

編輯凡例

- 一 一至六輯傳記資料所收人物，多為近代及現代人物。由於讀者建議，似應擴及古代，供研究中國古典、文學、歷史、哲學之學者參考。第七輯：中國古典小說戲劇家專輯所收人物遠溯晉唐，下及明清，咸認有助於中國古典小說戲劇之研究。現續推出第八、九、十輯。大致第八輯為晉唐，收陶淵明、王維、白居易、李白等 13 人。第九輯收後唐李煜及宋代王安石、陸游、歐陽修、蘇軾等 15 人。第十輯收元代元好問及明清鄭板橋、王陽明、袁宏道、顧炎武等 7 人。
- 二 第八輯編 122 冊，第九輯編 84 冊，第十輯 56 冊，合共 262 冊。
各輯資料內容仍以報刊為主，兼及文集、論叢、絕版書或尚未發表及出版之學位論文，研究報告。惟如涉及專門，則僅提供序目等條索。原稿或原著研究者，如有需要，亦可來函連絡本社複印提供。
- 三 報刊資料部份多由出版商或作者自行輯為文集論叢出版，徵集工作不免重複。決自十輯以後一律以報刊為對象，論文及文集、論叢等列為參考書目，供研究者參考。俾可節省人力、物力及時間。
- 四 此類工作通常由圖書館或基金會支持。近一兩年來，本社因經費困難，進度因而大減。除擬改組為財團法人，~~籌募經費外~~並考慮發行微片 (Microfiche) 以利圖書館及~~業~~
- 五 八、九、十輯資料大體收至 1980 年春初，~~俟有餘力~~，~~當~~進行續編，供研究者參考。
- 六 為供私人購買，每一個人按生平傳略、~~交遊~~、學行、思想、著作等標題分類，輯為專冊。讀者可依標題內容分購或選購，不必全購，浪費財力。如購全輯自即日起，可按九折優待。

韓柳歐蘇文之淵源

胡懷琛

唐宋八家。在中國文學史上佔重要之位置。實則八家之中。亦只韓柳歐大蘇爲重要。其餘王曾及二蘇不能與四人并稱也。

就四家而論。其淵源派別。各不相同。前人論文。多就本文而論。而不一探其文之來源。如魏叔子論文曰。錄云。退之如崇山大海。孕育靈怪。子厚如幽巖怪壑。鳥叫猿啼。永叔如秋山平遠。春谷倩麗。園林亭沼。悉可圖畫。東坡如長江大河。時或疎爲清渠。瀦爲池沼。李耆卿文章精義云。韓如海。柳如淵泉。歐如瀾。蘇如潮。就文論文。自以此二人之言爲最切當。然韓柳歐蘇之文之所以能如此者。未有一言道及。他人雖有言之者。然亦未能詳且盡也。余竊以爲四人文境之不同。乃根於其人之思想。及所受哲學影響之不同。韓退之文出于儒家。如其原道論佛骨表諸篇。極端反抗異於儒家之說。然無充足之理由。不過一例以邪說異端視之。又其答李翊書云。非三代兩漢之書不敢觀。非聖人之志不敢存。可見其於儒家以外之學說。未嘗涉獵。從一方面言。可謂純粹。從又一方面言。可謂狹陋。此可見退之思想。不出儒家範圍以外。至其行文。則筆力雄健。可稱爲力透紙背。且擬古而能變化。不存古人面目。此其所以爲後人所稱也。柳子厚雖與退之齊名。而其淵源則截然兩道。柳文一部分乃出於諸子。又一部分遊山水小記。則出於

山海經及水經注。如三戒螾蟻傳等文。全是莊生之寓言。即著名之郭橐駝傳一文。以種樹喻治民。亦全是老子學說。且子厚又有考證諸子之文多篇。可見其研究諸子之功深矣。子厚小記。千古獨絕。凡讀柳文者。無不知之。而不知其此種小記。乃由山海經及水經注脫胎而來。然子厚學古人。未能化盡摹仿痕跡。如

有烏赤首。鳥翼大如鵠。方東向立。(遊黃溪記)

朱子即謂其有小疵。蓋山海經所記異物。有云東西向者。蓋以其有圖畫在前故也。子厚不知而效之。殊無謂也。

又水經注中寫山水之景。頗多精練峭拔之語。實爲柳子厚小記所自出。摘錄數語。以與柳文比較。可以知矣。

人灘水至峻峭。南岸有青石。夏沒冬出。其石嶽崿。數十步中悉作人面形。或分明者。鬚眉皆見。因名曰人灘也。(江水人灘)

