The Invention of the New Culture Movement in 1919

Elisabeth Forster
University College

Doctor of Philosophy in Oriental Studies
2014

ABSTRACT

The expression ‘New Culture Movement’ was born in summer 1919, in the intersections of academic debate, political activism, media coverage and intellectual marketing strategies. I have traced the emergence of the phrase and the discourses around it, using sources like journals, newspapers, student essays, advertisements and conference protocols.

The New Culture Movement was a buzzword, deployed by practically-minded but lesser-known intellectuals to promote agendas they had held long before its invention. Many notions we associate with the Movement until today already surrounded it in 1919: for example, that it was connected to the political protests of ‘May Fourth,’ and driven by star intellectuals such as Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu. But closer scrutiny reveals that the New Culture Movement and its network of associations were a construct, an amalgam of newspaper stories and intellectual marketing ploys: the connection to May Fourth was created by newspapers; the intellectuals at the periphery drew upon Hu Shi’s and Chen Duxiu’s prestige to add glamour to their own agendas. Nevertheless, the New Culture Movement shaped China’s 20th century. As only some agendas could credibly be sold as the Movement, it catalysed the plethora of competing agendas that had emerged since the 19th century to tackle the challenges of a changed world order.

The New Culture Movement later became a founding myth of ‘Modern China’ and was regarded as the obvious result of global trends towards ‘modernisation,’ which visionary intellectuals recognised. But more recent literature has decentred the Movement, noted a longer history of its ideas and the careerism of its participants. I drive this point further by showing that, at the Movement’s very core, were practically-minded business and marketing strategies, deployed by numerous, lesser-known actors. It was in this way that the course for 20th-century China and one of its founding myths was set.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks go of course first and foremost to my supervisor, Peter Ditmanson, without whose invaluable help, inspiring insights and encouragement this thesis would have been neither started nor finished. I am also grateful to the many people who have helped me along the way. To mention just a few names (in alphabetical order), among them were Paul Bevan, David Bowles, Glen Dudbridge, Barend ter Haar, Henrietta Harrison, Isabella Jackson, Taotao Liu, Dirk Meyer, Rana Mitter, Laura Newby, Yang Song, David Der-wei Wang and Justin Winslett. Naturally, this thesis would not have come into existence without the Chinese Studies Library and the librarians Joshua Seufert, Trevor Langrish, Hannie Riley, Geneviève Wardley and Minh Chung.

I thank the AHRC, the Edwin Arnold Scholarship and the Keller Stiftung for funding my DPhil and the Kluge Center at the Library of Congress for a most productive research stay.

My special thanks go to Liu Qian, who took the trouble of reading all the chapters of this thesis and who gave me incredibly helpful feedback.

Parts of the Chapter Two will be published in the journal *Frontiers of History in China*. The formatting of this thesis follows the Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 7

New Culture Movement Today 7

State of the Field 10
The Discourse Created by New Culture Advocates 10
A Shift in the Narratives in the 1990s 13

My Argument 16

Implications and Benefits 21

Methodological Notes 23
Approach and Academic Conundrums 23
Methodology and Sources 26
Baihua as a Red Thread 28
Geographical Focus 28

What It Meant to Call It 'New Culture Movement' 31
A 'Movement' 31
'New Culture' 34

Historical Background 36
Academia and Education 37
Politics 39
The Media 43

CHAPTER I: ACADEMIC DEBATES IN EARLY 1919 53

Introduction 53
State of the Field: When Did the New Culture Movement Begin? 55

Newspapers Report about Two 'Factions of Learning' 56
'New Faction' 56
The 'Old Faction' and the *National Heritage* Magazine 62
The Usual 'Factional' Nitpicking at Beijing University 63
Beijing University's Opinion on 'Factions of Learning' 70

An Academic Debate 75
Shared Concerns and Approaches 77
Conflict: The Lessons of Evolution 80
Fu Sinian: Distinct Time Periods 82
Zhang Xuan: The Tracks of Evolution 86

Lin Shu and the End of the 'New Faction' 93
About Lin Shu 94
'Scholar Jing' 95
'Nightmare' 96
Reactions from the 'New Faction' 97
Letter to Cai Yuanpei 99

Conclusion **100**

CHAPTER II: FROM ACADEMIC NITPICKING TO THE 'NEW CULTURE MOVEMENT' **102**

Introduction **102**
Background Information: The May Fourth Demonstrations 104
State of the Field: May Fourth and New Culture 108

'New Faction' Success after May Fourth **113**

The Connection between May Fourth and New Culture **118**
A 'Historical Puzzle' 118
The Doom of the 'New Faction' 120
The 'Schools in Beijing' 122
The Void around the 'New Culture Movement' 124

Rumours **127**
Rumours before May Fourth 127
Truth or Conspiracy Theories? 129
Cai Yuanpei's Resignation in Three 'Acts' 132
Lin Shu and the 'Country-Selling Traitors' 142

Victims of the Government, Unite! **143**

Jing Guan's Perspective **145**

Conclusion **146**

CHAPTER III: THE BUZZWORD 'NEW CULTURE MOVEMENT' **151**

Introduction **151**
State of the Field: Agency in the New Culture Movement 153
Beijing-Shanghai Divide 155

Hu Shi's Fame **156**

Hu Shi's Frustration **163**

Case Study: Jiangsu Educational Association **165**
About the Jiangsu Educational Association 165
Selling the Jiangsu Educational Association's Agenda 167
'Signboard' Criticism 180

Phenomena of Co-optation **182**
A Plethora of Definitions 182
A New Argument for '*baihua*' 186
The *guoyu* Project 188
Blurred Boundaries between 'Centre' and Periphery 192

Self-Confidence of the New Culture Activists at the Periphery **194**
The Makers of the Movement 194
The 'Popularisation'-versus-'Enhancement' Debate 195
General Sense of Decline in Hu Shi's Circle 199

Conclusion **201**

CHAPTER IV: WHO CARED ABOUT THE NEW CULTURE MOVEMENT? 204

Introduction 204
State of the Field: Who Cared about the New Culture Movement? 207
Notes on the Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers 209

The Circle That Did Not Care – The Business Community 211
Sticking to *wenyan* 213
A Propensity for English 216

A Grey Area of Sporadic Interest – Humanities Circles 219
Lewis Chase's Students 219
Newspapers and School Journals 223

Upholding Opposition 224
Liu Shipei's Circle 224
The *Critical Review* 227

The Circle That Cared 232
The School Spring-Bamboo Journals 232
The Spring-Bamboo Journals of Political Interest Groups 235

A Discursive Circle 239
Citing Each Other 239
All Know Each Other 240
Infrastructure, Not Ideological Conditioning 244

Routes of Transmission 245
Advertisements 245
Getting Hold of a Journal 249
Case Study: Lewis Nathaniel Chase 251

Conclusion 263

CONCLUSION 266

Busting the Myth 266
A Buzzword 267
The Limits 269

Revealing New Things about 20th-Century China 272
Who Made the New Culture Movement? Agency and the Making of 20th-Century China 272
A Unique Mixture for 20th-Century China: Newspapers, New Culture and May Fourth 275

Future Research on the New Culture Movement 279

How to Teach the New Culture Movement 280

APPENDIX: 'HUMANITIES' IN 1919 AND THE DEPARTMENTS OF BEIJING UNIVERSITY 283

BIBLIOGRAPHY 286

INTRODUCTION

New Culture Movement Today

The New Culture Movement (*xin wenhua yundong* 新文化運動) has been regarded as a founding narrative of 20th-century China, constructed by actors as different as the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), Chinese government critics and Western and Chinese academics. While there is no doubt that China experienced tangible intellectual and social shifts in the first decades of the 20th century, the New Culture Movement itself is a strange thing. It is simultaneously omnipresent and elusive, a national myth and irrelevant. This conundrum is key to this study, in which I debunk central elements of standard narratives about the New Culture Movement, while pointing to the broad agency in the making of 20th-century China.

The New Culture Movement clearly still matters to people in the present. When the shock artist Zhu Yu 朱昱 (b. 1970) ate what seemed to be a stillborn foetus as part of a work of art in 2000, he alluded to Lu Xun's 魯迅 (1881-1936) *Diary of a Madman* (*Kuangren riji* 狂人日記).[1] The signatories of the Charta 08 referred to the New Culture Movement as an important stage in China's 20th century.[2] On occasion of the 90th anniversary of the May Fourth (*wu si* 五四) demonstrations of 1919, the *People's Daily* (*Renmin ribao* 人民日報) declared May Fourth and New Culture to have been a 'historical turning point' (*lishi zhuanzhe dian* 歷史轉折點).[3] This 'turning point' led to the foundation of the CCP in,

[1] Zhu Yu, *Shiren*; Yang Shousen, *Yishu jingjie lun*, 223; Holmes, 'Pillars of Fat', 21 November 2013; Holmes, 'Pillars of Fat', July 2014.
[2] Liu Xiaobo and others, 'Ba ling xianzhang'.
[3] Jin Chongji, 'Wu si yundong', *Renmin ribao*, 4 May 2009. I translate the names of all journals, books and newspapers into English, using the English translation provided by the authors or editors of the work, where available. Only for '*Xinchao*,' I follow the academic convention of translating it as '*New Tide*,' rather than as 'Renaissance' (the name given by the editors). I only use Pinyin for words that are more distinct and common in this form, such as '*baihua*,' '*wenyan*,' '*guoyu*' and so forth. In the same spirit, for most Chinese names I

according to this narrative, 1921.[4] By talking about May Fourth and New Culture together, the *People's Daily* drew upon a widespread habit to conflate May Fourth and New Culture. For reasons that I will outline in more detail later, I use 'May Fourth' to refer to the demonstrations that started in Beijing on 4 May 1919 and then spread to other cities in China. By 'New Culture,' I mean the cluster of *baihua* (白話, 'plain language'), science and democracy, Marxism and so on.

