



Guest Editor's Introduction

Chinese Folklore Studies: Toward Disciplinary Maturity

The historiography of Chinese folklore studies commonly traces the advent of the discipline to the Folksong Studies Movement (Geyaoxue yundong 歌谣学运动; hereafter, FSM) of the May Fourth era (1910s to 1920s)¹ (CHAO 1942; 1943; HONKO 1986; HUNG 1985; TUOHY 1991). In his critical study of this movement, Wolfram Eberhard highlighted the underlying forces of nationalism and cultural awakening that rendered early Chinese folklore studies a discipline of “political science” (EBERHARD 1970, 2). If we look to the connection between nationalism and the rise of folklore in Germany, Finland, Greece, and Turkey, we notice that this politicized disciplinary inception is hardly unique to China, or as Eminov described, it is rather another episode of “the nationalism-folklore syndrome” (EMINOV 1978, 174). In China, this deeply political nature has lasted well beyond the birth of the discipline, continuing throughout much of the twentieth century to shape the contours of folklore research.

By the beginning of the twenty-first century, Chinese folklore studies had adopted a more self-reflective recomposition of its disciplinary orientation and practices. Folklorists have returned to grassroots communities while critically engaging China's cultural policies and movements with their research. They also actively engage with disciplinary concerns and perspectives on a global scale. The articles in this special issue will introduce a few of these trends and developments by presenting recent work from the current generation of China-based folklorists.

CHINESE FOLKLORE STUDIES: A FIELD OF “POLITICAL SCIENCE”

Like the significant position of the May Fourth era in the history of modern China, the Folksong Studies Movement that took place in this era occupies a dominant place in the historiography of Chinese folklore. It was an exuberant period of research and social practice that is still valued and related to by

contemporary Chinese folklorists. Especially when compared to the chaotic war period (late 1920s to 1940s) and the self-circumscribed high socialist years (1950s to early 1980s), this inception phase represented a rare historical moment for Chinese folklore studies to look outward, actively importing and applying Western and Japanese theories, methodologies, and perspectives (CHEN 1988; HUNG 1985, 12–25, 43; MILLER 1994). The work of Chinese researchers in this period carried the visible influence of foreign scholars including Andrew Lang, W. D. Fox, Jane Harrison, Charlotte Burne, and Yanagita Kunio.

In addition, as HUNG (1985) reminded us in his seminal research on intellectual history and folklore in Republican China, the FSM was a complex endeavor that was characterized by debates and differences. Even among the movement's founders, Liu Fu 刘复 (1891–1934), Gu Jiegang 顾颉刚 (1893–1980), and Zhou Zuoren 周作人 (1885–1967), there were some differences behind the impulse driving their fascination with folk songs and folk literature. Zhou Zuoren's interest in folk literature was stimulated by the work of Yanagita Kunio 柳田国男 (1875–1962), but lacked Yanagita's nationalistic desire to search for a distinctive national character in folklore (HUNG 1985, 45). Nor did Zhou share Liu or Gu's romanticized view of the culture of the common people (*pingmin* 平民; *minzhong* 民众). In contrast, Liu and Gu sought to use appreciation for folk songs and folk literature to understand the lives and thus improve the material livelihood of common people (LIU 1919; GU 1928). As will be discussed, this interest echoed the main credo of cultural awakening of the New Culture Movement (Xin wenhua yundong 新文化运动; hereafter, NCM) that coincided with the FSM. Zhou approached folk songs as the basic foundation of a new national literature of modern China. ZHOU (1923) aimed to elicit from these songs their genuine feeling and sincerity, the common essence of all kinds of art.

As valuable as it is to recognize the complexity of the motivation at this inception stage, not all the threads of this highly complex and nuanced period would leave an imprint on the discipline of Chinese folklore later on. Rather, two intertwined ideological threads that were particular to the historical context of the NCM would continue to shape the disciplinary paradigms in the following decades: the class-based perspective of two cultures and the scholar-activist role of folklorists in China's political-social transformation.