自黃牛峽東入西陵界。至峽口一百里許。山水紆曲。兩岸高山重嶂。非日中夜半不見日月。絕壁或千許丈。其石彩色。形容多所像。類林木高茂。略盡冬春。猿鳴至清。山谷傳響。泠泠不絕。所謂三峽。此其一也。(江水西陵峽)

柳子厚小記云。

遂命僕過湘江。緣染溪。斫榛莽。芟茅茨。窮山之高而止。攀援而登。箕踞而遊。則凡數州之土壤。皆在荏席之下。其高下之勢。岿然窪然。若垤若穴。尺寸千里。攢感累積。莫能遞隱。縈青繚白。外與天際。四望如一。（始得西山宴遊記）

其中重洲小溪。澄潭淺渚。間厠曲折。平者深黑。峻者沸白。舟行若窮。忽又無際。有小山出水中。山皆美石。上生青叢。冬夏常蔚然。其旁多巖洞。其下多白礫。其樹多楓柝。石楠。椶櫚。樟。柚。草則蘭芷。又有異卉。類合歡而蔓生。轉轉水石。每風自四山而下。振動大木。掩冉衆草。紛紅駭綠。蒼勃香氣。衝濤旋瀨。退貯溪谷。搖颺葳蕤。與時推移。其大都如此。余無以窮其狀。（袁家渴記）

然柳子厚文出于老莊諸子。則嘗自言及焉。出於山海經水經注。子厚未嘗自承認。其答韋中立書云。參之穀梁以勵其氣。參之莊老以肆其端。參之國語以博其趣。參之離騷以致其幽。參之太史以著其潔。而其報袁君陳書亦云。左傳國語莊周屈原之辭。稍采取之。穀梁子太史公其峻潔。可以出入。自敘其得力之處。於老莊但云參之以肆其端。但是稍采取之。於山海經水經注則一言不及。此子厚深諱之。故雖其自述之言。不足信也。

然吾所云云。乃其大部分而言。實則子厚所自述。參之穀梁以勵其氣。參之離騷以致其幽。亦非虛言。其

於穀梁離騷。蓋性情相近。就思想而論。柳文勝於韓文。就文而論。柳文不及韓文。規模宏化。且不及韓文變化莫測。姚姬傳云。文士之效法古人。莫善于退之。靈變古人之形狀。雖有摹擬。不可得而尋其跡也。其他雖工於學古。而跡不能忘。楊子雲。柳子厚於斯。蓋尤甚焉。以其形貌之過於似古人也。（古文辭類纂序目）此言雖甚確當。然究非探源之論。蓋只論其形貌。不能言及其思想也。

歐陽永叔。文人皆謂其出於史記。劉融齋云。太史公文。韓得其雄。歐得其逸。雄者善用直捷。故發端便見出奇。逸者善用紆徐。故引緒乃覘入妙。魏叔子云。歐文之妙。只在說而不說。說而又說。是以極吞吐往復參差離合之致。史遷加以超忽不羈。故其文特雄。方望溪云。永叔摹史記之格調。而曲傳其風神。

諸人皆言其出于史記。余亦云然。論永叔之思想。則甚純粹。論永叔之性情。則甚和易。論永叔之時代。則甚太平。論永叔之境遇。則甚安樂。合此四者而成永叔之文。宜乎其不能雄也。宜乎其不能超忽不羈也。而能傳史遷之風神。能極吞吐往復參差離合之致者。則其爲人富於感情故也。歐文之所以能成一家者。惟深於情耳。夫統能之者。太史公後。則歐陽永叔耳。永叔而後。則歸震川耳。歐文之最佳者。以釋惟巖文集序、蘇氏文集序、江鄰幾文集序、梅聖俞詩集序、釋秘演詩集序、送楊真序、岷山亭記、真州東園記、瀟岡阡表、曼卿墓表、祭蘇子美文、祭石曼卿文諸篇爲最。是皆父子朋友死生離合之際。發於真性情之文也。

蘇東坡與其父洵弟轍遊京師。一時士大夫無不傾倒。獨王介甫見其文曰。此戰國之文。此言極有見地。蓋東坡擅場辯論。有蘇張縱橫之習。其文出於國策。千古無容有異議。

然東坡行文雖近國策。而決非僅僅學國策者所可比也。如清初魏叔子之文亦學國策。比諸東坡相差遠矣。東坡嘗讀莊子歎曰。吾昔有見。口未能言。今見是書。得吾心矣。東坡又多方外友。故文中往往有禪理。其自言行文曰。如行雲流水。初無定質。但常行於所當行。止於所不可止。雖嬉笑怒罵之辭。皆可書而誦之。然東坡之言。猶未及清人劉熙載所言爲透激。劉氏所著文概云。東坡最善於沒要緊的題說沒要緊的話。未曾有的題說。未曾有的話。又云。東坡多微妙語。其論曰。快曰達曰了。正爲非此不足以發微闢妙也。又云。東坡文只是拈來。此由悟性絕人。故處處觸著耳。總之東坡之文。出於國策。參於莊子佛書而變化者也。其文只長於議論。曰快曰達曰了。皆爲說理之標準。而非所語於抒情矣。故吾謂惟歐陽永叔能傳文之正統。東坡不足以言此也。

