joseph Roe Allen III and Timothy S. Phelan, *Parerga* 3 (Seattle, 1976), pp. 3-36.

See also Kōzen Hiroshi, "Shi Gu *Bunshō ryūbetsu shiron kō*" (A Study of Chih Yü's *Discussion and Notes for Literature Divided by Genre*), in *Iriya kyōju Ogawa kyōju taikyū kinen Chūgoku bungaku gogaku ronshū* (*Studies on Chinese Literature and Linguistics Dedicated to Profs. Iriya Yoshitaka and Ogawa Tamaki on Their Retirement from Kyoto University*) (Kyoto, 1974), pp. 285–299; and Tōkei, *Genre Theory*, pp. 79–80.

16. Nothing remains of the three poetic anthologies by Hsieh Ling-yün cited in the "Monograph on Literature" of the *Sui shu* (35, p. 1084).

17. The *Wen-shih chuan* is frequently cited in P'ei Sung-chih's notes to the *San-kuo chih* (Record of the Three Kingdoms) and in Liu Chün's commentary to the *Shih-shuo hsün-yü* (A New Account of Tales of the World). But whereas the "Monograph on Literature" in the *Chiu T'ang shu* (Old History of the T'ang Dynasty) (46, p. 2004) as well as that in the *Hsin T'ang shu* (New History of the T'ang Dynasty) (58, p. 1481) refer to its author as Chang Chih, the *Sui shu* "Monograph on Literature" (33, p. 976) and P'ei Sung-chih (e.g. *San-kuo chih* 9, p. 280) refer to him as Chang Yin.

The work as we know it is not, as Chung Hung says, an anthology, but rather a series of biographical synopses. Perhaps these were followed by excerpts of the writers' works, in some now unknown edition.

18. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 7; Takamatsu, pp. 45–48; Kōzen, pp. 66–70; Okamura, p. 230; and Takagi, pp. 104–111. Cf. the translation (of two phrases) by Bodman, p. 258.

Compare Chung Hung's final comment with the statement Liu Hsieh makes after enumerating the works of earlier critics: "Each of these reflects a particular corner of the field; few have even envisioned the whole open vista" (*Wen-hsin tiao-lung* 50: 128 [line 10], trans. Vincent Shih, p. 5; cf. the translation by Kōzen, *Bunshin chōryū*, p. 452; Mekada, *Bungaku*, p. 210; Li Ching-jung, *Wen-hsin* p. 428; and Kuo Chin-hsi, *Wen-hsin tiao-lung i-chu shih-pa p'ien* [Translation and Commentary for Eighteen Chapters of *Elaborations on the Essence of Literature*] [Hong Kong, 1964; rpt. 1966], pp. 234–235). From the critiques that follow, it is clear that Liu Hsieh laments the fact that earlier critics fundamentally fail to examine the basic nature of literature, whereas Chung Hung is unhappy that critics have failed to discuss individual works and authors.

19. Omissions from Chung Hung's list include the following three works:

Ts'ao P'i, *Tien-lun Lun-wen* ("Essay on Literature" in *Classical Treatises*), in *Wen hsüan* (Literary Selections) (Hu K'o-chia, ed., 1809; rpt. Taipei, 1971) 52: 6b–8a. The work appears in complete translations by Hughes, pp. 231–234; Ronald Miao, "Literary Criticism at the End of the Eastern Han," *Literature East & West* (1972), 16: 1016–1026; and Donald Holzman, "Literary Criticism in China in the Early Third Century A.D.," *Asiatische Studien/Etudes Asiatiques* (1974), 28(2): 128–131. For an informative study of the background to Ts'ao P'i's work, see Burton Watson, "Literary Theory in the Eastern Han," in *Yoshikawa hakase taikyū kinen Chūgoku bungaku ronshū* (*Studies in Chinese Literature Dedicated to Dr. Yoshikawa Kōjirō on His Sixty-fifth Birthday*) (Tokyo, 1968), pp. 1–13 (separate pagination). Note also T'an Chia-chien, "Shih-t'an Ts'ao P'i ti Tien-lun Lun-wen" (An Examination into Ts'ao P'i's "Essay on Literature" in *Classical Treatises*), *Hsin chien-she* (1964/2), pp. 93–102. P'ei Tzu-yeh, *Tiao-ch'ung lun* (Treatise on Carving Insects), in Yen K'o-chün, p. 3262 (*Ch'üan Liang wen* 53: 15b–16b). For studies of the work, see Hayashida Shinnosuke, "Hai Shiya *Chōchūron kōshō*—Rikuchō ni okeru fukko bungakuron no kōzō"

(Some Thoughts on the “Treatise on Carving Insects” by P’ei Tzu-yeh: A Restorative Theory of Literature in the Six Dynasties Period), *Nihon Chūgoku Gakkai hō* (1968), 20:125–139; and John Marney, “P’ei Tzu-yeh: A Minor Literary Critic of the Liang Dynasty,” *Selected Papers in Asian Studies*, vol. 1 (Western Conference of the Association for Asian Studies, Boulder, Colorado, October 10–11, 1975) (Albuquerque, 1976), pp. 161–171. Hayashida marshals evidence to assign authorship of the work to the 490s instead of the traditionally accepted date of 527–528. Thus the work would predate the major critical writings of the Liang.

Liu Hsieh, *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*. The omission of this work, so conspicuous by its absence, is “a self-conscious Confucian criticism-by-omission, a well-established historical technique in the *Spring and Autumn* [Annals] [*Ch’un-chiu*], as then understood” (Brooks, p. 139). See Gibbs, “Liu Hsieh,” p. 131, for the work’s cool contemporary reception. For a comparison of Liu Hsieh’s opus with that of Chung Hung, see Kōzen Hiroshi, “*Bunshin chōryū to Shihin no bungakukan no tairitsu*” (The Contrasting Literary Views of *Elaborations on the Essence of Literature and Gradings of Poets*), in *Yoshikawa hakase taikyū kinen Chūgoku bungaku ronshū*, pp. 271–288; Wilhelm, pp. 117–119; and Brooks, pp. 138–139.

20. *Shih-p’in chu*, p. 6; Takamatsu, pp. 18–19; Kōzen, p. 57; Okamura, p. 225; and Takagi, pp. 87–89. Cf. the translation by Brooks, p. 125, and Yeh and Walls, p. 45.

Liu Hui, whose biography appears in the *Nan Ch’i shu* (History of the Southern Ch’i Dynasty) (48:841–843), was a minor poet assigned to the “lower grade” of poets by Chung Hung (see *Shih-p’in chu*, p. 40; Takamatsu, pp. 122–123; Kōzen, pp. 248–250; and Takagi, pp. 372–376).

21. Only writers of *shih* poetry who are no longer living are treated in his work: “Since it is only deceased poets whose work can be properly evaluated, no one who is still alive is treated here” (*Shih-p’in chu*, p. 6; Takamatsu, p. 42; Kōzen, pp. 61–62; and Takagi, pp. 95–96).

