China's Bibliographic Tradition and the History of the Book

Lianbin Dai

Book History, Volume 17, 2014, pp. 1-50 (Article)

Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: 10.1353/bh.2014.0004

China's Bibliographic Tradition and the History of the Book

Lianbin Dai

As a physical object and "technology of intellect" (in Jack Goody's words), the book provides the material basis for book history, the history of reading, the history of knowledge, and texual scholarship. This is why bibliography, the first recognized discipline about books, has been fundamental to all of these scholarly fields[1]—in China as well as in the rest of the world. All book historians of traditional China should therefore have a general understanding of the long-established Chinese bibliographic tradition. In this article, bibliographic practices and theories from the sixteenth through the early twentieth centuries in China will be discussed in comparison with the Anglo-American and French traditions. Because of the intellectual/scholarly orientation of Chinese bibliography, which I will elaborate in what follows, historians of the book and reading in Ming-Qing China (1368–1911) will encounter the challenge of examining and refining bibliographic entries, a task much harder than that confronting their Western counterparts, who by comparison have enjoyed a luxury of bibliographic details. Traditional Chinese bibliography yields very limited historical information about a book's life; it needs to be modernized before it can produce a material foundation for historical studies of the book and reading habits.

The disciplinary affinity between bibliography and the history of publishing and the book has been commonly recognized in both Europe and Anglo-America.[2] The degree of affinity in the Chinese context, however, requires a reassessment. As Cynthia Brokaw suggests, the Western resource is different in both quality and quantity from the Chinese one.[3] Whereas Chinese bibliography focuses on intellectual and scholarly issues, the Anglo-American and European traditions highlight the book's physical features, a difference that results from the different roles of trade bibliography in traditional China and Europe. This article concludes by discussing how Chinese bibliography has shaped traditional studies of the book, and proposes an archaeology of the Chinese book as a bridge from traditional Chinese bibliography to modern historical methods.

I. The Orientation of Chinese Bibliography

Bibliographic pratices involve two approaches: treating books as physical objects or conveyors of information. Chinese bibliography is concerned with the content of the book more than with its materiality. This intellectual emphasis distinguishes the Chinese tradition from the Germanic tradition (concerned with the simple listing of books and their technical aspects), the English tradition (dealing with books as physical objects and extending to literary criticism in terms of book production), and the French tradition (which considers the book as a cultural force).

What, then, is bibliography? It is hard to define it simply, either historically or linguistically.[4] Rather than being equivalent to *muluxue* 目錄學 (lit. "the study of cataloguing") in modern Chinese, the counterpart of "bibliography" in classical Chinese is *jiaochouxue* 校讎學 (lit. "the study of collating"), a combination of textual collation, intellectual and schloarship criticism, editing, summarizing, and book listing. The practice of *jiaochou* (textual collation) can be traced back to the turn of the Christian era, when Liu Xiang 劉向 (79–8 BC) and his son Liu Xin 劉歆 (46 BC–AD 23) successively served as directors of the Han (206 BC–AD 220) imperial library, in which capacity they collated and catalogued the classical texts housed there, including those in some government agencies and private collections.[5] After a text was collated and edited, Liu Xiang made a list of its subtitles and prepared a report on it before presenting a transcribed copy to his emperor.[6] His tables of contents and reports were incorporated into the bibliography completed by his son.[7] A few items from this annotated bibliography are extant, enabling us to examine the structure and elements of the Lius' description. Liu Xiang's entry for the *Guanzi* (the *Book of Master Guan*) reads:

> [The table of contents, which is lost][8]
>
> The Commissioner of the Eastern [Metropolitan Area] Conservancy and Imperial Counselor First Class, Your servant [Liu] Xiang speaking:
>
> The books by Master Guan, which Your servant has collated, consisted of 389 bundles [of bamboo slips] in the palace, 27 bundles belonging to the Imperial Counselor Second Class, Bu Gui, 41 bundles belonging to Your servant Fu Can, 11 bundles belonging to the Colonel of the Bowmen Guards, Li, and 96 bundles in the office of the Grand Clerks, making a total of 564 bundles of books inside and outside the palace. In collating them, he has eliminated

> 484 duplicate bundles and made 86 bundles the standard text. This he has written on bamboo slips to form a basis for exact copies.
>
> Master Guan was a man from Yingshang. . . . [A passage of Guan's story is given, followed by Confucius's comments on Guan's contributions.] The Honorable Grand Clerk [Sima Qian (ca. 145–90 BC)] said: "I have read the books by Mr. Guan called *Shepherding the People* (*Mumin* 牧民), *The Mountains are High* (*Shan'gao* 山高), *Teams of Horses* (*Shengma* 乘馬), *State Enterprise* (*Qingzhong* 輕重), and *The Nine Storehouses* (*Jiufu* 九府). How fully does he discuss these things!" Furthermore he said, "[The saying goes:] 'He promotes [his ruler's] good qualities and corrects his bad ones. Thus prince and subject can be endeared to one another.' This surely must refer to Guan Zhong."
>
> The book *The Nine Storehouses* was not found among the people. The *Mountains are High* is also called *Appearance and Circumstances* (*Xingshi* 形勢). All the books by Master Guan aim at making the state wealthy and the people content. They treat essentials, which may show that they accord with the principles of the canonical books.
>
> [Your servant Liu] Xiang has respectfully drawn up this list of contents, which he submits to Your Majesty.[9]

This report was made between 22 and 16 BC. At that time, the table of contents was called "*mu*" 目 (lit. "subtitle"), while the report following it was called "*lu*" 錄 (lit. "record," "report"); the combination of these two characters marks the beginning of the Chinese bibliographic (*mulu*) tradition.[10] This tradition originally required that the bibliographer mainly outline the textual features and intellectual contents of the books that he enumerated. In the report cited here, Liu Xiang firstly listed the available versions, which he referred to during collating, and then informed his emperor of the result of his studies. What follows are the author's life, reviews of his work, the book's purpose, and the historical transmission of the text. Obviously, Liu Xiang's report was a study of textual and intellectual history, much more than a pure textual collation. The Lius' approach to collation and other procedures was complex, reportedly consisting of twenty-three steps before completing a report, from collecting various versions to the arrangement of subtitles, from classifying the book and writing a summary of it to listing textual variants. Among those steps, collecting various versions was the prerequisite for making an accurate collation and obtaining an ideal copy by identifying textual discrepencies,[11] as we see in other cultures. In their descriptions, however, the Lius only mentioned the ownership of those ver-

sions but said nothing about the physical features of the rolls and bamboo strips (the earliest forms of Chinese books) bearing the text.[12] Such a style of noting ownership of versions or editions was also employed in the Qing (1644–1911) imperial catalogue *Qingding Siku quanshu zongmu* (The annotated imperial bibliography of the Four Treasuries), with its first draft completed in 1782.

The cited report was excluded from the Monograph on Bibliography in Ban Gu's (32–92) *History of the Former Han*. This monograph was an abridgement of Liu Xin's annotated catalogue of the Han imperial library, the *Qi lue* 七略 (Seven summaries), which in turn was derived from Liu Xiang's work. Ban Gu, it is widely believed, preserved well the Lius' classification scheme in his adaptation. The *Guanzi*, in the different versions that Liu Xiang witnessed in the imperial library, came into being between 250–26 BC; it essentially is a repository of ancient materials written by anonymous writers over a long period of time.[13] Liu Xiang bibliographically treated the *Guanzi* in two ways: as a whole it was identified as Daoist in the category of the Schools of Philosophy, its chapter "*Dizi zhi*" 弟子職 (Duties of the student) was separately classified into the category of the Six Classics, while its chapters on warfare and poltical strategy were placed under the category of Military Art.[14] Liu Xiang traced the origin of Daoism back to ancient court annalists. In his conception, the annalists recorded poltical successes and failures of the past and present and understood simplicity and humble-mindedness as the basic rules for governing. Later annalists suggested that only these two rules be followed in political life and that the rituals, benevolence, and righteousness to which Confucians adhered in their moral philosophy be abandoned. This radical view, according to Liu Xiang, anticipated that of Daoists.[15] Liu Xiang attached the *Duties of the Student* to the *Classic of Filial Piety* on the grounds that both texts advocated an eternal principle of subjugation that, in Confucianism, students should follow in their relationship to their masters, just as sons should do with their parents.[16] Military arts, according to Liu Xiang, were the inventions of the ancient Ministry of War, and political strategies mainly aimed at defending the state, and were applied in warfare only in extraordinary circumstances.[17] Evidently Liu Xiang tried to relate the *Guanzi* as a whole and its separate chapters to a single origin in antiquity, that is, to an ancient political infrastructure that Confucian utopians outlined as ideal in their Classical exegeses. In spite of their intellectual controversies, according to Liu Xiang, all schools of philosophy, including the *Guanzi*, shared the same origin as the Six Confucian Classics.[18] By listing the whole *Guanzi* and its

separate chapters in appropriate categories and providing further explanations in his brief notes on categories and subcategories, Liu Xiang obviously attempted to illuminate the intellectual origins, contents, and significance of this catalogued book.

The Lius' work was the bibliographic representation of Confucianism's ascendancy to the status of imperial ideology in Han political and intellectual life. They intended to construct a "knowledge tree" based on the books that they edited and catalogued. To this end they emphasized the unity of knowledge as ideal and criticized multiple versions and texts as problematic; consequently, the official canon became uniquely authoritative. In their comprehensive bibliography, the canonical texts were considered the basis of all writing and central to all scholarly pursuits. They also traced the origin and development of scholarship back to the ancient state apparatus envisioned in the Confucian political ideal, equating generic categories with ancient political offices.[19] According to this ideal, political offices had a dual function—administrative and religious—that lent them an authority in education based on the laws and punishments they legislated.[20] Thus political authority manipulated the textual realm, and bibliography, as the Lius envisioned it, would play an ideological and political role. With the unity of knowledge and knowledge tree in mind, they created a catalogue that did not enumerate all books in the imperial library but was highly selective, focusing on the classification and history of scholarship. In practice, therefore, the Lius' bibliography was hermeneutic and, not surprisingly, didactic, with their work serving as a gateway to ideologically correct scholarship.[21]

The theory underlying this *jiaochou* tradition initiated by the Lius was reformulated in the twelfth century and reached its peak in the late eighteenth century, though the bibliographic practices they initiated had continued since their time, and the principles of description encoded therein had been adopted and adapted, more or less. The encyclopædist historian Zheng Qiao (1104–1162) emphasized the significance of classification and proposed that the bibliographer must search for, collate, classify, and catalogue books before collecting them into his library. An appropriate classification scheme of all books both extant and lost, according to him, would in itself illustrate the evolution of a school of learning and help any book "survive" in terms of its title and scholarly orientation.[22] Even though Zheng's age saw the proliferation of editions of a text as a result of the prosperous book industry, particularly in his native province, Fujian, he seemed unconcerned with this development. In his bibliographic practice, he simply listed the book's author, title, and number of chapters under the category (*lei* 類)

and subject (*zhong* 種) to which it belonged, without noting any physical features or editions.[23] What Zheng considered crucial was that books of the same scholarly orientation be grouped so as easily to be located in his bibliography.[24] His theory and practice were clearly determined by his historiography, whereby history should preserve, extend, and amend the record of the past. In his field, the bibliographer should guarantee the record's survival with a proper method, one that brings "order, usability, and sense among materials" into history to show their interrelationships.[25] Annotations or textual studies such as those that the Lius conducted, according to him, were unnecessary or impracticable in bibliography.

With his overemphasis on the classification scheme, Zheng Qiao failed to carry on the Lius' approach and procedures, even though he declared that he had done so.[26] The *jiaochou* tradition as a study of textual history had not been theorized until 1779, when Zhang Xuecheng (1738–1801) completed the *Jiaochou tongyi* (The general principles of bibliography), in which he discussed both the general principles and technical aspects of bibliography. Zhang proposed his theory in contradistinction to eighteenth-century evidential scholarship (*kaozheng* 考證), the development of which also required reference materials such as descriptive catalogues and annotated bibliographies that enabled the scholar to identify and collate the text in question. In Zhang's theory, classification and organization overshadowed textual analysis and philology, as he demonstrated in his definition of the *jiaochou* tradition:

> Since Liu Xiang and his son classified and catalogued [the collection in the imperial library], the purpose of bibliography *(jiaochou)* has been to distinguish [schools of] sciences and arts as well as to identify their origins and developments. Neither those who do not deeply understand the cause of the elaborateness of the Way or ancient doctrines, nor those who know nothing about the merits and demerits of various sayings, are competent to participate in it [i.e., bibliography]. In later times, every period witnesses scholars who classify and record the Classics and histories. However, less than 10 percent of hundreds or even thousands of people have been found capable of expounding general principles or sorting out the similarities and dissimilarities among various forms of sciences and arts. Doing so enables others to trace the origin via the branches and then to imagine the original appearance of the ancient text.[27]

In his definition, Zhang clearly elaborated the scholarly orientation of the Lius' bibliographic tradition and its philosophical goal of illuminating the

Way. While criticizing the use of bibliography by evidential scholars in their purely textual practices, Zhang introduced the concept of the Confucian Way (*dao* 道) into this field. His stress upon organization was intended to trace schools of scholarship back to the system of officials as teachers in antiquity and to the Six Confucian Classics,[28] as Liu Xiang had done. Appropriate classification, he suggested, would help the scholar to locate books under the class or subject that interested him and then to probe the related school of scholarship by reading those books.[29] The concept of *jia* 家 (a school of learning or art) was key in his theory, and from it *jiaxue* 家學 (the learning of a school or family) and *jiafa* 家法 (the discipline of a school) were derived.[30] According to Zhang, the bibliographer should distinguish a specific writing from others and place its title under the category to which it belonged, so that the historical development, learning, and discipline of the *school* could be elucidated. He considered these tasks and that purpose to be the essence of the Lius' activities, and highly esteemed their achievement. Even though they had used an outdated sevenfold classification scheme rather than the fourfold one predominant in his time, Zhang found the orientation of their scholarship to be indispensable and practicable for contemporary bibliographers.[31] In both the Lius' practice and Zhang's theory, the ideal bibliography should encompass a history of scholarship.[32] Zhang's elaboration of the Lius' model, especially his brief description of bibliography's purpose, now is widely recognized and embraced.[33]

Zhang's theory is also philosophical and ideological. The ultimate goal of classifying and listing books as branches of Confucian learning, he suggested, was to elucidate the Confucian Way that the ancient sages invented; without an understanding of the Way, no true learning would be possible.[34] Zhang justified this goal of bibliography by citing the *Book of Changes*, saying, "What is above form is called the Way; what is within form is called actual things and affairs (*qi* 器)." The Way cannot be dissociated from actual things and affairs, and he identified the Confucian Classics and other books as *qi* that embedded the Way. Only through tangible books could scholars access and understand the abstract Way.[35] This relation of the Way to books gives bibliography more than textual significance. Zhang assumed that the Lius' notes on scholarly schools, which came after the list of related books, were of greatest philosophical interest in elucidating the Way. In his discussions of the Schools of Philosophy, Zhang observed, Liu Xiang "always says such-and-such a school probably originated in the learning kept by such-and-such an ancient office, which evolved into the learning of such-and-such a person, and declined, becoming the corrupt doctrine of such-and-such a person."[36]

Zhang interpreted the deterioration and corruption of a school or theory with reference to Mencius (372–289 BC), who had warned of the moral and political consequences of evil words (i.e., unorthodox texts). "These evils growing in the mind, do injury to government, and, displayed in the government, are hurtful to the conduct of affairs."[37] "Perverse doctrines," "one-sided actions," and "licentious expressions," Mencius reiterated, should be eradicated so that the work of the ancient sages can continue.[38] Zhang assumed that the Lius kept these views of Mencius in mind while they were clarifying a school or theory's course of development. Thus, he inferred, their bibliography aimed at elucidating the eternal Way based on their understanding of the Confucian Classics, rather than simply listing books and their number of chapters.[39]

For this philosophical goal, more bibliographical elements—in particular intellectual annotations on books, schools, and subjects—were needed in an ideal bibliography than simply lists of titles and authors, yet the latter form was the more common one in practice (see Part II). Contemporary evidential scholarship, Zhang noted, could not achieve this philosophical goal at all. "Textual commentaries, philosophical explanations, and philological research—none of these alone can tell one about the Way. If one takes all three of these together and applies their combined power to augment extensive efforts at searching out the Way, then perhaps once [he] can come close."[40] In comparison to the Lius' tradition, Zhang said, the textual collation practiced by evidential scholars was frivolous, neglectful of the pursuit of the Way and development of scholarship.[41]

Zhang's theoretical invention was not popular in his age, as he himself recognized, because of his criticism of and distinction from the dominant evidential scholarship. He even tried to limit the circulation of his bibliographic writings within a circle of a few close friends.[42] Evidential scholars, however, valued bibliography as the scholar's first task and only gateway to academic pursuits. Even Zhang himself recognized this use of bibliography and attempted to compile a subject bibliography of historical writings following an evidential model (see Part III). Evidential scholars defined the goal of bibliography to be to distinguish authentic texts from forged ones, to examine the textual features of editions, and to collate the text, so that an authentic and ideal version could be produced.[43] All these textual practices, they claimed, were an essential part of the Lius' scholarship, which provided intricate evidential methods of identifying bibliographic entries and elements,[44] methods that Zhang Xuecheng had ignored in his theory. Textual collation and evidential studies had been employed in studies of previous

bibliographies. In this sense, critical studies of old catalogues by evidential scholars were textual in nature rather than historical or bibliographic.[45] As we will see in Part III, subject bibliographies also were developed, with all related titles both extant and lost enumerated and any pretexts to them abstracted. Catalogues focusing on editions became popular among bibliophiles and elite scholars. In spite of theoretical and practical differences, both Zhang's philosophical endowment and evidential scholars' textual position were traced back to the Lius' scholarship. The Lius' general principles and technical matters involved an ideological mission, academic pursuit, textual practices, bibliographic organization, and notes about versions of each text. Later evolutions and debates in theory and practice occurred entirely within the framework that the Lius' norm delineated.