The NCM was launched in a historical context during which China faced insecurity and crisis after a series of military defeats (especially the First Sino-Japanese War, 1894–1895), foreign invasion, and internal political chaos at the turn of the nineteenth century.² Echoing the cultural awakening approach of late Qing elites like Liang Qichao 梁启超 (1873–1929), who was drawn to intellectual trends in Japan, the May Fourth generation shared a belief in the inseparability of language and literary reform, social and intellectual transformation, and the modernization of cultural communication (SCHNEIDER 1971, 158–59). The written language (*wenyan* 文言) and literature of classicism that had been the mainstay of China's intellectuals for centuries were critiqued as not only lifeless and decadent but also as a prop of imperial governance. The once-derided vernacular language (*baihua*

白话) and literary genres of the common people were now regarded as a new, vital source of strength to construct China's modern literature and enlightened citizenry (CHEN 1917; HU 1917). This approach was well exemplified in 1922 in the inaugural issue of *Geyao zhoukan* 歌谣周刊 [Folksong Weekly], the official journal of the FSM. In the founding statement, the journal's editors explicitly designated the direction of the FSM movement as twofold: to reveal the voice of the common people and to develop a national poetry.³ Therefore, in addition to developing a progressive literature for a modern China, the collection and study of folk songs were intended to be a channel for understanding social messages and problems that were not heard in elite culture (LIU 1927).

In this light, the NCM as well as FSM and the activities of the Commoners' Education Lecture Society of Peking University (Beijing daxue pingmin jiaoyu yanjiangtuan 北京大学平民教育演讲团; 1919) and the Custom Survey Society (Fengsu diaocha hui 风俗调查会; 1923) can be viewed as a distinctive effort of the May Fourth intellectual generation to search for literary and cultural modernity for a new China (DOLEZLOVA-VELINGEROVA and WANG 2001). These indigenous modernist projects of linguistic, literary, and cultural reforms were a social application of that generation's ideological beliefs as they tried to reevaluate China's imperial past and to locate China's position in the modern world. During this process, social stratifications and the distinctions between language and literary products of different groups in imperial China were manufactured into an ideologically charged, clear-cut dichotomy between the aristocracy (*guizu* 贵族) and common folk (*minzhong* or *pingmin*) (DONG 1927; GU 1928). This dichotomy between high and low, classical and vernacular, became the starting point in the dominant discourse of cultural awakening and thus the anchor for the conduct of modernist projects for the construction of a new national character. By romanticizing the low and vernacular as the "political alternative to elite culture" (MILLER 1994, 12), the academic and social practices of this generation—ranging from the construction of China's literary history (OWEN 2001), fascination with folk literature and folklore, to the enlightenment-oriented cultural reforms—engaged in a *class-bound*, ideological redefinition of Chineseness. In this way, these intellectual leaders also conferred upon themselves the responsibility of being doctors of souls when it came to the fate of the nation-state, which, ironically, was not so dramatically different from the perspective of the imperial-era literati from which they tried so hard to break away (LEE 2001). Compared to their predecessors, the nationalist-intellectuals of the May Fourth era might perform different tasks for different ends, but the sense of duty or enthusiasm to engage in political-social transformations endured.

These two threads, each a product of its own particular political-social habitat, may have incarnated differently in different disciplines of China's academia. Yet, to folklorists of later generations, they continued as a persistent watermark on the development of their own discipline, including the use of folklore as a political instrument in the Yan'an era (HOLM 1991) or the more systematic construction of scholarly folklore after the founding of the PRC in 1949. EBERHARD (1970) has pointed out that

folktale collections published in communist China in the 1950s and 1960s preferred stories that emphasized negative portrayals of the upper classes. DORSON (1965) traced the instrumentalization of folklore research to serve Communist ideology in the former Soviet Union. He noted that scholars of different voices were severely criticized. MILLER (1994) intriguingly discussed the practices of the Chinese Communist technique of redaction when folktales and folk songs were edited and refined by folklorists in order to promote ideological or political messages. TUOHY (1991) and An and Yang (in this issue) have recognized the continuation of the politicized disciplinary orientation in socialist China, especially the class struggle perspective in scholarly research. Like the May Fourth intellectual generation, folklorists in socialist China who breathed the air of the political climate could hardly avoid blurring the lines between scholarship and politics, actively or inactively engaging in the knowledge production of a highly ideological society. The fact that the folklore lacked a critical edge and disciplinary self-reflection even decades after the FSM legacy makes the recent changes in contemporary Chinese folklore studies all the more exciting.