22. *Shih-p’in chu*, p. 6; Takamatsu, pp. 18–20; Kōzen, pp. 57–59; Okamura, p. 226; and Takagi, pp. 89–90.

The comparison of “guests” (i.e. reputations) with facts is an allusion to the *Chuang Tzu: Chuang-tzu yin-te* (A Concordance to Chuang Tzu) (Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series, Supplement No. 20) (Peking, 1947; rpt. Cambridge, Mass., 1956), 1:2 (line 25); cf. the translation by Burton Watson, *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* (New York and London, 1968), p. 32.

23. *Han shu* 30:1701. For fragments of the *Ch’i lüeh*, see Yen K’o-chün, pp. 351–353 (*Ch’üan Han wen* [Complete Prose Writing of the Han Dynasty] 41:4b–7a); and Ma Kuo-han, pp. 2382–2388.

24. *Han shu* 20:861. Pan Ku cites *Lun-yü* 6:21 (p. 11), where Confucius speaks of men “above the middling sort” and “below the middling sort” (trans. Waley, p. 119; cf. Legge, 1:191), and *Lun-yü* 7:2 (p. 35), where he speaks of the “wise of the highest class” and the “stupid of the highest class” (trans. Legge, 1:318; cf. Waley, p. 209).

25. The citations are from the *Wei lüeh* (Summary of the Wei Dynasty), as quoted in *San-kuo chih* 23:661, and from the *Tzu-chih t’ung-chien* (A Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government) (Peking, 1956 ed.), 69:2178. Both translations are by Achilles Fang, *The Chronicle of the Three Kingdoms (220–265)*, vol. 1 (Harvard-Yenching Institute Series 6)

(Cambridge, Mass., 1952), pp. 25 and 5. Hu San-hsing (1230–1287) states in his commentary to the *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien* passage that this marks the beginning of the system of grading officials. For studies of this system, see Donald Holzman, “Les Débuts du système médiéval de choix et de classement des fonctionnaires: Les Neuf Catégories et l'Impérial et Juste,” *Mélanges publiés par l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises* (Paris, 1957), pp. 387–414; Miyazaki Ichisada, *Kyūhin kanjinhō no kenkyū: Kakyō zenshi* ([Colophon title] The Mechanism of the Aristocracy in China: Installation of mandarins before the establishment of the competitive examination system) (Kyoto, 1956); and Miyakawa Hisayuki, *Rikuchōshi kenkyū* (Researches into Six Dynasties History) (Tokyo, 1956), pp. 263–335.

26. See n. 19.

27. Hightower, “*Wen hsüan* and Genre Theory,” pp. 143–144. See also Wang Yao, *Chung-ku wen-hsüeh ssu-hsiang* (Medieval Literary Thought) (1951; rpt. Hong Kong, 1973), pp. 124–152.

28. Kōzen, p. 13. William Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms* (London, 1937; rpt. Taipei, 1962), p. 229.

29. Trans. J. K. Shryock, *The Study of Human Abilities: The Jen wu chih of Liu Shao* (American Oriental Series 11) (New Haven, 1937; rpt. New York, 1966).

30. Richard B. Mather, “Introduction,” *Shih-shuo Hsin-yü: A New Account of Tales of the World* (Minneapolis, 1976), pp. xxii–xxiii.

31. E. Zürcher, “Recent Studies in Chinese Painting,” rev. of *Some T'ang and Pre-T'ang Texts on Chinese Painting*, by W. R. B. Acker, *TP* (1964), 51:381.

32. Trans. Richard B. Mather (see n. 30), and Bruno Belpaire, *Anthologie chinoise des Ve et VIe siècles: Le “Che-chouo-sin-yu” par Lieou (Tsuen) Hiao-piao* (Paris, 1974). Chapter titles here follow Mather's translation.

33. The preface to Shen Yüeh's *Ch'i-p'in* is found in Yen K'o-chün, pp. 3123–3124 (*Ch'üan Liang wen* [Complete Prose Writing of the Liang Dynasty], 30:2b–3a).

Liu Hui's work is referred to in one of his official biographies as a three-*chüan* work: *Nan shih* 38, p. 989. (Note that this Liu Hui is different from the one referred to in n. 20.)

34. Hsieh Ho's work is found in Yen K'o-chün, pp. 2931–2932 (*Ch'üan Ch'i wen* [Complete Prose Writing of the Ch'i Dynasty], 25:7a–10a), and in *Mei-shu ts'ung-shu* (A Fine Arts Collectanea) (Shanghai, 1923; rpt. Taipei, 1975), 3(6):103–110. Note also the annotated edition by Yü Chien-hua, *Chung-kuo hua-lun lei-pien* (Chinese Painting Theory by Categories) (Peking, 1957; rpt. Taipei, 1975), pp. 355–367.

The *Ku hua-p'in lu* is translated in its entirety by William R. B. Acker, *Some T'ang and Pre-T'ang Texts on Chinese Painting* (Leiden, 1954), pp. 1–32. For a comparative table of five well-known English translations of the “six laws” of painting by Hsieh Ho (which appear in this work), see Michael Sullivan, *The Birth of Landscape Painting in China* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1962), pp. 106–107 (translations are by Osvald Sirén, Arthur Waley, Shio Sakani-shi, Alexander Soper, and William Acker). Other more recent translations of the six laws appear in Edward Schafer, *Ancient China* (New York, 1967), pp. 111–123; Lin Yutang, *The Chinese Theory of Art* (New York, 1967), pp. 34–38; and Su Gin-djih, *Chinese Architecture: Past and Contemporary* (Hong Kong, 1964), p. 247. Note the additional works referred to by Lin Yutang, as well as the discussion and annotation in the following: James Cahill, “The Six Laws and How to Read Them,” *AO* (1961), 4:372–381; Wen Fong, “*Ch'i-yün-sheng-tung*:

‘Vitality, Harmonious Manner and Aliveness,’” *OA* (1966), n.s. 12:159–164; Wen Fong, “The First Principle of Hsieh Ho,” *NPMQ* (1967), 1:7–18; and Susan Bush, *The Chinese Literati on Painting: Su Shih (1037–1101) to Tung Ch’i-ch’ang (1555–1636)* (Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies 27) (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), pp. 15–18.

35. See Yen K’o-chün, pp. 3343–3345 (*Ch’üan Liang wen* 66:6a–9b), or *Fa-shu yao-lu* (Essential Recordings on Calligraphy) (*I-shu ts’ung-pien* ed.) 2:26b–32a.