Both the Lius and evidential scholars produced an ideal version after collating different editions of the text in question. This approach sounds similar to that used in New Bibliography, the orthodoxy of the Anglo-American tradition from the 1940s to the 1960s.[46] This tradition, however, differs from the Lius' norm in its orientation. Bibliography, in Sir W.W. Greg's words, is the "study of books as material objects . . . [and] has nothing whatever to do with the subject or literary content of the book."[47] Thus the bibliographer is concerned only with "pieces of paper or parchment covered with certain written or printed signs," and these signs are nothing more than "arbitrary marks."[48] Although he tinkered with his definition, Greg's own interests were not purely bibliographic but also literary. He used the term "critical bibliography," now known as analytical bibliography, to mean the "study of the material transmission of literary and other documents; its ultimate aim is to solve the problems of origin, history, and text . . . through minute investigation of the material means of transmission."[49] In this sense, Greg's system is intimately related to textual criticism.[50]

Greg's method was a departure that illuminated the functions of bibliography,[51] yet there were other branches of bibliography coexisting with his system in the Anglo-American tradition. *Enumerative* or *systematic bibliography* lists salient bibliographic details about a particular group of books and had proliferated since the late fifteenth century. Enumerative bibliography remained unchallenged until the nineteenth century, when all areas of the book industry were mechanized and a quantitative advance in the productive capacity of the printing press made it impossible to exhaust all imprints in a general bibliography.[52] It was still being practiced when Greg's method was ruling the Anglo-American world. Meanwhile, *historical bibliography,* pioneered by Joseph Ames (1689–1759) in England, treated books

as material objects and concentrated on subjects such as typography, book production, and publishing.[53] It had more to do with book collecting, and prompted the writing of the history of printing and publishing by employing methods developed by analytical bibliographers. For Roy Stokes, historical bibliography reveals the whole chain of physical forms of books, and its objects include economic, social, and cultural aspects; reading tastes; and ownership and distribution in addition to the manufacture of the book.[54] When Greg was developing his theory, historical bibliography was viewed as a science, while analytical bibliography was thought to be a method of literary study rather than a science.[55] The study of historical bibliography is indeed a prerequisite for the analytical bibliographer, who wishes to present bibliographic facts that are helpful in explaining or clarifying textual variants.

In *analytical bibliography,* the effects of the various procedures in book production upon the finished book are analyzed and then interpreted. Its three basic questions are: 1) What is the book in question? 2) Which particular edition, issue, printing, and recension of the work is it? 3) Is it complete and perfect, imperfect, or made-perfect?[56] The outcome of such critical analysis of the book as tangible object is the purview of *descriptive bibliography.* The system of description invented by Greg in the 1930s turned out to be effective and useful and was widely accepted.[57] More elaborative, complex, and accurate formulas were developed by descriptive bibliographers in the 1940s, whose concern was "to examine every available copy of an edition of a book in order to describe in bibliographical terms the characteristics of an ideal copy of this edition, to distinguish between issues and variants of the edition, to explain and describe the printing and textual history of the edition, and finally to arrange it in a correct and logical relationship to other editions."[58] A bibliographic description covers elements including author, title, facts of publication, title pages, format, collation list of contents, description page by page, paper, type, binding, facts relating to the work as a whole such as bibliographic references, and biographical and critical notes relating to the individual copy in question.[59] The elements covered in a description vary with the features of the book in question, such as one printed in the sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth century.[60] The purposes of such a description are to convey a record of the physical characteristics of a book as precisely as possible, to establish a standard against which textual variations in concrete copies can be checked, and to provide details of the book for both literary and printing or publishing history.[61]

The application of bibliography to textual studies is known as *textual bibliography.* It presumes that physical processes related to the publication

and dissemination of a book have a bearing on the development of the text, and these material features may explain or illuminate any textual problem. This belief is common in both literary criticism and textual editing.[62]

Among the five branches of classical bibliography in the Anglo-American tradition, the analytical, descriptive, and textual are under Greg's influence. Excepting enumerative bibliography, the other four branches deal with the book as a material object. Because of such an emphasis upon the physical feature of the book, Lloyd Hibberd proposed the term "physical bibliography" to cover all the branches of Anglo-American bibliography.[63] This emphasis theoretically anticipates the use of detailed and accurate primary sources by Anglo-American historians of the book, and also the advent of D.F. McKenzie's theory of the expressive function of the book's physical form.[64]

In the Chinese tradition, the Lius' model laid the groundwork for two disciplines that emerged out of *muluxue* (bibliographic studies) in the eighteenth century. One was *banbenxue* (the study of editions), the other was *jiaokanxue (*the study of collation), and both featured evidential scholarship. The separation of studies of editions from bibliographic studies took place first in the world of the library. Catalogues of imperial libraries had been conventionally thought to represent "pure" bibliographic studies according to the Lius' norm, and studies of editions were largely derived from the catalogues compiled after the imperial model by bibliophiles based on their private collections, with particular interest in Song (960–1279) and Yuan (1271–1368) imprints. Both imperial and private librarians collated their collected copies, which anticipated studies of collation. Given the affinity between them, *muluxue, banbenxue*, and *jiaokanxue* eventually constituted a trinity that formed the *jiaochou* tradition and contributed much to the prosperity of Qing evidential scholarship.[65]

The rationale for this trinity was practical. Notes on editions of the printed text emerged in the late twelfth century, but it was not until the eighteenth century that evidential scholars valued studies of editions as fundamental to their academic pursuits.[66] The publishing boom that commenced in the sixteenth century increased interest in and reinforced the significance of studies of editions among bibliophiles and textual scholars (see Part III). This new field finally became specialized in rare book catalogues in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. To collate the text in question, evidential scholars tended to collect as many different editions as they could, much as their counterparts would do in other cultures. They surveyed the publishing history of the text mainly based on previous catalogues. Without knowledge

of bibliography, it would not be possible for evidential scholars to understand questions concerning the survival, authenticity, and availability of the text in question.[67]

It is hard to equate any part of this trinity with any of the five branches of Anglo-American bibliography. We can reluctantly think of *banbenxue* as roughly equivalent to historical and descriptive bibliography, while *jiaokanxue* is similar to analytical and textual bibliography. Since the *jiaochou* tradition sometimes is folded into *muluxue,* the latter Chinese term can serve as either the equivalent of enumerative bibliography in a narrow sense, or a Chinese counterpart of the Anglo-American tradition as a whole. Even with such a comparison, we should not neglect the differences between Chinese bibliographic disciplines and Anglo-American ones. This means that the historian of the Chinese book should treat the *jiaochou* tradition as the prerequisite of his or her studies, not *banbenxue* alone as has been suggested:[68] *Muluxue* informs us about the book collecting and writing of a given period or region, *banbenxue* helps to reveal the various physical formats of the book, and *jiaokanxue* identifies textual individuality. Their technical functions, however, all originated in the Lius' bibliographic norm of intellectual/scholarly orientation.

II. Chinese Bibliographic Elements and Functions

In the Lius' norm, a bibliography should be annotated and critical, with two elements in the entry for a title and two more elements in the bibliography as a whole. The two elements in the entry are *pianmu* 篇目 (list of subtitles) and *xulu* 敘錄 (report on the book); the latter narrates the historical transmission of the text, its editions, and its author's life. In Liu Xiang's discription of the *Guanzi* quoted above, the list of subtitles is lost and his report as a result of collating is extant. At the end of a class or subject—for instance Confucianism or Daoism—comes a *xiaoxu* 小序 (brief note) describing its origin, evolution, and main intellectual features.[69] The general preface (*zongxu* 總序) to the bibliography summarizes the collection from which the bibliography is compiled and sketches the general scholarly landscape and principles of compilation.[70] In both theory and practice, Zhang Xuecheng insisted on the presence of all the elements that the Lius had invented. These elements were employed to illuminate the scholarly and intellectual orientation of a bibliography, to show the text's place in the appropriate school, and to help the interested reader roughly to understand the develop-

ment of the school and to decide whether or not to read it.[71] The information on editions and issues crucial for historians of the book and publishing, unfortunately, took up only a very minor portion of this ideal bibliographic structure. In most bibliographic practices of later periods, the list of subtitles, report on the book, and both general and brief prefaces tended to be omitted, with only author, title, and number of chapters enumerated.[72]

In contrast, materiality and the physical availability of the book have been the central bibliographic concerns in Europe since the sixteenth century. The humanistic bibliographer intended to direct his readers how to physically access classified books that interested them rather than construct a scholarly and instrumental genealogy by selecting, classifying, and arranging titles.

Like China, Europe has a long tradition of bibliography. The earliest activity can be traced back to Callimachus (b. ca. 303 BC), poet and director of the Alexandrian library, who compiled *Pinakes* (lit. "tables," "lists"), a catalogue of Greek authors and their works in his library, of which only a few fragments remain. The lists were arranged first by genre, and then subdivided alphabetically by author. Each author's brief biographical account would be followed by a summary of his writings that consisted of title, the first words of its text, and the number of lines.[73] Although such basic techniques as ordering authors chronologically and providing an alphabetical index were already employed by Johann Trithemius (1462–1516) in his bio-bibliography *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (Basel, 1494), it was not until the mid-sixteenth century that bibliography developed as a modern discipline with defined goals, formulas of description, and its systematized vocabulary. These were the contributions of Konrad Gesner of Zurich (1516–1565), often called the "father of bibliography" in Europe.[74]

Gesner's theory and practice emerged as humanism's accomplishment in the field of bibliography. In his theory, bibliographic information should serve the reader to achieve knowledge and to communicate it to others, and should invite more readers to share in further research. He emphasized the "physical availability of books" to common readers more than to learned elites. Reliable, useful, and precise information should be provided to ensure that the reader could locate any works. Gesner considered this to be the only valid goal of bibliography, which in turn motivated him to innovate techniques, including his formulae of description.[75] His theory and practice were illustrated fully in his *Bibliotheca universalis* (Zurich, 1545), the first bibliography of all known Hebrew, Greek, and Latin works in the Western world. This work consists of two parts: the first is arranged not chronologi-

cally as Trithemius had done, but alphabetically by the author's given name and accompanied by an index of authors listed by surname; the second, entitled *Pandectae, is* the first general subject bibliography with a classification scheme based on the concept of philosophy as an encyclopedia of the sciences and arts (he divided human knowledge into twenty-one subjects).[76] Among the information and data provided, he included the subtitles of the chapters the work contained, the nature of the material treated, a critical evaluation (as did his Chinese counterpart Liu Xiang), and even an extract from the preface, all of which were intended to help readers know "what has been written by each author, how, why, in what style" before they decided to purchase or not. With his innovative descriptive formulae, Gesner supplied printing data (place, name of printer, date of printing) as well as the book's format, number of pages, and price, all of which follow the title. The name of the printer, according to Gesner, could be useful in choosing among various editions; the date of printing was useful because newer editions were usually better than the earlier ones; the place of printing directed the reader to the city where he would be most likely to find the book that interested him.[77]

This Gesnerian information and data, together with the consideration he accorded common readers, were generally absent in the Chinese norm. The first Gesnerian-type concern that I have found in the Chinese tradition appeared in the eigthteenth century: Zhang Xuecheng, in his principles for compiling a general bibliography of historical writings, suggested that detailed publishing data be recorded in the bibliographic description. Textual variants among the editions of the work in question, their pretexts, and physical features would help the reader to evaluate editions. The place of storage of an edition's woodblocks, also noted in the bibliography, would direct interested readers to where they could have the book printed.[78] Unfortunately, Zhang's suggestion was not embraced by other contemporary Chinese bibliographers.

Although Gesner's information and data of printing enabled his readers to make individual and rational choices, it could erode the profits of printers and authors.[79] This does not mean that the printer's role was omitted from the compilation of his bibliographic canon. Second only to the public and private collections in Italy and German-speaking countries, the trade catalogues of various areas were also incorporated as main sources into his bibliography. Actually, many volumes were devoted to printers or publishers, with Gesner describing the cultural and technical features of their products.[80] In spite of the effort he devoted to make these innovations, Gesner

insisted upon the instrumental function of his bibliography for the public: as his work's subtitle indicates, his work is "[a] new work which is necessary not only for developing public and private libraries, but also very useful in helping students of all the arts and sciences to better carry out their studies."[81]

Although it was dishonored in various ways and even included by the Roman church in the *Index librorum prohibitorum,* Gesner's *Bibliotheca universalis* became the "central core" from which modern European bibliography developed.[82] The provision of printing data continued in later bibliographies. Among the national bibliographies that emerged as the consequence of the fading of Latin, growth of vernaculars, and establishing of nations, Andrew Maunsell's (ca. 1560–1604) *Catalogue of English Printed Bookes* (2 vols., London, 1595) had been followed as a pattern by other national bibliographers in seventeenth-century Europe. This first bibliography of English books listed only those works printed in the preceding fifty to sixty years and still available from publishers and booksellers. In addition to his English nationalism, Maunsell developed Gesner's concern with the "physical availability of books" to common readers to an extreme, exhibiting a hostile attitude towards scholars trained in the trilingual culture (Greek, Latin, and Hebrew): "It may be thought (right Worshipfull) a needlesse labour to make a Catalogue of English printed Books: yet to men of iudgment I hope it will be thought necessarie, for if learned men studie and spend their bodies and good for further the knowledge of their Country men, for the good of the common weale, methinketh it were pittie their studies, and the benefit of them should lie hidden."[83]

Therefore, in Maunsell's theory as in Gesner's, bibliography should serve as practical communication to satisfy the needs of the public. With this motive, again as Gesner had done, Maunsell supplied typographical and format notes for each book he listed. Information and data in his entries appear full and accurate, including the author's name, the translator's if any, the title with full details, the printer's or bookseller's name, the date of publication, and the format as well. Maunsell's work, which bears some modern bibliographic ideas, marks the maturing of the Western bibliographic tradition.[84] Those bibliographers who refused to provide any of the abovementioned details in their entries but gave only titles, such as Antonio Doni (1513–1574) in his *La libraria* (Venice, 1550–1551), were seen as incompetent in this field.[85] Doni's work was the first bibliography in a vernacular that attempted to describe all books in Italian.