The New Culture Movement is still regularly discussed on the Chinese microblog Sina Weibo (*Xinlang weibo* 新浪微博). For example, when Mo Yan 莫言 (b. 1955) received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2012, he caused a global intellectual controversy, as he is a member of the state-sponsored Chinese Writers' Association (*Zhongguo zuojia xiehui* 中國作家協會). On occasion of this controversy, a Weibo user cursed the New Culture Movement for linking politics and culture, while thanking Mo Yan for finally severing this unwholesome tie.[5] Another microblogger expressed hopes that Mo Yan might start a new New Culture Movement.[6] In short, the New Culture Movement appears in China's official political, popular and artistic discourse.

Nevertheless, the New Culture Movement is not a hot topic on Weibo. For example, New Culture intellectuals do not tend to appear on the microblog's hit list of searches for 'famous people' (*mingren* 名人). On a random day, namely, 26 February 2014, the names of actresses (the Hong Kong actress Carina Lau, Liu Jialing 劉嘉玲, b. 1965) and writers (Li Chengpeng 李承鵬, b. 1968) occupied the top ranks, with 126,654 and 80,134

use the Romanization chosen by the authors themselves, particularly when they wrote in English. For example, I refer to the young teacher in the 1920s Xu Peizhen 徐佩珍 as 'Bei' or 'Sze Be Tsung,' which was how she signed off her letters.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Laohu bu chi fanfan, 'Wu si yundong yihou …'.

[6] Shexie xiaolang, 'Fuxi zhengzhi ...'

searches.[7] On the same day, the 'New Culture Movement' did not even appear on this hit list. It was also only mentioned by 19 users on the whole website.

It is not a political slogan in such materials either, such as the 'China Dream' (*Zhongguo mengxiang* 中國夢想), promoted by Xi Jinping's 習近平 (b. 1953), the president of the People's Republic of China (PRC). Hardly a week goes by without the *People's Daily* mentioning the 'China Dream.' But the paper can go months without referring to the New Culture Movement.[8] Moreover, the New Culture Movement is not one of the events that form part of the, admittedly limited, canon of Western common knowledge about China. It is mentioned in a short 440-word article on the 'May Fourth Movement' in the academic edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.[9] This must be seen in contrast to the 1,500 words that are, for example, dedicated to 'postmodernism [philosophy].'[10] In terms of a global popular discourse, the 'New Culture Movement' does have entries in the influential online encyclopaedia Wikipedia, but only in seven languages, two of which are Chinese and Japanese.[11]

This existence between being present and being absent at the same time goes all the way back to the year 1919, the year in which the expression 'New Culture Movement' was invented. From 1919 to 1949, when the Shanghai newspaper *Shanghai News* (*Shenbao* 申報) ceased publication, this newspaper featured the expression '*xin wenhua yundong*' in 145 articles.[12] This sounds like a lot. But this is put into perspective by the fact that the *Shanghai News* was a daily newspaper and therefore published around 10,600 issues in

[7] 'Resou bang', *Sina Weibo*.
[8] Between 1 January 2012 and 31 December 2013, the *People's Daily* mentioned the 'China Dream' 78 times. The 'New Culture Movement' did not find any mention throughout the whole year of 2013. This is shown by a keyword search of the database the *People's Daily* (*Renmin ribao* 人民日報).
[9] *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. May Fourth Movement.
[10] Duignan, s.v. Postmodernism.'
[11] Western languages with an entry are English, Polish, German and Norwegian. See *Wikipedia*, s.v. New Culture Movement.
[12] This is shown by a search of the database *Shanghai News* (*Shenbao 1872-1949* 申報 1872-1949).

these 30 years. This is not only a matter of numbers. Students at Yanjing University (*Yanjing daxue* 燕京大學), Beijing Normal University (*Beijing shifan daxue* 北京師範大學) and Beijing University (*Beijing daxue* 北京大學) in the 1920s mentioned the New Culture Movement often in their homework and examination essays. But at the same time they showed themselves unaware of many issues and arguments proposed as part of the Movement.[13]

State of the Field

The Discourse Created by New Culture Advocates

In academia, the New Culture Movement has a firm place in narratives about 20th-century China. This is not least because academic narratives about the Movement were long shaped by a discourse the New Culture activists on various levels themselves had created.[14] Since the 1930s, the CCP has claimed to be originating from the Movement.[15] The CCP was, of course, shaped by New Culture advocates such as Chen Duxiu 陳獨秀 (1879-1942), Li Dazhao 李大釗 (1888/89-1927) and Mao Zedong 毛澤東 (1893-1976). Thanks to this connection to the CCP, the Movement was declared to be the aforementioned 'historical turning point' by that party,[16] a narrative that influences Chinese academic narratives until the present day.[17]

New Culture activists also shaped Western academic discourses about the Movement. As I show in Chapter Four, Hu Shi 胡適 (1891-1962) interacted with foreign intellectuals in

[13] Chase and et al., 'Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers'.
[14] See Doleželová-Velingerová and Král, *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital*, 1–2; Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity', 52–53; Weston, *The Power of Position*, 9; Kaske, *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education*, xii; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 79.
[15] Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 112.
[16] Jin Chongji, 'Wu si yundong'.
[17] See, for example, Li Bingzhong, Wei Canjin, and Lin Conglong, s.v. 'Xin wenhua yundong'; Li Shenzhao, s.v. 'Xin wenhua yundong'; Wu Jing, *'Xuedeng' yu wu si xin wenhua yundong*, 6.

China. He also travelled abroad in 1926 to influence Western opinion on the Movement.[18] Missionary journals like the *Chinese Christian Advocate* (*Xinghua* 興華) also reprinted narratives by local intellectuals groups about the New Culture Movement in 1919.[19] It seems that missionaries and foreigners in China then went on to be among the first to debate the New Culture Movement in Western academic journals.[20] This discourse became firmly tied in with academic narratives when, according to Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and David Der-wei Wang, it was replicated in Chow Tse-tsung's 1960 book *The May Fourth Movement*.[21] The influential work by Vera Schwarcz was also shaped by self-narratives: both *The Chinese Enlightenment* and *Time for Telling the Truth Is Running Out* were based on her interviews with the New Culture intellectual Zhang Shenfu 張申府 (1893-1986).[22]

This discourse, which began as early as 1919,[23] is a set of the following themes, some of which I have already mentioned: The New Culture Movement, in this narrative, was a turning point between 'premodern' and 'modern' China[24] – with 'modern' being defined as Western-style, Marxist or multi-centred, depending, unsurprisingly, on the political and

[18] Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment', 300.
[19] 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi jieshi', *Xinghua*. *the Chinese Christian Advocate* had been founded in 1910, and it was published by the Methodist Publishing House (*Hua Mei shuju* 華美書局). Its original name, *Chinese-American Religious Guardian* (*Hua Mei jiao bao* 華美教保), was changed into *Chinese Christian Advocate (Xinghua bao* 興華報) in 1910. At the time, it was edited by Li Fengqian 李逢謙 (no dates) and Luo Yunyan 羅運炎 (1889-?), a Chinese returned student from the US. See Zhao Xiaolan and Wu Chao, *Chuanjiaoshi zhongwen baokan shi*, 239–240; Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Pan Zhenwen'; Xu Youchun, s.v. 'Luo Yunyan'; *Quanguo baokan suoyin, qikan daohang*; 'Advertisement of the Methodist Publishing House', *Moti*.
[20] For example, Clarence H. Hamilton from the 'University of Nanking' published an article on the New Culture Movement in 1921. See Hamilton, 'Religion and the New Culture Movement in China', 225. F. L. Hawks Pott from 'St. John's University, Shanghai' wrote about the '"new thought" movement in China' in 1922. See Hawks Pott, 'The Intellectual and Social Crisis in China', 291.
[21] Doleželová-Velingerová and Wang, 'Introduction', 1; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964.
[22] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*; Schwarcz, *Time for Telling the Truth Is Running Out*. Only *Time for Telling the Truth Is Running Out* is explicitly based on Schwarcz' interviews with Zhang Shenfu. However, as Schwarcz began these interviews in 1979, and *The Chinese Enlightenment* was published in 1986, it is reasonable to assume that the interviews already influenced her first book. See Ibid., ix.
[23] An early example that combines many of its themes is Zhong Jiu, 'Wu si yundong de huigu', 608. See also Cai Dun, 'Zhu Jingnong xiansheng yanjiang jilu'.
[24] Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 79. Lanza described this discourse. He did not support it.

theoretical stance of the author.[25] It was not only the beginning of Marxism in China, but also of the modern Chinese language, which went back to the Movement's *baihua* project. The Movement was, according to this story, part of general global trends (for example, those of modernity) and therefore 'teleologically unavoidable.'[26] It was driven by the New Culture stars at Beijing University, among them Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu. They were, in this story, the most prominent and competent visionaries to recognise these trends,[27] and they defended their ideals against 'conservative' opponents. Finally, the discourse created by New Culture activists has conflated 'New Culture' and 'May Fourth:'[28] Cultural 'New Culture' and political 'May Fourth' were connected by shared themes (a general sense of newness) or personnel (New Culture activists were also May Fourth activists).