Note the following two studies of this work by Shirakawa Yoshio: “Ryō Yu Kengo *Shohin* no jobun oyobi ryakuron no kenkyū, Sono ichi” (A Study of the Preface and Short Comments in the *Gradings of Calligraphers* by Yü Chien-wu of the Liang, pt. 1), *Ōita Daigaku Kyōikugakubu kenkyū kiyō* (1977), 5(2):1–10; and “Ryō Yu Kengo *Shohin* kenkyū (A Study of *Gradings of Calligraphers* by Yü Chien-wu of the Liang), *Kokugo no kenkyū* (Ōita Daigaku) (1977), 10:105–115 [pt. 1].

36. See Yen K’o-chün, p. 3228 (*Ch’üan Liang-wen* 48:31b–32b), or *Fa-shu yao-lu* 2:32a–33b.

37. *Shih-p’in chu*, p. 6; Takamatsu, pp. 18–20; Kōzen, pp. 57–59; Okamura, p. 226; and Takagi, pp. 89–90. Cf. the translation (partial) by Cha Chu Whan, p. 43.

38. Yen K’o-chün, p. 615 (*Ch’üan Hou-Han wen* [Complete Prose Writing of the Later Han Dynasty], 26:8b); cf. the translation by Joseph Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China*, vol. 4: Physics and Physical Technology, pt. 1: Physics (Cambridge, 1962), p. 322.

Chess (called *i* 奕 by northerners and *ch’i* 碁 by southerners, according to Pan Ku in the same essay) is called *go* in Japanese. The object of the game, with 150 pieces on each side, is to surround an opponent’s pieces and occupy as many cross-points as possible. For an excellent bibliography of Western-language studies of the game, see Needham, 4(1):319.

39. *Ibid.*, 4(1):327.

40. *Ibid.*, 4(1):321, 315 and 326–327. See also Donald J. Harper, “The Han Cosmic Board (*Shih* 式),” *Early China* (1978–1979), 4:1–10.

41. *Wen-hsin tiao-lung* 1:1–3. This chapter is translated into English, with a helpful commentary, by Gibbs, “Literary Theory in the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*,” pp. 42–57, 179–193. Cf. the complete translation by Vincent Shih, pp. 8–13, and Hughes, *Art of Letters* pp. 236–240; and the partial translation by B. Alexéiev, *La Littérature chinoise: Six conférences au Collège de France et au Musée Guimet* (Paris, 1937), pp. 24–27; Francis Woodman Cleaves, trans., L. Z. Ejdlin, “The Academician V. M. Alexeev as a Historian of Chinese Literature,” *HJAS* (1947), 10:51–52; and James J. Y. Liu, *Chinese Theories of Literature*, pp. 21–25, 146–148. Cf. also the translations into Japanese by Kōzen, *Bunshin chōryū*, pp. 209–213, and Mekada *Bungaku*, pp. 3–7; and into modern Chinese by Kuo Chin-hsi, *Wen-hsin*, pp. 1–13, and Li Ching-jung, *Wen-hsin* pp. 1–9.

42. Gibbs, “Literary Theory in the *Wen-hsin tiao-lung*,” pp. 54–57. The terms “expressive, pragmatic, mimetic, and objective” are used by M. H. Abrams to distinguish orientations in critical theory (i.e. orientations toward the artist, the audience, the subject [or universe], or the work itself): *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (London, Oxford and New York, 1953; rpt. 1976), pp. 3–29.

43. *Shih-p’in chu*, p. 1; Takamatsu, pp. 1–2; Kōzen, pp. 22–25; Okamura, p. 233; and Takagi, pp. 31–35. Cf. the translations (complete) by Wilhelm, p. 118, and Bodman, p. 69 (cf. p. 265); and (partial) by Brooks, p. 135; Yeh and Walls, p. 50; and Wong Siu-kit, “*Ch’ing* in Chinese Literary Criticism,” D. Phil. Dissertation, Oxford, 1969, p. 15.

For a discussion of *ch'i* 氣 in earlier Chinese poetics, see David Pollard, "Ch'i in Chinese Literary Theory," in *Chinese Approaches to Literature from Confucius to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao*, ed. Adele Austin Rickett (Princeton, 1978), pp. 43-66; James J. Y. Liu, *Chinese Theories of Literature*, pp. 12, 70-72; and Yeh and Walls, pp. 61-62.

For discussion of the word *shih* 詩 ("poetry"), see Chen Shih-hsiang, "In Search of the Beginnings of Chinese Literary Criticism," pp. 45-63; Chow Tse-tsung, "The Early History of the Word *Shih* (Poetry)," in *Wen-lin: Studies in the Chinese Humanities*, ed. Chow Tse-tsung, pp. 151-209; and Chow Tse-tsung, "Ancient Chinese Views on Literature, the *Tao*, and Their Relationship," *CLEAR* (January, 1979), 1(1): 3-29.

44. See the following translations of the "Great Preface": (complete) by James Legge, *The She King, or The Book of Poetry*, in *The Chinese Classics*, 4:34-37, and Ferenc Tökei, *Naissance de l'épique chinoise. K'iu Yuan et son époque* (Paris, 1967), pp. 85-87; (nearly complete) by Donald Gibbs, "M. H. Abrams' Four Artistic Co-ordinates Applied to Literary Theory in Early China," *Comparative Literature Today: Theory and Practice* (Proceedings of the 7th Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association, Montreal and Ottawa, 1973) (Budapest, 1979), pp. 675-679; and (partial) by James J. Y. Liu, *Chinese Theories of Literature*, pp. 64, 69, 111-112, 119-120, and Bodman, pp. 65-67, 467.

45. *Shih-shuo hsün-yü* (SPTK ed.; rpt. Taipei, n.d.) 5 and 6, pp. 58, 59, 63; cf. the translation by Mather, pp. 171, and 179, 183, 192.

46. Yen K'o-chün, p. 2951 (*Ch'üan Liang wen* 1: 7a).

47. With *technē* (or *ars*), the conative (i.e. the exertive, which impels one toward action) dominates the cognitive (here, knowledge to do or make); the term is distinguished from *epistēmē* (or *scientia*), the disinterested exercise of intelligence, where the cognitive has become disengaged from the conative.

48. *Wen-hsin tiao-lung* 44: 115 (l. 5). Cf. the translations by Vincent Shih, p. 231; Kōzen, *Bunshin chōryū*, p. 417; Mekada, *Bungaku*, p. 183; and Li Ching-jung, *Wen-hsin*, pp. 359-360.

49. *Wen-hsin tiao-lung* 44: 115 (ll. 7-9). Cf. the translations by Vincent Shih, p. 232; Kōzen, *Bunshin chōryū*, p. 417; Mekada, *Bungaku* p. 183; and Li Ching-jung, *Wen-hsin*, p. 360.

50. Zürcher, p. 381. Note also the examples he cites and translates (*ibid.*) from *Shih-shuo hsün-yü* 8, pp. 75 (two), 79; cf. the translations by Mather, pp. 224, 226, 237.