In Chinese practices from the first to the late eighteenth centuries, bibliography had been initiated to serve scholarship and bibliophilism, that is,

to serve learned elites. Treated as a history of scholarship or an intellectual history, Chinese bibliography as a norm had provided clues about the evolution of schools of scholarship. In spite of Zhang Xuecheng's suggestion that the storage of woodblocks be noted as a bibliographic element, the "physical availability of books" to common readers rather than to learned elites alone did not come into Chinese bibliographers' mind until the mid-nineteenth century, when two bibliographies in which editions currently accessible to school students were noted came into being under the auspices of two provincial education commissioners.[86] Even in these two instrumental bibliographies, neither printing data nor information on formats was provided in detail in most cases.

III. Chinese Bibliographic Practices since the Sixteenth Century

Hundreds of bibliographies compiled in Ming (1368–1644) and Qing China are extant.[87] To survey them more effectively, we shall classify them into different types. The classification proposed in 1934 by Wang Pijiang (1887–1966) could be the simplest and most helpful. By the compiler's identity and his source for compilation, Wang divided traditional bibliographies into: 1) the bibliographer's bibliography (*mulujia zhi mulu* 目錄家之目錄), focusing on the classification and retrieval of the book and treating it as a physical object; 2) the historian's bibliography (*shijia zhi mulu*史家之目錄), clarifying the evolution of scholarship through his classification scheme and treating the book as an intellectual entity; 3) the bibliophile's bibliography (*cangshujia zhi mulu*藏書家之目錄), devoting to the editions and formats of the book and collecting it as a curio; and 4) the scholar's bibliography (*dushujia zhi mulu* 讀書家之目錄), stressing the summary and review of the book as an approach to academic study.[88] It is hard to allot these four types to any of the three branches of the *jiaochou* tradition, or to any branch of Anglo-American bibliography, since Wang categorized historical catalogues according to their compilers' identities and uses of books rather than disciplinary features. Wang's approach is praxis-oriented, but it is true that the bibliographer, historian, bibliophile, and scholar were the main compilers of most extant bibliographies in China. The intellectual and scholarly orientation of Chinese bibliographic tradition led to the neglect of printing data in practice.

Wang exemplified the "bibliographer's bibliography" by Liu Xin's *Qi lue*. By bibliographer, Wang largely refers to those in charge of cataloguing imperial library holdings and interested in "pure" bibliography. Most of their outputs were the catalogues of imperial libraries and government collections, commonly called *guanshu mulu* 官書目錄 (catalogue of government books).[89] Those bibliographers after the Lius, either inside or outside the imperial court, mainly considered the book rather than universal knowledge to be the sole subject of their bibliography, acting like Greg's "ideal bibliographer" who "[a]t best . . . is only the systematizer of other men's knowledge."[90] In practice, however, this type of official bibliographer did not describe physical elements of the book at all. Since the compilation of the *Sui History* (629–636)—its bibliographic section is known as the second extant Chinese bibliographic canon after that in the *History of the Former Han*—the catalogue of the government collection had tended to list only the author, title, and number of chapters but to cancel notes and brief and general prefaces, as we can find in the available 1042 *Chongwen zongmu* (General bibliography of the Chongwen library) of the Song court.[91] In terms of both the classification scheme and bibliographic description, the Ming government did not produce any catalogues comparable to this Song imperial canon. Until 1775, printing data and information on editions were absent from catalogues of the imperial library. In 1775 a catalogue of the rare collection in the Qing court was compiled and its supplement appeared in 1797.[92] All those rare books in these two catalogues were classified according to their dates of printing into the Song, Yuan, and Ming categories, under each of which books were subdivided by the fourfold classification scheme into the Classics, History, Philosophy, and Belles lettres. Although the date and place of printing as well as the printer's and publisher's names were identified, these two catalogues were oriented toward book collecting, as the listed bibliophiles' seals demonstrate.[93] Its purpose obviously deviated from the Lius' norm.

The Ming imperial collection was catalogued twice. Its first catalogue was completed in 1441; in the entry only the title and its number of fascicles were mentioned without even the number of chapters (or in some cases even the author) noted. With the location of any book in the library recorded, this catalogue was intended as an inventory to facilitate retrieval.[94] A second catalogue was compiled in 1605, in which the title, number of fascicles, and completeness were described, sometimes with the author and very brief summary. Far fewer titles were contained than those in the 1441 catalogue, and even the notes were incomplete.[95] The Ming deficiency of those basic

elements, as scholars like Zhu Yizun朱彝尊 (1629–1709) complained, concealed the authorial intention and textual feature of a title, both of which previous imperial catalogues tended to represent.[96]

Outside the Ming court, some government agencies such as the national universities (*taixue* 太學) in Beijing and Nanjing and the Messenger Office (*Xingrensi* 行人司) set up their own libraries. Catalogues were compiled of their collections, which were naturally much smaller than the imperial ones. The 1602 catalogue of the Messenger Office library listed the title and the number of fascicles only, as the 1441 imperial catalogue did. It was intended as an inventory of the Office's assets and a reminder to its staff to return the items they borrowed from the library.[97] A more detailed catalogue was made of the collection in the sixteenth-century National University of Nanjing, in which were noted the title, author, number of chapters, number of fascicles, number of woodblocks, completeness, survival, binding, origin, and other information the compiler thought pertinent, but those details were occasionally found in only some entries.[98] Quite similar were the entries in the catalogue of the National University of Beijing Library.[99]

Catalogues of imperial libraries and government collections had been the main sources for the historian's bibliography. This type refers to dynastic bibliography in the standard histories and retrospective and universal bibliography in other general historical works, represented respectively in Ban Gu's *History of the Former Han* and *Zheng Qiao's Tong zhi* (The general record). Liu Xin's court bibliography, the *Qi lue*, as mentioned above, was adopted and modified by Ban Gu in his *History of the Former Han* into the bibliographic section, the first historian's bibliography in China.[100] With its concern with universal knowledge rather than the book as a material object, the historian's bibliography followed the Lius' norm. Initiated with the Lius' work and Ban Gu's adoption of it, this norm was further confirmed in the bibliographic section of the *Sui History.*[101] With its intellectual and scholarly concern, the historian's bibliography did not note editions or other physical features of the book. It could be reliable for intellectual historians because of the light it shed on schools of scholarship and intellectual ideas,[102] but is not sufficient for historians of the book or publishing. Bibliographies of this sort illustrate dynastic scholarship and the intellectual climate rather than writing or book production. They were selective and incomplete, which is why it was necessary to compile supplements to dynastic bibliographies in the standard histories.[103]

More suggestive for book historians is the alteration in the scope of the historian's bibliography from a retrospective and universal one to one that

was contemporary and selective. The tradition of retrospective and universal bibliography represented by Ban Gu was theoretically questioned for the first time in the Tang period (618–907). Assuming a dynastic history to be simply a history of contemporary events, Liu Zhiji (661–721) proposed removing the bibliographic section from the standard history. He argued that output of titles had been dramatically increasing and there were too many to be listed in a monograph. Even if the bibliographic section needed to be kept, Liu insisted, only contemporary works would be enumerated.[104] His idea echoed early Qing compilers of the *Ming History* (1678–1735; printed in 1739). Moreover, the incompleteness of the Ming imperial catalogues made it impossible to compile a retrospective and universal bibliography as found in the standard histories of the Former Han, Sui (581–618), Tang, and Song. The only solution was to compile a list of Ming writings.[105] This unprecedented change in the scope of dynastic bibliography was confirmed by Republican compilers of the *Draft of the Qing History* (1914–1927); both its bibliographic section and late supplements included only Qing writings.[106]

The first Ming attempt to compile a historian's bibliography was conducted around 1595 by Jiao Hong (1540–1620), who in his *Guoshi jingji zhi* (Bibliographic section of the national history) emphasized the classification of books, both extant and lost.[107] Following Zheng Qiao's theory of classifying titles to clarify scholarship, Jiao listed the title, number of chapters, and author, followed by a brief note. Neither contemporary book collections nor contemporary writings were well represented in his bibliography: Jiao simply copied entries without any investigation from all available bibliographies, imperial and private, earlier and contemporary. Thus his work was harshly regarded as "indiscriminate" and "unreliable" by eighteenth-century court scholars.[108] Attempts were made between 1678 and 1735 to compile a monography of bibliography as a part of the *Ming History* under the auspices of the Qing court.[109] Among these compilers was Huang Yuji (1629–1691), who had been undertaking his enterprise of the *Qianqingtang shumu* (Catalogue of the One-thousand-*qing* Hall) before he served as a compiler in the Office for the Ming History in 1679. Ten years later Huang completed his draft, which was revised and reduced into the present version in the *Ming History*.[110] In his extant draft Huang included 15,660 titles, most of which are Ming writings, with a few titles from the Song, Liao (916–1125), Jin (1115–1234), and Yuan that were not recorded in the *Song History*. In some Ming entries, Huang provided the authors' brief biographies and limited data about publishing.[111]

Jiao Hong's declared "failure" as a historian-bibliographer was partly a consequence of the poor quality of Ming imperial catalogues. Indeed, it had appeared impracticable and unnecessary to compile a retrospective and universal bibliography prior to 1345, when the *Song History* (1343–1345) was completed. From its bibliographic section many titles were dropped, and this was the very reason for Huang Yuji's attempt to recover those concealed Song, Liao, Jin, and Yuan writings in his own bibliography, even though it was intended to be a catalogue of Ming writings.[112] This impracticability resulted in part from the prosperity of book production in the Song and in part from the challenge of private catalogues to imperial ones. In terms of book production, hand-copied books predominated over imprints in the Song, but some Song bibliophiles had noticed the significance of printed editions (see below). In the sixteenth century imprints finally became the dominant book form; the wide use of xylography undoubtedly multiplied imprints available in the market.[113] In terms of bibliographic achievement, the "bibliophile's bibliography" already surpassed the imperial catalogue in both scope and annotation in the first half of the thirteenth century, although imperial catalogues remained important until the compilation of *Siku quanshu zongmu in 1782*.[114] The Ming court actually did not effectively arrange or manage its library as previous dynasties had done. Qiu Jun (1418–1495) was concerned with its withdrawal from this role that a court conventionally was expected to assume. Following the Lius' norm, Qiu even designed a set of institutions for the storage and arrangement of books and archives,[115] but it obvisously had never been practiced until the collapse of the dynasty. In the whole course of the Ming, individual bibliophiles evidently maintained their technological advantages over their court colleagues.

The growth of private libraries as a result of the quantitative advance in book production from the sixteenth century onward undoubtedly enriched the "bibliophile's bibliography." With the number of books increasing, special techniques were required to compile catalogues. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, several guides for book collecting emerged. By the early seventeenth century, bibliophilist guides tended to emphasize the classification scheme suitable for a library in addition to instructions for enriching and preserving its holdings. Techniques of cataloguing books and describing their physical features were rarely covered in the seventeenth-century bibliophile instructions.[116] It was not until the eighteenth century that bibliographer Sun Congtian 孫從添 (ca. 1680–1759+) instructed the book collector to compile four different catalogues of his own collection: a

general and enumerative bibliography, an annotated catalogue of rare books and manuscripts, a cabinet bibliography for retrieval, and a list of books in processing or use; of these the second contains information on editions. Physical features were used in judging rare editions and in bibliographically describing them.[117] Since the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, the bibliophile's private bibliography had indeed preceded the imperial catalogue in using techniques of description. The first brief notes on editions appeared in the late twelfth century, when You Mao (1127–1194) noticed the different editions of some Confucian Classics and standard histories. In the currently available editions of his catalogue, however, the entry did not note the author or number of chapters, and none of the notes included the date of printing.[118] During the entire nineteenth century, Sun Congtian's manual was the only instruction in bibliography for private collections, and traditional Chinese library terminologies and methods of cataloguing rare works owe their origin mostly to his work. The criteria he invented for judging a genuine Song or Yuan imprint have been esteemed as infallible in this field.[119] Sun's advice, however, was more general and idealistic than specific and practical. Catalogues with notes concerning editions remained scarce in Ming-Qing China. Although a very few notes were made for a small number of books, they were too brief to be useful for scrupulous book historians.[120]

The lack of Gesnerian information in Chinese bibliography eventually was decried in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries by some professional bibliographers, who sought to examine bibliographic entries in order to collect and identify various editions of a text before collating and annotating it. It was not until 1805, however, when Qin Enfu 秦恩復 (1760–1843) compiled the catalogue of his library, that editions were noted in any entry of a bibliography. Qin's work was praised as a great advance in bibliographic description, which made the entry reliable for both bibliophiles and readers.[121] After Qin's catalogue, the nineteenth century witnessed a few general surveys of editions of all available books, and two significant achievements by Shao Yichen (1810–1861) and Mo Youzhi (1811–1871) respectively were published around 1910. Both centered on titles included in the *Siku quanshu zongmu*, in which no information of any kind on editions had been provided. Mo Youzhi's bibliography was later enlarged by Fu Zengxiang (1872–1950).[122] One more survey was conducted by Zhu Xueqin (1823–1875) roughly at the same time as Shao's and Mo's work, and it was a result of crossreferencing to the earlier two.[123] These three bibliographies make it possible to check the editions of a book produced before and in the eighteenth century.

The "scholar's bibliography," in Wang Pijiang's definition, is more concerned with the summary and review of the book than its physical forms. A few general and all subject bibliographies can be labeled as this type. Initially private rather than official, the scholar's bibliography appeared first in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries when Chao Gongwu (ca. 1105–1180) and Chen Zhensun (fl. 1211–1249) compiled their annotated bibliographies of the books they collected and witnessed.[124] Subsequently, only a few general bibliographies had carried on this scholarly tradition, which reached its peak with the 1782 *Siku quanshu zongmu*.[125] Most Ming and Qing subject bibliographies noted any discrepancy in the number of chapters among different editions and provided an extract from the preface and postscript of the catalogued book. The incorporation of extracted prefaces and postscripts into the bibliography was initiated in an early-sixth-century Buddhist catalogue.[126] It was applied for the first time to secular bibliography at the turn of the fourteenth century.[127] Its first successful application to subject bibliography is found in Zhu Yizun's *Jingyi kao (An investigation of the meaning of the Classics)* completed in 1699 and entirely published in 1755. Zhu invented a model for the compilation of later subject bibliographies. In addition to the listed editions of a book, quoted prefaces and postscripts could yield some clues concerning its publication, even though some dates were unfortunately removed from original pretexts when Zhu and his assistants were editing.[128] Zhu also was concerned with the existence and completeness of the text in question. In the entry he clearly marked the book "extant" (*cun* 存), "lost" (*yi* 佚), "incomplete" (*que* 闕), or "unwitnessed [by himself]" (*weijian* 未見). Interested readers could still track the extant, ignore the lost, supplement the incomplete, and have chances to witness what Zhu had not witnessed. This intention did not include the aforementioned Gesnerian concern with the physical availability of the book. Actually, Zhu was more interested in the authorial intention and academic meaning of the text than where to obtain it. He intended his bibliography as a history of and guide to classical learning, directing readers not to a tangible book but to a text and its academic stance instead,[129] as the Lius' bibliographic norm had done. Zhang Xuecheng was the first scholar-bibliographer who became concerned with the physical availability of the book through printing in his intention to improve Zhu's principles for compiling subject bibliography (see Part I).

