

Speech: China

Cold War experts reporting on imperial China presumed that free speech did not exist in China and that the issue was not up for discussion (Chapter 1), but classical Chinese sources frequently argue that dissent is a normal and an essential part of government. The two main arguments for this view were: (1) that it acts as a safety valve by preventing popular frustration from breaking out as violence; (2) that all governments require popular feedback so as to correct policies that might be harmful to the people.

The first is likely acknowledged to some degree by even the most draconian regimes. Presumably that is why governments spend so much money on religion or propaganda. The aim is to reduce frustration by convincing the populace that leadership is looking after its interests, if not now, then in the afterlife. The second argument derives from the Confucian view that Heaven's Mandate is reflected in the people's attitude toward government (*minxin*) (Chapters 2, 4, 5). Implicit in this doctrine is (1) the presumption that the people's attitude toward government is autonomous from government; (2) the assumption that it is the purpose of government to foster the people's welfare. It was believed, for instance, that in ancient times popular songs and ditties were systematically collected so as to learn of the people's complaints and, in theory, do something about it. The long history of social criticism in China arguably derives from this tradition.¹

One of the earliest examples of the first argument arose in response to King Li's 厉王 attempt to learn what the people thought of his regime. In this case, it was not the king's intention to adjust policy to suit the people's mood. Rather, it was his aim to

suppress any hint of dissent, so the king sent spies to gather intelligence and then executed those who complained. King Li was happy with the results and boasted to his advisor Duke Shao: “no one dares to speak now!” Duke Shao replied:

You have (merely) suppressed it. Stopping up the voice of the people/*min* is more dangerous than stopping up a river. If a river is dammed up and bursts (its dikes), the number of people killed will certainly be large. The people/*min* are just like this. For this reason those who plan to control rivers dredge them and provide channels (as outlets). In controlling the people one releases them (from constraints) and provides for speech (as an outlet).² 王喜, 告邵公曰: “吾能弭謗矣, 乃不敢言”。邵公曰: “是障之也。防民之口, 甚於防川, 川壅而潰, 傷人必多, 民亦如之。是故為川者決之使導, 為民者宣之使言”。

This must be one of the earliest texts to argue that some degree of free speech is necessary for governing “the people.” This argument, however, assumes a negative form: do X or you will regret the consequences. A more positive argument appears about the same time. It seems that a traveler from a neighboring state was inclined to talk politics in the village schools, and his assessments of the ruling elites were not always flattering. Someone suggested destroying the schools, but a minister replied:

Why should we? If people retire morning and evening and pass their judgment on the conduct of government as good or bad, I will do what they approve and will correct what they condemn. They are my teachers. On what grounds should we destroy those schools?³ 何為? 夫人朝夕退而游焉, 以議執政之善否, 其所善者, 吾則行之, 其所惡者, 吾則改之。是吾師也, 若之何毀之?

This passage says that political leaders should try to determine what “the people” want and adjust policy accordingly. Had a Greek or Roman said as much, historians of Western history would crow about “democratic” sentiments in classical times. I am not fond of teleological narratives, but this passage is remarkable for its time, and did in fact resonate with later texts throughout China’s long history.

It is of some interest that, despite the early date, political criticism appears to have been situated in the schools. Arguably throughout history, East and West, sites of learning have fostered deeper than average reflection, higher levels of cognitive dexterity and, therefore, critical thought. Not surprisingly, both East and West, those bent on control seek to weaken, intimidate, or control centers of learning, if not the learned.

One is reminded of Socrates, who was accused of a crime similar to the traveler’s, and at about the same time. Though Socrates’ case turned out badly, the issue was comparable. In the Chinese example the critic was saved by the Confucian notion that the source of political legitimacy lies in the people, with the implication that the government should welcome people’s feedback. At this early date of course (ca. fourth century BCE), there were no formal protections for dissent, nor were there formal channels for transmitting popular sentiment to those in charge, so things could have turned out badly for the traveler as well.

Institutional Protections for Political Speech in Han China

I am unaware of any formal protections for free speech prior to the reign of Emperor Wen (reigned 179 - 156 BCE), who issued numerous edicts considered exemplary in later ages. Among these are two protecting both the principle and the

practice of political speech. The first establishes the right of officers to address in unvarnished language whatever faults they find in the emperor's conduct or the administration:

I have heard that, in creating the teaming people, Heaven gave them rulers to nourish and govern them. [But] when the monarch lacks virtue, when the execution of government is unequal, then Heaven demonstrates its displeasure with calamities so as to warn the monarch of his government . . . [numerous calamities bear witness to my faults and so] I declare that all officers should carefully consider my faults, including things that I do not know and have not heard (about the empire), and inform me so as to supplement my failings. I further declare my intention to appoint officers who are wise, learned, and good, and who can admonish me by speaking freely, directly, and with exceptional candor, so as to remedy my deficiencies.⁴ 朕聞之，天生蒸民，為之置君以養治之。人主不德，布政不均，則天示之以菑，以誠不治 . . . 令至，其悉思朕之過失，乃知見之所不及，旬以啟告朕。及舉賢良方正能直言極諫者，以匡朕之不逮。

Perhaps the most important premise in this text is the frank admission of the emperor's fallibility. Later emperors often adopted similar language, suggesting that political feedback, especially unpleasant feedback, was not a normal feature of administration prior to that time, but came to be regarded as normative thereafter. The admission of fallibility requires that the administration would need some form of institutionalized checks, and indeed such checks would develop in time.

A notable feature of this edict is that bad government is defined as the “unequal” exercise of authority, privilege or favoritism if you will. The principle undergirding this presumption is the core premise in bureaucratic theory that laws must be applied equally irrespective of group membership. The *locus classicus* for this is Han Feizi (韓非子 ca. 281-ca. 233 B.C): “Under the law, punishments will not escape even the highest officers, while rewards will not discount even the commonest man”⁵ 刑過不避大臣，賞善不疑匹夫。 This concept of equality was essential if criticisms were to be accepted from officers and the people, for there would be no basis for determining whose argument was more beneficial to government unless facts and reason were considered without regard to social status.

The second edict goes further still, for it establishes the right of all taxpayers to complain about the government, including the emperor himself. It deserves translation in full:

In ancient times those who ruled had sheets on which (the people) could commend good government and the “complaint tree” so that (the people) could convey their criticisms to those in charge. (On the other hand) among our current laws is one that prevents the officials from speaking freely (of faults in the administration), so that I have no means to learn of my shortcomings. (With such a policy in effect), how should I ever attract good and capable men from afar into (government) service? Let it be revoked.