DISCIPLINARY MATURITY AT THE TURN OF THE NEW CENTURY

As TUOHY (1991) mentioned in her discussion of contemporary Chinese folklore studies, the post-1978 years were labeled in Chinese-language historiography as the “springtime” of the discipline. This referred to not only the institutional reconstruction of the discipline after its halt during the era of the Cultural Revolution (1966–1976) but also to the resumption of scholarly progress, including the nationwide folklore collection projects under government sponsorship,⁴ the promotion of public interest in folk culture and cultural revival in general, the development of multidisciplinary theoretical approaches, and the rise of new fields of study (for example, urban folklore, and so on) (WU and CHEN 1988; ZHOU 1988). A similar picture was depicted in a report by Lauri Honko on a 1986 Sino-Finnish joint folklore project in the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region (Guangxi zhuangzu zizhiqu 广西壮族自治区), which described the “opening up” and internationalization of the discipline, researchers’ new enthusiasm for fieldwork, and the “cautious experimentation with various theoretical views.” However, both scholars also pointed out the strong influence of official ideologies or Marxist legacy on the discipline, considering these to have been among the main characteristics of Chinese folklore studies, even if their influence was not “constricting” (Honko cited in MILLER 1994, 21).

The dynamic juxtaposition of old and new that Tuohy and Honko keenly observed conveys the basic theme of post-1980s disciplinary development, which has further flourished into the present. I highlight three tendencies of current Chinese folklore research that effectively represent this theme and are well reflected by the articles in this special issue.

The first is how the relative decline of deterministic ideology led to the new understanding and practice of “going to the people” (HUNG 1985).⁵ As mentioned earlier, the class-bound division of China into two (elite and common) cultures

molded the paradigms of Chinese folklore research in a way that crippled disciplinary development for much of the twentieth century. But it also raised the disciplinary status of folklore research in the Chinese academic system due to its political value and significance to the socialist regime. Although the appeal of class struggle is now a distant memory, the call of “going to the people” remains a crucial card that endows the discipline with a distinctive position for continuous governmental support and sponsorship. The difference is that whereas the subject of folklore studies was once the laboring masses or landless peasants, the vision of the “people/folk” and the approach of “going to the people” have undergone significant changes over recent years.

In this issue, An Deming and Yang Lihui discuss the ways that Chinese folklorists have consciously redefined the subject of the discipline since the late 1980s. “Class” (*jieji* 阶级) is no longer the determining or indispensable criterion when folklorists try to answer the fundamental disciplinary questions of “who” and “what.” In the 1990s, the reconstruction of “folk” (*min* 民) as an inclusive category of the general populace or the entire nation was elaborated and deepened in scholarly discussions, and folklore research has been increasingly anchored in the understanding of everyday culture rather than that of class nature (LI 1999, 13–15; GAO 1994).

An and Yang’s discussion on the new disciplinary horizon leads us to see not only the expansion of research topics but also the shifting theoretical orientation of folklore. Rather than a flattened, pre-constructed category of class or class culture, folklorists now face a three-dimensional sphere of “everyday culture” (*richang wenhua* 日常文化). This change has meant that a relatively full understanding of “folk” or “folklore” cannot be achieved without situating the studied subject in everyday, emergent reality. “Going to the people” has thus remained important, even as it changed in meaning. Folklore scholarship has returned to grassroots communities, not as a statement of class consciousness, but in order to effectively explore everyday culture in its living habitat. This shift shows that folklorists not only attend to the distinctive inner workings of individual communities against a larger sociopolitical backdrop, but also attempt to convey the views, voices, and experiences of real life from within the context of a living community. This shift is effectively illustrated by Liu Tieliang’s article in this issue.

Using a case study of rural Beijing, Liu Tieliang begins by showing how previous scholarship on village communities focused on the social, economic, religious, and cultural changes brought about during rural industrialization (for example, FEI 1939) or anthropological perspectives on the flow of cultural capital and human relations in rural communities (for example, YAN 1996). From a different perspective, Liu aims to approach “the sense of village community” (*xiangcun rentonggan* 乡村认同感) from practice, uncovering folklore that is “embodied” (*shenti minsu* 身体民俗) in farming and handicraft production, as well as its relation to cultural practices such as rites of passage, marriage practice, and local folk beliefs. In his interaction with the villagers, what gave Liu the deepest

impression was their detailed memories of farming and other production activities, and that recollection of work was frequently one of the liveliest elements in the villagers storytelling about their lives. This fieldwork experience prompted Liu to understand the villagers' sense of community from a different perspective. With the concept of "village production," Liu emphasizes that production and exchange are not limited solely to material needs or interests. These activities and their related cultural practices also generate embodied experiences and perceptual knowledge (*ganxing zhishi* 感性知识) that is accumulated in specific production processes in everyday life and shapes the villagers' self-identification with the community. Rather than being weakened or destroyed by industrialization, the villagers' sense of community was reconstituted through these village-based production/trade practices as well as the intertwined cultural-religious activities and life memories.