Among the four types of bibliographers defined by Wang Pijiang, the bibliophile contributed more to the description of the book's physical features than the other three. For the bibliophile, physical features were more useful

than textual variants when it came to identifing an early imprint. The author, title, and number of chapters alone did not suffice to determine a book's unique identity. This is the reason why more details about the book's physical forms and printing data can be found in the bibliophile's bibliography. Qian Zeng (1629–1701) was among the first to concern himself with the main physical features of the early imprint. In his annotated bibliography of rare books, he described some physical features helpful in dating and assessing the book, including the layout, column and space, script style, carving style, paper, ink, binding, in addition to evidence from the preface and postscript, printer's colophon, and even its previous collectors' seals.[130] Qian's techniques were employed by other contemporary bibliophiles, and even in the 1775 and 1797 court bibliographies of rare books. The significance of noting physical features for bibliophiles, however, had not been theorized until the first half of the eighteenth century, when Sun Congtian completed his guide to book collecting.[131] The bibliophile, according to Sun, should describe the author, title, number of chapters, and number of fascicles in his enumerative bibliography. In his catalogue of rare books and manuscripts, he is expected to write down in the entry the date of printing (the edition and the issue), the colophon seals, the previous collectors' names, completeness, and textual collation.[132] Sun's bibliophilist theory was appreciated by bibliophile Huang Pilie (1763–1825), who published Sun's guide in 1812.[133] Huang insisted that a book in any library should be catalogued with reliable data of editions, issues, or hand-copying.[134] In his practice, he described in prose important physical elements of his Song imprints, as or even more than Sun suggested, including the genealogy of editions and issues, the number of chapters, discrepancies in phonological and exegetical notes, textual variants, circulation among bibliophiles, the origin and result of duplicating and copying, and the size of the column and the quality of binding.[135]

The bibliophilist bibliographies by Qian Zeng and Huang Pilie appeared as dissident for the conservative bibliographers who concurrently were historians and scholars.[136] In his bibliographic canon, scholar-bibliographer Zhang Jinwu (1787–1829) attempted to incorporate bibliophilism into the bibliographic norm of distinguishing sciences and arts as well as clarifying their derivations and developments, with an intention to correct the over-bibliophilist tendency in his period. He made an impressive combination of all elements that had appeared in the bibliographic descriptions by his time: summary, quoted prefaces and postscripts, colophons, collators, collectors, editions, in addition to title, author, and number of chapters. These elements, according to Zhang himself, would work together to show both the intellectual and physical aspects of the book.[137]

The bibliophilistic description of elements, however, had remained popular and even become more specialized. One of the influential works features the layout formats (columns and spaces) in both extant Song-Yuan books and Ming-Qing ones tracing or imitating the earlier imprints.[138] As a result of this specialization, amateur bibliographers finally gave way to professionals at the turn of the twentieth century, and the bibliographic description achieved a fixed form. Among the first professionals was Miao Quansun (1844–1919). In his bibliographic canon, he introduced for the first time the height and width of the printed part of the half-folio (*banye* 半葉) into the description.[139] He established in his later career a formula of description, which was never explicated by Miao himself but was summarized by a bookman of later generation:

> [Title], of [X] chapters,
> by [the author's name, followed by his native place or official title that should be duplicated from the first chapter of the original copy], printed in [date and place of printing, which require the bibliographer's skill to determine], with a model of [X] columns of [X] characters per half folio, white (or black) folding line, single (or double) marginal line, [X] characters below the folding point(s) at the central line of the block. The end of the chapter bears the name of [proofreader/publisher, or the printer's colophon]. The book begins with the preface by [an author's name] in the [X] year of [a reign name], and the preface for re-carving its woodblocks by [an author's name] in the [X] year of [a reign name]. It ends with the postscript by [an author's name] in the [X] year of [a reign name]. [The author of the book], whose courtesy name is [X], a native of [place name], succeeded in the metropolitan examination with a *jinshi* degree in the [X] year of [a reign name] and took his highest official position of [an official title] (The author's brief biography can be an extract from the preface and the colophon or from the related entry in the *Annotated Bibliography of the Four Treasures* [*Siku titao*]). This book was edited by [an editor's name, the author himself, or his descendents]. The first woodblocks were carved for this book in the [X] year of [a reign name], and the current edition's woodblocks were re-carved following the format of the edition of [a person, place, or date]. The current copy had been collected by [a book collector] for his library [the name of his studio], and bears his seal [the characters in the seal copied].[140]

With Miao's format of description in discursive prose, which differs from but is comparable to the formula in Anglo-American descriptive bibliography, we can tell his concern with the book's main physical features. This concern distinguishes him from previous practitioners, yet in practice Miao himself heavily relied on the bibliophilist legacy of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries. He did not challenge the long-established norm, but applied, naturally with adaptations, some of its principles and technical matter to his practice. Although his formula is widely applied with modifications to the present bibliography of early Chinese books, only a small number of imprints extant from the late imperial period are described using this formula. In this sense his formula does not mean the standardization of traditional bibliographic practices or the beginning of professionalization of the librarians that we can find in the project "*Bibliographie universelle de la France*." In 1790–1796, all French libraries, under the direction of a *Bureau de la bibliographie,* were required to submit to a "harmonization of classification and cataloguing practices," cataloguing every holding with a precise bibliographical description: author, title, place of edition, printer and bookseller, date of edition, size, number of volumes, and copy-specific notes.[141] Even though Miao and his colleagues became professional to make a living with their specialized capacity, they, and their predecessors as well, had never shared any standardized classification scheme or cataloguing style.[142] Instead amateurism remained dominant in traditional Chinese bibliographic practices.

In spite of their different intellectual stances and academic interests, Chinese bibliographic practitioners prior to the early twentieth century in general can be roughly divided into two groups: one was concerned with rare editions and manuscripts, examining their physical features and circulation among bibliophiles, while the other stressed the classification scheme, collecting textually valuable books and producing manuscripts of rare titles for academic research.[143] Both bibliophilism and the scholarly orientation were conventionally traced back to the Lius' work, and the close affinity between these two types of practices was reinforced in eighteenth-century evidential scholarship. At least in terms of the classification scheme, bibliophilism was subordinated to the scholarly orientation, for no bibliophiles had suggested any original classification scheme that could be parallel to the sevenfold and fourfold systems (and their adaptations) that dominated traditional theories and practices.

IV. Bibliographic Responses to European Challenges

The Chinese bibliographic norm was challenged in the late nineteenth century, when modern European knowledge was introduced to the Chinese elite and when reformers incorporated Western learning in their political and cultural practices. In their first encounters with books on European science and arts, Chinese bibliographers found them incompatible with the fourfold classification system, because the contents of those books were highly specialized and originated in a very different epistemic tradition at the other end of Eurasia.[144] Chinese practioners responded in two ways: 1) by abandoning the fourfold classification scheme and directly adopting the modern European classification system of knowledge when cataloging books on European science and arts, and 2) by combining European categories with Chinese ones when enumerating both Western and Chinese books into one list, without the Four Branches (Classics, History, Philosophy, and Belles lettres) governing any catagories.

Reformist Kang Youwei (1858–1927) and his disciple Liang Qichao (1873–1929) responded in the first way. In 1896 Kang presented his *Riben shumuzhi* (Annotated bibliography of Japanese books) to the Guangxu emperor (r. 1875–1909). In this bibliography, Kang classified all Japanese books on European knowledge he had collected into fifteen categories, which were further divided into 250 subcategories. He included disciplines unknown to his predecessors and contemporaries, such as physiology and European medicine, European science and philosophy, religion, global geography and history, politics, law, argriculture, industry, commerce, education, scripts and lanaguages, and fine arts.[145] Kang attached this bibliography to his study of the Meiji Reformation (1868–1912) in Japan. He presented these two books to the Guangxu emperor, suggesting the launching of political and social reforms in the Japanese way to modernize China.[146] In this sense, his bibliography served as his political statement, which explains his imitation of the Monograph of Bibliography in the *History of the Former Han* that had originated in the Lius' work. Kang wrote two general prefaces to his bibliography and brief notes to categories and subcategories that he considered essential for the reformation, in which he briefly described the evolution of the disciplinary field and its practical significance for Chinsese politics and society. Just as Liu Xiang compiled the imperial bibliography to support the ascendancy of Confucianism by illustrating an ideal knowledge tree (see Part I), Kang prepared bibliographic justification for his pro-

paganda of modernization.[147] He thus carried on the Lius' concept of the function of bibliography: scholarly, ideological, expressive, hermeneutic, and didactic.

The same purpose of serving reformation propaganda was employed by Liang Qichao in his *Xixue shumu biao* (Bibliography of Western learning; 1896). Like Kang Youwei, Liang dropped the fourfold classification scheme, instead classifying translated books according to the modern European knowledge landscape as he understood it. Liang divided modern European knowledge into four branches: Learning (*xue* 學), Governance (*zheng* 政), Religion (*jiao* 教), and Miscellaneous (*za* 雜). Liang did not include any religious titles. Roughly speaking, his "Learning" corresponded to modern natural science, and his "Governance" to social science and humanities. For Liang, Goverance and Learning were inseparable from each other, and Western Governance was derived from and based upon Western Learning, which he presumed ought to yield benefits for China as for Japan.[148]

Neither Kang nor Liang proposed any bibliographic solution for systemizing both European and Chinese knowledge into a united catalogue. Among the earliest attempts to compile a united catalogue was *Guyue Cangshulou shumu* (Catalogue of the Ancient Yue Library, 1904) by Xu Shulan 徐樹蘭 (1837–1902), who established this first public library in modern China. After Liang Qichao, Xu classified all knowledge into Learning and Governance, under which 48 categories governed 332 subcategories. This bibliography was intended to be universal, stressing ancient Chinese texts to illustrate the historical development of politics and scholarship on the one hand, and texts on European knowledge to provide models for reforming China on the other. As a result, Xu employed both traditional Chinese catagories and newly introduced European ones. He juxtaposed, for instance, the categories of the *Book of Changes*, the Four Books, and Neo-Confucianism with physiology, physics, logic, and law under the branch of Learning; and chronology, biography, and geography with history of foreigners, diplomacy, agriculture, industry, and fine arts under the branch of Governance.[149] This classification was obviously illogical, though it endowed Chinese and European epistemic traditions with equal significance. Only after modifying Dewey's Decimal Classification System, introduced into China for the first time in 1909, did Chinese bibliographers develop a modern Chinese classification system of knowledge.[150]

In their first responses to the increasing publication of European knowledge, Chinese bibliographers evidently failed to develop any new classification scheme for traditional Chinese books at all.[151] Miao Quansun's for-

mula, therefore, was rather an attempt to defend the disciplinary territory of traditional Chinese bibliography in its encounter with the European classification system of knowledge. Instead the Chinese norm continued to dominate conventional understandings and catalogues of traditional Chinese books until the first half of the twentieth century (see Part VI).

V. The Role of Trade Bibliography

So far we have discussed how the Chinese bibliographic norm differed, in both theories and practices, from the Anglo-American and Gesnerian traditions. In short, the Chinese norm was scholarly, ideological, and hermeneutic to the neglect of physical features, while Anglo-American practices were concerned with the materiality and physical availability of books. Traditional Chinese bibliographies were compiled for elite scholars or bibliophiles; European bibliographers claimed to serve the general public.

These disparities partly resulted from the different uses of libraries, totally private in traditional China while mostly public in premodern Europe. The lack of physical features in the Chinese description also resulted from the absence of book producers (printers, publishers, and booksellers) from the formulation of the bibliographic norm. Traditional Chinese bibliography, in Wang Pijiang's definition, was produced by and for book consumers (historians, bibliophiles, and scholars). Bibliographic concerns rested with libraries and authors (dynastic, local, and private) whose goals were bound up with scholarship or collecting. Thus I assume that booksellers, printers, and publishers made no essential contribution to the tradition of Chinese bibliography. This is not to say that trade catalogues did not exist,[152] only that they did not play the role that their European counterparts had in the formation of bibliographic practices.

One of the very few early trade catalogues extant from imperial China was printed in 1522 by a Beijing-based printer-publisher, who advertised his new products by listing fourteen titles and emphasizing the Song-Yuan origin of their woodblocks.[153] Another trade catalogue was left by Huang Pilie, who ran a bookstore in Suzhou where books he published were available; the titles and prices were listed in his public notification.[154] Most other extant catalogues dedicated to books produced by Ming household publishers such as the Min and Ling families, who were known for their multicolor printed books, were compiled by later bibliophiles. Entries in those catalogues contained the title, with its author and number of chapters elimi-

nated in most cases and with few physical features described.[155] In the first half of the seventeenth century, Mao Jin 毛晉 (1599–1659), a publisher of Changshu, compiled a catalogue of his own imprints and noted the number of leaves under the title.[156] Those same bibliographic elements appeared in the catalogues compiled by some government agencies of their publications (not libraries) together with the number of fascicles (and even the total quantity of papers used in some cases), but with author and number of chapters omitted.[157] Noting only the number of leaves or fascicles under the title, therefore, had been common in Ming publisher-catalogues, no matter whether the catalogued publication was governmental or household. Those catalogues largely served as the inventories of the publishers' assets, with which they could check the woodblocks in their stocks. Moreover, from the number of leaves or fascicles the potential purchaser could estimate the size and thus price of a book that interested him. More catalogues of and by commercial publishers did appear in Ming China. At least one was compiled of the books produced by the commercial publishers of Jianning, the Ming center of commercial publishing.[158] Unfortunately, no catalogue of this sort is extant, and we know nothing about its description style or its compiler.

We have not found any other sales catalogues than those cited above. The Chinese counterpart of the European sales catalogue did not develop until the late nineteenth century and became common only in the early Republican Period (1911–1949).[159] Some late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century booksellers catalogued the books in stock or those they had personally seen, but they simply enumerated according to the predominating fourfold classification scheme. These newly developed catalogues could supplement previous bibliographies, but their compilers acquiesced to scholarly and historical tradition rather than inventing their own principles.[160]

Unlike their late imperial Chinese colleagues, European printers, publishers, and booksellers were deeply involved in the compilation of catalogues, and their achievements became an indispensable part of their national bibliographic traditions. Gutenberg's rediscovery of printing had multiplied book production. Consequently the commercial printer and publisher needed to sell most of his products within a short period to get a return on his capital investment, and in the meantime his potential readers wanted to know about newly available publications. Therefore advertising prospectuses immediately appeared to increase the dissemination of printed books in the later fifteenth century, initiating the present form of the modern publisher's catalogue as an effective tool for distributing bibliographic information widely.[161] The catalogues for the book fairs of Frankfurt (since 1564)

and of Leipzig (since 1594) were well known. Books in most of the fair catalogues were classified according to their typefaces (roman or gothic), which became a necessary element in the description to indicate readability.[162] These catalogues were an important source for bibliographers from Gesner to Maunsell. According to Daniel Morhof's (1639–1691) theory, the best typographers and printers played a role equal to that of scholars in producing authoritative texts.[163] In contrast, Chinese woodblock-carvers and printers never enjoyed such appreciation, excepting those scholars who collated and published texts that interested them. Professional printers and publishers commonly never had the social and cultural status that their gentry customers enjoyed.

These early European prospectuses can also be viewed as the predecessor of current bibliography, which developed into the form of the literary journal in the second half of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, first in Paris and then in other major cities in Europe. Bibliographic information, with the circulation of those journals, spread beyond political boundaries and over the hurdles created by censorship. In 1665 *Le Journal des Sçavans* debuted, to provide timely information with an exact record of new books printed in Europe. A structural innovation in the literary journal was the *estrait* (brief summary): after reading the summary, a person would decide to read a particular book or not, as a reader of Gesner's bibliography was able to do.[164] Such an exact record of information and summary makes it easier for the book historian to reconstruct the physical and textual features of a particular book, including data about its printing.

European booksellers and printers participated in bibliographic studies with equal enthusiasm. By profession booksellers, especially antiquarian ones, were concerned with selling books and therefore they needed to clearly describe to potential purchasers the physical features and merits of the copies for sale. This professional concern, which had been one of the main motives for European booksellers' bibliographic activities, was naturally first reflected in technical and practical studies of incunabula. The first bibliography of editions of incunabula was compiled in the late seventeenth century by German bookseller Cornelis à Beughem (1639–1717+) in Emmerich in his *Incunabula typographiae* (Amsterdam, 1688). He applied for the first time the word "incunabulum" to the books themselves. His descriptions were over 130 years earlier than those of editor and bibliographer Ludwig Hain (1781–1836), who standardized the techniques of describing incunabula in his *Repertorium bibliographicum* (Stuttgart & Tübingen, 1828–1838), the basic bibliography of fifteenth-century books.[165] Investiga-

tions of early imprints did not flourish until the early eighteenth century in Paris, where the bookseller's bibliography attained its zenith. The business purposes of their catalogues determined the criteria by which Parisian booksellers (and bibliophiles) classified and described their books. Among those talented booksellers, Gabriel Martin (1679–1761) proposed and utilized his own *systema bibliographicum*, which was intended to suit common readers who were not necessarily erudite or learned. His system was later cited in the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot (1713–1784), who praised it for "more order, more intelligence and more rationality in the divisions." Another bookseller, Prosper Marchand (ca. 1676–1756), invented five categories in his bibliography: Theology, Jurisprudence, Philosophy, *Humanae litterae*, and History. His invention became the foundation of the so-called "system of the Parisian booksellers." For both Martin and Marchand, the bibliographer's task was to provide "the history and description of books" or "information about books" as material objects.[166] Their concern, which was essentially technical and practical, obviously differed from the cultural, scientific, and religious concerns of scholarly and ecclesiastical bibliographers, and diverged from the scholarly norm of the Chinese tradition.