HAN YÜ AS A *KU-WEN* STYLIST

DIANA YU-SHIH MEI

The literary stature of Han Yü 韓愈 (768-824) is enthusiastically noted by Su Shih 蘇軾 (1035-1107) thus: "His writings quickened literature from its languor lasting through eight dynasties; his *tao* saved all mankind from drowning (in heresies)" 文振八代之衰,道濟天下之溺.¹ This evaluation by a literary giant of the Sung dynasty of a literary giant of the T'ang might be a bit extravagant in expression, but it is certainly penetrating in observation. Today, more than ever before, it has become evident that Han Yü plays a unique role in both the literary history and intellectual history of China. He is, first, an epoch-making literary theorist whose doctrine of the union of *tao* 道 (the "Way") and *wen* 文 ("literature" in its broad sense) sounded the death knell of the extremely formal art of parallel-prose writing that had dominated the preceding centuries, and heralded a new age of didacticism in literature.² Secondly, he created a prose style which he himself labelled *ku-wen* 古文 ("ancient prose") but which has since become identified with the classic and the orthodox in traditional Chinese writings.³ Thirdly, as an artist of essay writing, he is principally responsible for elevating this genre to the realm of pure literature. Before his time, essay writing served for the most part a utilitarian function. From the time of Han Yü on, essay writing has come to be conceived, executed, and consciously criticized as literature.⁴ Fourthly and lastly, he holds his place in intellectual history as the founder and inspirer of the Confucian Renaissance Movement, which culminated in the Neo-Confucianism of the Sung dynasty and considerably changed the cultural outlook of China thereafter.⁵

This paper does not propose to discuss the various phases of Han Yü's achievement outlined above,⁶ but will, instead, confine itself to the literary and stylistic implication of Han Yü's ideology and his theory of classicism in literature. It proposes to examine, in more specific terms, the various methods and techniques employed by Han Yü in a number of his representative prose works to realize his classical ideal and effect simultaneously what might be called a "literary transformation" in line with his anti-Buddhist and anti-Taoist ideology.

The emphasis of the present study then will be placed on Han Yü's literary experiments and achievements. Certain representative pieces of his collected essays will be examined with regard to the writer's intended goal and the eventual success or failure in its realization. The study will further attempt to trace and bring out the changes in Han Yü's prose style as well as his concept of style as we proceed from his earlier works to his later works, and to relate the changes in his literary style to changes in Han Yü's personal, moral, and spiritual outlook.

The primary document which treats the literary theory of Han Yü most fully is his "Letter in Answer to Li Yi" 答李羽書.⁸ Written in A. D. 801 when Han Yü was first appointed to the post of *po-shih* 博士 ("academician") in the Ssu-men 四門 Academies in Ch'ang-an, the "Letter" represents at once a continuation of, and a departure from, the earlier *ku-wen* theories.

In the sense that many of the ideas and terms Han Yü made use of in his "Letter" have their historical origins in the writings of his predecessors in the *ku-wen* movement, the "Letter" is a continuation of tendencies already in existence.

For example, in Han Yü's idea that literature is the "external expression of *tao* 道 (the "way") and *te* 德 ("virtue") and that a writer should aspire to the same ideal as the classical masters had exemplified in their writings, he carries on the classical tradition of didacticism in literature of Hsiao Ying-shih 蕭穎士 and Li Hua 李華 (both *chin-shih* 進士 of 735).⁹ In his distinction between the *chen* 眞 ("true") and the *wei* 僞 ("false") among the classics, he echoes Liu Chih-chi 劉知幾 (661-721), Tan Chu 啖助 (725-770), and many classical scholars of his own day.¹⁰ In his haphazard reference to *ch'i* 氣 ("vital force") and *yen* 言 ("language"), he joins the rank of such men as Liang Su 梁肅 (753-793), Ch'üan Te-yü 權德輿 (759-818), and appropriates Buddhist source of inspiration current among them.¹¹ And in his concept of *yang* 養 ("to nourish, to cultivate"), and of the vital relationship between *tao* 道 (the "way") and *wen* 文 ("literature"), he reminds us not only of Mencius, but more pointedly of Liu Mien 柳冕 (active 790), his senior contemporary.¹² Thus in the light of historical derivation of ideas, Han Yü's theory of literature is a continuation of his *ku-wen* predecessors, and Han Yü himself a rather unoriginal theorist.