51. Ssu-ma Ch'ien, when writing about Confucius and Ch'ü Yüan, said he could imagine what sort of men they were from their writings (*Shih chi* [Records of the Historian], 49, p. 1947 and 84, p. 2503); the latter passage is translated by Burton Watson, *Records of the Grand Historian of China: Translated from the Shih chi of Ssu-ma Ch'ien* [New York and London, 1958], 2 vols., 1: 516; cf. Burton Watson, "Ssu-ma Ch'ien's Theory of Literature," in *Ssu-ma Ch'ien: Grand Historian of China* [New York, 1958], pp. 154-158).

Yang Hsiung, in his *Fa-yen* (Model Sayings), wrote: "Spoken words are the sounds of the mind, and written words are the images of the mind. When words and images take form, it becomes evident whether one is a gentleman or an ordinary man" (*Fa-yen* [SPPY ed.] 5:3b-4a; cf. the translations by E. von Zach, *Yang Hsiung's "Fa-yen" (Worte strenger Ermahnung): Ein philosophischer Traktat aus dem Beginn der christlichen Zeitrechnung* [Sinologische Beiträge (1939), 4(1); rpt. San Francisco, 1976], pp. 23-24; Bruno Belpaire, *Le Catechisme philosophique de Yang Hiong-tsé: Le "Fa-yen" de Yang Hiong-tsé* [Brussels, 1957?], pp. 44-45; and David Knechtges, *The Han Rhapsody: A Study of the "Fu" of Yang Hsiung (53 B.C.-A.D. 18)* [Cambridge, 1976], p. 94).

For additional translations of this Yang Hsiung passage and discussion of its use in Sung dynasty texts on painting and calligraphy, see James F. Cahill, "Confucian Elements in the Theory of Painting," in *The Confucian Persuasion*, ed. Arthur Wright (Stanford, 1960), p. 130, and Bush, *Chinese Literati*, pp. 20, 73. For examples of Sung dynasty allusion to Yang Hsiung's statement in which the basic argument is transformed, see Wixted, "Yüan Hao-wen," pp. 131–139 (and 395–397, 619–620).

As E. B. Brooks notes, "In Jūng Húng's [Chung Hung's] literary program . . . portability of style is a kind of personal insincerity—an attitude toward style as something exterior and alienable, rather than the direct and inevitable imprint of the personality itself. . . . [F]ault, then, lay in possessing a style that was *not* the man" (p. 131). (Brooks makes this point in reference to Chung's critiques of Chiang Yen and T'ao Ch'ien.)

To illustrate the nature of Six Dynasties criticism, Zürcher draws the following comparison between traditional Chinese and modern Western critical attitudes: "If a modern Western critic, when invited to characterize in a few words the *paintings* of Rubens, would say 'Powerful and impetuous, he let his mind dwell on the exuberant beauty of Nature; harmonious and of classic elegance, his overflowing vitality appears from every movement of his brush,' adding, by way of further elucidation, that 'his manners were in no way inferior to those of the Ancients,' his public would hardly feel satisfied. To the medieval Chinese, it would have been a perfectly admissible piece of art criticism: a comment on the *character and personality* of an 'ancient worthy,' as observed through his works" (p. 382).

52. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 14; Takamatsu, pp. 28–29; Kōzen, pp. 102–103; and Takagi, pp. 159–161. Cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, p. 58.

53. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 29; Takamatsu, pp. 78–80; Kōzen, pp. 193–194; and Takagi, pp. 289–290.

54. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 27; Takamatsu, pp. 71–72; Kōzen, pp. 178–179; and Takagi, p. 269.

55. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 3; Takamatsu, pp. 7–8; Kōzen, pp. 37–38; Okamura, p. 224; and Takagi, pp. 55–57.

56. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 17; Takamatsu, pp. 38–40; Kōzen, pp. 133–134; and Takagi, pp. 191–192. Cf. the translation by Brooks, p. 139.

57. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 25; Takamatsu, pp. 67–68; Kōzen, pp. 173–174; and Takagi, pp. 260–262. Cf. the translations by Cha Chu Whan, p. 50, and Ronald C. Egan, "The Prose Style of Fan Yeh," *HJAS* (1979), 39(2): 368.

58. See n. 43.

59. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 23; Takamatsu, pp. 60–61; Kōzen, p. 159; and Takagi, pp. 234–235. Cf. the translation (partial) by Yeh and Walls, pp. 58, 65.

60. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 14; Takamatsu, pp. 28–29; Kōzen, pp. 102–103; and Takagi, p. 161.

61. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 14; Takamatsu, pp. 28–29; Kōzen, pp. 102–103; and Takagi, pp. 159–160. Cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, pp. 58, 64.

For the nonpejorative interpretation of *ch'i* 奇 as "originality," see Takagi, p. 160, and Kōzen, "*Bunshin chōryū to Shihin no bungakukan no tairitsu*," pp. 272–278. For an example of its problematic usage in later criticism, see Wixted, "Yüan Hao-wen," pp. 280–284, 291–292.

62. E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago and London, 1976), p. 97.

63. John M. Ellis, *The Theory of Literary Criticism: A Logical Analysis* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1974), p. 99 (quoting from his article, "Great Art. A Study in Meaning," *British Journal of Aesthetics* [1963], 3:167). See also Monroe C. Beardsley, *Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism* (New York and Burlingame, 1958), pp. 510–511, 524–543, 547.

64. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 14; Takamatsu, pp. 30–31; Kōzen, pp. 110–111; and Takagi, p. 169. Cf. the translations by Wong Siu-kit, p. 24, and Donald Holzman, *Poetry and Politics: The Life and Works of Juan Chi, A.D. 210–263* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. vii, 233.

65. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 22; Takamatsu, pp. 56–57; Kōzen, p. 154; and Takagi, pp. 225–226. Cf. the translation by Brooks, p. 145.

66. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 24; Takamatsu, p. 63; Kōzen, p. 165; and Takagi, pp. 243–245.

67. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 27; Takamatsu, pp. 72–73; Kōzen, pp. 181–182; and Takagi, p. 274.

68. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 24; Takamatsu, pp. 64–65; Kōzen, p. 167; and Takagi, pp. 248–249.

69. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 20; Takamatsu, pp. 51–52; Kōzen, p. 145; and Takagi, pp. 212–213.

70. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 16; Takamatsu, p. 34; Kōzen, p. 120; and Takagi, pp. 180–181. Cf. the trans. by Chou Ju-ch'ang, p. 50, and Yeh and Walls, p. 71.

71. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 23; Takamatsu, pp. 60–61; Kōzen, pp. 159–160; and Takagi, p. 237.

72. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 3; Takamatsu, pp. 6–7; Kōzen, pp. 35–37; Okamura, p. 223; and Takagi, pp. 51–53. Cf. the translations by Cha Chu Whan, p. 52; Jonathan Chaves, *Mei Yao-ch'en and the Development of Early Sung Poetry* (New York and London, 1976), p. 116; and Yeh and Walls, p. 50.

73. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 23; Takamatsu, pp. 61–62; Kōzen, pp. 161–162; and Takagi, pp. 239–240. Cf. the translation by Chaves, *Mei Yao-ch'en*, p. 116.

For discussion of the term *p'ing-tan* 平淡, especially its use in Sung criticism, see *ibid.*, pp. 114–115, and Yokoyama Iseo, "Sō shiron ni miru 'heitan no tai' ni tsuite" (On the Style of "Plainness" in the Poetical Criticism of the Sung Dynasty), *Kambun Gakkai kaihō* (1961), 20: 33–40.

74. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 13; Takamatsu, pp. 25–27; Kōzen, pp. 98–99; and Takagi, p. 151. Cf. the translations by Brooks, p. 142; Holzman, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 233; and Yeh and Walls, p. 58.

75. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 21; Takamatsu, pp. 54–56; Kōzen, p. 151; and Takagi, pp. 223–224.

76. A most helpful discussion of the problem of valuation in the arts is provided by Elder Olson, "On Value Judgments in the Arts," *Critical Inquiry* (September, 1974), 1(1): 71–90; rpt. in "*On Value Judgments in the Arts*" and *Other Essays* (Chicago and London, 1976), pp. 307–326.

The following is Olson's ten-point list of conditions for a sound value judgment in the arts:

1. There must be a perceptible characteristic or trait.
2. It must be essential to the work and not accidental.

3. The sensible form must be accurately perceived.
4. It must be correctly interpreted.
5. The suprasensible substructures must be grasped in their totality and in the totality of their relations as constituting the final subsumptive whole which is the form of the work.
6. The standard or criterion must represent an actual value.
7. It must be appropriate to the form.
8. It must be appropriate to the characteristic or trait.
9. The value syllogism must be a valid syllogism.
10. It must be clearly and unequivocally expressed (hence, it may contain no metaphors) (pp. 317–318).

Note that the first five conditions relate to the concept of a work, and the last five to the establishment of a judgment as such.

Reference is here made to condition 2.

77. The *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu t'i-yao* (Summary of the General Catalogue of the Imperial Library), completed in 1782, makes the following comment in reference to Chung Hung's work:

The Liang dynasty is now more than a thousand years distant, and of the pieces left from it, the old works, nine-tenths are lost: it is improper to gather together fragments and fix the comparative merits of the literature as it was in the complete collections of that day.

([Shanghai, 1934 ed] 195:94; tr. Elizabeth Huff, "Shih-hsüeh by Huang Chieh: A Translation," Ph.D. Dissertation Radcliffe 1947, pp. 56–57; cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, p. 49; also paraphrased by Wilhelm, p. 115.)

78. Note, for example, the influence of Chung Hung on the series *Lun-shih san-shih-shou* (Thirty Poems on Poetry) by the thirteenth-century poet-critic, Yüan Hao-wen. Yüan clearly draws on Chung Hung for his estimations of Ts'ao Chih, Liu Chen, Chang Hua, Juan Chi, and P'an Yüeh; regarding Liu K'un and T'ao Ch'ien, he transforms Chung's critiques into something quite different; and he takes issue with Chung Hung on the matter of Lu Chi's poetry: see Wixted, "Yüan Hao-wen," pp. 86–91, 95–97, 103–105, 108–115, 122–126, 159–163.

79. Theoretical discussion of the separability or nonseparability of description and valuation would be too involved to undertake here. See Hirsch, *Interpretation*, pp. 95–109, and Ellis, *Theory*, pp. 82, 92–93. Note especially in this regard discussion of Kant by Hirsch, pp. 98–106.

Suffice it to say that description and valuation are not easily disengaged: description invariably provokes valuation, and reflection on valuation provokes further description.

80. Olson, "Value Judgments" p. 323. He notes that all evaluations in the arts "must depend immediately or remotely" upon such a descriptive proposition.

81. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 14; Takamatsu, p. 29; Kōzen, pp. 106–107; and Takagi, p. 163. Cf. the translation by Brooks, p. 143.

82. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 13; Takamatsu, p. 25; Kōzen, pp. 95–96; and Takagi, pp. 148–149. Cf. the translation by Brooks, p. 143, and Yeh and Walls, p. 57.

83. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 11; Takamatsu, pp. 20–21; Kōzen, p. 88; and Takagi, pp. 138–139. Cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, p. 58.

84. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 15; Takamatzu, pp. 31–33; Kōzen, p. 115; and Takagi, p. 172. Cf. the translation by Cha Chu Whan, p. 49, and Yeh & Walls, p. 59.

85. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 20; Takamatsu, pp. 52–53; Kōzen, p. 147; and Takagi, pp. 215–216. Cf. the translations by Brooks, p. 143, and Anna Straughair, *Chang Hua: A Statesman Poet of the Western Chin Dynasty* (Occasional Paper 15, Faculty of Asian Studies, The Australian National University) (Canberra, 1973), p. 16.

86. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 25; Takamatsu, pp. 66–67; Kōzen, pp. 170–172; and Takagi, p. 254. Cf. the translation by Brooks, p. 132, and Wilhelm, p. 115 (cf. Jonker, p. 281).

87. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 23; Takamatsu, pp. 61–62; Kōzen, pp. 161–162; and Takagi, pp. 238–239.

88. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 13; Takamatsu, pp. 25–27; Kōzen, pp. 98–100; and Takagi, pp. 152–153. Cf. the translation by Brooks, p. 142; Wong Siu-kit, p. 23; and Yeh and Walls, p. 79.

This is an allusion to the *Analects: Lun-yü yin-te* 6:18, p. 10; cf. Legge, 1:190, and Waley, p. 119.

89. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 20; Takamatsu, pp. 52–53; Kōzen, p. 147; and Takagi, pp. 215–216. Cf. the translations by Brooks, p. 143, and Yeh and Walls, p. 55.

90. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 23; Takamatsu, pp. 61–62; Kōzen, pp. 161–162; and Takagi, pp. 239–240.

91. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 11; Takamatsu, pp. 20–21; Kōzen, p. 88; and Takagi, pp. 238–239. Cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, p. 57.

92. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 25; Takamatsu, pp. 67–68; Kōzen, pp. 173–174; and Takagi, pp. 259–260. Cf. the translation by Cha Chu Whan, p. 50.

93. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 28; Takamatsu, pp. 74–75; Kōzen, p. 186; and Takagi, pp. 280–281. Cf. the translation by Bodman, p. 245.

94. *Hsing* 興 is used as an element in Chung's critiques of Chang Hua, Hsieh Ling-yün, and T'ao Ch'ien, but not in the sense used here. See Takagi, p. 216, for discussion of the problem of explicating the term *hsing-t'o* 興託 in the passage on Chang Hua. See nn. 116 and 136 for the Hsieh Ling-yün and T'ao Ch'ien passages.