This professional consciousness prepared the bookseller-bibliographer's independence and autonomy, which was first theoretically justified by Marchand. He described bibliography as a technique, an *ars,* of arranging books properly on shelves and of describing them precisely and accurately in catalogues.[167] Marchand's concept was refined by Guillaume François De Bure (1731–1782) in his *Bibliographie instructive: ou traité de la connoissance des livres rares et singuliers* (10 vols., Paris, 1763–1782), with an intention to promote the professional competence of his ideal "learned booksellers." As the first French scholar-bookseller, De Bure divided his theory of *connoissance des livres* (knowledge about books) into two parts: the *science des gens de lettres* (knowledge about the content of the book) and the *science d'un libraire* (bookseller's science). The former was the academic researcher's area, focusing on the cultural and scientific value judgments on the work, whilst the latter concentrated on the typographical features of the book and its commercial value.[168] De Bure's theory and practice were confirmed in the early nineteenth century, when bookseller Jacques Charles Brunet (1780–1867) compiled his *Manuel du libraire et de l'amateur de livres* . . . (3 vols., Paris, 1810). Brunet's *Manuel* was esteemed as the bible of booksellers and rare book librarians for more than a century. His annotations about the scholarly and commercial value of the books he listed are still respected. Classifying books according to the Parisian bookseller's sys-

tem, Brunet aimed at offering everything relating to the physical aspects (*le matériel*) of the book, including its various editions, their counterfeits, and collations of old books, as well as information about their peculiarities and characteristics.[169] That connection between booksellers and collectors and that of *savants* and *philosophes* in France did not emerge in imperial China, where antiquarian booksellers were viewed by conservative bibliographers as "pluckers" (*luefanjia* 掠販家), the lowest rank of bibliophile.[170]

The Parisian booksellers' bibliographies provided a model for their provincial colleagues. Many French towns had their own *bibliothèque municipale*, cataloguing mainly the pre-1800 imprints with the physical forms of the book commonly noted. Meanwhile, the printer's bibliography became influential in the book world. The printer Philippe Renouard (1862–1934), who had been regarded as the French counterpart to Greg in English bibliographic studies, paid more attention to the social aspect of bibliography in his descriptive and enumerative bibliographic practices. The emphasis upon the study of printers and publishers, chronological and geographical, made the French bibliographic studies distinctive from the Anglo-American ones, which had centered mainly on the author, the title, and the physical book.[171]

Bibliographic techniques invented by Parisian booksellers were employed across the Channel by English antiquarian booksellers to catalogue early books. From their activities emerged English historical bibliography, the basic technique for the study of old books focusing on an analytical and comparative examination of typefaces.[172] Historical bibliography provided physical details of books, which prepared the way for analytical bibliography.

This kind of continuous exact record of bibliographic information, both internal and external to the book, made possible the emergence of a new book history first in France and then in the rest of Europe and the United States. In their masterpiece *L'apparition du livre* (1958; English edition 1976), Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin launched a field centered on the patterns of production, distribution, and reception of texts rather than lingering over the physical features of texts as bibliography does, and investigating reading practices as an aspect of book history. Their work was "new" in that it distinguished itself from the traditional study of books as material objects in nineteenth-century England and the Renaissance,[173] but its blood relationship to bibliography is widely recognized.

VI. Studies of the Book within the Chinese Norm

It is obvious that the bibliographic tradition shaped studies of the book in traditional China. Despite the conventional neglect of the book's physical features in the bibliographic norm, the development of the book's physical appearances actually elicited some scholars' attention in late imperial China. As a field based on but eventually independent from the bibliographic norm, however, those scholarly examinations emerged much later than studies of textual transmission. It is also notable that the investigation of physical forms served only as a tool of textual criticism and aimed at promoting the reading of the text that the form bears rather than understanding the book as a tangible object.

The origin of Chinese textual criticism was conventionally attributed to the Lius of the first century. It was only in the second half of the eighteenth century, however, that the materiality of the book became the concern of some scholars who preferred concrete evidential studies over abstract philosophical inquiries. They briefly described the evolution of writing materials from bamboo strips, wooden tablets, and silk to paper; of book forms from scroll to codex; and of production methods from hand-copying to woodblock printing during the long period extending from the Zhou (1046–221 BC) to the Song dynasties.[174] Their descriptions, especially those about the Zhou, Qin (221–207 BC), and Han (206 BC–AD 220) books, were based on transmitted texts only. None of those eighteenth-century scholars worked with any real books extant from these three dynasties. In 1912 Wang Guowei (1877–1927) published his study of the technical features of bamboo and wooden records, a study still fundamental for studies of the Chinese book prior to the age of printing.[175] Wang's work marked the emergence of studies of texts on bamboo and wood (*jianduxue*), a field independent from bibliography and addressing the problem of the book's physical features as one of historical scholarship.

When investigating the physical features, Wang Guowei could keep in mind the combination of incomplete texts on bamboo and wood excavated by Aurel Stein (1862–1943) in 1906–1907 in northwest China on the one hand, and the critical reading of transmitted texts in the tradition of evidential scholarship on the other hand. This methodology was fully practiced in his reading of Stein's findings, with Luo Zhenyu's (1866–1940) cooperation and based on the documents reproduced in Édouard Chavannes's (1865–1918) plates.[176] Excavated texts actually (but slowly) modified and enriched our understanding of the physical features of ancient books. Fifty years after

Wang's work, Chen Mengjia (1911–1966) revised Wang's description based on the Han books excavated in 1959 in Wuwei, Gansu province.[177] Since the 1970s more texts on bamboo and wood have been excavated. The texts on silk found in Changsha in 1972–1973 represent the transitional period from bamboo and wood to paper. Li Ling's recent studies based on those new findings provide a clearer and fuller description of the ancient book's physical features.[178] For specialists in texts on bamboo, wood, and silk, those physical features require a reading method very different from that which obtains in print culture. They examine the materiality of the text to promote their understanding of it. In their work, studies of the book's physical features have enjoyed independence from bibliography, but became subjugated to a new tradition of textual criticism initiated by Wang Guowei.

Wang Guowei's work also stimulated historians, bibliographers, and bibliophiles to survey the development of the physical forms of printed books. Based on transmitted texts, Ye Dehui (1864–1927) outlined the changes in terms used to describe the physical book. He traced the origins of those terms back to particular physical forms of the book. For example, he related the term *ce* 冊 (lit. "series of bamboo strips") with the book on bamboo and wood, and *juan* 卷 (lit. "scroll") with the book on silk.[179] Wang's and Ye's descriptions were incorporated in 1926 by Ma Heng (1880–1955) into his study, adding more materials and evidence from extant early books and antiquities.[180] In 1935 Yu Jiaxi scraped out more transmitted records to supplement and modify earlier descriptions.[181]

The abovementioned studies pioneered by Wang Guowei were an early twentieth-century phenomenon.[182] They largely anticipated works on Chinese book history in the second half of the twentieth century, which Cynthia Brokaw has briefly reviewed.[183] Wang's methodology of combining excavated materials with transmitted texts became possible only in this period, when the introduction of archaeology contributed to the modernization of traditional historical studies, and when archaeological discoveries were academically used for the first time in the restoration of ancient Chinese history.[184] This attention to the book's physical features, however, did not abolish the predominance of the bibliographic norm in the field of book history. Except for a few historians who luckily had access to the excavated books, most book historians in China were trained in traditional bibliography and worked as bibliographers and bibliophiles. Bibliographic and bibliophilistic constraints have therefore remained unchallenged.

Invented as a history of scholarship, Chinese bibliography was conventionally considered to be the gateway to traditional learning.[185] Although its

norm was established in scribal culture, bibliography gained its place in the scholarly knowledge system with the spread of woodblock printing. With the dramatic increase in writing and publishing, scholars could learn from bibliography how to choose the right text to read. Thus bibliography was employed not only to list library holdings but also to shape reading habits. Both textual variants in transmission and authorship were examined with the same care accorded to the classification scheme, since they all were important for a proper reading of the text.

Although the Chinese tradition of textual collation can be traced back to Liu Xiang or earlier,[186] the specialized investigation of textual variants and their possible connections to changes in the physical form of books became a part of evidential scholarship in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Most evidential scholars were trained in judging textual variants with a view to restoring an ideal version of the text in question. They established methods and principles for collating by providing numerous examples. Among them was Wang Niansun (1744–1832). He demonstrated textual variants that resulted from the misplacement of bamboo strips and wooden tablets; the incorrect decoding of Chinese scripts in irregular forms (e.g., ancient scripts [*guzi* 古字], the use of chancery script [*lishu* 隸書], cursive script [*caoshu* 草書], and graphic variants [*sushu* 俗書]); the misplacement of commentaries into the text proper and vice versa; and wrong punctuation.[187] More examples were provided by Yu Yue (1821–1907), who suggested that traditional punctuation marks and improper division of chapters and paragraphs could also cause textual variants.[188] The impacts of the physical forms upon textual variants in imprints were systematized in 1931. In his collation of a late Qing edition of the Yuan Statute, Chen Yuan (1880–1971) illustrated how textual errors were caused in the process of transcribing, editing, and printing, and summarized previous methods of collating for the first time.[189] However multifarious those examples appeared to be, they were intended as aids to reading ancient texts for both schoolboys and scholarly readers.[190] In essence, however, both Wang Niansun's and Yu Yue's evidential studies were not historical, but textual and philological;[191] to clarify the expressive function of physical forms was not their ultimate purpose. The Chinese bibliographic norm, with textual collation as one of its branches, nurtured the critical practices of scholars from Wang Niansun to Chen Yuan.

Yet, some scholars have questioned how helpful the examination of textual variants could be in reading ancient texts. Lü Simian (1884–1957) suggested restoring the Han tradition of *zhangju* 章句 (lit. "paragraphs and

sentences," philological interpretation), which stipulated rules about chapter organization, punctuation, and commentary in particular, all correlated to the reading strategy and reading practice. In the classical learning of the Han dynasty, according to Lü, *zhangju* referred first to punctuation marks and particles (*xuzi* 虛字) showing the structure of the classical text and commentaries on the text.[192] His judgment about the existence of punctuation marks in the Han was supported by excavated texts on bamboo and wood. Han scholars indeed used various marks to separate sentences and chapters, so that they could understand, memorize, and recite the classical texts.[193] Lü highlighted the function of the *zhangju* tradition when European punctuation marks were introduced to Chinese writers and readers. His suggestion, which appeared independently of the bibliographic (*jiaochou*) tradition, was impracticable for common readers who did not know the lost Han tradition at all. Roughly at the same time, Yu Jiaxi proposed that, to read ancient texts, the reader should know the ancient principles for writing and editing as well as the common way of disseminating texts.[194] Yu shared with modern book historians an interest in such topics as authorship, dissemination, genres, and the physical features of ancient texts. His theoretical assumption, however, was based on the concept of *jiafa* (school paradigm), the core concept of the Chinese bibliographic norm that Zhang Xuecheng emphasized in his theory (see Part I). In Yu's view, only with an understanding of *jiafa* could the reader know the formation of the ancient text and its original features.[195] His application of this concept revealed the close affinity of his studies with the bibliographic norm and his bibliographic stance: bibliography was still the gateway to reading ancient texts.

The first half of the twentieth century witnessed studies of the physical features of the old Chinese book. In comparison with their evidential predecessors in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, scholars of several generations from Wang Guowei to Li Ling have taken advantage of combining transmitted texts with excavated ones in their studies of book history. Their predecessors had no chance of referring to archaeological discoveries, but developed an enriched bibliographic norm to govern their studies, even in the sixteenth century. Hu Yinglin (1551–1602) based his studies firmly on his own library. Various texts and their editions available in the flourishing contemporary book market made possible his examination of the authenticity of the text.[196] As an enthusiastic book collector, bibliographer, and scholar, however, Hu focused his interest on the classification scheme in addition to the history of book collecting and anecdotal notes about the contemporary book industry. Therefore he has been viewed as a bibliog-

rapher rather than a book historian and his writing as more bibliographic than historical.[197] In his point of view, the study of the book (and history of the book) was still a part of bibliography rather than a field of history. This view, as I have demonstrated thus far, remained unaltered in traditional Chinese book studies.

Conclusion: Towards Archaeology of the Chinese Book

Diverse bibliographic traditions, together with the interdisciplinarity of book history, largely shaped the national particularity of studies of early books even within Europe. In France book history has been the bibliographic branch of *annaliste* socioeconomic history; German scholars have staked out their strengths in the areas of the history of printing and the reception of literature; in England this field focused on the history of printing and bookselling at 1930s Oxford.[198]

In the Anglo-American tradition, the movement from New Bibliography to a new book history was theoretically triggered by McKenzie with his "sociology of texts" as a supplement, if not an opposition, to Greg's analytical bibliography. Greg's rationale of bibliography and its application lay in tracing the relationship between the extant text and its earlier versions, while New Bibliography had functioned as textual criticism and an auxiliary to literary criticism.[199] McKenzie's own stance is firmly bibliographic. His innovation, stressing the technical and social processes of textual transmission, turns bibliography into something dynamic and open. For the fields of bibliography and book history, his theory reveals the symbolic meaning of the book's physical features, endowing the materiality of the text with the same significance as its content.

In terms of applying Anglo-American bibliography to the exposure of the book's physical features and their expressive function, a few French scholars have attempted to utilize its techniques. Their first attempt to assimilate New Bibliography emerged in the 1960s. One year after Lloyd Hibberd proposed the term "physical bibliography" to characterize the branches of Anglo-American bibliography, Roger Laufer coined "*bibliographie matérielle*" as a revision of Anglo-American bibliography in order to describe the French book's material features with the formula of symbols and figures.[200] Initially, Laufer's adoption and adaptation of Anglo-American bibliography seemed unacceptable for most French bibliographers and historians, who

insisted upon their *annaliste* tradition. In the 1970s and 1980s, he continued promoting the technical advantages of his *bibliographie matérielle* in identifying the book by physical features.[201] However, it was not until the late 1990s that those advantages were recognized by a few French bibliographers, convincing French historians of the book to 1) catalogue an author's writings; 2) reconstruct the book's production by a printer; 3) identify the edition on which the production was based and restore the genealogy of various editions; and 4) expose counterfeit and pirated editions, forbidden books, and the fake and the fraudulent as well.[202] These methods actually integrate all branches of Anglo-American bibliography, and the second usage particularly resonates with McKenzie's theory of the text's meaning as the outcome of "concurrent production."[203] The current practice of *bibliographie matérielle* in France is still limited, yet its achievements have confirmed the methodological significance of the Anglo-American tradition for book historians.[204] With their emphasis on the reconstruction of physical features, both New Bibliography and its French revision take the first steps towards further inquiries into the social and cultural aspects of the book and its use, as the *annaliste* tradition has done.

This does not mean that Chinese bibliography should have had the same theoretical experience as the Anglo-American and French traditions, but it confronts us with some obstacles that we need to overcome before we can modernize historical studies of early Chinese books. Because printing data and descriptions of physical features were neglected in China's bibliographic norm, it will be difficult to have a statistical survey of when and where books were printed or published and by whom, let alone why, simply based on extant traditional bibliographies. An archaeology of the book is needed to bridge the gap between traditional bibliography and a modern book history of imperial China. New Bibliography and its French revision can stimulate us to modernize traditional bibliographic descriptions in order to obtain more details about a book. Such a modernization requires a combination of all the three branchs of the Chinese *jiaochou* tradition in the historical context. Neither bibliographic studies, studies of editions, or scholarship of collation alone, nor a combination of them divorced from history, can lead to the development of new historical studies of the old Chinese book. This is a complicated task, both theoretically and methodologically, but it deserves further exploration.