But on the other hand, Han Yü did not incorporate these inherited ideas unchanged. He created new contexts for them, and invested them with new meanings. Take the *chen-wei* 眞僞 ("true-false") dichotomy for example. In the earlier use of the concepts *chen* and *wei*, their chief reference is to the authenticity and inauthenticity of a historical text, the authorship of that text, its historical dating, and its linguistic convention.¹³ But in Han Yü, the *chen-wei* concept is given a new ideological orientation and made applicable to the problem of *tao* as well. Similarly, the *tao-te* ("Way and virtue") concept in the "Letter" also differs in context and meaning from the concept used in the writings of earlier *ku-wen* advocates. Earlier, the *ku-wen* theorists defined their concepts of *tao* and *te* by opposing them to the antithetical decadence of the parallel-prose writings. But in Han Yü, the target has shifted from the parallel-prose to the unorthodox *tao* of Taoism and Buddhism, and the definition of *tao* and *te* begins to take on an unequivocal Confucian context of meaning.¹⁴ In view of the new channelling of existing *ku-wen* concepts into a strictly Confucian framework, and of the new polemical possibilities thereby engendered, the literary theory of the "Letter" is a departure from the past.

The departures and continuities discussed above constitute only a comparatively minor contribution to the *ku-wen* development. Han Yü's most significant and original contribution in the "Letter" is to be found in the actual literary program for the methodological cultivation of the *ku-wen* ideal: the integration of *tao* and *wen*. The "Li Yi Letter" was probably the only document up to that time which contained such a program and which treated the literary aspects of *ku-wen* theory from a literary point of view, attempting to solve literary problems in tangible, practical, literary terms.¹⁵

To achieve the goal of a *ku-wen* writer which is the integration of *tao* and *wen*, the program prescribes three steps. First, one must read the classics thoroughly and extensively in order to "expurgate all clichés" 務去陳詞 from one's own writings. Secondly, one must learn to discriminate between the true and the false among the classics in order that one may purify oneself from all that is false and "impure" 雜. Thirdly, one must cultivate the true *tao* and its external expressions as exemplified in the classical literature in order that one may suffer no inner lapses.¹⁶

Two points in the program especially deserve our attention. One has to do with the change in context and meaning of such critical terms as "clichés," "false," and "impure," and the other with the emergence of new positive literary ideals and criteria that are literary counterparts to Han Yü's ideological goal. With the introduction of the Confucian context into the definition of the true *tao*, the terms "clichés," "false" and "impure" no longer refer to the worn-out expressions, formal pretensions, and trivial, demoralizing subject matter of the parallel-prose tradition alone. When their target expands from the parallel-prose tradition to include Taoism and Buddhism, the indictments "false" and "clichéd" expand accordingly to include all Taoist and Buddhist literature. Similarly, the "impure" elements that need to be purged no longer mean the "four tones and eight deformities" of the parallel-prose rules but include as well all non-Confucian expressions in literature.

"Purity" in *wen* and "truth" in *tao*, then, are two phases of the new ideal Han Yü set down in the program for all *ku-wen* writers. To have insisted on a strictly Confucian interpretation of the true *tao*, and to have predicated his stylistic ideal of purity on his Confucian ideology is Han Yü's essential contribution to the *ku-wen* movement as a literary theorist. Nearly all the principles of style later on developed by Han Yü in his literary career can be referred back to this early passionate *ku-wen* ideal of his, and gain a unity of purpose through this perspective. A number of Han Yü's representative prose works will be examined below to see in what way and with what degrees of success these works show forth Han Yü's life-long effort to implement his own *ku-wen* program.

The works chosen for discussion are 1. "Letter Written While Attending the Civil Service Examination" 應科目時與人書 (793)¹⁷ 2. "Farewell Preface to Li Yüan Upon his Return to the Meander Valley" 送李愿歸盤谷序 (801)¹⁸ 3. "Stele Inscription

on the Pacification of the Huai-hsi Rebellion" 平淮西碑 (818)¹⁹ 4. Stele Inscription on the Lo-ch'ih Shrine at Liu-chou" 柳州羅池廟碑 (823)²⁰. Punctuated by his two exiles to the southern frontier (803, 819), these four works cover a span of thirty years of Han Yü's literary career and may be considered representative of his three different stages of stylistic development.