See n. 103 for annotation on *fu*, *pi*, and *hsing*.

95. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 20; Takamatsu, pp. 51–52; Kōzen, pp. 145–146; and Takagi, p. 214. Cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, p. 58.

96. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 25; Takamatsu, pp. 67–68; Kōzen, pp. 173–174; and Takagi, pp. 259–260. Cf. the translations by Wong Siu-kit, p. 24, and Yeh and Walls, p. 58.

97. *Shih-p'in chu*, pp. 14–15; Takamatsu, pp. 30–31; Kōzen, pp. 110–112; and Takagi, pp. 169–170. Cf. the translations (complete) by Holzman, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 233, and (partial) by Wong Siu-kit, p. 24, and Holzman, *Poetry and Politics*, p. vii.

98. *Wen hsüan* 29:14a; cf. the translations by Zach, *Die Chinesische Anthologie*, p. 526, and Brooks, p. 144.

99. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 20; Takamatsu, pp. 49–51; Kōzen, pp. 142–143; and Takagi, pp. 207–209. Cf. the translation by Brooks, p. 144.

100. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 20; Takamatsu, pp. 51–52; Kōzen, pp. 145–146; and Takagi, pp. 212–213.

The terminology is drawn from the *Analects: Lun-yü yin-te* 17:22, p. 37; cf. the translations by Legge, 1:330, and Waley, p. 216.

101. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 17; Takamatsu, pp. 39–41; Kōzen, p. 133; and Takagi, pp. 193–194. Cf. the translations by Brooks, p. 139, and Yeh and Walls, p. 60.

102. Note Chung Hung's comment at the end of his second preface:

As for my promoting or demoting poets to these three gradings, it is not at all something final. I simply present this unusual framework, begging the attention of those knowledgeable in the matter.

(*Shih-p'in chu*, p. 8; Takamatsu, pp. 46–48; Kōzen, pp. 71–72; Okamura, p. 230; and Takagi, pp. 111–114. Cf. the translation [partial] by Yeh and Walls, p. 49.)

103. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 4; Takamatsu, pp. 11–13; Kōzen, pp. 44–48; Okamura, p. 224; and Takagi, pp. 67–70. Cf. the translations (complete) by Wilhelm, p. 118; Brooks, p. 136; and Cha Chu Whan, p. 45; and (partial) by Chaves, *Mei Yao-ch'en*, p. 112; and Chen Shih-hsiang, "The *Shih-ching*: Its Generic Significance in Chinese Literary History and Poetics," *Bulletin of History and Philology* (Academia Sinica) (January, 1969), 39(1), rpt. in *Studies in Chinese Literary Genres*, ed. Cyril Birch (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1974), p. 18.

Fu, *pi*, and *hsing* are critical terms that appear in the "Great Preface" to the *Shih ching* (see n. 44). For Western-language discussion of them, see Hightower, "Wen hsüan and Genre Theory," p. 519; Chen Shih-hsiang, "The *Shih-ching*: Its Generic Significance," pp. 8–41, esp. pp. 14–25; C. H. Wang, *The Bell and the Drum: "Shih Ching" as Formulaic Poetry in an Oral Tradition* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1974), p. 3; and Allen, "Chih Yü's Discussion," pp. 9–11, 17–18, 21–23.

For useful examples of *fu*, *pi*, and *hsing* in poetry, see Brooks, pp. 136–138.

104. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 4; Takamatsu, pp. 11–12; Kōzen, pp. 44–49; Okamura, p. 224; and Takagi, pp. 71–72. Cf. the translations by Brooks, p. 136; Cha Chu Whan, pp. 45–46; and Yeh and Walls, p. 53.

105. The quotation is from the *Analects: Lun-yü yin-te* 17:8, p. 36; Legge, 1:323. It is from a passage of special importance in early literary theory. Note the translations and discussion by the following: Waley, p. 212; Zau Sinmay, "Confucius on Poetry," *T'ien Hsia Monthly* (September, 1938), 7(2): 144–145; Ma Yau-woon, "Confucius as a Literary Critic: A Comparison with the Early Greeks," in *Essays in Chinese Studies Dedicated to Professor Jao Tsung-i* (Hong Kong, 1970), p. 20; Donald Holzman, "Confucius and Ancient Chinese Literary Criticism," in *Chinese Approaches to Literature*, ed. Rickett, pp. 36–37; C. H. Wang, pp. 4–5; James J. Y. Liu, *Chinese Theories of Literature*, p. 109; and Vincent Y. C. Shih, "Literature and Art in 'The Analects,'" trans. C. Y. Hsu, *Renditions* (Autumn, 1977), 8: 14–16.

106. *Shih-p'in chu*, pp. 4–5; Takamatsu, pp. 13–15; Kōzen, pp. 49–53; Okamura, pp. 224–225; and Takagi, pp. 72–78. Cf. the translations (partial) by Wilhelm, p. 118 (cf. Jonker, p. 281); Maureen Robertson, "... To Convey What Is Precious": Ssu-k'ung T'u's Poetics and the Erh-shih-ssu Shih P'in," in *Transition and Permanence: Chinese History and Culture, A Festschrift in Honor of Dr. Hsiao Kung-ch'üan*, ed. David C. Buxbaum and Frederick W. Mote (Hong Kong, 1972), p. 352; David E. Pollard, *A Chinese Look at Literature: The Literary Values of Chou Tso- jen in Relation to the Tradition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1973), p. 9; Cha Chu Whan, pp. 43–44, 47; and Yeh and Walls, pp. 51–52.

The construing of Chung Hung's phrases as alluding to specific poems or poets here follows the Chinese and Japanese commentators noted immediately above.

107. Among the pragmatic ends of literature noted by Chung Hung is the important earlier tradition of expressing moral or political stricture in verse (see Donald Gibbs, "Notes on the Wind: The Term 'Feng' in Chinese Literary Criticism," in *Transition and Permanence*, ed. Buxbaum and Mote, pp. 285-293). Chung Hung speaks of Tso Ssu's poetry as "succeeding in the purpose of indirectly expressing stricture in verse" (*Shih-p'in chu*, pp. 16-17; Takamatsu, pp. 37-38; Kōzen, pp. 129-130; and Takagi, pp. 187-188; cf. the translations by Yeh and Walls, pp. 56, 58). Of Ying Chü, he says that "he has succeeded in the poet's aim of provoking and criticizing" (*Shih-p'in chu*, p. 22; Takamatsu, pp. 56-57; Kōzen, pp. 154-155; and Takagi, pp. 226-227). Concerning a poem by Ho Yen, he notes that "the principle of criticism through indirection is evident" (*Shih-p'in chu*, p. 21; Takamatsu, pp. 54-56; Kōzen, pp. 151-152; and Takagi, pp. 221-222). And in his critique of Yen Yen-chih, he praises certain aspects of his work, to which he adds:

Yen also enjoys allusions, so that his writing becomes ever more constricted.