Furthermore it sometimes happens that the people curse the emperor, and agree among themselves not to disclose this fact, but later break their promise and use

this to level false accusations against one another. The local officers treat this as treason, and should the people object (to the charge), officials treat the objection as slander to the court! This is to take advantage of the people's ignorance, entrapping them and leading them to their deaths. I will have none of this! Henceforth, whoever commits these things shall not be punished.⁶ 上曰：「古之治天下，朝有進善之旌，誹謗之木，所以通治道而來諫者。今法有臣不敢盡情，而上無由聞過失也。將何以來遠方之賢良？其除之。民或祝詛上以相約結而後相謾，吏以為大逆，其有他言，而吏又以為誹謗。此細民之愚無知抵死，朕甚不取。自今以來，有犯此者勿聽治。」

The first line derives from the Confucian principle that popular feedback is a positive and normal feature of government. The ensuing passage reiterates the point made in the earlier edict, that an effective administration requires outspoken officers. The principle protecting constructive criticism having been established, the edict goes on to protect even verbal attacks on the emperor's person. Why?

Notice that the final passage focuses on entrapment, either locals trying to entrap rivals into speaking carelessly, or officials entrapping the people by putting words in their mouths, reading expressions of frustration as evidence of criminal intent. Obviously such practices could be manipulated—either by local officials or by political cliques—to quash those criticisms the other edicts had presumed were necessary for effective governance. As with many of Emperor Wen's edicts, the legal reasoning here is based upon a clear distinction between public and private: if officials are allowed to entrap taxpayers by

interpreting personal complaints as a public crime, then whistleblowers could be easily suppressed and the whole system of checks would collapse.

In both of these edicts one finds a consistent guiding principle, namely, that channels of feedback are both good and necessary for effective administration. It would be easy to wax cynical about such laws were it not that, by the Latter Han, we find privately published essays assume such principles as a matter of course. Wang Chong (27-97) asserted that ordinary taxpayers, with no official position to speak of, not only could, but should expose faults in government:

When there are intelligent men in the world and in office, they set forth the truth and persuade others in the most forthright manner so as to enlighten the court. When out of office, they weigh theories and criticize sophistry so as to awaken those among the public who have been deceived. If the public can't find its way back to reason, then in attempting to establish the truth it will easily be misled by falsehoods. If those who discuss public affairs do not seek help (from critical feedback), then their reasoning will be confused and they won't even be aware of their error. This is why my book *Weighing Theories* was written, to consider all the classical writings and to expose those that differ from the facts, lest groundless fantasies should overcome what is true and beautiful.⁷ 故夫賢人之在世也，進則盡忠宣化，以明朝廷；退則稱論貶說，以覺失俗。俗也不知還，則立道輕為非；論者不追救，則迷亂不覺悟。是故《論衡》之造也，起眾書並失實，虛妄之言勝真美也。

What is most revealing in this passage is what Wang Chong takes for granted. He doesn't argue that men of learning should debate policy issues in writing—he presumes as much and seems confident that his readers will recognize the same. He even compares private arguments on policy in publications to debates by men in office. What gives him, an ordinary taxpayer, a right to enlighten misguided officials? Judging from context, facts and logic. When others are confused in their reasoning, Wang will set them straight; when classical sources make claims contradicting the facts, he will use the facts to correct them.

Wang Chong's presumptions are of a piece with Emperor Wen's memorials. If officials or the people, using facts and logic, can show that current policy is damaging to the people or the state, then those in charge should accept such arguments. Such assumptions made possible the development of political discourse outside the halls of government. During the Latter Han (25 - 220 CE), when central administration no longer functioned as designed, such non-official political activity began more and more to augment the range of political speech and action.

A foundational principle of classical bureaucratic theory in China was the distinction between court and state, the official and the office, or private and public (Chapter 6). The imperial court, staffed largely by eunuchs, was not part of the regular bureaucracy. Regular officers were recruited by recommendation and worked their way up the ladder through good performance and positive reviews, but eunuchs could acquire important positions directly through imperial favor.

Many who opposed eunuch encroachments on public office at that time were framed or otherwise disposed of, though the regular officials also had their victories.

Nonetheless, it soon became apparent that regular channels of feedback were inadequate to the task of healing the ailing polity, so alternative means were devised, including student demonstrations, political pamphlets, and non-official political organizations.⁸ These battles extended as well to the cultural sphere so that we find at this time publicly displayed portraits of martyrs and other forms of politicized art.⁹

Visualizing Dissent in Han China

If the principle of open speech was first institutionalized in Han times, it was also during that period that acts of political defiance were first made visible. In this early period allegory was one method employed to represent political abstractions. Phoenixes, for instance, are among the most common images in sculptures produced for local scholars at that time. One early period text describes the phoenix as an allegory of good government: "Virtue", rests on the phoenix's head, "Benevolence" sits on its back, "Righteousness" on its neck, and "Trust" resides within its bosom.¹⁰ In principle this type of allegory is not much different from what one might expect in classical European sculpture, with different parts of the image representing different abstract virtues.

During the political struggles plaguing the latter half of the Han dynasty, intellectuals developed a rhetoric of heavenly omens in an attempt to expand the scope of political discourse and add the weight of the Mandate theory to their own pleas for reform. The Han version of the theory went that, through sympathetic resonance, a good government would move Heaven, or Nature, to manifest auspicious signs such as phoenixes. The appearance of heavenly omens then, would serve to legitimize the government.¹¹

Needless to say Han period monarchs welcomed such a ruse, but this was a double-edged sword. Evil omens could signify imminent decline, and even good omens could be manipulated to criticize government if political practice contrasted markedly with the ideal. Apocryphal “classics” appeared describing different kinds of omens and interpreting their political significance. Local officials made use of these, proclaiming the appearance of omens corresponding to those described in apocryphal texts. Phoenixes and other ominous creatures were reported with some frequency, but the existence of such omens was always difficult to document. In the absence of actual phoenixes, pictures of omens and omen texts were displayed on tombs, shrines, and other monuments erected by local scholars. These images allegorized abstract political concepts, sometimes with a critical twist.