The "Letter Written While Attending the Civil Service Examination" (hereafter referred to as the "Examination Letter"), and the "Farewell Preface to Li Yüan Upon his Return to the Meander Valley" (hereafter referred to as the "Li Yüan Preface") are two works written before Han Yü's first southern exile to Shan-yang 山陽.²¹ Reflective of Han Yü's initial conception of the nature and method of a pure *ku-wen* style, they can be best studied in the light of Han Yü's doctrines for the means and end of the first step of his *ku-wen* program, namely, "learning from the ancients," and "expurgation of all clichés."

By "learning," Han Yü means literally *hsieh* 學 ("to learn," "to study") or *shih* 師 ("to model after," "to hold as a teacher"). Its significance in literary writings is expounded at greater length in his "Letter in Answer to Liu Cheng-fu" 答劉正夫書.²²

"If someone should ask me whom should one take as a model in literary writings, I would respectfully answer that one should take the ancient sages and worthies as one's model. If he should point out, 'But the works of the ancient sages and worthies are preserved in variant wordings, which wording should I accept?' I would respectfully answer that he should take the ideas as the model and not the wording."

"Learning from the ancients" then, according to Han Yü, is very much like a kind of meeting of great minds in literary writings. It is qualitatively different from imitation in the sense of mimicry in that a true act of "learning" does not "take as a model" the realized form of a great mind, that is, the surviving text; it "takes as a model" the essence of that mind, which is the ideas expressed through the text.

Further on in the same "Letter," Han Yü resorts to historical and practical examples to prove that *ch'i* 奇 ("extraordinariness"), being a sign of true greatness, is a logical and desirable object of learning.

"Men take no notice of the hundred and one objects they see day and night. But when they see something extraordinary, they watch and talk about it together. Is the case of literature any different from this? So many men of the Han Dynasty were competent in letters, but only Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju 司馬相如, the Grand Historian 太史公, Liu Hsiang 劉向, and Yang Hsiung 揚雄 were considered the best. This

is because those who applied themselves long and hard are also remembered long in posterity. As to those who ride with the world and do not hold any distinction of originality, although they may not be considered odd by their contemporaries, their names will of course not be perpetuated through the later generation. For every one of your sundry household articles you have no doubt some use, but the items that you consider precious must have something extraordinary about them. Why should a gentleman's attitude towards literature be any different?

This emphasis on being unusual and extraordinary is identical in spirit with the doctrine of "expurgating all clichés" in the "Li Yi Letter;" it defines in more specific terms what Han Yü considers to be the central characteristic of great classical writings, and what, at that early stage of his literary development, seems to be the most important quality one should attempt to "learn" in one's writings. When elevated to the conceptual level, this emphasis on "extraordinariness" becomes the conceptual principle behind the form and style of the "Examination Letter" and the "Li Yüan Preface."

The "Examination Letter" is formally labelled a "letter." Without that label, we probably would not have recognized the epistolary form it is enclosed in. When stripped of its addresses and title, the "Letter" is almost a fable, much in the style and spirit of Chuang-tzu.²³ Some critics of Han Yü, in fact, did accept the work as an imitation of the Chuang-tzu fable, and consider its mélange of the epistolary form with the fable a concrete proof of Han Yü's predilection for the "extraordinary."²⁴ This, admittedly, is true. However, one must not forget that Han Yü's literary performance, when geared to the "extraordinary," has more often than not an ideological dimension and a theoretical point. If we look at the "Examination Letter" from a different perspective, that is, looking at it not just through time and against a classical background as an imitation or an attempt to revive certain classical literary form, but looking at it also in time and against a contemporary background as a means of "expurgating all clichés" that prevail in the writings of fables and supernatural tales of its day—then we will see that Han Yü's adaptation of the classical fable in the "Examination Letter" and his re-creation of the ostentatiously archaic prose form and style in it are not merely aimed at achieving "extraordinariness."

In a study dated 1934, Li Chia-yen 李嘉言 pointed out that Han Yü's classical revival movement, aside from being a purely literary revolt against the parallel-prose tradition of the Southern Dynasties literature, is more specifically a revolt against and a repudiation of the Buddhism expressed through that literature.²⁵ The penetration of Buddhism into literature, we might add here, did not cease with the fall of the Southern Dynasties. It is true that the inception of the T'ang Dynasty