Liu's article demonstrates how Chinese folklore has left behind many of its scholarly and ideological preconceptions and adjusted the lens to what is significant in the reality of the people. This shift has helped Chinese folklorists to refocus on ideologically sensitive issues, such as self-organized, community-based folk religious practices (see Peng and Chen's articles in this issue). Equally important, this approach emphasizes understanding the fieldwork site on its own terms and with its own logic, transforming the fieldwork site from a locus of data collection to a base of theoretical reconstruction.

The second new tendency has been the critical reevaluation of the role of folklorists in China's sociopolitical landscape. Since the May Fourth era, generations of folklorists (as well as scholars of other academic disciplines in China) have been engulfed by the turbulent sociopolitical tides of their time. The strong sense of engagement of the May Fourth intellectuals remained deeply rooted in the discipline. Many scholars of later generations continued to carry it out through their scholarship as well as participation in specific social practices. In this issue, Chen Zhiqin's article on China's current intangible cultural heritage (ICH) movement (*Feiwuzhi wenhua yichan yundong* 非物质文化遗产运动) stands as representative of how this engagement has been actively yet critically played out by contemporary folklorists.

One year after UNESCO created the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003, China zealously embraced this call and launched its own nationwide movement, mobilizing an array of social forces ranging from regional governments to folklorists. As An and Yang have noted, this government-guided project has created significant developmental opportunities for folklore as a discipline as folklorists participate in the promotion of official discourse and raise social awareness of safeguarding culture. Folklorist GAO Bingzhong (2007) points out that ICH-related folklore scholarship can contribute to the recognition of marginal folk culture (such as folk beliefs that are often regarded as superstitions) by mainstream society, allowing it to become "a component of the positive public consciousness" (*gonggong yishi* 公共意识). In addition to theoretical support, folklorists also participate as ethnographers and specialist committee members to review and rank ICH applications.

Folklorists' active engagement and its potential to shape folk culture on the ground remind us of the aforementioned discussions by HONKO (1986) and TUOHY (1991) of the strong influence ideology has had on the discipline in China, even during its liberating "springtime." However, unlike folklore of the Yan'an era or the early years of socialist China, the current era of engagement coexists with a self-conscious disciplinary reflection on the role of folklorists in this movement, as well as of the ICH movement in general. Gao Bingzhong contextualizes his in-depth analysis of the official discourse of the ICH movement within the lineage of modern China's numerous cultural upheavals. While pointing out that the Chinese state embraces UNESCO's ICH initiative to improve its own political image on the world stage,⁶ Gao argues that this movement does reveal a rather different logic of cultural politics at the discursive and perceptual (*linian* 理念) level. While folk culture once faced the threat of systematic cultural destruction, it is, for the first time in China's modern history, officially recognized and supported by the state (GAO 2013, 143). Yet Gao also reminds us not to ignore the difference between the positive direction at the discursive level and the problematic ICH practices that in reality still put the issue of legitimacy in question.

Consistent with Gao's self-reflective spirit, AN (2008; and see this issue), focuses on the reality of folklorists' engagement with the ICH movement. He argues that given the decision-making power of the evaluation committee, China's ICH review regulations have produced a hegemonic discourse on the value of ICH items. Folklorists and specialists serving on the committee have become the agents of authority to determine the evaluation criteria and the ICH status of cultural items and practices, whereas tradition-bearers are placed in a vulnerable position of being evaluated. An also warns us that such practices of privileging certain traditions over others can also lead to inequality and conflict among social and cultural groups.

Echoing this line of theoretical discussion, Chen Zhiqin's article in this issue presents an illustrative case study to question China's government-guided model of safeguarding ICH. This article examines the processes by which two significant local folk beliefs in Shaoxing 绍兴, Zhejiang province 浙江省—the worship of Yu the Great (Da Yu 大禹) and Emperor Shun (Shun Wang 舜王)—are transformed as though they were recognized as ICH at the local, provincial, and national levels.