Among those omens chosen for display, one common type was the hybrid animal. All such images consisted of parts from two bodies united into one, a symbolic strategy that made effective use of visual analogues to allegorize harmony between society and government. The hybrid fish, for instance, can swim only when both of its two halves cooperate, and this omen appears only when the ruler “protects recluse scholars.”¹² By refusing to serve in government, recluse scholars implied that the current administration fell short of the ideal. It was a form of political speech, and one can think of many governments throughout history that would not tolerate such noncompliance. That the scholars devised a specific omen to equate tolerance for passive dissent with good government, suggests some degree of anxiety that they might, in fact, need protection.

Likewise the hybrid bird (fig. 00) appears only when the government cooperates with recluse scholars, convincing them to serve in government. The hybrid beast appears when the government cares for the indigent—widows, orphans, and the like (fig. 00).¹³ All of these omens allegorize the body politic in such a way that it is seen as consisting of the ruler on the one hand, and the scholars who potentially serve as officials on the other. Alternatively it can be imagined as the administration generally on the one hand and the people on the other. In either case the ruler's authority is conceived neither as independent nor as absolute, an assumption that would be echoed in Song political thought (Chapter 3), for the Mandate theory underlying the rhetoric of omens implies a reciprocal relationship between the ruler and the people.

Another way in which political ideals could be visualized was in the figures of exemplary persons. These figures did not function as metonyms for a social group—rather they functioned as synecdoche, representing abstract values such as courage in the face of tyranny. Images of this sort are not uncommon among the carvings of the late Han empire. Jing Ke (荊軻 ?–227 B. C), for instance, who attempted to assassinate the tyrant Qin Shihuang (秦始皇 259–210 B. C), is illustrated among the Wu Family shrines engravings. There also we find the statesman Zhao Dun 趙盾 (?–601 B.C), who defied Duke Ling (晉靈公 ?–607 B.C). The Duke was violent and lawless, and Zhao Dun said as much to his face, with the result that he suffered multiple attempts on his life. The reliefs at the Wu Family Shrines show Zhao Dun and his retainer in court with Duke Ling, thwarting one of the Duke's assassination attempts (fig. 00).¹⁴

In these reliefs the heroes are, respectively, a man attempting to kill his monarch, and a man openly criticizing his ruler. It is not an easy thing to find comparable subjects in the record of ancient or early modern European art. Why? Presumably this is so because the very idea of opposing—much less killing—a monarch, was not accepted in Europe by those who controlled art production. It does not follow that such ideas did not exist. As noted in Chapter 3, the Scottish Calvinist George Buchanan argued that the people had a right to resist sovereigns and even “to kill a [tyrant].”¹⁵

Comparable sentiments can be found in classical China, but in China, it was major philosophers and intellectuals who promoted those views, rather than second or third string writers. Mencius, for instance, when considering whether it is right to kill a tyrant, observed: “I refer to depraved criminals as rogues, and so (in the case of the tyrant Zhou) I have heard of the rogue Zhou being executed; I have not heard of anyone assassinating a monarch”.¹⁶ 残贼之人，谓之一夫，闻诛一夫纣矣，未闻弑君也 This sentiment is the Confucian escape clause that no monarch could afford to forget. It helps us to understand images of corrupt monarchs such as can be found throughout the history of art in China.

Another figure whose story provoked questions of dissent is Liu Xiahui, whose story and significance have been covered in Chapter 6. The point of that story, as is clear from classical commentary, is that moral strictures cannot be followed mechanically, and that a man must make his own judgments as to where the higher moral purpose lies, in defiance of social convention if need be.

In each of these cases the underlying moral standard is the value of human life. Qin Shihuang was emperor, but his contempt for human life denied him political legitimacy.

The same applies to Duke Ling, while in the case of Liu Xiahui, a moral taboo could be contravened for the sake of saving a woman's life. This is a fairly abstract moral standard because the meaning is not contingent upon group membership but rather applies equally across class and gender boundaries.

Though the individuals vary, the topos remains the same: the defiance of conventional authority in light of a higher moral principle. This is not allegory; it is more akin to synecdoche, because in each case the figure stands for the moral quality that he embodies in his actions. A similar visualization strategy will reappear in Song period painting.

Political Feedback in Medieval China

The Han dynasty collapsed in the early third century CE and with it, the benefits of a centralized meritocratic administration. During the medieval period the administrative procedures developed under the Han often took a back seat to privilege, so that by Tang times it became necessary to regenerate institutional channels for feedback. In 685 Empress Wu Zetian 武则天 (reigned 690-705) established two types of *jianguan* (諫官 assessment officers), the *bujue* 补阙 and *shiyi* 拾遗. Both terms refer to correcting errors in government. Both offices enjoyed "the right and the obligation to criticize the monarch's words, deeds, and orders."¹⁷ There were over thirty such officers, each of which was allotted two hundred pages for assessments each month. Bai Juyi had served in such a capacity but, despite the fact that he produced reams of criticism, he nonetheless felt this was insufficient. In his two poems on "Suiting Myself" (Chapter 10), Bai

complained that he was unable to speak freely, even though that was his duty as a remonstrance officer.

Judging from the chapter on officials in the *Song History* (《宋史》), this may have been the case much of the time during the Tang. Apparently at the outset of the Song, the bureaucracy was run much as it had been during the late Tang dynasty (Chapter 2). The historian states that men treated their offices as sinecures and made little effort to address their duties. He mentions in particular the sorry state of the remonstrance offices:

“Remonstrances never spoke of faults . . . the Remonstrance Officer and the Zhengyan (also charged with exposing abuse) made no special effort to attend to their responsibilities, nor did they undertake to offer remonstrances or criticisms.” 諫議無言責 司諫、正言非特旨供職亦不任諫諍。¹⁸

Bai deeply resented this situation. He once wrote a memorial focused on the story of Zhu Yun (朱雲 ca.90-ca.18 BCE), the Han dynasty official who defied the corrupt Emperor Cheng (漢成帝 51-7 BCE) to his face, exposing abuses of power within his administration. In that memorial Bai discoursed at length on the necessity for open speech in any government if it is to avoid eventual decline and collapse.¹⁹

Like many of Bai Juyi's views, this one appears to have had an impact on official rhetoric and policy in Song times, for a hanging scroll on the theme dating to the early Southern Song is preserved in the National Palace Museum in Taipei (fig. 00). The style of the scroll suggests the work of court artists. In it we see military officers seizing Zhu Yun, but he defiantly grasps the balustrade while holding his seal of office before him (fig. 00). It was that seal that gave him the right to speak freely to in court, accusing the chief

minister of corruption. While sturdy guardsmen attempt to drag him away, he remains steadfast, his head raised high in heroic defiance. A slovenly Emperor Cheng slouches inelegantly on his throne beside an obsequious minister and palace ladies (fig. 00), while another minister steps forward to intervene on Zhu's behalf. This is the crucial scene in Bai's account of the event, the one where the monarch yields in order to avoid an unfavorable public image. The subject would have been appropriate for the offices of the Department of Investigation (御史台), but wherever it was hung, it is evident that the court felt the need to align itself with Bai Juyi's example by proclaiming official support for open speech.