and the early advent of the *ku-wen* movement did see some change in the outward habit of the current writings. But Buddhism, as an inner spring to the outer literary expression, retained its firm grasp on the world of thought and belles-lettres. In the eighth century, Taoism, with the claim of Lao-tzu as the ancestor of the royal Li family,²⁶ suddenly rose in its political status and was given a more favorable position in its standing rivalry with Buddhism in the spheres of philosophy, religion, social activities, politics and literature. Many eminent writers of the century who claimed to be political or literary reformers of the Confucian school were at the same time Buddhist and Taoist adepts. Li Po 李白 (701-761), for instance, sang as rhapsodically about the revival of the classical ideals of *chen* 眞 ("sincerity") and *ch'un* 純 ("purity") in literature²⁷ as he did about the Taoist quest for immortality. Wang Wei's 王維 (699-759) poetry was famed for its *ch'an* spirit. Po Chü-yi 白居易 (772-846), a Confucian scholar and a reformer-revivalist in politics and poetics, was privately a Buddhist in his spiritual allegiance. Among the *ku-wen* theorists, there were also T'ien-tai Buddhist disciples like Li Hua and Liang Su, and Taoist erudites like Tu-ku Chi 獨孤及 (744-796). To these contemporaries and immediate predecessors of Han Yü, Taoism, Buddhism and Confucianism presented no problem of ultimate incompatibility. Rather, they represented three different facets of value and forms of personal fulfillment, which, at different times and under different circumstances, could be cultivated simultaneously or separately in perfect harmony and concord with one another.

Contemporaneous with this Buddhist and Taoist influence in the high literary society, the world of popular literature too was inundated with popular Buddhist and Taoist writings. *Pien-wen* 變文 ("ballad"), for instance, was a well-known literary vehicle of popular T'ang Buddhism. And *ch'uan-ch'i* 傳奇 ("tales of marvels"), a new prose form which matured in the eighth century, depended heavily upon Buddhist and Taoist myths for its themes and structural devices. The records of literary and popular gossips were filled with omens, portents, and magical exploits, testifying to the potency of the Taoist and Buddhist magic and the supernatural power of their priests and monks.²⁸ When the literary world, especially that of *hsiao-shuo* 小說 ("hearsay," "fiction") writings, in which Han Yü found himself, was thus flooded with various Taoist and Buddhist extravagances, we cannot very well say that Han Yü, in advancing his doctrines of "learning from the ancients" and "expurgating all clichés" in his own writings, aimed merely to approximate the form and style of a remote classical model in order to expel the influence of a more recent but already outmoded literary tradition—the parallel-prose.²⁹ If we are to interpret Han Yü's adaptation of the classical fable in his "Examination Letter" as an "extraordinary" act, then the significance of its "extraordinariness" has to be further clarified in light of a dual and not a single objective: from the literary point of view, it is conceived as an opposition to the parallel-prose style, from the

ideological point of view, it is conceived as a means to purify the *hsiao-shuo* of its contemporary clichés of Taoist and Buddhist superstitions, and to return the form and function of the fable to its classical archetype.

To oppose the parallel-prose style, Han Yü finds in the classical fable an initial artistic device to demonstrate his doctrines of "learning from the ancients" and of "expurgating all clichés." For each "cliché" of parallelisms,³⁰ Han Yü proposes in the "Letter" a means of redress by invoking a classical antecedent. For instance, eschewing literary allusions, Han Yü creates in this instance a fable himself. In describing the monster, instead of relying on an elegant variation of synonyms and symmetry of syntax, he deliberately employs archaisms and crude repetition of words and phrases such as *kuai-wu* 怪物 ("strange creature," "extraordinary creature"), *shih-wu* 是物 ("that creature"), *ch'i* 其 ("it"), *ch'i-te-shui* 其得水 ("when it is in the water"), *ch'i-pu-te-shui* 其不得水 ("when it is out of water") and *pu-neng-tzu-chih-hu-shui* 不能自致乎水 ("cannot betake itself to the water"). And against the regulated four-six rhythm, he uses a great number of particles—*kai* 蓋, *ku* 固, *jan* 然—which are designed to disrupt the four-six beat and to create in its place a free-flowing cadence.³¹

As a means of returning the form and function of the fable to its classical archetype, Han Yü conscientiously underlines the "illustrative" aspect of his supernatural creature and departs from the conventional practice in *hsiao-shuo* of his times. If we take a random look at the collections of T'ang dynasty *hsiao-shuo* writings,³² we will find that the existence of such supernatural beings as fabricated by Han Yü in his "Examination Letter" is generally presented as real and not fictional. They are frequently regarded by the common people and officials alike as portents of fortune or calamity. Taoist priests and Buddhist monks, especially monks of the Tantric Sect 密宗,³³ who are believed to possess magic power over these supernatural beings, are often asked by the T'ang people to exercise their power to avert calamities, exorcise evil spirits and solicit blessings such as timely rain. The conventional *hsiao-shuo* and pseudo-historical records, whenever they register these events, inadvertently bear witness to the superhuman power of the Taoist priests and Buddhist monks, and become in that respect an influential literary medium for spreading superstitious beliefs of the Taoist and Buddhist religions. The illustrative fable, however, has the advantage of the *hsiao-shuo* without its pitfall. Written to be interpreted thematically and not realistically, it has a legitimate access to the material of a *hsiao-shuo*, but is by tradition safe-guarded from the latter's superstitious elements. Therefore, when Han Yü employs the form and style of a classical fable in the "Examination Letter," he is not just trying to achieve the "extraordinary" in the technical sense. By posing an anti-conventional stand, he is trying also to "expurgate" the current Taoist and Buddhist "clichés" from the use and device of *hsiao-shuo* writing in his time. In this sense, Han Yü's predilec-