Elements of this narrative can be found in Vera Schwarcz' ground-breaking *The Chinese Enlightenment* and in Jonathan Spence's popular textbook *The Search for Modern China*.[29] They are also part of the political or the popular discourse on the Movement, as exemplified by the *People's Daily*, or comments on Sina Weibo and the online encyclopaedia Baidu baike (百度百科, 'Baidu Encyclopaedia').[30]

[25] David Der-wei Wang has argued that the New Culture Movement introduced a Western-style modernity, see Wang, *Fin-de-Siècle Splendor*, 1. Daruvala has analysed a multi-centred modernity in New Culture, see Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*. For the New Culture Movement as the rise of Marxism, see Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*, 10. Li Quan points to the New Culture Movement's opposition to 'feudalism' (*fengjian zhuyi* 封建主義). This, however, is a hallmark of Marxist modernity. See Ibid.; Sayer, *Capitalism and Modernity*, 11.

[26] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 9. Like Lanza, Weston described the discourse. He did not support it.

[27] This has been described by Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity', 52–53; Ip, Hon, and Lee, 'The Plurality of Chinese Modernity', 491.

[28] See for example Schneider, *Wahrheit und Geschichte*, 151; Wang, 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937', 467–471; Chen Pingyuan, '"Shaonian yiqi" yu "jiaguo qinghuai"', 1. For Wu Jing's discussion of his decision to call the New Culture Movement 'May Fourth,' see Wu Jing, *'Xuedeng' yu wu si xin wenhua yundong*, 6–7.

[29] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*; Spence, *The Search for Modern China*, 299–308.

[30] For a description of the New Culture Movement as a watershed moment, see Gao yu xin wonder, 'Xin wenhua yundong shide Zhongguo wenxue gu jin fenlie …'; 'Wei minzu fuxing zouxiang qingchun yuezhang', *Renmin ribao*, 4 May 2009. For it being driven by the New Culture stars, see *Baidu baike*, s.v. 'Xin wenhua yundong'.

A Shift in the Narratives in the 1990s

A new generation of historians has challenged this discourse starting from the 1990s: These scholars questioned the importance of the famous New Culture intellectuals. Instead, they started seeing them as one social group among many, and therefore began exploring new sources (for example, newspapers) and broader reaches of society (for example, lesser-known intellectuals).[31] They broke up the narrative that the New Culture intellectuals 'progressively' and 'iconoclastically' stood up against their 'conservative' opponents, and showed instead that these opponents were equally intent on reform.[32]

Scholars moreover stopped regarding New Culture intellectuals as visionary ivory-tower scholars and came to see them as pragmatic and career-oriented.[33] This coincided temporally with changes in these scholars' own working environments. The late 1980s and 1990s were the time when things like the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and the Research Excellence Framework (REF) were introduced, producing a self-perception of academia as a hectic, production-oriented place.[34] Finally, the scholars of this generation even started challenging developments and narratives shaped by New Culture activists. They conveyed that these had actually 'obscured' a clearer view of history[35] or 'repressed'

[31] On newspapers, see, for example, Harrison, 'Newspapers and Nationalism in Rural China 1890-1929'; Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?*; Pang Ju'ai, *Kua wenhua guanggao yu shimin wenhua de bianqian*; Fu Dehua, Pang Rongdi, and Yang Jiguang, *Shi Liangcai yu 'Shen bao' de fazhan*. On lesser-known intellectuals, see Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 147–173; Hammerstrom, 'Buddhists Discuss Science in Modern China'. Similarly, see the collections on May Fourth and New Culture in a certain province, such as Tianjin lishi bowu guan and Nankai daxue lishi xi 'Wu si yundong zai Tianjin' bianxie zu, *Wu si yundong zai Tianjin: Lishi ziliao xuanji*; Zhonggong Zhejiang shengwei dangxiao dangshi jiaoyan shi, *Wu si yundong zai Zhejiang*; Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiu suo, *Wu si yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji*; Zhonggong Jiangsu shengwei dangshi gongzuo weiyuan hui and Zhongguo di er lishi dang'an guan, *Wu si yundong zai Jiangsu*. For a combined analysis of peripheral and famous activists, see Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*.

[32] See, for example, Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 239–256; Ye Shixiang and Zhang Dongmei, 'Xiandaixing shiye zhong de "guocui pai" he "Xueheng pai"'.

[33] Examples are Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 2; Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity'.

[34] This new self-image of academia is described in the chapter 'Mass Production and Academic Life' in Billig, *Learn to Write Badly*, 12–39. That historians' own working conditions might be reflected in their assessment of early 20th-century academia is suggested by the fact that Fabio Lanza drew a parallel between universities in the early 20th and 21st centuries. See Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 73–74.

[35] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 8.

more specifically Chinese versions of 'modernity.'[36] In this way, these reinterpretations contributed to moving the New Culture Movement into the interstices of canonical event and irrelevance even in academic narratives.

However, there are limits to the post-1990s developments. First of all, many books written since then have focused on individual people (Lin Shu 林紓 [1852-1924], Lu Xun) or individual spheres (Beijing University, *baihua*, academic debates and so on).[37] They have not drawn the research on these spheres together into a larger narrative about the 'New Culture Movement' as a whole, which could replace those provided by Vera Schwarcz and Chow Tse-tsung. Secondly, the discourse shaped by New Culture advocates has not completely vanished. In 2000, Rana Mitter conveyed the impression that New Culture followed obvious global trends towards modernisation, that it was 'in the air.'[38] In 2004, Timothy Weston talked about the 'conservative undertow' of the New Culture Movement. By this he meant the 'Confucian' idea (as identified by Lin Yü-sheng), that cultural change had to precede political change, and the mission of New Culture intellectuals 'to "awaken" China.'[39] The influential work of Chen Pingyuan, himself based at Beijing University, is premised on the idea that it was the New Culture stars at that university who drove the New Culture Movement. Finally, 'New Culture' and 'May Fourth' are still routinely used synonymously in both English- and Chinese-language literature.

[36] Wang, *Fin-de-Siècle Splendor*. This narrative was also promoted by Dorothy Ko or Harriet T. Zurndorfer. Ko argued that the 'May Fourth' paradigm of women's history displayed women as suppressed by a patriarchal culture, which glossed over the literary culture some of them had created. In the same spirit, Zurndorfer showed that New Culture scholars wrote female scholars of the Qing Dynasty out of history, since these women did not fit with New Culture notions of scholarship and feminism. See Ko, *Teachers of the Inner Chambers*, 1–4; Zurndorfer, 'The Fugitive Self'.

[37] On Lin Shu, see Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.* On Lu Xun, see Davies, *Lu Xun's Revolution*. For Beida, see Weston, *The Power of Position*; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*. On *baihua*, see Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese*; Zhou, *Placing the Modern Chinese Vernacular in Transnational Literature*. On the academic debates, see Luo Zhitian, 'Xin wenhua yundong shiqi guanyu zhengli guogu de sixiang lunzheng'; Chen Pingyuan, *Zhongguo xiandai xueshu zhi jianli*.

[38] Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*.

[39] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 9. Lin Yü-sheng expressed this idea in Lin, *The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness*.

Thirdly, the importance of the New Culture Movement is still taken for granted in academia. This is indicated by the firm place the Movement has in contemporary teaching and research. The New Culture Movement is part of Western Chinese Studies curricula on 20th-century China for undergraduate students. Chinese academia knows 'a state-funded discipline called "Lu Xun studies" (*Lu Xun yanjiu* 魯迅研究).'[40] According to Xu Jilin, Chinese intellectuals still construct Lu Xun into 'an enduring figure of "modern orthodoxy" (*xiandai daotong* [現代道統]).'[41]

Moreover, a huge amount of academic literature is still being produced on New Culture themes. In recent years, Chen Pingyuan has explored a wide variety of topics, from the demonstrations on 4 May 1919, to academic debates about language at Beijing University, to Zhang Taiyan's 張太炎 (1869-1936) *baihua* writings or the canonisation of New Culture literature.[42] Luo Zhitian has investigated the emergence of 'national learning' (*guoxue* 國學) with a focus on people like the New Culture intellectual Fu Sinian 傅斯年 (1896-1950) and one of his most outspoken critics, Zhang Xuan 張煊 (no dates).[43] Xu Jilin has shown the networks around famous New Culture intellectuals like Hu Shi and Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培 (1863-1940).[44] Michael Gibbs Hill and Gloria Davies have written new histories about the famous New Culture sceptic Lin Shu and New Culture author Lu Xun respectively.[45] Fabio Lanza and Timothy Weston have described Beijing University, which styles itself as the 'cradle of the "May Fourth" Movement' (*'wu si' yundong de ceyuan di* '五四' 運動的策源地), and its role in the student demonstrations of May Fourth.[46] Zhou

[40] Davies, *Lu Xun's Revolution*, 15.
[41] Cited in Ibid. Original citation: Xu Jilin and Luo Gang, *Qimeng de ziwo wajie*, 136.
[42] Chen Pingyuan, *Zhongguo xiandai xueshu zhi jianli*; Chen, *Touches of History*; Chen Pingyuan, '"Shaonian yiqi" yu "jiaguo qinghuai"'.
[43] Luo Zhitian, 'Xin wenhua yundong shiqi guanyu zhengli guogu de sixiang lunzheng'.
[44] Xu Jilin, *Jindai Zhongguo zhishi fenzi de gongong jiaowan*.
[45] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*; Davies, *Lu Xun's Revolution*.
[46] 'Beida jianjie', *Beijing daxue* [website]; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*; Weston, *The Power of Position*.