In his private capacity Bai argued further that poems critical of social ills should be systematically collected, as in classical times, so that the central government could learn the people's true condition:

Greedy officials harm the people without scruple,
Corrupt officials hide this from the monarch without fear.
Has my lord not seen, in the late years of King Li,
It was always the officials who benefited [from the suppression of dissent] and not
the monarch?
Oh lord, oh lord, please hear this:
If you wish to break beyond the barriers and get to what the people think,
You must first consult those poems that denounce injustice.²⁰

《采诗官》：贪吏害民无所忌，奸臣蔽君无所畏。君不见，历王胡亥之末年，群臣有利君无利？君兮君兮愿听此：欲开壅蔽达人情，先向歌诗求讽刺。

It is no accident that Bai cited the story of the tyrant King Li mentioned at the outset of this chapter. Since Han times the name of King Li had served as shorthand for the suppression of open speech. The only proper solution to the problem, Bai maintained, was to encourage channels for free speech, including folk poetry and, of course, published poems.

Bai's effort to promote criticism outside official channels was part of his attempt to revive political feedback from the general public, an ideal shared by numerous mid and late Tang literati. During Tang times poets such as Du Fu, Liu Zongyuan, Pi Rixiu (皮日休 ca. 834-883) and others wrote biting social commentary in verse. Such poems portrayed victimized farmers or poverty-stricken old women, exposing villainous officials who would rob them of their last mouthful. These critiques were not always general in nature; they might be so specific that contemporaries could easily identify which officials were responsible for the offenses. Du Xunhe's (杜荀鶴 846-904) indictment of officials in Hu Cheng County 胡城縣 exemplifies how accurately the poets could aim their barbs:

Last year, in this county, this town,
The county's people (*min*) dare not speak of injustice.
Now county officers wear bright red merit ribbons;
Must be the red was dyed from the blood of living souls!²¹

去歲曾經此縣城，縣民無口不冤聲。

新來縣宰加朱紱，便是生靈血染成。

The poet cleverly exposed the tragic irony of this event by repeating the word “county” three times in a poem consisting of only twenty characters. Combined with the

term *min*, such repetition underscored the fact that the perpetrators of this bloody act were officials, men whose duty it was to nourish and protect the people. After savagely suppressing local dissent, these shepherds of the people received red merit ribbons rather than being charged with crimes.

The fashion for such caustic verse was echoed in Bai Juyi's many calls for frank exposures of injustice. Certainly the poems in his *New Folk Songs* collection serve as models of undiluted social critique. These poems tend to be long, but we can examine one famous specimen so as to pinpoint salient features of the rhetoric:

"An Old Charcoal Seller"

Author's subtitle: To Complain of the Royal Commissionary System

An old charcoal seller

Cuts firewood, burns coal by the southern mountain.

His face, all covered with dust and ash, the color of smoke,

The hair at his temples is gray, his ten fingers black.

The money he makes selling coal, what is it for?

To put clothes on his back and food in his mouth.

The rags on his poor body are thin and threadbare;

Distressed at the low price of coal, he hopes for colder weather.

Night comes, an inch of snow has fallen on the city,

In the morning, he rides his cart along the icy ruts,

His ox weary, he hungry, and the sun already high.

In the mud by the south gate, outside the market, he stops to rest.

All of a sudden, two dashing riders appear;
An imperial envoy, garbed in yellow (his attendant in white),
Holding an official dispatch, he reads a proclamation.
Then turns the cart around, curses the ox, and leads it north.
One cartload of coal-a thousand or more catties!
No use appealing to the official spiriting the cart away:
Half a length of red lace, a slip of damask,
Dropped on the ox—is payment in full!²²

賣炭翁

伐薪燒炭南山中。
滿面塵灰煙火色，
兩鬢蒼蒼十指黑。
賣炭得錢何所營，
身上衣裳口中食。
可憐身上衣正單，
心憂炭賤願天寒。
夜來城上一尺雪，
曉駕炭車輾冰轍。
牛困人飢日已高，
市南門外泥中歇。
翩翩兩騎來是誰，

黃衣使者白衫兒。
手把文書口稱敕，
迴車叱牛牽向北。
一車炭，千餘斤，
官使驅將惜不得。
半匹紅紗一丈綾，
繫向牛頭充炭直。

The first feature to notice is the subtitle. Bai explained in his preface that these poems were intended to reach people who did not normally read poetry, and so he often included an explanatory preface so that the thrust of the poem would not be lost to the reader. As for the poem proper, it purports to record an actual event. Much of the poem's first half provides a detailed description of the old man's clothing, face, fingers, even the ashen color of his skin. Several more lines describe the wretched poverty of his life and livelihood. Up to that point the poem's only colors are gray, white, and black, but that changes as imperial yellow enters the scene. Within the space of a few lines we witness court envoys rob the old man of his hard-earned property. Bai's indictment makes it perfectly evident that the emperor has no right to take the charcoal seller's property. This principle, of course, derives from Mencius, but is expressed in *Xunzi* as well.

The other poems in that collection are no less forthright in railing against the privileges of the nobility, injustices to women, and other social issues.²³ Clearly Bai was hoping to raise the bar for social criticism, for in his famous letter to Yuan Zhen (元稹779-

831), he complained at length about poets who veiled their criticism in allegory, dismissing large swathes of medieval poetry as mincing and spineless. His model for greatness was Du Fu (杜甫 712-770), whose political denunciations were direct and unvarnished.²⁴

One could easily write a book about Bai Juyi's crusade for open speech, both as an official and as a private taxpayer, and he was not alone. His friend Liu Zongyuan demystified the conceptual basis for hereditary authority, proving that the "feudal" system was a product of historical circumstance, and not the wise design of the sage kings. Another friend, Han Yu 韩愈, expanded the moral authority of the individual in his influential essay on Bo Yi 伯夷: "What sets men of letters apart from all others is their independent conduct. Concerned only that (their conduct) be consistent with justice and paying no mind to the endorsement or condemnation of others, all (such men) are true heroes, men of integrity, principles, and flat honesty, who see clearly [what should be done]".²⁵ 士之特立独行，适于义而已。不顾人之是非，皆豪杰之士，信道笃而自知明者也 Han Yu's argument resonates with the story of Liu Xiaohui. In both instances the responsibility for moral action rests upon the individual. Men of education, at least, could no longer hide behind conventional morality but must face the consequences of their own choices.