tion for the "extraordinary" cannot be interpreted as a matter of style alone. It is intimately related to his doctrine of "learning from the Ancients" on the one hand, and his anti-Buddhist and anti-Taoist ideology on the other.

In a number of Han Yü's other early works, we can find the same attempt at transforming the ordinary into the extraordinary and the contemporary into the classical executed with varying degrees of ingenuity. The story of "Po-lo and the Marvellous Steed" 伯樂與千里馬說 is another example.³⁴ These works in their day aroused little admiration but much criticism. P'ei Tu 裴度, a statesman and friend of Han Yü, criticized him for such "frivolous" treatment of literature.³⁵ And Ch'ien Mu 錢穆 thinks that Chang Chi's 張籍 criticism of Han Yü's notorious taste for the "mixed, unreal stories" is specifically directed at these works.³⁶ I myself also suspect that Han Yü's repeated failures at *chin-shih* examination and at civil enlistment has something to do with his choice of such "samples" for the expression of his "extraordinary" talent.³⁷

Aside from certain stylistic and doctrinary interest, the "Examination Letter," however, is not a successful execution of Han Yü's ideal of the "extraordinary." The imitative act here, unsustained by an equally elevating content, has a tendency to lapse into the very mimicry Han Yü expressly wanted to avoid. What is extraordinary about the "Examination Letter" obviously lies in its manner of articulation, *i. e.*, its choice of such eccentric characters as the "strange creature," and "beaver and the otter" and the adaptation of a pseudo-archaic language. The personal plight which these characters illustrate has nothing intrinsically "extraordinary" in itself. That fantastic creature, pitifully caught between its own arrogance and its urgent need for help, has neither the disinterested wisdom nor the compensating innocence of an animal of the true fable. At the time when he wrote this "Examination Letter," Han Yü evidently was perceptive enough to see the need and possibility of achieving the effect of "extraordinariness" through "imitation of the ancients" and "expurgation of all clichés." But his conceptual power and literary skill at that time was still unable to do justice to his theoretical vision. Eight years later, when Han Yü made another attempt at the "extraordinary" in his "Li Yüan Preface," we see a new artist emerging, with all his former zest for novelty and audacity, but without much of the *gaucherie* and crudeness.

Before we discuss the "Li Yüan Preface," a brief review of the *hsü* 序 ("Preface") development up to T'ang times may be in order.

The *hsü* 序, in its early form, is an introductory essay prefixed to a book or a chapter in a book. Its purpose, according to Chang Shih-chai 章實齋, is to "evince the aim and scope of a work, and is not meant to make a display of its beauty and excellence."³⁸ The most notable early examples of this kind of *hsü* are K'ung An-kuo's 孔安國 "Preface to the *Shang-shu*" 尚書序, Wei Hung's? 衛宏 "Great Preface to the *Shih-ching*" 詩大序, and Ssu-ma Ch'ien's 司馬遷 prefaces to the *Shih-chi* and its individual chapters.

Upon the rise of the *fu* 賦 ("rhymeprose") in Han times, another kind of "preface" developed. This second kind of "preface" is more literary than scholastic in nature. It differs from the first in both form and function in that it is first conceived as a prologue and not a prose essay, and its primary purpose is to set the stage in the reader's imagination for the rhapsodic descriptions to follow (in the form of a dialogue between two or more fictional characters), and not to "evince the aim and scope of a work." In the second half of the Han dynasty, when the *fu* itself grew increasingly academic in outlook, the *fu* preface, too, deviated from its original form of imaginary prologue and began to take up pseudo-scholastic air and to discourse on various polite topics in the form of an essay.