Notes

I would like to thank Prof. Timothy Brook, Prof. Catherine Swatek (University of British Columbia), and Prof. Hilde De Weerdt (Leiden University) who critically read the drafts of this article. Thanks also go to Dr. Alison Bailey, Prof. Leo K. Shin (University of British Columbia), Prof. Dominique Varry (ENSSIB, Lyon), and the anonymous readers of this journal for their constructive comments and advice. Yi Chen of Boston, Anna Belogurova, Desmond Cheung, Dewei Zhang, and a special friend supported and encouraged me in their own ways in the stages of writing and revising this article. Librarians of the Bodelian at Oxford managed to meet my demands for the books I needed.

1. Leslie Howsam, *Old Books and New Histories* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 13–15, 20–27.

2. David Shaw, "*La bibliologie* in France," in *The Book Encompassed: Studies in Twentieth-Century Bibliography*, ed. Peter H. Davison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 206–24; John L. Flood and Conor Fathy, "Analytical and Textual Bibliography in Germany and Italy," ibid., 258–69; D. F. McKenzie, "History of the Book," ibid., 290–301.

3. Cynthia Brokaw, "On the History of the Book in China," in *Printing and Book Culture in Late Imperial China*, eds. Brokaw and Kai-wing Chow (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 20–21.

4. Rudolf Blum, *Bibliographia: An Inquiry into Its Definition and Designations*, trans. Mathilde V. Rovelstad (Chicago: American Library Association, 1980); Luigi Balsamo, *Bibliography: History of a Tradition*, trans. William A. Pettas (Berkeley: B.M. Rosenthal, 1990).

5. For their biographies, see Michael Loewe, *A Biographical Dictionary of the Qin, Former Han and Xin Periods (221BC–AD 24)* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 372–75, 383–86, respectively.

6. Peter Van der Loon, "On the Transmission of Kuan-tzŭ," *T'oung Pao* 41, no. 4–5, Second Series (1952): 358–66; Tsuen-hsuin Tsien, *Written on Bamboo and Silk: The Beginnings of Chinese Books and Inscriptions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 14.

7. Ban Gu 班固, *Han shu* 漢書 [The history of the Former Han] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 30.1701.

8. Ikeda On 池田温, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku* 中國古代寫本識語集録 [Collected colophons of ancient Chinese manuscripts] (Tōkyō: Ōkura Shuppan, 1990), 67A–69B.

9. Liu Xiang, *Bie lu* 別錄 [Separated records], recovered in Yao Zhenzong 姚振宗, *Kuaige shishi shanfang congshu* 快閣師石山房叢書 [Collectanea of the Villa of Modeling Stones in the Fast Pavilion] (Hangzhou: Zhejiang shengli tushuguan, 1931), 12a–b; van der Loon, "On the Transmission of Kuan-tzŭ," 360–62.

10. Yu Jiaxi 余嘉錫, *Muluxue fawei* 目錄學發微 [An exploration to bibliography] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007), 23–26.

11. Sun Deqian 孫德謙, *Liu Xiang jiaochou xue zuanwei* 劉向校讎學纂微 [A detailed examination of Liu Xiang's bibliography] (Siyiguan, 1923), 1a, 2a.

12. For the physical forms of those earliest Chinese books, see Tsien, *Written on Bamboo and Silk*.

13. For the formation and nature of the Guanzi, see W. Allyn Rickett, trans., *Guanzi: Political, Economic, and Philosophical Essays from Early China* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 3–24.

14. Ban Gu, *Han shu*, 30.1729, 1718, 1757.

15. Ibid., 30.1732.

16. Ibid., 30.1719.

17. Ibid., 30.1762, 30.1758.

18. Ibid., 30.1746.

19. Mark Edward Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 325–30.

20. Ibid., 42–44.

21. Zhou Yanwen 周彥文, *Zhongguo muluxue lilun* 中國目錄學理論 [Chinese bibliographic theories] (Taibei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1995), 6–27.

22. Zheng Qiao 鄭樵, *Tong zhi* 通志 [The general record] (Chongren: The Xie family, 1859), 71:1a–20b, esp. 2a–4b.

23. Ibid., 63:1a–69:45b. For a brief introduction to Zheng's classification scheme, see Albert B. Mann, "Cheng Ch'iao: An Essay in Reevaluation," in *Transition and Permanence: Chinese History and Culture*, eds. David C. Buxbaum and Frederick W. Mote (Hong Kong: Cathay Press, 1972), 40–43; Thomas H.C. Lee, "History, Erudition and Good Government: Cheng Ch'iao and Encyclopedic Historical Thinking," in *The New and the Multiple: Sung Senses of the Past*, ed. Lee (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2004), 175–77.

24. Lee, "History, Erudition and Good Government," 177.

25. Mann, "Cheng Ch'iao: An Essay in Reevaluation," 37.

26. Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠, *Jiaochou tongyi* 校讎通義 [The general principles of bibliography] (Wuxing: Jiayetang, 1922), 10:1b, 10:12b–13b, 10:14b.

27. Zhang Xuecheng, *Jiaochou tongyi*, 10:1a.

28. Ibid., 10:2a–3b.

29. Ibid., 10:7a–b.

30. David S. Nivison, *The Life and Thought of Chang Hsüeh-Ch'eng, 1738–1801* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966), 64, 171–73.

31. Zhang Xuecheng, *Jiaochou tongyi*, 10:4a, 7a; for a brief introduction to the evolution of the classification scheme in traditional Chinese bibliography, see Tsuen-hsuin Tsien, "A History of Bibliographic Classification in China," *Library Quarterly* 22, no. 4 (October 1952): 308–16.

32. Yu Jiaxi, *Muluxue fawei*, 9–12, 44–45.

33. Ibid., 18.

34. Zhang Xuecheng, *Wenshi tongyi* 文史通義 [The general principles of literature and history] (Wuxing: Jiayetang, 1922), "Yu Zhu Cangmei zhonghan lun xue shu" 與朱滄湄中翰論學書 [Letter on learning to Zhu Cangmei], 9:29b–34b; "Yu Chen Jianting lun xue" 與陳鑑亭論學 [Letter on learning to Chen Jianting], 9:39b–42b. For the translations of these two letters, see Zhang Xuecheng, *On Ethics and History: Essays and Letters of Zhang Xuecheng*, trans. Philip J. Ivanhoe (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 103–10, 126–29, respectively.

35. Zhang Xuecheng, *Wenshi tongyi*, "Yuan dao" (zhong) 原道中 [On the Way, Section Two], 2:7b–8b, 9a–b; Zhang, *On Ethics and History*, 37, 38–39.

36. Zhang Xuecheng, *Jiaochou tongyi*, "Yuan dao" 原道 [On the Way], 1:3; translation cited from Nivison, *The Life and Thought of Chang Hsüeh-Ch'eng*, 64.

37. *The Mencius*, 3/2, in James Legge, trans., *The Chinese Classics* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1960), 2:191–92.

38. *The Mencius*, 6/9, Ibid., 2:283, 284.

39. Zhang Xuecheng, *Jiaochou tongyi*, "Yuan dao," 1:3; for Zhang's reference to Mencius, see Wang Zhongmin 王重民, ed., *Jiaochou tongyi tongjie* 校讐通義通解 [General commentary to the general principles of bibliography] (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1987), 4–5.

40. Zhang Xuecheng, *Wenshi tongyi*, "Yuan dao" (xia) 原道下 [On the Way, Section Three], 2:10b; translation cited from *On Ethics and History*, 40.

41. Zhang Xuecheng, *Zhang shi yishu waibian* 章氏遺書外編 [Supplements to the *Posthumous collection of Zhang Xuecheng*] (Wuxing: Jiayetang, 1922), 1:8a–9a.

42. Zhang Xuecheng, "Shang Xinmei gongzhan shu" 上辛楣宮詹書 [Letter to Qian Daxin, the Supervisor of the Household of the Heir Apparent], in *Zhang shi yishu* 章氏遺書 [The posthumous collection of Zhang Xuecheng] (Wuxing: Jiayetang, 1922), 29:58b–59b.

43. Wang Mingsheng 王鳴盛, *Shiqi shi shangque* 十七史商榷 [Discussions on the seventeen standard histories] (1787), 1:1b–2a.

44. Tao Cunxu 陶存煦, *Qing Yao Haicha xiansheng Zhenzong nianpu* 清姚海槎先生振宗年譜 [The chronological biography of Master Yao Haicha Zhenzong of the Qing dynasty] (Taibei: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1986), 19–20.

45. Liang Qichao 梁存超, *Qingdai xueshu gailun* 清代學術概論 [Intellectual trends in the Qing period], 4th ed. (Changsha: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1940), 86–89; translation in *Intellectual Trends in the Ch'ing Period*, trans. Immanuel C. Y. Hsü (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), "Bibliography," xx, xxi.

46. As a bibliographic theory and practice, New Bibliography was pioneered by Alfred W. Pollard (1859–1944), Ronald B. McKerrow (1872–1940), and Sir W.W. Greg (1875–1959). For an easier and clearer comparison, I will mainly cite Greg as the representative of the Anglo-American tradition in this article.

47. W. W. Greg, "Bibliography—A Retrospect," in *The Bibliographical Society, 1892–1942: Studies in Retrospect* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1945), 24.

48. W. W. Greg, *Sir Walter Wilson Greg: A Collection of His Writings*, ed. Joseph Rosenblum (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 1998), 141.

49. Ibid., 126.

50. Ibid., 143–47.

51. Roy Stokes, *The Function of Bibliography*, 2nd ed. (Aldershot: Gower, 1982), 4.

52. Greg, *A Collection of His Writings*, 90; Stokes, *The Function of Bibliography*, 23.

53. Joseph Ames, *Typographical Antiquities: An Historical Account of Printing in England* (London, 1749).

54. Stokes, *The Function of Bibliography*, 137, 140–45.

55. Greg, *A Collection of His Writings*, 124; J. D. Cowley, *Bibliographical Description and Cataloguing* (London: Grafton & Co., 1939), 7–8.

56. Stokes, *The Function of Bibliography*, 46–47, 50.

57. W. W. Greg, *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, 4 vols. (London: Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, Oxford, 1939); Julian Roberts, "The Bibliographical Society as a Band of Pioneers," in *Pioneers in Bibliography*, eds. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1988), 93–96.

58. Fredson Bowers, *Principles of Bibliographical Description* (Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1986), 6; it was first published in 1949.

59. Stokes, *The Function of Bibliography*, 73, 86.

60. Bowers, *Principles of Bibliographical Description*, 124.

61. Ibid., vii.

62. Stokes, *The Function of Bibliography*, 107–8; Fredson Bowers, *Bibliography and Textual Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964).

63. Lloyd Hibberd, "Physical and Reference Bibliography," *Library* s.5, no. 20 (June 1965): 124–34.

64. D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London: British Library, 1986), 8, 20.

65. Ye Dehui 葉德輝, *Shulin qinghua* 書林清話 [Pure talks about books] (Changsha: Guan'gu tang, 1920), 1:24b; Zhang Shunhui 張舜徽, *Jiaochou guang lue* 校讎廣略 [A Comprehensive study of bibliography] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1963), 1–2. For the emergence of *jiaokan xue* in the Qing period, see Liang Qichao, *Qing dai xueshu gailun*, 96–98; English translation in Liang, *Intellectual Trends in the Ching Period*, "Bibliography," xxxiv–xxxviii. For brief introductions to the development of *banben xue* and *jiaokan xue*, see Cheng Qianfan 程千帆 and Xu Youfu 徐有富, *Jiaochou guangyi, Jiaokan bian* 校讎廣義校勘編 [Extended theory of bibliography: The section of studies of collation], *Cheng Qianfan Quanji* 程千帆全集 2 (Shijiazhuang: Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe, 2000), 5–7; Cheng and Xu, *Jiaochou Guangyi, Banben Bian* 校讎廣義版本編 [Extended theory of bibliography: The section of edition studies], *Cheng Qianfan Quanji* 1 (Shijiazhuang: Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe, 2000), 1–15.

66. Ye Dehui, *Shulin qinghua,* 1:5a–8a.

67. Ye Dehui, *Cangshu shi yue* 藏書十約 [Ten principles for book collecting] (Changsha: Xiangtan Ye shi, 1911), 3b.

68. Brokaw, "On the History of the Book in China," 21.

69. Yu Jiaxi, *Muluxue fawei*, chaps. 3–5.

70. Yao Mingda 姚名達, *Zhongguo mulu xue shi* 中國目錄學史 [A history of Chinese bibliography] (Taibei: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1971), 168–73.

71. For Zhang's insistence on the Lius' norm in his theory and practice, see Wang Zhongmin, ed. *Jiaochou tongyi tongjie*.

72. Yu Jiaxi, *Muluxue fawei*, 8–18; Yao Mingda, *Zhongguo mulu xue shi*, 169.

73. Rudolf Blum, *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, trans. Hans H. Wellisch (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 150–60.

74. J. Christian Bay, "Conrad Gesner (1516–1565): The Father of Bibliography," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, no. 10 (1916): 53–86. Theodore Besterman thinks that it should be Johann Trithemius rather than Konrad Gesner who deserves this honorific title and paternity; see Besterman, *The Beginnings of Systematic Bibliography*, 6–10.

75. Balsamo, *Bibliography*, 30, 35, 36–37.

76. Ibid., 40.

77. Ibid., 38–39.

78. Zhang Xuecheng, "Lun xiu Shiji kao yaolue" 論修史籍考要略 [Main points on compiling the Bibliography of historical writing], in *Jiaochou tongyi tongjie*, ed. Wang Zhongmin, 164.

79. Balsamo, *Bibliography*, 41–42.

80. Ibid., 35, 57.

81. Cited from ibid., 33.

82. Ibid., 42–45.

83. Cited from Besterman, *The Beginnings of Systematic Bibliography*, 29; also in Balsamo, *Bibliography*, 54.

84. Besterman, *The Beginnings of Systematic Bibliography*, 28–29; Balsamo, *Bibliography*, 54.

85. Balsamo, *Bibliography*, 56.

86. Long Qirui 龍啓瑞, *Jingji juyao* 經籍舉要 [Catalogue of essential classical works] (1847), ed. Yuan Chang 袁昶 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1939); Zhang Zhidong 張之洞, *Shumu dawen* 書目答問 [Answers to inquiries into bibliography] (1876. Photographic reprint in *Xuxiu Siku quanshu* [hereafter XXSK]); Fan Xizeng 范希曾, ed., Shumu dawen *buzheng* 書目答問補正 [Answers to inquiries into bibliography, with supplements and corrections] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1963); for a brief introduction to these two bibliographies and Fan's supplements and corrections, see Cheng Qianfan and Xu Youfu, *Jiaochou guangyi, mulu bian* 校讎廣義目錄編 [Extended theory of bibliography: the section of bibliographic studies], Cheng Qianfan quanji 3 (Shijiazhuang: Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe, 2000), 205–09.

87. There is no exhaustive survey of bibliographies compiled in imperial China, including those still extant. Nagasawa Kikuya 長澤規矩也 made an annotated bibliography of traditional bibliographies by eighteen types; see Nagasawa Kikuya, "'Shina shoseki kaidai shomoku shoshi no bu' 支那書籍解題書目書誌之部 [An annoated bibliography of Chinese books: the section of bibliography]," in *Kanseki kaidai ichi* 漢籍解題一 [Introduction to Chinese books, Part I], *Nagaswa Kikuya chosakushū* 長澤規矩也著作集 [The collection of Nagasawa Kikuya] 9 (Kyūko Shoin, 1985), 183–92.

88. Wang Pijiang 汪辟疆, *Muluxue yanjiu* 目錄學研究 [A Study on bibliography] (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1934), 1–11; Matsumi Hiromichi 松見弘道 borrowed the classification from Wang; see Matsumi, "Chūgoku mokurokugaku shikō" 中国目録学私考 [My examination of Chinese bibliography], *Toshokan Kai* 4, no. 4 (March 1953): 117-22.