It would appear that, by this time, the cognitive skills of a significant part of the population enabled them to see through the claims of medieval pomp and piety. In the absence of institutional reform, leading intellectuals took it upon themselves to fashion a new discourse, a new way of speaking and thinking that ranked facts over religion or

decorum. Through a close analysis of historical facts, Liu Zongyuan undermined the fictitious foundations of feudal hierarchy, just as Bai Juyi had subverted the imperial dignity by exposing the royal person as a glorified thief. Looking back from the perspective of Song times, Su Shi recognized the late Tang as the moment when Chinese intellectuals woke up from eight centuries of medieval darkness:

From the late Han period on, the way of learning declined. Literature deteriorated, and fallacious teachings (such as the Daoist and Buddhist religions) sprang up everywhere . . . It was only when Han Yu rose up from among the people [that] . . . literature was restored to its true meaning after eight-hundred years of decline, and the right way of learning saved the world from drowning (in ignorance). How? With such candor as would enrage the ruler of men! With such valor as would challenge the generals of the three divisions! How is this not ranging over Heaven and Earth, or presiding over the rise and decline of civilizations? How is this not courage, such as stands alone, in all of time?²⁶ 自东汉以来，道丧文弊，异端并起 . . . 独韩文公起布衣 . . . 文起八代之衰，而道济天下之溺；忠犯人主之怒，而勇夺三军之帅：岂非参天地，关盛衰，浩然而独存者乎？

Some like to cast this as a contest between different dogmas, with the Confucians preferring their own canons to those of the Buddhists, but that is to misread what Su Shi says. The entire argument turns on the definition of the “right way of learning”, and what that is becomes clear toward the end of the passage. What made Han Yu’s approach to learning different from the Daoists or Buddhists was not group loyalty, but the fact that he fearlessly confronted the emperor and the generals with the facts of the case, even if that

meant making enemies of powerful people. The reference to the generals of the three divisions likely refers to Han Yu's memorial arguing against the wars to suppress the aborigines in the southwest. Han Yu noted that the generals were getting rich off the venture while Chinese soldiers as well as locals were dying needlessly. To make matters worse, local resistance was only inflamed by cruel methods of suppression.²⁷ This is what Su Shi meant by the "right way of learning": using facts and logic in the cause of social justice.

It was in that context that Bai wrote a series of poems entitled "Free Speech" (*fangyan* 放言, Chapter 10). This collection was modeled on Yuan Zhen's poems on the same theme. In content the poems dealt repeatedly with the need for the free expression of personal political views. Now the need for political criticism had been identified in classical sources, and the ideal had been legislated in Han times, but what is significant here is that this classical political concept has now congealed into a single term, an abstract concept, like "equality" or "the people", that could be promoted as a necessary feature of the body politic.

institutional Reforms in Song China

Some of the major Song reforms were reviewed in Chapter 2: Grievance Offices opened formal channels of feedback for ordinary taxpayers; Sima Guang drafted an edict inviting frank criticism from people of all walks of life, and Su Shi noted that the censors now could criticize even the imperial throne without fear of reprisal. But the most important protection for open speech was the foundational premise of Song law, namely, that all taxpayers were equal under the law. This basic principle was established by the

first of the Song emperors when, in 971, he issued an edict stating that tenants should be registered as taxpaying citizens. It would be easy to overlook the far-reaching significance of this simple law. The fact is that, from late Han times through the end of the Tang, the re-feudalization of society—the augmentation of privilege at the expense of law—often was the result of taxpayer flight to the “protection” of large landowners.

The process worked like this: whenever the economy went sour—as is inevitable in advanced societies—small farmers found themselves unable to pay taxes. Rather than fall into debt and slavery, they often opted to become tenants for large landowners. Since tenants did not have to pay taxes, this was a means of escaping disaster. The problem was that, the more taxpaying citizens fled to the protection of the landowners, the smaller the empire’s tax base became. The large landowners, on the other hand, became ever larger and more powerful. Eventually they became so powerful that, like the very rich today, they could avoid paying taxes.

The shrinking tax base only weakened the central government further, such that it would be more willing to concede to the demands of the superrich. With the central government debilitated, tenants could not turn to officials for legal protection and so in essence they became the landowners’ dependents, not so different from those hapless English yeomen described in Chapter 3. It was this class of large landowners who formed the basis for the new aristocracy that sprang up after the fall of the Han. This process continued in variations throughout the medieval period until Song Taizu 宋太祖 broke the chain by providing tenants legal equality vis-a-vis the landlord.

Song statesmen understood clearly the profound implications of this law. Sima Guang remarked that both landlords and tenants “as taxpayers are equal under the law. Now no one is in a position to lord it over the other (in a court of law)”²⁸. 皆编户齐民，非存上下之势 This short sentence offers a good working definition of legal equality. Hu Hong (胡宏 1102-1161), writing in the twelfth century, put it even more bluntly: “Even if it’s the emperor himself, [officials must] protect the people as they would their own babies; how much more so if it’s a case of landlords and tenants? All are equal under the law!”²⁹ 虽天子之贵，而保民如保赤子，况主户之于客户，皆齐民乎

A review of eleventh and twelfth century reforms makes it clear that Song administrative structure, and in particular the system of checks, was thoroughly informed by the principle of legal equality (Chapter 6). We find as well much evidence for the institutionalization of values championed by late Tang radicals: prioritizing facts over social status, for instance, or the notion that the taxpayer, in principle at least, is on an equal footing with the official.