Chen shows how Shaoxing's regional governments participated directly on behalf of tradition-bearers, working as the official body to manage and submit the ICH application. During this process, local governments downplayed the diversity and richness of folk worship traditions that coexist in the region (for example, clan and non-clan based rituals) and engaged in integrating and standardizing folk traditions into the roster of officially approved public rituals for the purpose of achieving ICH status. In doing so, governmental officials not only changed names and fixed the dates of rituals (which are now tied to the Western calendar), but also came to officiate over the rituals themselves. Clan members, who still hosted their rituals independent from the official ones, were invited to be present at the

public official rituals but were not allowed to hold their ceremonies in the temple where the public official rituals took place. Official interference also extended to the cultural symbolism of the rituals. Whereas imperial documents and folk rituals praised Yu as a sagacious ruler, officially approved public rituals transformed Yu into a patriotic hero of flood-taming.

Chen argues forcefully that rather than safeguarding ICH, China's ICH movement provides a new stage for local governments to exercise power over folk traditions. Local governments not only replace folk groups as the main, official body to regulate and represent folk beliefs but also deprive tradition-bearers of their cultural ownership and their right to socially and economically benefit from their cultural resources. Chen concludes by questioning the ultimate purpose of safeguarding ICH if the ICH that is officially recognized no longer belongs to people's everyday lives.

Chen's critique of such a prominent state-launched movement reveals that, although folklore remains highly politicized, there is a new space in Chinese disciplinary circles for intellectual independence and critical potential. This kind of multivocality and self-reflection indicates the increasing disciplinary maturity if we consider this discipline's century-long history of struggle in the muddy waters of politics and scholarship. More importantly, this critical tendency, interwoven with the entrenched disciplinary tradition of engagement in social practices, will enable folklore to continue to play a meaningful role in China's many sociocultural transformations.

The final tendency that this issue reflects is the disciplinary communication between Chinese scholars and international folklore circles. Given the deep exposure of Chinese scholars to global academia, the opening up of Chinese folklore studies is itself to be expected. However, what needs to be emphasized is that, except the rare outward-looking moment of the May Fourth era, the discipline had for a very long time been confined to native grown theories and perspectives. The opportunity to reconnect and converse with international folklore circles at the turn of this new century has been so exciting that it has become one of the major transformative forces on the discipline, especially its theoretical development.

During our conversations with China-based scholars on which themes and perspectives should be represented in this issue, all sides noted the great influence of two "imported" theoretical perspectives: embodiment and context. In this issue, these perspectives are reflected in the work of Peng Mu and Yang Lihui.

Peng Mu examines how the beliefs about the otherworld, or yin world (*yin-jian* 阴间), are formed in a rural Chinese community in Chaling 茶陵 county in southeast Hunan 湖南 province and how the villagers integrate these beliefs into everyday life. Peng Mu compliments previous approaches, such as the study of religious symbolism or the relationship between the religious system and social structures, by examining empirical religious practices at the grassroots-level through an embodied perspective. In her study, she emphasizes the importance of understanding the bodily practices of local spirit mediums and the generated embodied repre-

sentations of the yin world at important rituals and religious moments such as the Zhongyuan Festival (*zhongyuanjie* 中元节, also called *guijie* 鬼节 [ghost festival]).

In her analysis, Peng draws insights from Pierre BOURDIEU's (1990) theory of practice, particularly his view on "practical belief," not as a kind of arbitrary adherence to a set of instituted doctrines but rather as a "state of body." In this view, enacted belief as a form of symbolic thought is instilled by childhood learning, which treats the body as "a living memory pad," "an automation that leads the mind unconsciously along with it," and "a repository for the most precious values." Situating this perspective in the distinctive inner-working of local religious practices, Peng examines the spirit medium's knowledgeable and effective responses to villagers' inquiries about dead family members. She shows that the mediums' seemingly extraordinary bodily potency (that is, communicating the yin world) was enabled by their upbringing and religious experience in local life, through which the mediums absorbed ideas about the interrelated realms between the yin and yang worlds into their bodily practices. For the villagers, the embodied encounters with the yin world that these spirit mediums provided for them at such important religious moments further reinforced their beliefs. Peng particularly highlights the embodied performances of spirit possession and their decisive impact on local world views at these rituals. She argues that, through something tangible (for example, words voiced in an entranced state), the yin world manifests itself through a medium's body and this sheer materiality "engraves the most indelible memory and impression" on people's minds about an invisible realm.