89. Wang Pijiang surveyed the catalogues of imperial libraries and government collections from the first to the mid-seventeenth centuries. According to him, about sixty catalogues of this sort had been compiled, with only nine extant and two left incomplete; see Wang, *Muluxue yanjiu*, 73–77.

90. Greg, *A Collection of His Writings*, 90–91.

91. Wei Zheng 魏徵 and Linghu Defen 令狐德棻, *Sui shu* 隋書 [The history of the Sui dynasty] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973), 32.906–07, 33.992; Wang Zhongmin 王重民, *Zhongguo muluxue shi luncong* 中國目錄學史論叢 [Collected essays on the history of Chinese bibliography] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1984), 213; Ikeda On 池田温, "*Sūmon sōmoku* kanken" 「崇文總目」管見 [Short note to the General bibliography of the Chongwen Library], in *Tōhō Gakkai Sōritsu Gojisshūnen Kinen Tōhōgaku Ronshū* 東方學會創立五十週年記念東方學論集 (Tōkyō: Tōhō Gakkai, 1997), 85–102; Aitani Yoshimitsu 會谷佳光, "*Sūmon Sōmoku*: sono hensan kara Shu Ison kyūzō shōhon ni itaru made" 「崇文總目」：その編纂から朱彝尊舊藏抄本に至るまで [The general bibliography of the Chongwen Library: From its compilation to the manuscript collected by Zhu Yizun], *Nishō gakusha daigaku jinbun ronsō*, no. 68 (January 2002): 156–73.

92. Ye Dehui, *Shulin qinghua*, 1:6a–b.

93. Yu Minzhong 于敏中, *[Qinding] Tianlu Linlang shumu* [欽定]天祿琳琅書目 [Catalogue of the Library of Heavan Rank and Beautiful Jade, imperially approved] (1775) (Changsha: Wang Xianqian, 1884); Peng Yuanrui 彭元瑞, *[Qinding] Tianlu Linlang shumu houbian* [欽定]天祿琳琅書目後編 [Supplement to the Catalogue of the Library of Heavan Rank and Beautiful Jade, imperially approved] (1797) (Changsha: Wang Xianqian, 1884).

94. Yang Shiqi 楊士奇, ed., *Wenyuange shumu* 文淵閣書目 [The catalogue of the collection in the Pavilion of Wenyuan] (1441) (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1937); Yongrong 永瑢 and Ji Yun 紀昀, *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 四庫全書總目提要 [The annotated bibliography of the Four Treasuries] (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1933), 85.1781–82; Kurata Junnosuke 倉田淳之助, "Mindai no shoshigaku" 明代の書誌学 [The bibliography of the Ming], in *Shoshigaku ronshū: Kanda Hakushi kanreki kinen* 書誌學論集: 神田博士還曆記念 [Collected essays on bibliography: in honour of Dr. Kanda's retirement] (Kyōtō: Heibonsha, 1957), 57.

95. Sun Nengchuan 孫能傳 and Zhang Xuan 張萱, *Neige cangshu mulu* 內閣藏書目錄 [A catalogue of the Imperial Library] (1605), ed. Zhang Junheng 張鈞衡, in *Shiyuan congshu* 適園叢書 (Wucheng, 1912); Kurata Junnosuke, "Mindai no shoshigaku," 57. In the late fifteenth century, Qian Pu 錢溥 (*jinshi* 1439) compiled a catalogue of the imperial library after his retirement based on his notes during his court libarianship, with only the title and the number of fascicles recorded; see Qian Pu, *Bige shumu* 祕閣書目 [A catalogue of the Palace Library], MS (Photographic reprint in *Siku quanshu cunmu congshu* [hereafter SKQSCM]); Yongrong and Ji Yun, *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao*, 87.1812–1813.

96. Zhu Yizun, *Diaojiao Buzheng Jingyi kao* 點校補正經義攷 [Examinations of the meaning of the Classics, punctuated with supplements], ed. Lin Qingzhang 林慶彰 et al. (Taibei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan wenzhe yanjiusuo choubeichu, 1999), 294.760–62.

97. Xu Tu 徐圖, *Xingren si congke shumu* 行人司重刻書目[New catalogue of the Messenger's Office Library] (1602), ed. Zhao Yichen 趙詒琛 and Wang Dalong 王大隆, in *Ji mao congbian* 己卯叢編 (n.p., 1939).

98. Mei Zhuo 梅鷟, *Ming nanyong jingji kao* 明南廱經籍考 [Catalogue of the book collection in the Ming National University in Nanjing] (16th Century) (Changsha: Guan'gu tang, 1902).

99. Chen Pan 陳磐, *Ming taixue jingji zhi* 明太學經籍志 [Catalogue of the collection in the Ming National University in Beijing] (Shanghai: Yin yin lu, 1916).

100. Ban Gu, *Han shu*, 30.1701. Ban's bibliographic section had been the subject of bibliographical and historical studies in the Song, Ming, and Qing periods. For a recent and detailed

study, see Zhang Shunhui, *Jiaochou guang lue*, 141–72; see also Zhang Shunhui, *Han shu yiwen zhi tongshi* 漢書藝文志通釋 [A general explanation of the bibliographical section of the *History of the Former Han*] (Wuhan: Hubei jiaoyu chubanshe, 1990).

101. Wei Zheng and Linghu Defen, *Sui shu*, 32.908–909.

102. E.R. Hughes, "Concerning the Importance and Reliability of the *I Wen Chih*," *Mélanges Chinois Et Bouddhiques*, no. 6 (1938): 173-82.

103. Yu Jiaxi, *Gushu tongli* 古書通例 [General principles of ancient books] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007), 188–200; Wang Zhongmin, "*Mingshi yiwenzhi* yu bushi yiwenzhi de xingqi" 明史藝文志與補史藝文志的興起 [The monography of bibliograpy in the *History of the Ming* and the rise of the supplementary dynastic bibliography], in *Zhongguo muluxue shi luncong*, 213–24. Most supplements to dynastic bibliographies were included in *Ershiwu shi bubian* 二十五史補編 [Supplements to the twenty-five standard histories] (Shanghai: Kaiming shudian, 1936–37).

104. Liu Zhiji 劉知幾, *Shi tong* 史通 [Understanding history], ed. Pu Qilong 浦起龍 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1978), 59, 61–62; Edwin G. Pulleyblank, "Chinese Historical Criticism: Liu Chih-Chi and Ssu-Ma Kuang," in *Historians of China and Japan*, ed. W.G. Beasley and E.G. Pulleyblank (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 145; David McMullen, *State and Scholars in T'ang China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 177–78.

105. Ni Can 倪燦, "Xu 序" [Preface], in *Ming shi* 明史 [The history of the Ming], ed. Wan Sitong 萬斯同, MS. (photographic reprint in XXSK), *juan* 133, no paginaton; *Ming shi yiwenzhi, bubian, fubian* 明史藝文志•補編•附編 [The bibliographic section of the *Ming History* and its supplements, with appendix] (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1959), 5; Zhang Tingyu 張廷玉, et al, *Ming shi* [The Ming history] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), 96.2344.

106. Zhao Erxun 趙爾巽 et al., *Qing shi gao* 清史稿 [The draft of the Qing history] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976), 145.4220; Zhang Yu 章鈺 and Wu Zuocheng 武作成, eds., *Qing shi gao yiwen zhi ji bubian* 清史稿藝文志及補編 [The monography of bibliography of the *Draft of the Qing History* and its supplement] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982); Wang Shaozeng 王紹曾, ed., *Qing shi gao yiwen zhi shiyi* 清史稿藝文志拾遺 [A supplement to the bibliographical section of the *Draft of the Qing History*] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2000).

107. Jiao Hong 焦竑, *Guoshi jingji zhi* 國史經籍志 [The section of bibliography in the *National History*] (1602) (Photographic reprint in SKQSCM); see also *Ming shi yiwenzhi, bubian, fubian*.

108. Yongrong and Ji Yun, *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao*, 87.1814; Wang Guoqiang, *Mingdai muluxue yanjiu*, 115–26.

109. Most results of those attempts are included in *Ming shi yiwenzhi, bubian, fubian*; for a brief and general introduction, see Wang Zhongmin, "*Ming shi yiwenzhi* yu bushi yiwenzhi de xingqi," 213–24.

110. Wang Zhongmin, *Zhongguo muluxue shi luncong*, 185–212; Zhang Minghua 張明華, *Huang Yuji he Qianqingtang shumu* 黃虞稷和千頃堂書目 [Huang Yuji and his *bibliography of the Hall of One-thousand-qing*] (Beijing: Guoji wenhua chuban gongsi, 1994); Inoue Susumu 井上進, *Shorin no chōbō: dentō Chūgoku no shomotsu sekai* 書林の眺望：伝統中国の書物世界 [An overview of books: The world of books in traditional China] (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 2006), 338–69.

111. Huang Yuji, *Qianqingtang shumu*.

112. Yu Jiaxi, *Gushu tongli*, 196–97.

113. Inoue Susumu, *Chūgoku shuppan bunka shi: shomotsu sekai to shi no fukei* 中国出版文化史：書物世界と知の風景 [A cultural history of publishing of China: The book world and the landscape of learning] (Nagoya: Nagoya University Press, 2002), 175; Joseph P. McDermott, *A Social History of the Chinese Book: Books and Literati Culture in Late Imperial China* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2006), 96.

114. Wang Zhongmin, *Zhongguo muluxue shi luncong*, 113, 122.

115. Qiu Jun 丘濬, *Daxue yanyi* bu 大學衍義補 [Supplement to the *Extended Meaning of the* Great Learning] (Fujian, 1559), ch. 94.

116. Qi Chenghan 祁承㸁, *Danshengtang ji* 澹生堂集 [Collection of the Hall of Simple Life] (Microfilm in Bodleian Library), 14:1a–45b.

117. Ts'ung-T'ien Sun, "Bookman's Manual," trans. Achilles Fang, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 14, no. 1–2 (June 1951): 238–41; Cheuk-woon Taam, "The Development of Chinese Libraries Under the 燦h'ing Dynasty, 1644-1911" (Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1933), 58–59.

118. Ye Dehui, *Shulin qinghua*, 1:5a–b; You Mao 尤袤, *Suichutang shumu* 遂初堂書目 [Catalogue of the Hall of Suichu], ed. Pan Shicheng 潘仕成, *Haishan Xianguan congshu* edition (Fanyu: the Pan family, 1846); Yongrong and Ji Yun, *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao*, 85.1779; Wang Zhongmin, *Zhongguo mulu xue shi luncong*, 120.

119. Cheuk-woon Taam, "The Development of Chinese Libraries Under the Ch'ing Dynasty, 1644-1911," 59.

120. Chao Li 晁瑮, *Chao shi Baowentang shumu* 晁氏寶文堂書目 [Catalogue of the Hall of Treasure letters of the Chao family], MS. (photographic reprint in XXSK); Qian Zeng 錢曾, *Qian Zunwang Shugutang cangshu mulu* 錢遵王述古堂藏書目錄 [Catalogue of the book collection in the Hall of Telling Antiquity of Qian Zeng], MS. (photographic reprint in XXSK); Ji Zhenyi 季振宜, *Ji Cangwei cangshumu* 季滄葦藏書目 [Catalogue of Ji Cangwei's book collection] (1805) (Photographic reprint in XXSK).

121. Gu Guangqi, "Shiyanzhai shumu xu" 石研齋書目序 [Preface to the catalogue of the *Shiyan Studio*], in *Sishizhai ji* 思適齋集 [Collection of the Studio of Sishi] (1849) (Photographic reprint in XXSK), 12:5b–6a.

122. Shao Yichen 邵懿辰, *Zengding Siku jianming mulu biaozhu* 增訂四庫簡明目錄標注 [A commented simplified bibliography of the Four Treasures, enlarged], ed. Shao Zhang 邵章 (1911) (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000); Mo Youzhi 莫友芝, *Lüting zhijian chuanben shumu* 郘亭知見傳本書目 [Catalogue of the extant books known and witnessed by Mo Youzhi] (Beijing: Tanaka Keitarō 田中慶太郎, 1909); Mo Youzhi and Fu Zengxiang 傅增湘, *Cangyuan dingbu Lüting zhijian chuanben shumu* 藏園訂補郘亭知見傳本書目 [Bibliography of the books witnessed and known by Lüting, corrected and supplemented in the Garden of Collection], ed. Fu Xinian 傅熹年, 4 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1993).

123. Zhu Xueqin 朱學勤, *Zhu Xiubo piben Siku jianming mulu* 朱修伯批本四庫簡明目錄 [Simplified bibliography of the emperor's Four Treasures, noted by Zhu Xueqin], MS. (Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 2001); Gu Tinglong 顧廷龍, "*Zhu Xiubo shoupi Siku jianming mulu* ba" 朱修伯手批四庫簡明目錄跋 [Postscript to the simplified bibliography of the Four Treasures with commentary by Zhu Xiubo], in *Gu Tinglong wenji* 顧廷龍文集 [Collection of Gu Tinglong] (Shanghai: Shanghai kexue jishu wenxian chubanshe, 2002), 156–57.

124. Chao Gongwu 晁公武, *Junzhai dushuzhi* 郡齋讀書志 [Catalogue of the Prefecture Office], ed. Sun Meng 孫猛 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1990); Chen Zhensun 陳振孫, *Zhizhai shulu jieti* 直齋書錄解題 [Annotated bibliography of the collection in the Studio of Honestness], ed. Xu Xiaoman 徐小蠻 and Gu Meihua 顧美華 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1987).

125. Yu Jiaxi, *Muluxue fawei*, 8–12.

126. Sengyou 僧祐, *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 [Collected notes of the Buddhist *Tripitaka*], ed. Su Jinren 蘇晉仁 and Xiao Lianzi 蕭煉子 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1995).

127. Ma Duanlin 馬端臨, "Jingji kao" 經籍考 [Treatise on bibliography], in *Wenxian Tongkao* 文獻通考 [General examination of literatures] (Chongren: The Xie family, 1859). Ma finished his work in 1307 and it was first published in 1324.

128. For an introduction to subject bibliographies after Zhu Yizun, see Yu Jiaxi, *Muluxue fawei*, 86–88; Cheng Qianfan and Xu Youfu, *Jiaochou guangyi, mulu bian*, ch. 6.

129. For Zhu's descriptional formula, see Tian Fengtai 田鳳台, "Zhu Yizun yu Jingyi Kao" 朱彝尊與經義考 [Zhu Yizun and his Investigation of the meaning of the Classics]," in *Zhu Yizun Jingyi Kao yanjiu lunji* 朱彝尊經義考研究論集 [Collected essays on Zhu Yizun's Investigation of the meaning of the Classics], eds. Lin Qingzhang 林慶彰 and Jiang Qiuhua 蔣秋華 (Taibei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan Zhongguo wenzhe yanjiusuo choubeichu, 2000), 72–86.

130. Qian Zeng 錢曾, *Dushu minqiu ji* 讀書敏求記 [Catalogue of books read by Qian Zeng] (1728) (Photographic reprint in XXSK).

131. Sun, "Bookman's Manual," 222–28; Taam, "The Development of Chinese Libraries Under the Ch'ing Dynasty, 1644-1911," 54–59.

132. Sun, "Bookman's Manual," 239, 240.

133. Ibid., 246; Huang Pilie 黃丕烈, "*Cangshu jiyao* ba" 藏書紀要跋 [Postscript to the *Bookman's Manual*], in *Yaopu keshu tishi* 堯圃刻書題識 [Postscripts to the books produced in the Garden of Firewood], ed. Miao Quansun 繆荃孫 (n.p., 1916), 10b–11a.

134. Huang Pilie, "*Ji Cangwei cangshumu* ba" 季滄葦藏書目跋 [Postscript to the *Catalogue of Ji Cangwei's collection*], in *Yaopu keshu tishi*, 10b.

135. Wang Qisun 王芑孫, "Tifu weidinggao" 惕甫未定稿 [The unsettled draft of Tifu], in *Yuanyatang quanji* 淵雅堂全集 (1798) (Photographic reprint in XXSK), 7:17a.