Although he goes contrary to what is distinguished, his is a fine literary talent for ordering affairs of state (i.e. for the elevated documentary style).

(*Shih-p'in chu*, p. 25; Takamatsu, pp. 67-68; Kōzen, pp. 173-175; and Takagi, pp. 260-262. Cf. the translations [complete] by Cha Chu Whan, p. 50, and Egan, p. 368; and [partial] by Brooks, p. 142. The last phrase echoes Ts'ao P'i's comment, "Writing is, indeed, the great profession by which the state is ordered" [*Wen hsüan* 52:7b; cf. the translations by Hughes, p. 233; Miao, "Literary Criticism at the End of the Eastern Han," p. 1026; and Holzman, "Literary Criticism in China in the Third Century A.D.," p. 131].)

Of interest also in this regard are the statements by Chung Hung that reflect specifically affective concerns. He speaks of the Old Poems as "stirring the heart and moving the soul" (*Shih-p'in chu*, p. 11; Takamatsu, pp. 20-21; Kōzen, p. 88, and Takagi, p. 138-140; cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, p. 57). Of Juan Chi, he says: "His poems 'On Expressing My Feelings' can release the spirit and provoke the deepest thoughts"; his poetry "makes one forget what is petty and near-at-hand and lets one attain the far-away and grand" (*Shih-p'in chu*, pp. 14-15; Takamatsu, pp. 30-31; Kōzen, pp. 110-111; and Takagi, pp. 168-170; cf. the translation by Holzman, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 233). And as earlier cited, Chung Hung spoke of the "perfect poetry" as being such that "those who read from one's work find it inexhaustible and those who hear from it are moved."

108. Ting Fu-pao, *Ch'üan Han San-kuo Chin Nan-pei-ch'ao shih* (Complete Poetry of the Han, Three Kingdoms, Chin, and Northern and Southern Dynasties) (1916; Peking, 1959; rpt. Taipei, 1968), p. 260 (*Ch'üan San-kuo shih* [Complete Poetry of the Three Kingdoms] 3:6b).

109. *Wen hsüan* 29:15a; cf. the translations by Zach, *Die Chinesische Anthologie*, p. 528; Hans H. Frankel, "Fifteen Poems by Ts'ao Chih: An Attempt at a New Approach," *JAOS* (1964), 84(1):8; and J. D. Frodsham and Ch'eng Hsi, *An Anthology of Chinese Verse: Han Wei Chin and the Northern and Southern Dynasties* (Oxford, 1967), p. 45.

110. *Pei-t'ang shu-ch'ao* (Extracts from the Northern Hall) (1888 ed.; rpt. Taipei, 1966), 157:9b.

111. Ting Fu-pao, p. 830 (*Ch'üan Sung shih* [Complete Poetry of the Liu-Sung Dynasty], 3:17b).

112. *Shih-p'in chu*, pp. 6-7; Takamatsu, pp. 42-45; Kōzen, pp. 62-66; Okamura,

pp. 229–230; and Takagi, pp. 96–104. Cf. the translations (almost complete) by Cha Chu Whan, pp. 48–49, and (partial) by Brooks, pp. 130, 141–142; Ch'en Shou-yi, p. 229; Wong Siu-kit, p. 30; Pollard, p. 92; Bodman, pp. 69–70; Marney, "P'ei Tzu-yeh," p. 168; Yeh and Walls, p. 51; Egan, p. 368; and W. L. Wong, "Selection of Lines in Chinese Poetry-talk Criticism—With a Comparison between the Selected Couplets and Mathew Arnold's 'Touchstones,'" in *China and the West: Comparative Literature Studies*, ed. William Tay, Ying-hsiung Chou, and Heh-hsiang Yuan (Hong Kong, 1980), p. 37.

Concerning "documents dealing with the ordering of the state," see n. 107.

113. For translation and discussion of Shen Yüeh's rules of prosody, see Charles D. Olney, "The Six Dynasties Poet Shen Yüeh," M. A. thesis, Columbia, 1971, pp. 18–19; E. Bruce Brooks, "Journey toward the West: An Asian Prosodic Embassy in the Year 1972," rev. of *Versification: Major Language Types*, ed. W. K. Wimsatt, *HJAS* (1975), 35:249–250; Ferenc Tökei, "Textes prosodiques chinois au début du VI^e siècle," *Mélanges de Sinologie offerts à Monsieur Paul Demiéville*, II, ed. Yves Hervouet (Paris, 1974), pp. 297–312; and Bodman, pp. 271–320.

114. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 25; Takamatsu, pp. 67–68; Kōzen, pp. 173–175; and Takagi, pp. 260–261. Cf. the translations by Cha Chu Whan, p. 50, and Egan, p. 368.

115. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 29; Takamatsu, pp. 78–79; Kōzen, pp. 193–195; and Takagi, p. 291.

116. *Shih-p'in chu*, pp. 17–18; Takamatsu, pp. 38–40; Kōzen, pp. 133–135; and Takagi, pp. 191–196. Cf. the translations (complete) by Brooks, p. 139, and (partial) by Yeh and Walls, pp. 59, 60, 66, 72.

Note that Chung Hung's Japanese commentators all interpret one part of this passage in the following way: "New sounds, beautiful and refined, continually converge."

117. See Olson's conditions 2–5 and 6–8 (n. 76).

Chung Hung does make reference to a standard of evaluation not directly concerned with literary performance. An appeal to authority is found in his remark concerning Chang Hua: "Men of insight regret how much womanish sentiment and how little high-spiritedness there is in his verse" (*Shih-p'in chu*, p. 20; Takamatsu, pp. 52–53; Kōzen, pp. 147–148; and Takagi, p. 217; cf. the translation by Straughair, *Chang Hua*, p. 16). Reference is made to an even wider board of critical review when, in the first of the prefaces to his work, Chung Hung says:

Slicked down, fatty sons from noble families, embarrassed lest their compositions not come up to par, spend all day fiddling with revisions and half the night crooning. In their estimation, their verses are outstanding; but a consensus of opinion finds them flat and pedestrian.

(*Shih-p'in chu*, p. 5; Takamatsu, pp. 15–17; Kōzen, pp. 53–55; Okamura, p. 225; and Takagi, pp. 80–82; cf. the translation by Cha Chu Whan, p. 47.) And although Chung Hung spoke of Li Ch'ung's critical treatise as being "coherent but not incisive" (see n. 12), he also states, "The *Discourse on the Forest of Writing Brushes* being a sound discussion, Lu Chi is praised therein as being more profound than P'an Yüeh" (*Shih-p'in chu*, p. 16; Takamatsu, p. 33; Kōzen, p. 120; and Takagi, pp. 180–181; cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, p. 71).