Gang, Shi Shumei and Edward Gunn have reframed the *baihua* project.[47] Peng Peng has explored the involvement of the political party Research Clique (*Yanjiu xi* 研究系) in the Movement.[48] In sum, although the old discourse has been challenged, it has not lost its grip on academia and no new narrative about the New Culture Movement has been formulated that could replace it.

My Argument

In this thesis, I tie together these academic developments to create a new story about the phenomenon of the 'New Culture Movement' as a whole, tracing agency in the invention of the Movement, revealing the uses of its rhetoric and examining its power and its limitations. I argue that the New Culture Movement was a buzzword, deployed by practically-minded but lesser-known intellectuals to promote agendas they had held long before its invention. Although many central elements of familiar New Culture narratives were already present in 1919 and the early 1920s, closer scrutiny reveals that they were a construct, an amalgam of newspaper stories and intellectual marketing ploys.

In retrospect, it would seem obvious that people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were prestigious intellectuals. However, in 1919 this was a new phenomenon created by newspaper stories. To be sure, as professors at Beijing University, Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were already established academics. Although Beijing University was not as prestigious at the time as it seems now,[49] it was already an institution to which the eyes of intellectuals all over the country turned.[50] Nevertheless, only a little earlier, in the first four months of 1919, contemporaries would have been surprised to hear that Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu were

[47] Zhou, *Placing the Modern Chinese Vernacular in Transnational Literature*; Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese*, 217–296; Shi, *The Lure of the Modern*, 71.
[48] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003.
[49] Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 9.
[50] The *Shanghai News* mentioned Beida in nine articles in 1918 and even around 40 times in 1917. This is indicated by a search of the database *Shenbao 1872-1949*.

stars of a 'Movement.' Not only did the expression 'New Culture Movement' not exist yet. Newspapers merely regarded people like Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu as an ivory-tower 'faction of learning' (*xuepai* 學派), the 'New Faction' (*xinpai* 新派). They were, in this narrative, embroiled in an academic squabble with an opposing and superior 'faction,' the 'Old Faction' (*jiupai* 舊派).[51] Their bone of contention was two incomprehensible forms of language – the 'New Faction' advocated a *baihua* so Westernised that it was hardly intelligible to the common people and the 'Old Faction' endorsed a reformed *wenyan* (文言, 'Classical Chinese').[52] This is the argument I make in Chapter One of this thesis.

The later fame of figures like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu hinged on the fact that, after compartmentalizing the debating academics into fixed *xuepai*, newspapers ascribed warlord-political allegiances to them. In February 1919, the famous translator and intellectual Lin Shu took sides with the 'Old Faction' and published a set of tirades against the *baihua* advocates in newspapers.[53] Newspapers then even started claiming that he was enlisting his friends in the government to oust people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu from Beijing University. This made the 'Old Faction' look like government allies and the 'New Faction' like its victims. Before the May Fourth demonstrations, this was regarded as a sign for the impending doom of the 'New Faction.' Chen Duxiu was dismissed from Beijing University in April 1919,[54] and the *Shanghai News* diagnosed in the same month that Chen and his circle had lost the debates.[55]

However, from 4 May 1919 onwards, people in urban centres all over the country started protesting against a clause in the Treaty of Versailles, which awarded formerly German

[51] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao', *Shenbao*, 6 March 1919; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', *Gongyanbao*, 18 March 1919.
[52] On the idea that *baihua* was highly Westernised and therefore incomprehensible, see Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese*, 217–296; Shi, *The Lure of the Modern*, 71.
[53] Lin Shu, 'Yaomeng'; Lin Shu, 'Jing Sheng'; Lin Shu, 'Da daxuetang xiaozhang Cai Heqing taishi shu'.
[54] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 64.
[55] Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing', *Shenbao*, 25 April 1919.

regions in Shandong Province to Japan. Although May Fourth and New Culture were conflated as early as 1919, the connection between the two was not immediately obvious. The most strident indication for this was contemporaries' reaction to this conflation. The intellectual Li Jinxi 黎錦熙 (1890-1978), for example, said that he 'did not expect' (*bu liao* 不料) political May Fourth to promote the cause of ideas like *baihua*.[56] The head of the History Department of Yanjing University, Philippe de Vargas (1888-1956, Chinese name: Wang Kesi 王克私), called it a 'historical puzzle.'[57]

The connection between May Fourth and New Culture emerged from stories reported in newspapers like the *Shanghai News*. May Fourth was, of course, primarily a protest against Japan. However, since the government was held responsible for the debacle at Versailles, these protests were also directed against the government. As in this situation newspapers kept repeating that Lin Shu had incited the government to get rid of people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, these academics were soon associated with the May Fourth demonstrators.[58] Thanks to this association, their ideas came to be regarded as expressions of anti-government sentiment, which was now very popular. In this way, a young teacher in Shanghai who went by the name of Jing Guan 靜觀 (no dates) explained that he did not demonstrate during May Fourth. However, he expressed his solidarity with the demonstrators by discussing the 'question of the new woman' (*xin funü wenti* 新婦女問題). He was, he said, just 'like the professors at Beida [that is, Beijing University], Mr Chen Duxiu and Mr Hu Shizhi' (*xiang Beida jiaoyuan Chen Duxiu xiansheng he Hu Shizhi xiansheng* 像北大教員陳獨秀先生和胡適之先生).[59] This is the topic of Chapter Two.

[56] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 137.
[57] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 18. For more information on de Vargas and the manuscript, see footnote 80 on page 119 of this thesis.
[58] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai', *Shenbao*, 13 May 1919.
[59] Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 31–32. 'Hu Shizhi' was Hu Shi's courtesy name (*zi* 字). For more details, see pp. 73-74 of this thesis.

Jing Guan and many like him then founded journals to support what they claimed to be Chen Duxiu's and Hu Shi's ideas. Contemporaries often estimated that around 400 journals were launched.[60] At some point in summer 1919, people started calling this the 'New Culture Movement.'[61] It is impossible to trace when exactly this happened or who talked about the New Culture Movement first. But the fact that it first appeared in lesser-known journals, rather than in Chen Duxiu's famous magazine *New Youth* (*Xin qingnian* 新青年), suggests that it was coined by intellectuals at the periphery. According to Ouyang Junxi, one of its first mentions appeared on 31 August in the Shanghai magazine *Weekly Review* (*Xinqgi pinglun* 星期評論).[62] The first time *New Youth* used it was in December 1919, and the first time this magazine dedicated a whole article to it was even later, in April 1920.[63] Moreover, it appeared suddenly in a number of publications in autumn 1919, and people used it as if the expression was well-known. I therefore speculate that it was invented orally in discussion and study groups in the summer of 1919, and then made it into print later.

Once invented, the buzzword 'New Culture Movement' was filled with a lot of rhetoric, which later entered the standard narratives about it: It claimed the Movement to be inspired

[60] Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 2; de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 18; see also Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 178; Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 161; Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 74; Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 137.

[61] Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 195; Zheng Shiqu, 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun', 7; Kaske, *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education*, 458; Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 71; Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 73; Bowles, 'Finding the Way', 33. This is also indicated by searches in the following databases: *Quanguo baokan suoyin*; *Shenbao 1872-1949*; *Zhongguo guojia shuzi tushu guan (Minguo zhuanlan)*.

[62] Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 73; Xian Jin, 'Xin wenhua yundong de wuqi', *Xingqi pinglun*, 31 August 1919; Bowles, 'Finding the Way', 33. In this article, the journal cited the educator and later GMD politician Wu Zhihui 吳稚暉 (1865-1953) on the Movement. According to Ouyang Junxi, the *Weekly Review* (*Xingqi pinglun*) was not only authored by GMD members, but it was 'generally acknowledged to be an important platform of expression for the Guomindang' (*gongren de Guomindang de zhongyao yanlun zhendi* 公認的國民黨的重要言論陣地). According to David Bowles, the *Weekly Review* (*Xingqi pinglun*) was funded by the GMD. See Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 73; Bowles, 'Finding the Way', 34. On Wu Zhihui, see Sun Youkui, s.v. 'Wu Zhihui'.

[63] Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 73; Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', April 1920. For more information on the Jiangsu Educational Association, see pp. 41-43 and 165-167 of this thesis.

by Beijing University's stars (Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu and so forth), to advocate their ideas ('*baihua*'), to be a watershed moment and relevant for all of society. However, what was happening in reality was that lesser-known intellectuals co-opted the label 'New Culture Movement,' including its star personnel and rhetoric, and grafted it onto their own agendas, which they had already held for a couple of years. I show this by the example of the Jiangsu Educational Association (*Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui* 江蘇省教育會). Its members marketed their same cluster of ideas over the course of 1919, variously as called for by the end of World War I, as a counter-measure against the May Fourth protests and as the 'New Culture Movement that continues the May Fourth Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong shi jixu wu si yundong* 新文化運動是繼續五四運動).[64]

Many intellectuals like them tried selling a huge variety of ideas as 'New Culture Movement,' ranging from popular- and vocational-education projects, *guoyu* (國語, 'national language'), political ideals like Marxism, and even scepticism against *baihua*.[65] For intellectual urban strata, there must have been something very powerful in this blend of political and anti-government May Fourth and the polarised academic group at Beijing University, who were depicted as brave government victims. Ideas that could convincingly be sold as 'New Culture Movement' gained traction over the next few years. For example, Marxism became important for 20th-century mainland China. *Guoyu*, which groups like the Jiangsu Educational Association had promoted for years, made it into the primary-school curriculum in 1920. As a result, people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were flattered to be called 'centre of the New Culture Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong de zhongxin* 新

[64] For the reference to World War I, see Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Cheng jiaoyu zongzhang zuzhi Zhonghua xin jiaoyu she wen', 2. For the reference to the counter-measure against May Fourth, see Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Cheng Qi shengzhang chenshu taolun xuechao hou jiuji fangfa wen', 6. For the reference to the New Culture Movement, see Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.
[65] For details on the *guoyu* project, see pp. 188-191.