Although Peng's embodied approach to village religion in many ways resembles Liu Tieliang's aforementioned research on the embodied experience of work in historical rural Beijing, it is worth noting that while Peng draws inspiration from scholars like Bourdieu, Liu's emphasis on embodiment seems to have originated largely from his own fieldwork experience. This interesting picture indicates that the high interest in foreign theories in current scholarship does not lead to the loss of native tunes. Rather, it makes the discipline a more open-ended and dynamic field with increasing richness and complexity. Regardless of the starting points of their research perspectives, both articles make their analyses speak to the distinctive inner-workings of individual communities. Both contribute to the growth of a common ground in the theoretical orientations of the current discipline, which is to approach folklore as a living, performative, and embodied component of everyday life (folklore as people live it). At the same time, this picture also denotes an exciting opportunity for native and foreign theories of the same or similar interest that coexist in current scholarship to communicate. This opportunity is cogently illustrated in this issue by Yang Lihui's performance-centered myth research.

In her article, Yang points out that the perspective of context, which arose from performance-centered verbal arts research in American folklore studies in the 1970s, was introduced to China around the mid-1990s. In the past decade, "context" has gradually become a keyword in Chinese folklore scholarship. Like the fundamental disciplinary changes it brought to American folklore studies, the

perspective of context as a guiding framework has also shifted China's folklore scholarship from conventional text-based research to research on "folklore in context" (LIU 2009). This shift is particularly reflected in the studies of folk narrative, such as myth, which conventionally relies on historical literary texts.

Yang shows that the new lens of context brings scholarly attention to dimensions of mythology that were previously overlooked. She explores brother-sister marriage myth traditions in three Han communities, examining how myth-telling in an immediate performance and a larger social context affect the produced narrations. Her findings show that the context of emergent, fluid performance plays a vital role in shaping texts, regulating narrating occasions, defining the composition and scale of narration and audience, and determining the function and meaning of myth. At the same time, the larger context of social and cultural change influence the scale, presentation, and transmission of myth-telling traditions in these communities.

However, Yang's long-term research also allows her to see the enduring stability of myth texts across time and place. The core form and content of myth (including the essential motifs and their combination as well as the basic plot) remains the same throughout the historical course. This fact prompts her to rethink the limitation of this guiding perspective: how much influence can context exert on the transmission and transformation of folklore? To what extent can the perspective of context help us to effectively study folklore, especially verbal arts like myths, proverbs, or folktales? Yang is not alone in this line of questioning. Her article cites a heated debate in the discipline on the relationship between text and context in 2003 and 2004, which was triggered by CHEN Jianxian's (2003; 2004) call for the return to the text when it comes to myth research. Chen argued that overemphasis on the perspective of context can only lead to an "external" approach, one that does not deepen understanding of the inherent nature or qualities of myth text itself. He points out that an approach that exclusively privileges content, if generalized as the guiding framework for folklore scholarship as a whole, risks ignoring the distinctive characteristics of folk literature and arts as a specific field.

The questions raised by Yang and Chen show that the outward-looking tendency in this new century features a dialogic process during which Chinese folklorists engage in critical and in-depth conversations with international folklore circles. It may yet take time and practice to construct a sophisticated balance between the native and the foreign so that a characteristically Chinese discipline of folklore studies can be fully developed, but this newly-opened space has set this journey in motion. We hope that this issue will demonstrate the dynamism of developments in China to Anglophone folklore circles, and that through it more communication and exchange can be realized.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to my co-editors, Peng Mu, who translated the articles, and Thomas DuBois. As a group, we would like to thank our China-based contributors whose support and insights have made this meaningful project possible. We are also grateful for Zou Kunyi's help in transla-

tion, the patience and encouragement of the editors of this journal, and the constructive feedback and input of two anonymous reviewers. All transcriptions of Mandarin Chinese in this issue follow the standard pinyin Romanization system. We also follow the Chinese convention of listing a surname before a given name when it comes to Chinese names.

NOTES

1. The Folksong Studies Movement began with the foundation of the Folksong Collection Bureau (Geyao zhengjichu 歌谣征集处) at Peking University in February 1918 and lasted until 1925 in the north (and then experienced a very brief revival from 1936 to 1937). The May Fourth era is named after 4 May 1919, when several hundred students from Beijing's universities took to the streets to protest China's treatment at the Paris Peace Conference, demanding territorial integrity for China. It is used to signify the high tide of Chinese modern nationalism in the studies of Chinese history. It also coincides with a trend to a cultural awakening, such as the New Culture Movement (see page 260), vernacular language (*baihua* 白话) reform, and mass education programs.

2. Different social strata expressed their nationalistic efforts through the continuous but barely coherent political, social, and military activities such as the 1898 reform in the Qing court, the new acceptance of foreign technology, the Boxer Uprising, and so on. Although these efforts were barely coherent due to their different goals and means, the nationalistic feeling of “anti-imperialism” (*fandi* 反帝) and “national salvation” (*jiuguo* 救国) was commonly shared.