As summarized in Chapter 2, the first principle is evident in the requirement that a magistrate was obliged to provide the plaintiff with concrete reasons for his judgment.³⁰ The second is reflected in the complex system of checks designed to prevent officials from abusing the powers of office for private interest. Should a taxpayer feel that a judgment was unfair, or that her rights had been infringed, she could complain to the magistrate, or use the petition bureaus. She could also appeal the case to a higher-level officer, such as a circuit inspector. If she wanted to take more direct action, she could sue the magistrate himself. In this case the suit could not be investigated by anyone associated with the

magistrate's office so as to avoid a conflict of interest. Should it come to light that an officer had abused his authority vis-a-vis the taxpayers, "serious disciplinary action" was to be applied. This could mean demotion or removal from office.³¹

What is most significant in these developments is the change implied in the taxpayer's subject position. No matter how effectively, or ineffectively these laws may have been enforced, they openly recognized the rights of taxpayers to question the magistrate's wisdom and authority. The fallibility of government was written into the law at multiple levels. This meant that taxpayers not only distinguished between court and state, or the office and the man, but also between what was law and what was right.

This distinction is illustrated poignantly in a passage from the Song histories. Zou Hao 邹浩 had been recommended for a post in the Department of Investigation 御史台, but there were risks. An official who took his job too seriously might offend powerful people and, like Su Shi, could be framed or otherwise compromised. Zou's mother, Mrs. Zhang however, declared that "If my son can serve his country, and has the support of public opinion, then what worry could I have?" 母張氏曰：“兒能報國，無愧於公論，吾顧何憂”？³²

This passage is revealing in several respects. Note that Zou Hao's mother, Mrs. Zhang, distinguishes between what the state declares as right, and what is good for the country. She has considered the possibility that her son might be framed and exiled, yet she might still be proud that he served his country well. Secondly, she distinguishes between what the state declares as right and what public opinion supports, where the

latter is considered a more reliable guide to what is actually right. All of this is based on the assumption that a non-noble woman is within her rights to fashion her own views about the reasonableness of public policy. These are startling assumptions for the eleventh century. Nothing Mrs. Zhang said suggests in any way that she viewed herself as a dutiful subject of his imperial majesty. Clearly, we are no longer dealing with a dynastic realm. Song period taxpayers took for granted both the personal nature of political views and their expression in multiple media.

Visualizing Dissent in Song China

The literary practice of political expression enters into the art of the Song dynasty in three forms. The first of these has been described in Chapter Four, where we saw examples of paintings realistically recording the wretched condition of the people. In these works, particular individuals stood as metonymy for “the people’s” suffering. The second form is metaphor, and the third is the exemplary figure who represents an abstract concept by synecdoche.

These latter two were employed together in a large number of landscape paintings during the tenth and eleventh centuries. Many of these paintings take as their main subject recluses, “fishermen” (recluse scholars) or other men of principle who have fled to the wilderness to avoid serving a government they regard as corrupt. Typically these men appear nearby, or alongside, natural metaphors for men of integrity, such as tall pines or bamboo. During the early part of the Tang/Song transition, this was a dominant theme in landscape painting, so here I will mention only a few examples.

One of the earliest such landscapes is the "Riverbank" 溪岸图 hanging scroll attributed to Dong Yuan 董源 (ca. 934-ca. 962) in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. We see a scholar with his family in a small pavilion by the waterside (figs. 00 and 00). His wife and child cling together behind him. Mother holds her baby close, while an older child looks anxiously toward her. Father rests his arm on the windowsill peering outward from the open pavilion, calm and unafraid. We know that the wind is blowing fiercely, for the artist has rendered the effects of wind on the water, reeds, and trees with impressive fidelity. We know, therefore, that this wind is blowing directly at this scholar and his family.

The reference is to one of the Classical Odes called the "North Wind". Early on classical commentary identified the north wind as a metaphor for oppressive government. The gentleman, however, composes himself and remains calm in the face of adversity. In his letter to Yuan Zhen on literary standards, Bai identified this trope, though not without criticism: "Lines like 'How chilling is the north wind' use the wind to allegorize oppressive government; 'The snow and sleet, so thick' uses the image of heavy snow to criticize conscription and corvee labor . . . In each case the poet speaks of 'this,' but the meaning refers to 'that'. Who would be offended by this stuff!?" 設如“北風其涼”，假風以刺威虐也；“雨雪霏霏”，因雪以愍征役也……皆興發於此而義歸於彼。反是者可乎哉！³³

Perhaps because of Bai's critique of allegory, this theme became rare in early modern Chinese painting, but it appears several times in surviving works from the Han period (fig. 00). Although the Han artist rendered the physical condition of things simply, almost diagrammatically, the composition he adopted in fact is not so different from that

of the tenth century artist. The wind god, an allegorization of oppressive government, applies heavy pressure to the scholar, yet the latter remains calm and holds his head high in defiance of illegitimate force. The concept of political resistance is graphically designed into the composition where, in both works, a powerful force presses against a vertical form yet is unable to bend it.

Both the Han period scholars who commissioned this stone engraving and the tenth century artist had to presume (1) that government can act in illegitimate ways, (2) that individuals have a right to decide when this is the case, and (3) individuals have a right to practice passive resistance. Both figures, then, present the viewer with much more than exemplars of moral integrity. They enable the viewer to visualize, graphically, the more abstract concept of political “resistance”.

Allegorical compositions such as the Metropolitan painting are rare among surviving Song paintings. A more common figure in paintings of this period is the recluse. In Song paintings, the figure of the recluse is marked by his traveler's staff. In the painting “Clearing Autumn Skies Over Mountains and Valleys,” 《谿山秋鑑圖》 attributed to Guo Xi (郭熙1020-1090), three such men can be seen wandering in a desolate landscape. That the landscape is portrayed as desolate is telling, for this serves as a metaphor for the inhospitable political conditions of the time. A recluse scholar with staff walks bolt upright directly beside two tall pine trees (fig. 00). The naturalistic style of the painting permits the artist to reveal that these pines have withstood seasons of harsh weather. Bark is flaking and branches at the top are broken or dead. This image itself is a topos found in many Song period landscapes, appearing as early as the tenth century. The wind and frost have

been so harsh that the topmost branches could not survive, though other branches continue to flourish defiantly.