文化運動的中心).[66] But at the same time, they lamented that they had no control over the ideas that were debated in their names. This is the argument of Chapter Three.

Although the proponents of the Movement claimed it to be of broad social relevance, the franchise was only negotiated by a limited circle. These were mostly students, professors and other intellectuals involved in what would today be called humanities subjects and education, as well as secondary-school students. Another group was political interest associations, such as the political party Research Clique, which was headed by Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873-1929). In the early 1920s, interest in the New Culture Movement hardly ever made it beyond this circle. Businesspeople and social or natural scientists did not care about the New Culture Movement at all. Rural areas, moreover, were unaffected by these debates too.[67] In short, what has been constructed into a starting point for 'Modern China' was a buzzword – omnipresent in that a huge variety of agendas and even some commercial items were sold under its headline, and evasive in that it was a label for pre-existing agendas, rather than the inspiration for ideas itself, and relevant only to a small group of urban teachers, students and academics. I outline this in Chapter Four.

Implications and Benefits

With this narrative, I bust the 'myth of the "New Culture Movement."' By the 'myth of the "New Culture Movement,"' I mean the story that has placed New Culture at the beginning of 'Modern China,' and equipped it with well-established rhetoric (connecting May Fourth, Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu as initiators and so forth). As shown above, this narrative was largely shaped by contemporary participants, and my thesis debunks the rhetoric of this story.

[66] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)', *Shenbao*, 15 September 1920.
[67] Rana Mitter has argued that the New Culture Movement was an urban phenomenon. See Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 25.

Far from rendering the New Culture Movement unimportant, debunking this 'myth' shows the power of the New Culture Movement to reveal something more meaningful about Republican China and 20th-century China. The observation that Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were not the Movement's initiators, but nevertheless declared to be the Movement's 'centre,' indicates that agency in Republican intellectual developments did not rest with only a few 'key figures.' It rested with broadening circles of intellectual groups, who officially ascribed agency to the then-glamorous star academics at Beijing University, with the aim to give their own agendas more weight. Since some of the ideas the lesser-known intellectuals promoted gained importance for the whole 20th century (*guoyu*, Marxism), my study of the New Culture Movement shows that widespread agency and a complex interaction between 'centre' and periphery were involved in creating that century's ideas and ideologies.[68]

My story of the New Culture Movement also shows how it was created out of many components of Republican society. Some of them originated earlier in Chinese history, some of them were peculiar to the 20th century and of a more global provenance. These components were newspapers, ideas about 'factions of learning,' state politics and non-state political activism, academic and educational discourses, universities in the spotlight and less visible urban associations. The New Culture Movement resulted from an amalgamation of all these facets. This makes my narrative resonate with scholarship investigating 'multi-centred modernities' in China,[69] even though I do not use the already well-explored framework of 'modernity.'

Finally, this thesis indicates how important such rhetoric can be. Although the New Culture Movement was a buzzword, it was so potent that it gave broader traction to ideas

[68] By 'periphery,' I mean that these intellectuals were not very visible in the image of the New Culture Movement they themselves created, and at whose centre they positioned people like Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu.
[69] See, for example, Wang, *Fin-de-Siècle Splendor*; Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*.

which could be credibly sold under this label. For example, *guoyu* became part of primary-school curricula only one year after the New Culture Movement's invention. Although the New Culture Movement itself was only a label, it facilitated important shifts in China's intellectual and academic landscape. Reinhart Koselleck has argued that historical 'events' can reshape 'structures,' that is, political, social, military or other conditions that have existed for a relatively long time.[70] In a similar way, the introduction of the buzzword 'New Culture Movement' was the 'event' that became a catalyst for a variety of competing agendas (such as *guoyu*, reformed *wenyan*, popular education and so on). They had emerged in the 19th century and became important for the 20th century. [71]

Methodological Notes

Approach and Academic Conundrums

When scholars approach the New Culture Movement, they often see it as the name for a set of ideas. This indicates the power that categories created in the Republican Period still hold over academic research today. In order to escape this Republican grip, I proceed from the standpoint that not even names for events, such as the 'New Culture Movement,' should be taken for granted, but that their emergence, their purposes and their meaning itself must be unravelled. My study therefore focuses on the phrase 'New Culture Movement' and the discourses surrounding it.

This approach addresses a conundrum that has emerged in the academic study of the New Culture Movement: how to define and date it. A lot of scholarly ink has been spilled on both attempts. Several beginning dates have been suggested: 1914, the launch of the

[70] Koselleck, 'Representation, Event, and Structure', 105–111.
[71] I would like to thank David Bowles for his comments on this issue at the Chinese Studies Seminar at the University of Oxford on 22 May 2014.

magazine *Tiger* (*Jiayin* 甲寅);[72] 1915, the founding of Chen Duxiu's journal *New Youth*; or 1917, the publication of Hu Shi's 'Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature' (*Wenxue gailiang chuyi* 文學改良芻議) in *New Youth*.[73] This article, the argument goes, marked the beginning of the *baihua* 'movement.' Various end dates have been proposed too: 1923, when *New Youth* became the 'institutional publication of the Chinese Communist Party' (*Zhongguo gongchan dang jiguan kanwu* 中國共產黨機關刊物); 1925, May Thirtieth Movement; 1928, establishment of the Nanjing Regime; the 1930s, or even Mao Zedong's speech at the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art (*Yan'an wenyi zuotan hui* 延安文藝座談會) in 1942.[74] Rana Mitter has even suggested a change in the 'atmosphere,' rather than a 'specific date,' should measure the Movement's end.[75]

Attempts to define the Movement's meaning have been similarly diverse. It has been identified as 'Chinese enlightenment'[76] or as a 'Literary Revolution, democracy, and science.'[77] Scholars have made lists of elements that constituted the New Culture Movement. These have included, for example, 'science and democracy' (*kexue yu minzhu* 科學與民主), the 'critical attitude' (*pingpan de taidu* 評判的態度) and 'social reform' (*shehui gaizao* 社會改造).[78] Additional elements have been listed, such as *baihua*,

[72] For 1914 as start date of the New Culture Movement, see Weston, 'The Formation and Positioning of the New Culture Community', 260. For 1915, see Timothy Weston citing Vera Schwarcz, Jerome Grieder and Chow Tse-tsung. Ibid., 255. See also Wu Jing, *'Xuedeng' yu wu si xin wenhua yundong*, 6. David Der-wei Wang has also suggested 1915. For him, 1915 was significant for debates about language held by Chinese students at Cornell University. As their result, Hu Shi started advocating language reform. See Wang, 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937', 468.

[73] Hu, 'Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature'. For 1917 as start date, see *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. May Fourth Movement; Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*, 9–10. Daruvala identifies 1917 as the year when 'a historical consciousness centered on the newness of the present' and 'a Social Darwinian reading of the promise and threat of the future' 'join[ed] forces.' See Ibid., 9.

[74] For 1923 as end date, see Wu Jing, *'Xuedeng' yu wu si xin wenhua yundong*, 6. For 1925, see Larson, *Literary Authority and the Modern Chinese Writer*, 1. Rana Mitter has shown that other authors have also identified 1925, 1928 and the 1930s, see Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 99.

[75] Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 99.

[76] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*.

[77] Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 72.

[78] Zheng Shiqu, 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun', 11–14.

Marxism or feminism.[79] For contemporaries in 1919, defining the New Culture Movement was even more complicated. The later co-founder of the *Critical Review* (*Xueheng* 學衡) Liu Boming 劉伯明 (1887-1923), for example, claimed that the New Culture Movement was about *baihua* scepticism, rather than about *baihua* advocacy.[80] In other words, it has proven nearly impossible to boil down the New Culture Movement to a clear time period or a coherent agenda.

My approach of examining the discourses surrounding the expression 'New Culture Movement' itself enables me to address the question of when the New Culture Movement began: as an idea, it began in summer 1919, when the expression was invented. This approach also shows that it does not always make sense to establish definitions when exploring the contemporary meaning of a powerful expression. Instead, it can be more useful to examine the circumstances of its birth and the mechanisms behind its invention: The phrase 'New Culture Movement' was a marketing buzzword and consequently attempts to reify it through a definition miss the point. The New Culture Movement was invented as a label, designed to sell a wide range of independent ideas. These ideas were not born out of the Movement, but retrospectively declared to be the Movement. Instead of suggesting yet another definition and yet another time frame for the New Culture Movement, I therefore explore how the label 'New Culture Movement' emerged over the course of the year 1919, and how people negotiated it in the early 1920s.