3. This was the most important folklore journal during this period, and eventually promoted the formation of the discipline, publishing ninety-seven issues with a focus on folk song studies but also including research on folktales, children's literature, and proverbs.

4. One of the most important and ambitious projects is the compilation of “Three Collections of Folk Literature” (Minjian wenxue santao jicheng 民间文学三套集成) under the guidance of the Ministry of Culture, The State Ethnic Affairs Commission (Guojia minzu shiwu weiyuanhui 国家民族事务委员会), and the Chinese Folk Literature and Arts Research Society (Zhongguo minjian wenyi yanjiuhui 中国民间文艺研究会). This nationwide folk literature collecting and documentation project lasted from 1984 to 2004, resulting in the publication of *Zhongguo minjian gushi jicheng* 中国民间故事集成 (Collection of Chinese folktales), *Zhongguo geyao jicheng* 中国歌谣集成 (Collection of Chinese folk songs), and *Zhongguo yanyu jicheng* 中国谚语集成 (Collection of Chinese proverbs). For details, see An Deming and Yang Lihui's article in this issue.

5. In his research, Hung used “going to the people” as his book title to epitomize the ideological foundation and its resulted practices of Chinese intelligentsia who viewed “the people” as an alternative source of vitality to build a new China in the early twentieth century.

6. Gao does not discuss this point in his articles in detail, but this view is clearly stated in his email exchange with the author (dated 26 August 2014). I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for directing our attention to this issue.

REFERENCES

- AN Deming 安德明
2008 *Feiwuzhi wenhua yichan baohu: Minsuxue de liangnan xuanze* 非物质文化遗产保护—民俗学的两难选择 [Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage: A dilemma for folklore studies]. *Henan shehui kexue* 1: 14–20.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre
1990 *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- CHAO, Weipang
1942 Modern Chinese folklore investigations. *Folklore Studies* 1: 55–76.
1943 Modern Chinese folklore investigations. *Folklore Studies* 2: 79–88.
- CHEN Duxiu 陈独秀
1917 *Wenxue geminglun* 文学革命论 [On literary revolution]. *Xin qingnian* 2: 1–4.
- CHEN Jianxian 陈建宪
2003 *Zouxiang tianye huigui wenben: Zhongguo shenhua xue lilun fansi zhiyi* 走向田野回归文本—中国神话学理论建设反思之一 [Going to the field and returning to the text: A reconsideration of the foundation of Chinese mythology theory]. *Minsuyanjiu* 4: 5–13.
2004 *Luelun minjian wenxue yanjiu zhong de jige guanxi wenti: Zouxiang tianye huigui wenben zai sikao* 略论民间文学研究中的几个关系—“走向田野回归文本”再思考 [A brief discussion on relations in the study of folk literature: Rethinking “Going to the field and returning to the text”]. *Minzu wenxue yanjiu* 3: 17–23.
- CHEN Qinjian 陈勤建, ed.
1988 *Dangdai Zhongguo minsu xue* 当代中国民俗学 [Contemporary Chinese folklore study] Shanghai: Shanghai Wenyi Chubanshe.
- DOLEZÉLOVA-VELINGEROVA, Milena, and David Der-wei WANG
2001 Introduction. In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, Milena Dolezelova-Velingerova and Oldrich Kral, eds., 1–30. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- DONG Zuobin 董作宾
1927 *Wei minjian wenyi jinggao duzhe* 为民间文艺敬告读者 [A respectful letter to the readers of folk literature and art]. *Minjian wenyi* 1: 1–5.
- DORSON, Richard
1965 Foreword. In *Folktales of China*, ed. Wolfram Eberhard, v–xxxi. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- EBERHARD, Wolfram
1970 *Studies in Chinese Folklore and Related Essays*. Bloomington: Indiana University Research Center for the Language Sciences
- EMINOV, Sandra
1978 Folklore and nationalism in modern Chinese. In *Folklore, Nationalism, and Politics*, ed. Felix Oinas, 163–84. Indiana University Folklore Institute, Monograph Series, vol. 30. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publications, Inc.