Any educated Song scholar would understand the reference, for tall pines had long served as metaphors of integrity. One eleventh century critic, describing paintings of pines and rocks by the artist Zhang Zao (張瑑, active second half of 11th century), was unambiguous regarding the image's political significance:

In painting pines he was especially able to express his ideas in the figure (of the tree). He could wield two brushes simultaneously, one in each hand, making with one a living branch and with the other a dead one. The pine's disposition was as if defying the wind and rain, and its character was as if scorning the mist and frost.³⁴

尤於畫松特出意象，能手握雙管一時齊下，一為生枝，一為枯幹，勢凌風雨，氣傲煙霞。。

Here again we find the same graphic code. A tall, vertical, object, resisting horizontal forces pressing it to yield. It is a diagram of political defiance, one that informed one of Mei Yaochen's (梅堯臣 1002 - 1060) more stirring political poems:

Though the moon may fade it is no less bright;

Though a sword may break it is no less keen.

The moon becomes full only after it fades;

A sword, though broken, can be forged again.

Power and profit may press like mountains

But a hero's heart is hard to bend.

There are things a man must hold dear;

Though you kill him, you can't make him yield.³⁵

月缺不改光，劍折不改剛。

月缺魄易滿，劍折鑄復良。

勢利壓山岳，難屈志士腸。

男兒自有守，可殺不可苟。

This poem is a call to resistance: “let them try to silence us; others will rise up in our stead!” But the core theme, resistance, is conveyed by means of a graphic metaphor: rigidity as integrity; pressure as oppression; unbending resistance as defiance. These are difficult, and abstract political ideas, concepts unavailable to a large portion of the world's population at that time, for they require a person to imagine that he or she, someone without power, has a right to challenge those who possess it. In Song China such an idea was central to the political system, as we have seen, and was visualized repeatedly with the aid of graphic metaphors.

Less graphic, if more easily understood, is the image of the donkey rider, whose presence is almost ubiquitous in early Song landscapes. Peter Sturman identified this image and Bo Liu has delved further into the theme.³⁶ It appears to have been associated with the Tang poet Meng Haoran 孟浩然 (689 or 691-740), but in Song painting more likely it became a general figure for the maverick poet, an impecunious intellectual who travels the countryside writing poems about failed government. He has been rejected by a

corrupt regime and so rubs shoulders with the people, recording with his pen an unjust regime.

In the landscape attributed to Li Cheng (李成 919–967) in Kansas City (fig. 00), the donkey rider appears to be heading for an eatery beneath a temple, where we see ordinary folk ungracefully shoveling rice into their mouths (fig. 00). In the handscroll signed by Taigu yimin (太古遺民 active 1200–1250) in the same museum, he has parked his donkey outside a rustic eatery and is preparing to enter (figs. 00; 00). In Guo Xi's "Early Spring," 《早春圖》 dated 1073, a close inspection of the landscape reveals farmers, lowly officials or fishermen with their families, but we see as well the maverick poet on his donkey. Even in *Jiangshan* 江山 landscapes, such as the landscape by Qu Ding in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, where the landscape represents the polity as imagined by the court (Chapter 3), there is room for the donkey rider (fig.00), the voice of resistance.

Another type of metaphor, less graphic and more literary, was widely used in fan painting. As Bo Liu has shown, sparrows on a wintry branch (fig. 00) referred to poor people suffering from cold and hunger.³⁷ In some paintings of hungry sparrows, we see their beaks open, chirping in the frosty air. As cited by Bo Liu, the Yuan dynasty poet Wu Cheng revealed for us the hidden meaning of this small detail:

There are no more tree leaves for them to depend on,

Though they have beaks and can chirp, to whom can they complain? 更無樹葉可因依，有喙能鳴懃與誰。

Why should sparrows, metaphors for rural taxpayers, presume they have a right to complain? Wu's poem presumes the existence of the Grievance Offices. His poem charges

that, in his time (post-Song), those offices are not functioning properly, but at the same time he takes for granted the people's right to complain. It would be difficult to find comparable works in other parts of the world at this time.

In other instances sparrows might allude to neglected scholars. Other metaphorical images included hungry crows, orchids, plum trees, or bamboo (scholars) growing among thorns (corrupt slanderers). Others have investigated the literary connotations of these images.³⁸ What needs to be stressed here, following Bo Liu's analysis, is the social practice of waving politically charged fans in public places.

In a dynastic realm, ordinary taxpayers are not expected to develop a unique public persona based on individual behavior or personally chosen accessories. In Song China, however, any taxpayer who could afford it could purchase a fan with almost any design he or she desired: peonies for richness and beauty, plums for integrity, drunken poets for the mavericks, donkey riders for social critics, freezing sparrows for the socially conscious, or even paintings of starving children (Chapter 4). Such blatant displays of individual taste, such open indictments of the authorities, would not be tolerated in other parts of the world for centuries.

It would be a mistake, however, to interpret such social practices as reflective of some quality of national spirit. There is no spirit, at least not one that stems from national character. Resistance to injustice is structural; it is built into all social systems in one way or another, and to varying extents.³⁹ What is special about early modern China is the degree to which resistance had been articulated—politically, legally, and in non-official

sources—as well as the degree to which it had become a normal part of the lives of taxpayers, whether they were suing the magistrate or just cooling off in a local tavern.

¹ For an introduction to this tradition of poetry see Joseph R. Allen, *In the Voice of Others: Chinese Music Bureau Poetry* (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1992), 37-51.

² Martin Powers, *Pattern and Person: Ornament, Society, and Self* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press East Asian Series, 2006), 99-100.

³ James Legge, ed. and trans., *The Chinese Classics*. 3d ed. 5 vols. (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1960), V:561;565-6

⁴ Emperor wen of Han 漢文帝, “Chu feibang yaoyan zhi lingzhao” (除诽谤妖言之令诏 Edict on renouncing the crime of making grievances and complaints of the government), *Wenyuange siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書, Vol. 1417, Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2003, P168.

⁵ Xue He and Xu Keqian 薛和, 徐尅謙, *Xianqin faxue sixiang ziliao yizhu* 先秦法學思想資料譯注 (Elucidation and commentary on materials for pre-Qin legal thought). Haimen County: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1990, 80.

⁶ Sima Qian (司馬遷 c.145-85 B.C), *Shiji* (史記Records of the grand historian), in the series of *Zhongguo xueshu leibian* 中國學朮類編, Taipei: Dingwen Shuju, 1981, 423

⁷ Wang Chong, (王充 27-c.100 A.D), *Lunheng* (論衡Discourses Weighed in the Balance), Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1991, 442.

⁸ Chen Chi-yun, *Hsun Yueh: the life and reflections of an early medieval Confucian* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 43-44.