To be sure, my focus on the expression 'New Culture Movement' is in some ways limited, as other words in 1919 and the 1920s were simultaneously used to describe ideas associated with it. Such terms included 'new intellectual tide' (*xin sichao* 新思潮), which had been in use for some time, or the English 'Chinese Renaissance,' an expression

[79] Spence, *The Search for Modern China*, 300–302.
[80] Xi Ping, 'Duiyu "Liu Boming jun yanjiang xin wenhua yundong zhi yiyi ji biyao" de piping', *Juewu*, 1 July 1920, 4.

particularly promoted by Hu Shi.[81] To trace the discourses around these phrases would be an interesting topic for further research, but would go beyond the scope of this project. My focus, however, is warranted. First of all, the words '*xin wenhua yundong*' and their translations into Western languages ('New Culture Movement,' 'Neue Kulturbewegung' and so on) are, until the present day, central for academic and political discourses about the phenomena in question. This thesis is about the moment in which the core of these discourses was born. Moreover, contrary to 'new intellectual tide' or 'Chinese Renaissance,' the invention of the expression 'New Culture Movement' coincided temporally with a shift in the image of figures like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, and the power of ideas like *baihua* and *guoyu*. The appearance of the label 'New Culture Movement' is therefore an indicator along which these shifts can be explored.

Methodology and Sources

The buzzword 'New Culture Movement' emerged from the interplay of a variety of factors and agencies in the year 1919, and only an examination of all these layers can yield an understanding of this process. I therefore analyse a wide range of sources, from famous magazines like *New Youth* and *New Tide* (*Xinchao* 新潮), to lesser-known journals, newspapers, diaries, student essays, conference protocols, advertisements and telegrams. Following the nature of these sources, I explore academic and educational discourses, social and intellectual networks, media reception and coverage as well as political activism.[82] This approach builds upon previous research on the New Culture Movement or related topics, which has chosen a wide variety of focal points: from work on the 'New

[81] Hu Shi, 'Xin sichao de yiyi'; de Vargas, *Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance*. Yü Ying-shih has discussed Hu's preference of the term 'Chinese Renaissance,' see Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment', 300.

[82] 'Politics' could be understood as academic politics (institute politics, academic competition) or as related to governance (warlord politics, protests and so forth). Although I explore the first sphere through my study of networks, I mean to designate politics in the governance sense by 'political activism.'

Culture stars' Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu to less famous groups;[83] from research on intellectual history to the media, institutions and social networks;[84] from attention to academia to the emphasis of political developments.[85]

Although this thesis is not strongly theoretically informed, it must be seen in the context of 20th-century theories in the environs of postmodernism, structuralism or poststructuralism. I draw upon them in the form of the practical and flexible approaches of historical inquiry to which they have been distilled down by people like Michael Gibbs Hill, Fabio Lanza, Timothy Weston and Leo Lee.[86] In its aim to decentre the New Culture Movement, my thesis shares interfaces with 'cultural history,' which seeks to investigate history 'from the bottom up,' and which was inspired by structuralist notions of 'culture' in anthropology. It draws inspiration from poststructuralist and new historicist suggestions to break down boundaries between 'classical' genres of inquiry, such as 'social history, intellectual history' and so on, and ask how a 'discourse'[87] emerged out of, and 'constitute[ed],' the subject matters of these various spheres.[88]

A second important feature of my approach is inspired by Lydia Liu's notion of 'translingual practice.' Liu has suggested to not only observe which keywords people used,

[83] For research on the 'stars,' see Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*; Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*; Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*; Gao Pingshu, *Cai Yuanpei nianpu changbian*; Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*; Wang, *Fu Ssu-Nien*. On smaller and local groups, see Chen, *The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai*; Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 147–173; Carter, *Creating a Chinese Harbin*, 77–88; Hammerstrom, 'Buddhists Discuss Science in Modern China'.

[84] For work on intellectual history, see Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*; Luo Zhitian, 'Xin wenhua yundong shiqi guanyu zhengli guogu de sixiang lunzheng'; Zheng Shiqu, 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun'; Chen, *Touches of History*, 191–208; Jenco, 'Culture as History'. For analyses of social networks, media and institutions, see Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?*; Lin, *Peking University*; Xu Jilin, *Jindai Zhongguo zhishi fenzi de gongong jiaowan*; Pang Ju'ai, *Kua wenhua guanggao yu shimin wenhua de bianqian*; Tang Xiaobing, *Xiandai Zhongguo de gongong yulun*. For a combination of these focal points, see Li Fan, 'Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue'; Weston, *The Power of Position*; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*

[85] For attention on academia, see Weston, *The Power of Position*. For a study of political events, see Lanza, *Behind the Gate*; Chen, *Touches of History*, 11–66.

[86] Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity'; Weston, *The Power of Position*; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*

[87] Reddy, 'Anthropology and the History of Culture'.

[88] Taylor, s.v. New Historicism.

but to further investigate what they meant with these keywords.[89] I consequently examine the discourses behind expressions like '*baihua*.' This shows that sometimes two groups of people used the same keywords to express different ideas. It also reveals that keywords could be deployed with a special agenda in mind – for example, they could be polemics or marketing strategies. In other words, this approach allows me to go beyond the surface of words, and explore ideas, worldviews or strategies that lie behind them.

Baihua as a Red Thread

A doctoral thesis is an enterprise limited in terms of time and word count. While I appreciate that a huge number of ideas was discussed as 'New Culture Movement' in the early 1920s, I have chosen one of its themes as a red thread for the focus of my investigation. This theme is *baihua* and the discourses surrounding it. *Baihua* is a useful focus for a number of reasons. Most importantly, I tell the story of how academic debates were reinterpreted as a Movement. The academic debates of early 1919, however, circled around the *baihua*-versus-*wenyan* question. After the expression 'New Culture Movement' was invented, *baihua* was usually regarded as one of its central ideas. This was shown, for example, by the fact that self-avowed supporters of the New Culture Movement usually wrote in *baihua*.[90] In other words, although I acknowledge that ideas associated with the New Culture Movement were much more manifold than *baihua*, this element is a good case study, along which to pursue this investigation.

Geographical Focus

Just like the richness of the New Culture Movement forces me to confine my investigation to a thematic focus, I also need to restrict it to a geographical case study. In 1919 and the

[89] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 19–20.
[90] One exception is, as I show in Chapter Four, Liu Boming, who claimed that the New Culture Movement actually supported *baihua* scepticism. See Xi Ping, 'Duiyu "Liu Boming jun yanjiang xin wenhua yundong zhi yiyi ji biyao" de piping'. Another exception is the Guomindang, which preferred a mixture of *baihua* and *wenyan*. See Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 81.

early 1920s, China was split into two political entities: the domain of the Beiyang Government (*Beiyang zhengfu* 北洋政府) in the North and that of Sun Yat-sen (Sun Zhongshan 孫中山, 1866-1925) in the South. According to Andrew Nathan and Liang Yiqun, this started with the coup by Zhang Xun 張勳 (1854-1923), the 'Pigtail General,' in 1917. When the coup was suppressed after barely two weeks, Duan Qirui 段祺瑞 (1865-1936) resumed his post as premier. However, he planned to elect a new parliament, since this would give him an advantage in the warlord power games. This, however, was not allowed under the Provisional Constitution (*Linshi yuefa* 臨時約法) of 1912, which was in force at the time. Sun Yat-sen protested against Duan's move and, together with warlords of provinces in China's south-west, he established his own government in Canton to 'protect the constitution' (*hufa* 護 法).[91]

Marie-Claire Bergère had told a different version of this story. According to her, Sun Yat-sen joined the warlords in the south due to a quarrel with Duan Qirui over the question if China should enter World War I. Duan was in favour of this, because this would give him the opportunity to take loans from Japan, officially to fund the war, but in reality to further his own domestic power. Sun was against it. Duan fell out with President Li Yuanhong 黎元洪 (1864-1928) over this and started resorting to force to push through his standpoint.

In this situation, Sun Yat-sen set himself up to become the protector of the republican institutions. He moved to Canton and declared members of parliament who were there to be the legitimate government. In the end, Sun's government in Canton still declared war on Germany. Sun's original opposition to China's entry into World War I had been, according to Bergère, merely a domestic power game.[92] It is not relevant for this thesis what really happened in 1917. It is only important to note that China was divided into two separate

[91] Nathan, *Peking Politics, 1918-1923*, 91–92; Liang Yiqun, s.v. 'Duan Qirui'.
[92] Bergère, *Sun Yat-Sen*, 1998, 270–73.

entities in 1919. I merely examine the Beiyang territory, as it contained the declared 'centre' of the New Culture cosmos, Beijing University and its academics.[93]

Within the Beiyang domain, my focus is specifically on Beijing and the Shanghai/ Jiangsu/ Zhejiang region. I choose Beijing, because the Movement's avowed 'centre' was based there. Although I describe figures like Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu and Fu Sinian, this dissertation is not about these individuals, but only uses them as case studies. Moreover, I have selected the Shanghai/Jiangsu/ Zhejiang region, on the one hand, due to the availability of sources,[94] and on the other hand, because the New Culture Movement was discussed particularly vibrantly there.[95] This was because many of its 'stars' came from this region[96] and because the publishing industry flourished in Shanghai. Research into the New Culture Movement in other urban areas would be very revealing, but would go beyond the scope of this project.