FEI, Hsiao-t'ung

- 1939 *Peasant Life in China: A Field Study of Country Life in the Yangtze Valley*. Preface by Bronislaw Malinowski. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

GAO Bingzhong 高丙中

- 1994 *Minsu wenhua yu minzhong shenghuo* 民俗文化与民众生活 [Folk culture and folk life]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe.
- 2007 *Zuowei feiwuzhi wenhua yichan yanjiu keti de minjian xinyang* 作为非物质文化遗产研究课题的民间信仰 [Folk belief as the subjects of intangible cultural heritage]. *Jiangxi shehui kexue* 3: 146-54.
- 2013 *Zhongguo de feiwuzhi wenhua yichan baohu yu wenhua geming de zhongjie* 中国的非物质文化遗产保护与文化革命的终结 [The conservation of China's intangible cultural heritage and the ending of culture revolutions]. *Kaifang shidai* 5: 143-52.

GU Jiegang 顾颉刚

- 1928 *Shengxian wenhua yu minzhong wenhua* 圣贤文化与民众文化 [The culture of the sages and the culture of the commoners]. *Minsu zhoukan* [Folklore weekly] 2: 1-8.

HOLM, David

- 1991 *Art and Ideology in Revolutionary China*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

HONKO, Lauri

- 1986 *Wooden bells ringing*. *Nordic Institute of Folklore Newsletter* 14: 3-16.

HU Shi 胡适

- 1917 *Wenxue gailiang chuyi* 文学改良刍议 [A tentative proposal for the reform of literature]. *Xin qingnian* 2: 1-11.

HUNG, Chang-tai

- 1985 *Going to the People: Chinese Intellectuals and Folk Literature, 1918-1937*. Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies and Harvard University Press.

LEE, Leo Ou-fan

- 2001 *Incomplete modernity: Rethinking the May Fourth intellectual*. In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, Milena Dolexlova-Velingerova and Oldrich Kral, eds., 31-65. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

LI Huifang 李惠芳

- 1999 *Zhongguo minjian wenxue* 中国民间文学 [Chinese folk literature]. Wuhan: Wuhan daxue chubanshe.

LIU Fu 刘复

- 1919 *Zhongguo zhi xiadeng xiaoshuo* 中国之下等小说 [Low-grade fiction in China]. *Taipingyang* 1: 1-22.

LIU Jing'an 刘经庵

- 1927 *Geyaoyu fu nü* 歌谣与妇女 [Folksong and women]. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan.

LIU Xiaochun 刘晓春

- 2009 *Cong minsu dao yujing zhong de minsu: Zhongguo minsuxue yanjiu de fanshi zhuanhuan* 从“民俗”到“语境中的民俗”——中国民俗学研究的范式转换 [From “folklore” to “contextual folklore”: Shifting patterns of Chinese folklore studies] *Minsu yanjiu* 2: 5-35.

MILLER, Lucien

- 1994 General introduction. In *South of the Clouds: Tales from Yunnan*, Lucien Miller and Guo Xu, eds., trans. Xu Kun, 3–40. Seattle: the University of Washington Press.

OWEN, Stephen

- 2001 The end of the past: Rewriting Chinese literary history in the early Republic. In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, ed. Milena Dolezelova-Velingerova and Oldrich Kral, 167–92. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

SCHNEIDER, Laurence A.

- 1971 *Ku Chieh-kang and China's New History: Nationalism and the Quest for Alternative Traditions*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

TUOHY, Sue

- 1991 Cultural metaphors and reasoning: Folklore scholarship and ideology in contemporary China. *Asian Folklore Studies* 50: 189–221.

WU Bing'an 乌丙安 and CHEN Qinjian

- 1988 Woguo dushi minsuxue yanjiu de xin keti 我国都市民俗学研究的新课题 [A new research topic: Urban folklore in China]. In *Dangdai Zhongguo minsuxue* 当代中国民俗学 [Contemporary Chinese folklore studies], ed. Chen Qinjian, 30–43. Shanghai: Shanghai wenyi chubanshe.

YAN, Yunxiang

- 1996 *The Flow of Gifts: Reciprocity and Social Networks in a Chinese Village*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

ZHOU Xing 周星

- 1988 Zhongguo mingsuxue yanjiu de xiandai sikao 中国民俗学研究的现代思考 [Contemporary reflections on Chinese folklore research]. In *Dangdai Zhongguo minsuxue* 当代中国民俗学 [Contemporary Chinese folklore studies], ed. Chen Qinjian, 15–29. Shanghai: Shanghai wenyi chubanshe.

ZHOU Zuoren 周作人

- 1923 Zhongguo mingge de jiazhi 中国民歌的价值 [The values of Chinese folk songs]. *Geyao zhoukan* 6: 4.