⁹ Martin J. Powers, “Pictorial Art and its Public in Early Imperial China,” *Art History*, v. 7 (2), 135-163, reference pp. 149-151; Fan Ye 范曄 (398-445), *Hou han shu* 《后汉书》 (History of the Latter Han dynasty) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973), 62.2068; 60B.2006; 62.2067; 62.2069, note 2.

¹⁰ For a discussion of the date of the text see Martin J. Powers, *Art and Political Expression in Early China* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 239 - 240.

¹¹ Martin J. Powers, Hybrid Prodigies and Public Issues in Early Imperial China,” *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* v. 55, pp. 1-50.

- ¹² Martin J. Powers, *Art and Political Expression in Early China* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 247-249.
- ¹³ Powers, *Art and Political Expression*, 224-278.
- ¹⁴ Powers, *Art and Political Expression*, 42-44; 197-198.
- ¹⁵ Cited in Danielle S. Allen, *Talking to Strangers: Anxieties of Citizenship since Brown v. Board of Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 72.
- ¹⁶ Meng Ke (孟軻 372-289 B.C), "Mencius" in *Duanju shisanjing jingwen* (斷句十三經經文 The Thirteen Classics with punctuations), Taipei: Taiwan kaiming publishing house, 1991, 6
- ¹⁷ Eugene Feifel, S.V. D., Ph. D, *Po Chu-i as a Censor: his Memorials Presented to the Emperor Hsien-Tsung During the Years 808 - 810* (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1961), 31 - 33.
- ¹⁸ Tuotuo(脫脫 1314-1355), *Songshi* (宋史 Official history of the Song dynasty), Yang Jialuo 楊家駱ed., in the book series *Zhongguo xueshu leiban* 中國學術類編, Taipei: Dingwen Publishing House, 1980. P.3768.
- ¹⁹ Bai Juyi白居易, "Celin yi" (策林 一, first chapter of the policy essays) in Zhang Chunlin张春林 ed., *Baijuyi quanji* (白居易全集 Collected works of Bai Juyi), Zhongguo wenshi chubanshe, 1999, 399
- ²⁰ *Bai Juyi quanji*, 65.
- ²¹ Du Xunh (杜荀鶴846-904), "Zaijing huchengxian" (再經胡城縣 Pass by Hucheng county the second time), in annot., Wuhandaxue zhongwenxi gudianwenxue yanjiushi武汉大学中文系古典文学研究室选注, *Xinxuan tangshi sanbai shou* (新选唐诗三百首 Three hundred selected Tang poems), Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 2000, 459
- ²² Bai Juyi白居易, "Mai tan weng" (賣炭翁 Old charcoal seller), in Zhang Chunlin张春林 ed., *Baijuyi quanji* 34
- ²³ Bai Juyi (白居易 772-846), Liu Mingjie刘明杰ed., *Bai Juyi quanji* (白居易全集Collected works of Bai Juyi), Beijing: Zhuhai Chubanshe, 1996:45-7, 59, 86, 149, 159, 184-7, 282, 321
- ²⁴ Bai Juyi白居易, "Yu yuanjiu shu" (与元九书A Letter for Yuan Zhen), in Zhou Shaoliang 周紹良 ed., *Quan tangwen xinbian*, (全唐文新編 Collected essays from the Tang dynasty), Vol. 3, No.3, Jilin wenshi chubanshe, 2000, 7622 《》
- ²⁵ Han Yu(韓愈 768-824), "Boyi song"(伯夷頌 Odes to Boyi), in Zhang Chunlin张春林 ed., *Han Yu Liu Zongyuan quanji*(韓愈、柳宗元全集 Collected works of Han Yu and Liu Zongyuan), Zhongguo wenshi chubanshe, 1999, 96
- ²⁶ Su Shi (蘇軾 1037-1101) "Chaozhou hanwengong miao bei" (潮州韓文公廟碑Inscription on the temple in honor of Han Yu in Chaozhou), Zhang Chunlin张春林 ed., *Su Shi quanji* (蘇軾全集 Collected works of Su Shi), Zhongguo wenshi chubanshe, 1999, 655
- ²⁷ Charles Hartman, *Han Yü and the T'ang Search for Unity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 103-104.
- ²⁸ Qu Chaoli 屈超立, *Songdai difangzhengfu minshi shenpan zhineng yanjiu* (宋代地方政府民事審判職能研究 The function of civil courts in local government in Song times) (Chengdu: Bashu shudian, 2003), 34
- ²⁹ Qu Chaoli 屈超立, *Songdai difangzhengfu minshi shenpan zhineng yanjiu*, 34.
- ³⁰ Qu Chaoli, *Songdai difang zhengfu*, 102.
- ³¹ Qu Chaoli, *Songdai difang zhengfu*, 7.
- ³² Tuotuo(脫脫 1314-1355), *Songshi* (宋史 Official history of the Song dynasty), p. 10958
- ³³ Bai Juyi白居易, "Yu yuanjiu shu" (与元九书A Letter for Yuan Zhen), in Zhou Shaoliang ed., *Quan tangwen xinbian*, 7622
- ³⁴ For this translation I consulted Alexander Coburn Soper, *Experiences In Painting: An Eleventh Century History of Chinese Painting, Together With the Chinese Text In Facsimile*. Washington: American Council of Learned Societies, 1951, 5.11b-12a, 81. See also Acker, William Reynolds Beal. *Some T'ang And Pre-T'ang Texts On Chinese Painting: Translated And Annotated*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1954,, II:284.
- ³⁵ Mei Yaochen, 梅堯臣, "Guyi" (古意 In the spirit of the great men of old), in Zhu Dongrun 朱東潤 annot. *Mei Yaochen ji* (梅堯臣集 Collected works of Mei Yaochen), (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980), 30
- ³⁶ Peter Sturman, "The Donkey Rider as Icon: Li Cheng and Early Chinese Landscape Painting.", *Artibus Asiae*, vol. LV, 1/2 (1995), pp. 43-97. Bo Liu, *Political Expression in Song Dynasty Fan Painting*, Dissertation, University of Michigan, 2009, 65-87.
- ³⁷ As cited in Bo Liu, "Political Expression in Song Dynasty Fan Painting," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 2008), 50.

³⁸ Charles Hartman, "Literary and Visual Interactions in Lo Chih-ch'uan's *Crows in Old Trees*" in *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, v. 28 (1993), pp.129-167

³⁹ See Charles Tilly, "Speaking Your Mind Without Elections, Surveys, or Social Movements," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 47, Issue 4 (Winter, 1983),461-478.