Timothy Weston has emphasised that the May Fourth Movement was experienced very differently in various regions.[97] However, the two focal points of my thesis, Beijing and the region around Shanghai, were very well connected, and this also seemed to be the case for other urban areas. Someone teaching in Beijing would hold summer schools in Shandong or Jiangsu and correspond with colleagues in other cities throughout the year.[98] Academics in Beijing published their work with editors in Shanghai.[99] Scholars from Zhejiang found employment in Beijing, or students from Beijing in Shanghai.[100] Or they

[93] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'. Technically, the 'centre' referred to Hu Shi. However, Hu Shi was based at Beijing University at the time.
[94] For example, important for my research have been the databases *Quanguo baokan suoyin* of the Shanghai Library; and *Shenbao 1872-1949*.
[95] Elman, 'Review of *The Power of Position: Beijing University, Intellectuals and Chinese Political Culture 1898-1929*, by Timothy B. Weston', 842.
[96] Hu Shi, for example, was born in Shanghai. Chen Duxiu was born not far away, in Anhui. Cai Yuanpei was from Zhejiang. See Boorman, s.v. Hu Shih, 167; Chow, s.v. Chen Duxiu; *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. Cai Yuanpei.
[97] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 10.
[98] 'Lewis Chase to E.A. Chase', 17 June 1923, 3; 'Lewis Chase to E.H. Cressy'; 'Lewis Chase to Shurman'.
[99] Wang Yuanfang, *Yadong tushuguan yu Chen Duxiu*; Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*.
[100] Boorman, s.v. Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei, 296–97; Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 32.

were based in Beijing and read the *Shanghai News*, a newspaper printed in Shanghai. In other words, academics at the time were a fairly mobile community and it would make little sense to draw a sharp distinction between intellectual events in Beijing and in Shanghai.

What It Meant to Call It 'New Culture Movement'

A few words need to be said on the elements of the expression '*xin wenhua yundong*.' It is not my aim to build my thesis on meticulous definitions of '*wenhua*' and '*yundong*.' Since the New Culture Movement was a franchise that sold many things, this would miss the point. In fact, the New Culture Movement had so many meanings that it was almost devoid of meaning of its own.[101] Nevertheless, I will say a few things about the sort of associations the individual words '*wenhua*' and '*yundong*' may have evoked in contemporaries in the 1910s and 1920s, and how, in this way, they contributed to making the New Culture Movement such a powerful mix. 'New Culture' and 'Movement' could signal that people who deployed them dominated the whole field of intellectual activity (which was 'culture'), and that they were very much in touch with the times by doing so (calling things a 'Movement' was the trendy thing to do in late 1919).

A 'Movement'

Rudolf Wagner has traced the emergence of the word 'movement' in a Western, Japanese and Chinese context.[102] The idea of a social movement was invented by Lorenz vom Stein (1815-1890) in 1851. As a description of one's own project, it was used first by Émile Zola (1840-1902) in 1885. Zola used it to express that a certain issue was 'broadly based' and 'popular.' The expression, as '*yundong*' (運動), arrived in China in the early years of the

[101] I would like to thank Glen Dudbridge for his comments on this issue at the Chinese Studies Seminar at the University of Oxford on 22 May 2014.
[102] Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 69–82.

20th century via Japan. The person to use it most prominently was Chen Duxiu in his article '1916,' which appeared in *New Youth* in 1916. In Wagner's analysis, Chen Duxiu carved out the following few features for a 'movement:' It was a global form of 'political action,' suitable to cause 'fundamental changes in society.' After all, 'movement' is the opposite of 'stagnation,' and a 'movement' could therefore counter the 'stagnation' in which China was caught up, according to a widespread narrative at the time. A 'movement' was not state-led and it was based in a broader public, rather than being driven by a specific group. As such, it required an, in Wagner's words, an 'awakening' of the masses.[103]

Two of Rudolf Wagner's points are most important for the purpose of this thesis. First of all, the May Fourth Movement was called a 'Movement' before it even started, and it was a name the participants gave themselves. In the morning of 4 May 1919, before the demonstrations began, one of their organisers at Beijing University, Di Fuding 狄福鼎 (1895-1964), already called them a 'movement.' Beijing University student Luo Jialun 羅家倫 (1897-1969) then famously invented the name 'May Fourth Movement' (*wu si yundong* 五四運動) in an article in the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun* 每週評論) barely two weeks later, on 26 May 1919. This *Weekly Review* was a student journal at Beijing University thematically close to *New Youth*. In other words, before much or anything had happened, and before it would have been possible to identify events as a 'movement' based on a set of criteria, it was already given this name. This means that the 'Movement' in 'May Fourth Movement' was a self-advertisement, rather than an objective description. By contrast, newspapers at the time tended to call May Fourth '"activities," *huodong* 活動 or *judong* 舉動.' Secondly, after the May Fourth Movement had gotten its name, it became

[103] Ibid., 71–74; 78–80.

very popular to call things a 'Movement,' without necessarily reflecting on what 'movement' meant.[104]

What must have therefore happened, I would like to speculate, is this: The people who invented and used the franchise 'New Culture Movement' did so to advertise their own ideas as meeting the needs of current times. At the same time, it had become trendy to call things a 'Movement.' It was therefore only logical for them to name their franchise 'Movement' as well. This means that the designation 'Movement' was a marketing strategy, rather than a sober description of reality. Moreover, calling their intellectual engagement a 'Movement' broke through the matrix of academic factions, or *xuepai*. By calling their ideas a 'Movement,' its advocates could tap into the features Chen Duxiu had outlined for the expression and indicate that their agendas were widely popular and accepted, the only relevant trend at the time, and not challenged by any opposing *xuepai*.

One way to deal with this observation is to abandon the term 'New Culture Movement.' Leo Lee, for example, has called it the 'May Fourth intellectual project,' to describe New Culture as an unglamorous academic venture.[105] I do not choose to do so, however. First of all, I want to engage with the origins of the discourse that has for decades been called 'New Culture Movement,' and in order to make this clear, I maintain this phrase. Secondly, the expression 'New Culture Movement' was something very real after 1919, circulating in very real ways. Finally, I am not interested in what the thing called 'New Culture Movement' 'really was.' Instead, I ask what the expression 'New Culture Movement' meant for the people who used it. To signal that the New Culture Movement was a self-

[104] Ibid., 70–71. For Luo Jialun's article, see Luo Jialun, '"Wu si yundong" de jingshen', 26 May 1919. In this article, Luo Jialun explored the three 'spirits' of the May Fourth Movement, namely, the 'spirit of students' sacrifice' (*xuesheng xisheng de jingshen* 學生犧牲的精神), the 'spirit of government by society' (*shehui caizhi de jingshen* 社會裁制的精神) and the 'spirit of national autonomy' (*minzu zijue de jingshen* 民族自決的精神). He did not connect May Fourth with any cultural aspects.
[105] Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity', 31, 58, 61–62 .

descriptive label, I spell 'Movement' with a capital 'm.' By this, I emphasise that it was a proper name.

'New Culture'

Like 'Movement,' 'New Culture' was also suited for self-advertisement, endowed with the potential to express that its advocates dominated all possible spheres of the influence they, as intellectuals, could have. Tani Barlow has pointed out that '*wenhua*' (文化, 'culture') at the time described the purview of intellectuals. '*Wenhua*' was the sphere of reality that they dealt with, '*wenhua*' was what they did. They were the 'knowers of *wenhua*,' the 'possessors of knowledge about literature and civilization.' Consequently, Barlow said, intellectuals were in constant competition about who could dominate this sphere.[106] By putting themselves in charge of 'New Culture,' people who sold their intellectual products as 'New Culture Movement' therefore signalled that they were now in control of the new form the whole sphere of intellectual activity would take.

The expression '*xin wenhua*' (新文化, 'New Culture') was not newly coined in the year 1919. In 1918, for example, the *Guangzhou English-Language Times* (*Guangzhou yingwen shibao* 廣州英文時報) expressed its hope that China would gradually move towards a 'new culture' (*xin wenhua* 新文化), as soon as it stopped being held back by the 'militarism' (*wuli zhuyi* 武力主義) of the warlords.[107] In other words, when coining the phrase 'New Culture Movement' in late 1919, people were drawing upon an expression that was already there. By appropriating the expression, they implied that they were now in charge of this older project of 'New Culture.'

---

[106] Barlow, 'Zhishifenzi [Chinese Intellectuals] and Power', 211.

[107] The *Shanghai News* cited the *Guangzhou English-Language Times* in 'Waibao lun Nan Bei jianghe yaodian', *Shenbao*, 17 December 1918. That this is one of the earliest mentions of '*xin wenhua*' is suggested by a search in these databases: *Quanguo baokan suoyin*; *Shenbao 1872-1949*. Phrases like 'reforming culture' (*weixin wenhua* 維新文化) were of course older. See 'Huiyi zhengwu chu yifu biantong Hanlin yuan guanzhi', *Shenbao*, 15 November 1909.