For discussion of the circularity implicit when an appeal is made directly or indirectly to

the standard of authority, see Olson, "Value Judgments," p. 316, and Beardsley, *Aesthetics*, pp. 548–549.

118. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 30; Takamatsu, pp. 80–82; Kōzen, pp. 196–197; and Takagi, p. 297. Cf. the translation by Wilhelm, p. 115.

119. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 15; Takamatsu, pp. 31–33; Kōzen, pp. 115–116; and Takagi, p. 174.

120. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 15; Takamatsu, pp. 31–33; Kōzen, pp. 115–116; and Takagi, p. 174. Cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, pp. 56, 58 (see also pp. 64–65).

121. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 16; Takamatsu, pp. 35–36; Kōzen, pp. 124–125; and Takagi, pp. 182–184.

122. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 17; Takamatsu, pp. 37–38; Kōzen, pp. 129–130; and Takagi, pp. 187–189.

123. *Shih-p'in chu*, pp. 16, 17; Takamatsu, pp. 33–37, 37–38; Kōzen, pp. 119–121, 129–130; and Takagi, pp. 179–180, 187–189. Cf. the translation (of the former) by Yeh and Walls, p. 71.

124. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 29; Takamatsu, pp. 77–78; Kōzen, p. 192; and Takagi, pp. 287–288.

125. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 29; Takamatsu, pp. 77–78; Kōzen, p. 192; and Takagi, p. 287. Cf. the translation by Robertson, p. 333, and Yeh and Walls, pp. 66, 73 (cf. Paul W. Kroll, rev. of *Studies in Chinese Poetry and Poetics*, vol. 1, ed. Ronald C. Miao, *CLEAR* [January, 1980], 2[1]:148).

126. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 29; Takamatsu, pp. 77–78; Kōzen, p. 192; and Takagi, pp. 286–287. Cf. the translation by Robertson, p. 333, and Yeh and Walls, pp. 66, 73.

127. See n. 70.

128. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 16; Takamatsu, pp. 33–34; Kōzen, pp. 119–121; and Takagi, p. 180. Cf. the translation by Robertson, p. 332, and Yeh and Walls, pp. 66, 70, 71 (see also p. 68).

The passage also appears in the *Shih-shuo hsin-yü* (4:44; cf. the translation by Mather, p. 136), where it is attributed to Sun Ch'o (320–377).

129. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 26; Takamatsu, pp. 67–68; Kōzen, pp. 173–175; and Takagi, pp. 263–264. Cf. the translation by Yeh and Walls, p. 66 (see also pp. 68, 70, 72) (cf. Kroll, p. 148).

The passage also appears, in somewhat altered form, in the *Nan shih* (34:881), where it is attributed to Pao Chao; cf. the translation by Adele Austin Rickett, *Wang Kuo-wei's "Jen-chien tz'u-hua": A Study in Chinese Literary Criticism* (Hong Kong, 1977), pp. 88–89.

T'ang Hui-hsiu is treated by Chung Hung in the section on "lower grade" poets (see *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 37; Takamatsu, pp. 111–113; Kōzen, pp. 232–234; and Takagi, pp. 346–348; cf. the translation by Brooks, p. 133).

130. Note discussion of this by Robertson, pp. 332–333, and Yeh and Walls, pp. 67–71. Cf. Elder Olson's conditions 9 and 10 for a sound proposition of value (n. 76).

131. Note the filiation charts provided by Takamatsu, pp. 161–162; Brooks, p. 140; Kōzen, p. 16; and Takagi, p. 15. Note also the discussion of Chung Hung's filiation of writers by Wilhelm, pp. 115–116; Brooks, *passim*; and Yeh and Walls, pp. 45–48.

132. Presumably the description-valuations following the statements of filiation stand in relation to the latter much as they stand in relation to the gradings proper, as justifications of them. The assignment of filiations, moreover, like the assignment of gradings, can be viewed more as a rhetorical than an analytical device.

133. It may be in reference to this that the Sung poet Mei Yao-ch'ên (1002–1062) wrote: “Loving to discuss the poetry of past and present, / Laughing at Chung Hung in our critical judgments” (*Wan-ling hsien-sheng chi* [Collection of the Wan-ling Gentleman] [SPTK ed.] 57:6a; trans. Chaves, *Mei Yao-ch'ên*, p. 117; cf. the other, less pejorative references to Chung Hung in Mei Yao-ch'ên's verse cited by Chaves, pp. 116–117). For critiques of Chung Hung by Yeh Meng-te (1077–1148) and Wang Shih-chen (1643–1711), see Huff, pp. 53–56, and Yeh and Walls, pp. 48–49 (for the latter only). For these and other citations of Chung's critics, see Takagi, pp. 22–23. The following are two studies of Chung Hung's placement of T'ao Ch'ien: Wang Shu-min, “Lu Chung Hung p'ing T'ao Yüan-ming shih” (On Chung Hung's Critique of T'ao Yüan-ming's Poetry); *Hsüeh yüan* (1948), 2(4):68–69; and Shu Chung-cheng, “Shih-p'in wei-shen-ma chih T'ao Ch'ien yü chung-p'in” (Why the Gradings of Poets Places T'ao Ch'ien in the “Middle Grade”), *Kuo-li Cheng-chih Ta-hsüeh hsüeh-pao* (May, 1975), 31:1–12. Cf. in this regard Brooks' comments on portability of style (cited in n. 51) and the “crafty” nature of hermit poets (p. 133).

134. *Wen hsüan* 30:4b, trans. James Robert Hightower, *The Poetry of T'ao Ch'ien* (Oxford, 1970), p. 229; cf. the translations by Zach, *Die Chinesische Anthologie*, p. 545; and William Acker, *T'ao the Hermit* (London, 1952), p. 99 (rpt. in *Anthology of Chinese Literature*, ed. Birch, p. 203).

135. *Wen hsüan* 30:27a; trans. Hightower, *The Poetry of T'ao Ch'ien*, p. 180; cf. the translations by Zach, *Die Chinesische Anthologie*, p. 568, and Brooks, p. 132.

136. *Shih-p'in chu*, p. 25; Takamatsu, pp. 65–67; Kōzen, pp. 169–172; and Takagi, pp. 251–258. Cf. the translations (complete) by Wilhelm, p. 115 (cf. Jonker, p. 281), and Brooks, p. 132, and (partial) by Yeh and Walls, pp. 54, 56, and Cahill, “Confucian Elements in the Theory of Painting,” p. 123.

Concerning the line, “When one reads his works, the fine character of the poet himself comes to mind,” cf. n. 51.

In speaking of the “unadorned directness” of T'ao's poetry, Chung Hung is using language from the *Analects*: *Lun-yü yin-te* 12:20, p. 24; cf. the translation by Legge I:259, and Waley, p. 168.

See Brooks' interpretation of the final two lines of the critique as being pejorative (pp. 132–134).

137. Ellis, *Theory*, p. 102.