The affixing literary preface achieved the status of a minor literary form of its own during the Wei 魏 (A. D. 220-264) and Chin 晉 (A. D. 265-419) dynasties. At first, it was affixed to a single poem, a series of poems, a *chen* 箴 ("admonition") or a *sung* 頌 ("eulogy"), intensely personal in its frame of reference. Then it branched off into a different category, a category made famous in the history of preface by a number of its prominent writers such as the "Preface to the Chin-ku Poems" 金谷詩序 by Shih Ch'ung 石崇 (d. A. D. 300),³⁹ and the "Preface to the Lan-t'ing Poems" 蘭亭詩序 by Wang Hsi-chih 王羲之 (A. D. 321-379).⁴⁰ These prefaces to collections of occasional poems are products of a new fad of gatherings among literary coteries which came into vogue in the third and the fourth centuries A. D.. The fact that these prefaces are social and occasional in nature, and that they are sometimes read for their own literary brilliance are two of the main reasons why they are so frequently confused with the *sung-hsü* 送序 ("farewell preface") of the T'ang dyansty.⁴¹ Actually, *sung-hsü*, which is a new prose form developed in the early T'ang dynasty, differs from the preface to collection of occasional poems in two essential aspects. First, the former is a truly independent prose form whereas the latter is not. Second, the former has a single defined audience which the latter does not have.⁴² However, most of the *sung-hsü* written before Han Yü provide very dull readings.⁴³ The attempts they made at exalting the leave-taking party are stereotyped and full of hyperbole and literary allusions. The same is true with their efforts at dramatizing the locales. Let us now turn to Han Yü's "Li Yüan Preface" to see how he manages there to "expurgate" the inherent "clichés" that developed into that prose form before his time.

The title "Farewell to Li Yüan Upon His Returning to the Meander Valley" indicates four traditional motifs of a "farewell preface": the leave-taking party, his destination, the return, and the author's farewell gesture. The conventional treatment of the first two motifs—the leave-taking party and his destination—as has been pointed out above, is full of stereotyped compliments and literary allusions. The compliments are paid in terms of recognized social values and official achievements, and the allusions are to the ancient sages and eminent historical personages.

Han Yü has turned away from both these conventional approaches. Instead of dramatizing the desination of Li Yüan's "return"—the Meander Valley—with hyperboles, Han Yü adopts with startling simplicity the lucid style of a *yu-chi* 遊記 ("notes on sight-seeing trips"). The Meander Valley, unlike the bank of the meandering stream where the Lan-t'ing gathering took place,⁴⁴ is endowed with none of the historical or ritualistic glamor of the latter. Therefore, Han Yü merely enumerates in his introduction a number of simple facts: the geographical location of the Meander valley, its legends and inhabitants are all summarily dealt with. The details are specific but not trivial. While they are rendered provocative to the imagination by the repetitious use of "some say," they incur no fanciful distortions of facts.⁴⁵ The tempo thus created is at once brisk and exciting. The unusual crispness of the prose style artistically transcends all the flatness that is inherent in the subject itself.

After the brief introduction of the locale, Han Yü swiftly passes on to the leave-taking party—Li Yüan—and the motif of his "return."⁴⁶ The problem he faces there again is how to eulogize without falling into clichéd compliments, how to commend Li Yüan's voluntary retirement without invoking the conventional image of an eccentric disdainfully keeping himself aloof from the mundane world.⁴⁷ The solution Han Yü reaches is unique. He let Li Yüan speak for himself so that the texture of his language conveys its own value. Consequently, we have in the second unit of the "Li Yüan Preface" a long soliloquy by Li Yüan. The diction in the soliloquy, reflective of Han Yü's early intellectual allegiance, reminds us strongly of Mencius.⁴⁸ The same art of diverting the audience's attention from familiar subject matter to novel stylistic innovation which we have already witnessed in the fable device in the "Examination Letter" is again exercised here. The age-old court-and-country conflict is dramatically transformed into two lively, absorbing, antithetic portraits of "outstanding personages."

The third and last part of the "Preface" begins with a song epilogue, sung by Han Yü, approving and praising the choice his friend has made between the two types of "outstanding personages." In this last part, Han Yü introduces the most surprising technical innovation of the entire work. He has adapted for the meter and diction of his song the two oldest and most venerated poetic traditions. The first half of the song, as it can be readily observed, is written in the meter and style of the *Shih-ching* odes. It celebrates in borrowed austerity the bucolic setting of the Meander Valley. The second half of the song, written in the meter and style of the *Ch'u-tz'u*, appropriates the religiosity of its model and invokes divine blessing on Li Yüan and his life in the Meander Valley. The shift in the middle from the *Shih-ching* meter to the *Ch'u-tz'u* meter (between "Coiling and winding the roads lead hither and thither" and "Ah! the pleasure of the Meander (Valley), a leisure pure and carefree") formally emphasizes a subtle transition in the lyric content of