136. Hong Liangji 洪亮吉 (1746–1809) divided the book collectors in his time into five ranks, with Huang Pilie placed in the fourth as a "*jianshang jia*" 鑑賞家 (connoisseur). Yu Jiaxi regarded Qian Zeng as another connoisseur. See Hong, "Beijiang shihua" 北江詩話 [Poetry criticism by Beijiang], in *Hong Liangji ji* 洪亮吉集 [Collection of Hong Liangji], ed. Liu Dequan 劉德權 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001), 2271; also cited in Yu Jiaxi, *Muluxue fawei*, 83.

137. Zhang Jinwu 張金吾, "Liyan" 例言 [Principles of compiling], in *Airijinglu cangshuzhi* 愛日精廬藏書志 [An annotated bibliography of the collection in the House of Loving the Sun] (1887) (Photographic reprint in XXSK).

138. Jiang Biao 江標, *Song Yuan ben hangge biao* 宋元本行格表 [A List of the columns and spaces in the Song and Yuan imprints] (n.p.: 1897).

139. Miao Quansun, *Qing Xuebu Tushuguan shanben shumu* 清學部圖書館善本書目 [Bibliography of the rare collection in the Ministry of Education Library of the Qing], ed. Deng Shi 鄧實 and Miao Quansun, *Guxue huikan* 古學彙刊 edition (Shanghai: Guocui xuebao she, 1911).

140. Chen Naiqian 陳乃乾, "Shanghai shulin mengyi lu" 上海書林夢憶錄 [A recollection of bookshops in Shanghai] (1943), in *Zhongguo xiandai chuban shiliao* 中國現代出版史料, ed. Zhang Jinglu 張靜廬, vol. Jia bian 甲編 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1954), 425.

141. Dominique Varry, "Revolutionary Seizures and Their Consequences for French Library History," in *Lost Libraries: The Destruction of Great Book Collections Since Antiquity*, ed. James Raven (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 190–91.

142. For the varieties in the traditional bibliographic pratice, see Zhou Yanwen, *Zhongguo muluxue lilun*, 43–56.

143. Miao Quansun, "Pinghu Ge shi shumu xu" 平湖葛氏書目序 [Preface to the Catalogue of the Ge family library of Pinghu], in *Yifengtang wen man cun* 藝風堂文漫存 [Selected essays of the Hall of Yifeng] (Taibei: Wen shi zhe chubanshe, 1973), 65.

144. Yao Mingda, *Zhongguo muluxue shi*, 145, 146–47.

145. Kang Youwei 康有爲, *Riben shumu zhi* 日本書目志 [Bibliography of Japanese books on European knowledge], in *Kang Nanhai xiansheng yizhu huikan* 康南海先生遺著彙刊 (Taibei: Hongye shuju, 1976).

146. Kang Youwei, *Riben bianzheng kao* 日本變政考 [A study of the Meiji Reformation in Japan] (Beijing: Zijincheng chubanshe, 1998), "Xu" 序 [Preface]: 4a–b; 12:40b.

147. Kang Youwei, *Riben shumu zhi*, "Zixu" 自序 [Self-preface], 1–5.

148. Cited from Lai Xinxia 來新夏, *Qing dai mulu tiyao* 清代目錄提要 [An annotated bibliography of Qing bibliographies] (Ji'nan: Qi Lu shushe, 1997), 280–81.

149. Cited from ibid., 212–13.

150. Yao Mingda, *Zhongguo muluxue shi*, 161–66.

151. Ibid., 152.

152. Zhou Yanwen labels the bibliophilism-oriented bibliographies as trade catalogues; see Zhou, *Zhongguo muluxue lilun*, 137–41.

153. Beijing tushuguan 北京圖書館, ed., *Zhongguo banke tulu* 中國版刻圖錄 [Illustrations of ancient Chinese imprints] (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1961), Plate 406.

154. Miao Quansun, "*Shiliju cangshu tiba ji* shuhou" 士禮居藏書題跋記書後 [Postscript to the *Postscripts to Books collected in the Shili Studio*], in *Yifengtang wen xuji* 藝風堂文續集 [Continuity to the *Collection of the Hall of Yifeng*] (1910) (Photographic reprint in XXSK), 6:23a–24a.

155. E.g. Tao Xiang 陶湘, *Ming Mao shi Jiguge keshu mulu* 明毛氏汲古閣刻書目錄 [A Catalogue of the books published by the Jigu Pavilion of the Mao family of the Ming], in *Wujin Tao shi shumu congkan* 武進陶氏書目叢刊 (Wujin: Tao An, 1932); Tao Xiang, *Ming Wuxing Minban shumu* 明吳興閔板書目 [A Catalogue of the books published by the Min Family of Wuxing of the Ming], in *Wujin Tao shi shumu congkan*.

156. Mao Jin 毛晉, *Jiguge jiaoke shumu* 汲古閣校刻書目 [Catalogue of books collated and produced in the Pavilion of Drawing Antiquity], in *Xiaoshi shanfang congshu* 小石山房叢書 (Haiyu: Gu Xiang, 1869).

157. For instance, the entry in "Jingchang shumu" 經廠書目 [A catalogue of the publications by the Palace Printing Office], in Yongrong and Ji Yun, *Siku Quanshu zongmu tiyao,* 87.1814–15; Liu Ruoyu 劉若愚, "Neiban jingshu jilue" 內板經書紀略 [A brief note on the books published in the Palace], in *Zhuo zhong zhi* 酌中志 [Moderate notes], *Haishan Xianguan Congshu* edition (Fanyu: the Pan family, 1845), 18:3a–7b; see also Chen Pan, *Ming taixue jingji zhi* and Mei Zhuo, *Ming nanyong jingji kao*.

158. A catalogue entitled "Jianning shufang shumu" 建寧書坊書目 [Catalogue dedicated to the bookshops of Jianning] was listed in Huang Yuji, *Qianqingtang shumu*, 294B.

159. Cheng Qianfan and Xu Youfu, *Jiaochou guangyi, mulu bian,* 219.

160. An example of a catalogue of books in stock compiled by a late Qing bookseller is Zhu Jirong 朱記榮, *Xingsutang mudu shulu* 行素堂目睹書錄 [A list of books seen in the Xingsu Abode] (Wuxian: Zhu shi Huailu jiashu, 1885). The most influential catalogue compiled by a bookseller since the late Qing is Sun Dianqi 孫殿起, *Fanshu ouji* 販書偶記 [Occasional notes in book selling] ([Beijing]: Jiexianju, 1936), which has been viewed essentially as supplementary to *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao*.

161. Balsamo, *Bibliography*, 21–25.

162. E.g. the Frankfurt Fair catalogues from 1564 to 1600 reproduced in Georg Willer, ed., *Die Messkataloge des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts*, 5 vols. (Hildesheim-New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972).

163. Balsamo, *Bibliography*, 122.

164. Ibid., 94–107.

165. Cornelis à Beughem, *Incunabula typographiae sive catalogus librorum scriptorumque proximis ab inventione typographiae annis, usque ad annum christi m.d. inclusive . . .* (Amstelodami: Apud Joannem Wolters, 1688); Ludwig Hain, *Repertorium bibliographicum, in quo libri omnes ab arte typographica inventa usque ad annum m.d. typis espressi . . .* (Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1826); Balsamo, *Bibliography*, 122, 156.

166. Cited from Balsamo, *Bibliography*, 127, 129.

167. Ibid., 129–30.

168. Ibid., 133–34.

169. Ibid., 154–55.

170. Hong Liangji, "Beijiang shihua," in *Hong Liangji ji,* 2271; Yu Jiaxi, *Muluxue fawei*, 83.

171. Shaw, "*La bibliologie* in France," 207–9; for the bibliocentric feature of the Anglo-American tradition, see John Feather, "Cross-Channel Currents: Historical Bibliography and *l'histoire du livre*," *Library* s6-II, no. 1 (1980): 4–5.

172. Ames, *Typographical Antiquities*.

173. Robert Darnton, *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History* (New York: Norton, 1990), 108.

174. Essays by Wang Jipei 汪繼培 (*jinshi* 1805) and Xu Yangyuan 徐養原 (1758–1825) on the physical forms of the book in the Zhou dynasty and those by Zhao Tan 趙坦 (1765–1828) and Jin E金鶚 (1771–1819) on the physical forms of the book since the Han and Tang dynasties are included in Ruan Yuan 阮元, ed., *Gu Jing Jingshe wenji* 詁經精舍文集 [Collected essays of the Villa of Reading the Classics] (1801) (Photogtaphic reprint in *Zhongguo lidai shuyuanzhi* 中國歷代書院志 [Chinese gazetteers of academy of past ages]), 11:28a–38b; see also Jin E, "*Zhoudai shuce zhidu kao*" 周代書冊制度考 [Examination of the physical forms of the book in the Zhou dynasty], in *Qiugulu lishuo* 求古錄禮說 [Essays on rituals in the Studio of Seeking Antiquity] (1876) (Photographic reprint in XXSK), 10:1a–5a, and "*Han Tang yilai shuji zhidu kao*" 漢唐以來書籍制度考 [Examination of the physical forms of the book since the Han and Tang dynasties], in 15:1a–3a.

175. Wang Guowei 王國維, *Jian du jian shu kao* 簡牘檢署考 [On bamboo and wooden documents and the methods of packaging and addressing them] (1912) (Photographic reprint in Wang Guowei yishu 王國維遺書 9); Joey Bonner, *Wang Kuo-Wei: An Intellectual Biography* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 165–69.

176. Luo Zhenyu 羅振玉 and Wang Guowei, *Liusha zhuijian* 流沙墜簡 [Destroyed bamboo strips and wooden tablets in the desert] (Shangyu: Luo shi Chenhanlou, 1914); Édouard Chavannes, *Les documents chinois découverts par Aurel Stein dans les sables du Turkestan oriental* (Oxford: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1913); Bonner, *Wang Kuo-Wei*, 169–70.

177. Chen Mengjia 陳夢家, "You shiwu suojian Handai jiance zhidu" 由實物所見漢代簡冊制度 [Han physical features represented in the real bamboo strips and wooden tablets], in *Han Jian zhuishu* 漢簡綴述 [Collected papers on Han documents on bamboo and wood] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), 291–15.

178. Li Ling 李零, *Jianbo gushu yu xueshu yuanliu* 簡帛古書與學術源流 [The excavated ancient texts on bamboo strips and silk and the origin and development of scholarship], rev. ed. (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2008), 125–43.

179. Ye Dehui, *Shulin qinghua*, 1:8b–18b.

180. Ma Heng 馬衡, "Zhongguo shuji zhidu bianqian zhi yanjiu" 中國書籍制度變遷之研究 [A study on the development of the physical forms of early Chinese books] (1926), in *Fanjiangzhai jinshi conggao* 凡將齋金石叢稿 [Collected essays on ancient epigraphies in the Studio of Fanjiang] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977), 261–75.

181. Yu Jiaxi, "Shuce zhidu bukao" 書冊制度補考 [A supplementary examination of the early book's physical forms], in *Yu Jiaxi wenshi lunji* 余嘉錫文史論集 [Collected essays on literature and history of Yu Jiaxi] (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1997), 505–23.

182. Shimada Kan 島田翰 published in 1905 his study of the material forms of old Chinese books, mainly with inspirations from the Qing scholars of evidential studies and based on transmitted texts only. Yu Jiaxi pointed out his borrowing from Wang Jipei. See Shimada Kan, "Shosatsu sōō kō" 書冊裝潢考 [An examination of the material forms of early books], in *Hanji shanben kao* 漢籍善本考 [Studies of Chinese rare books] (Kobun kyūsho kō 古文舊書考 [Stuides of old Chinese books]) (Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 1905), 1:15a–26b, esp. 16a; Wang Jipei, "Zhoudai shuce zhidu kao" 周代書冊制度攷, in *Gu jing jingshe wenji*, ed. Ruan Yuan, 11:28a–32a, esp. 31b; Yu Jiaxi, *Muluxue fawei*, 35.

183. Brokaw, "On the History of the Book in China," 34–38n.1–18.

184. Wang Guowei, *Gushi Xinzheng* 古史新證 [New evidence for ancient history] (1925) (Beijing: Qinghua daxue chubanshe, 1994), 1–58. Ken-ichi Takashima reconsiders Wang's approach ahistorical; see Takashima, "How to Read Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions: A Critique of the Current Method," *Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities Bulletin*, no. 76 (2004): 22–43.

185. Wang Mingsheng 王鳴盛, *Shiqi shi shangque* 十七史商榷 [Discussions on the seventeen standard histories] (1787) (Photographic reprint in XXSK), 1:2a, 22:10a.

186. Cheng Qianfan and Xu Youfu, *Jiaochou guangyi, jiaokan bian*, 1–6.

187. Wang Niansun 王念孫, "*Huainan* neipian ba" 淮南內篇跋 [Postscript to the inner section of *Huainanzi*], in *Dushu zazhi* 讀書雜志 [Miscellaneous notes of reading] (1832) (Photographic reprint in XXSK), IX.22:1a–29a.

188. Yu Yue 俞樾, *Gushu yiyi juli* 古書疑義舉例 [Examples of questionable variants in ancient texts] (1899), in *Gushu yiyi juli wuzhong* 古書疑義舉例五種 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1956), 105–8, 151–53.

189. Chen Yuan 陳垣, *Jiaokanxue shili* 校勘學釋例 [An introduction to textual collation with samples] (1931) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), 1–19, 144–50.

190. Yu Yue, *Gushu yiyi juli*, "Xu" (Preface).

191. Liang Qichao, *Qingdai xueshu gailun*, 72–77, 83–84; Liang, *Intellectual Trends in the Ch'ing Period*, 70.

192. Lü Simian 呂思勉, *Zhangju lun* 章句論 [On chapters and sentences] (1926) (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1933), 3–14, 42–43.

193. Chen Mengjia, "You shiwu suojian Handai jiance zhidu" (1962), 299, 308–9. Marks used in texts on bamboo and wood also appeared in texts on silk; see Li Ling, *Jianbo gushu yu xueshu yuanliu,* 132, 141.

194. Yu Jiaxi, *Gushu tongli*, 296.

195. Ibid., 203–4, 206–7, 223, 230, 274–75, 279, passim.

196. Timothy Brook, "Medievality and the Chinese Sense of History," *Medieval History Journal* 1, no. 1 (1998): 159–60.

197. Lü Bin 呂斌, *Hu Yinglin wenxianxue yanjiu* 胡應麟文獻學研究 [A study of Hu Yinglin's bibliography] (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2006), chap. 2; Hu Yinglin, *Jingji huitong* 經籍會通 [A comprehensive study of books] (1589), in Guangya congshu 廣雅叢書 (Guangzhou: Guangya shuju, 1896).

198. Shaw, "*La bibliologie* in France"; Flood and Fathy, "Analytical and Textual Bibliography in Germany and Italy"; McKenzie, "History of the Book." The printer to the University of Oxford John Johnson and his colleagues pioneered the history of printing and bookselling in England; see Esther Potter, "Oxford Books on Bibliography," in *Pioneers in Bibliography*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1988), 101–16.

199. McKenzie, "History of the Book," 290–91.

200. Hibberd, "Physical and Reference Bibliography"; Roger Laufer, "Pour une description scientifique du livre en tant qu'objet matériel," *Australian Journal of French Studies* 3, no. 3 (December 1966): 252–72.

201. E.g. Roger Laufer, *Introduction à la textologie: vérification, établissement, édition des textes* (Paris: Larousse, 1972); *La bibliographie matérielle* (Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1983).

202. Dominique Varry, "Shiwu muluxue dui liaojie jindai chubanpin de gongxian" 實物目錄學對了解近代出版品的貢獻 [The contribution by *bibliographie matérielle* to the understanding of the modern publication], in *Zhongguo he Ouzhou: yinshuashu he shujishi* 中國和歐洲：印刷術和書籍史 *China et Europe: Histories de Livres*, ed. Han Qi 韓琦 and Bussotti Michela (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2008), 158–59.

203. D. F. McKenzie, *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays*, ed. Peter D. McDonald and Michael Felix Suarez (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 13–85.

204. Dominique Varry is one of a few French book historians who apply and advocate *bibliographie matérielle*; see his course online *Introduction à la bibliographie matérielle* <URL: http://dominique-varry.enssib.fr/bibliographie%20materielle>.