The word '*wenhua*' in the meaning of 'culture' took shape in the 19th century. '*Wenhua*' as such went back to the Han Dynasty and then meant, in Lydia Liu's interpretation, '*wen* or artistic cultivation in contrast to *wu* or military prowess.'[108] According to the *Great Chinese Dictionary* (*Hanyu da cidian* 漢語大詞典), it designated 'civil administration and changing through education" (*wenzhi jiaohua* 文治教化).[109] In the 19th century, Japanese intellectuals coined the word '*bunka*' (文化) to find an equivalent to the Western word 'culture' ('culture' in English, 'culture' in French, 'Kultur' in German and so on). In this meaning, it made its way to China in the 1860 and 1870s.[110]

Since '*wenhua*' or '*bunka*' was designed to render the Western word 'culture,' its meaning (if not its function, as shown by Barlow) was very similar to the Western one at the time. Anthropological definitions, which were only developed in the 1950s and 1960s, are of course excluded.[111] In the West itself, 'culture' in its forms in the various languages had undergone a considerable history too. Raymond Williams has even called it 'one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language.'[112] In the 19th and early 20th centuries, however, a set of meanings was distilled out. Among them was 'culture' as something that 'indicate[s] a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period, a group, or humanity in general.' That is, it invoked the binary of one culture versus another culture, Eastern culture versus Western culture. Another meaning that crystallised was a word that 'describes the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity … culture is music, literature, painting and sculpture, theatre and film.'[113]

[108] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 239. For a discussion of *wen* until the Song Dynasty, see Bol, *This Culture of Ours: Intellectual Transitions in T'ang and Sung China*, 1–3.
[109] Hanyu da cidian bianji weiyuan hui and Luo Zhufeng, s.v. 'Wenhua'.
[110] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 33–34.
[111] Reddy, 'Anthropology and the History of Culture'.
[112] Williams, *Keywords*, 87.
[113] Ibid., 90.

Barlow and Liu have identified these two meanings for '*wenhua*' at the time as well. '*Wenhua*' could be used as part of the 'binary of East/West'[114] and was as such linked with 'national identity.' [115] It could also denote all those things like 'literature and civilization.'[116] This observation is borne out by Chen Duxiu's definition of the 'content of culture' (*wenhua de neirong* 文化底内容), which 'includes things like science, religion, morality, arts, literature and music' (*baohan zhe kexue, zongjiao, daode, meishu, wenxue, yinyue zheyang* 包含著科學、宗教、道德、美術、文學、音樂這樣).[117]

As mentioned above, '*wenhua*' additionally had the function of designating the purview of intellectual work in the 1910s and 1920s. Through the expression 'New Culture Movement,' its proponents could therefore indicate that they were the dominant power in their sphere of influence. In short, the buzzword 'New Culture Movement' was a very clever marketing strategy and, since it is used a hundred years later until the present day, a very durable one.

Historical Background

The New Culture Movement emerged out of the nexus of academia and education, politics and the media. In the following sections, I give a brief historical overview over these spheres. They were interconnected, as individuals could move through all of them over the course of their personal careers, and often had contacts to people in other areas.[118]

[114] Barlow, 'Zhishifenzi [Chinese Intellectuals] and Power', 211.
[115] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 240.
[116] Barlow, 'Zhishifenzi [Chinese Intellectuals] and Power', 211.
[117] Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', April 1920, 1. Chen Duxiu gave this definition when explaining the 'New Culture Movement,' which certainly shaped his definition. Chen Duxiu also added that culture was everything that was not the 'military, politics … and industry' (*junshi, zhengzhi ... chanye* 軍事、政治……產業), see Ibid.
[118] Lanza and Barlow have made similar points on the interconnectedness of the spheres, see Barlow, 'Zhishifenzi [Chinese Intellectuals] and Power', 211; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 9. Xu Jilin has meticulously traced contacts between intellectuals in Republican China, see Xu Jilin, *Jindai Zhongguo zhishi fenzi de gongong jiaowan*.

Academia and Education

The moment instrumental in shaping academia and education of the 1910s and 1920s was 1905, the year in which the civil-service examinations were abolished. Under the impact of Western semi-colonisation and the influx of Western ideas in the 19th century, criticism of the century-old examination system became so loud that it could not be ignored anymore in the early 1900s. Consequently, the government of the Empress Dowager Cixi 慈禧 (1835-1908) put an end to the old system in 1905 as part of her New Policies (*Xin zheng* 新政) and replaced it with a new structure of schools, universities and educational-political institutions.[119]

Schools and universities in the Republican Period were very diverse, and of course the origins of many of them predated 1905. As Yeh Wen-hsin has shown, there were schools and universities run by the state, such as Beijing University, and those run by missionaries, such as Yanjing University in Beijing or St John's University (*Sheng Yuehan daxue* 聖約翰大學) and McTyeire School (*Zhong xi nü zhong* 中西女中) in Shanghai. There were prestigious places, like Beijing and Yanjing University, and less prestigious schools like normal schools designed to train primary- and secondary-school teachers. Among them was the Second Women's Normal School of Jiangsu Province (*Jiangsu shengli di'er nüzi shifan xuexiao* 江蘇省立第二女子師範學校).[120]

These schools differed in the subject areas they were teaching, in the amount of tuition fees they were collecting and the salaries they were paying their staff.[121] Philological subjects (Chinese, literature, history, philosophy) were concentrated at universities like Beijing and

[119] On the abolition of the examination system in the context of the New Policies, see Spence, *The Search for Modern China*, 245. Laurence Schneider, Lanza and Wang Fan-sen are among those who have cited the end of the civil-service examinations as important for the developments at Beijing University around May Fourth. See Schneider, *Ku Chieh-Kang and China's New History*, 6; Wang, *Fu Ssu-Nien*, 3–4; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 9.
[120] Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 3–5.
[121] Ibid.

Qinghua University (*Qinghua daxue* 清華大學).[122] Missionary colleges (like St John's University in Shanghai) or private universities (like Fudan University [*Fudan daxue* 復旦大學]) emphasised professional and economics subjects.[123] It was, moreover, the professional, economics, science or social science subjects, not the humanities, that attracted the highest number of students in the Republican Period.[124]

In spite of these differences, the various types of schools were permeable. For example, an American professor in Beijing, Lewis Nathaniel Chase (1873-1937, Chinese name: Chai Yisi 柴義思), taught at both the state-run Beijing University and the missionary Yanjing University.[125] Hu Shi gave lectures at Beijing University, at Women's Higher Normal School (*Nüzi gao shi[fan xuexiao]* 女子高師[範學校]) and at Private Chinese University (*Sili zhongguo daxue* 私立中國大學).[126] Secondary schools and universities were not strictly separated either. Apart from the fact that graduates from normal schools went on to teach at primary or secondary schools, people could be employed at both sorts of schools over the course of their lives. Cai Yuanpei, for example, used to teach at Nanyang Public School (*Nanyang gongxue* 南洋公學), before he became chancellor of Beijing University in 1916.[127] In other words, although there were various types of schools in China in the 1910s and 1920s, these were well interconnected.

---

[122] Ibid., 17.
[123] Ibid., 2–3.
[124] Ibid., 17.
[125] Manuscript Division, 'Biographical and Organizational Note: Lewis Nathaniel Chase'.
[126] Jing Guan, 'Dumen xuejie xiaoxi', *Shenbao*, 5 November 1919.
[127] Yu Wenzao, s.v. 'Cai Yuanpei'; Cai Zhiguang and Xie Zewei, *Pudong mingren shujian baiting*, 158. According to Diana Lin, Cai Yuanpei preferred the English translation 'chancellor' for '*xiaozhang*' (校長), since this was closer to 'Kanzler,' the German title for heads of universities. I will therefore refer to all principals of Beijing University as 'chancellor. See Lin, *Peking University*, 54.
Nanyang Public School was founded in 1879. In 1901, it introduced a special course that taught English, politics and financial management, and which was led by Cai Yuanpei. In 1902, Nanyang Public School experienced a major student protest over the government's attempt to restrict freedom of speech. It merged with three other schools in 1921 and was then known as Communication University (*Jiaotong daxue* 交通大學). Zhang Kaiyuan, s.v. 'Nanyang gongxue'.

Politics

Warlord Politics

The boundaries between politics, on the one hand, and academia and education, on the other, were equally permeable. In imperial China, politics and academia were strongly intertwined. After all, the point of passing a high-level civil-service examination was to get a good job in the imperial state bureaucracy. When the examination system was abolished in 1905, the relationship between the two spheres became complex and later the topic of much sinological study. Diana Lin, Fabio Lanza, Timothy Weston and Yü Ying-shih, for example, have examined how Beijing University sought to sever as many ties as possible with the state, particularly under its chancellor Cai Yuanpei.[128]

Debates about learning for the sake of learning and the refusal to participate in politics were popular in the 1910s. Beijing University professor Hu Shi, for example, famously stated in 1917 that he did not want to talk about politics for 20 years.[129] His student Fu Sinian declared that 'Chinese politics is not only a mess in the present. As for the future, I also think it will be [even] more of a mess.' (*Zhongguo de zhengzhi bu te xianzai shi zaogao de, jiu shi jianglai, wo ye yiwei shi geng zaogao de.* 中國的政治不特現在是糟糕的，就是將來，我也以為是更糟糕的。)[130]

Hu Shi's and Fu Sinian's pessimism was caused by the politics of warlords who were at the time dominating the Chinese government.[131] The Warlord Period of Republican China lasted from Yuan Shikai's 袁世凱 (1859-1916) death in 1916 to China's military reunification by Chiang Kai-shek 蔣介石 (Jiang Jieshi, 1887-1975) in 1927. The

[128] Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment', 307; Lin, *Peking University*, 41; Weston, *The Power of Position*, 8; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 10.
[129] Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, 175.
[130] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 1979, 175.
[131] Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, 174–75.

government whose capital was Beijing at the time was called the Beiyang Government, thanks to the important influence of Yuan Shikai's Beiyang Army (*Beiyang jun* 北洋軍).[132]

When the revolution of 1911 had toppled the Qing Dynasty, and when the Republic of China had been founded on 1 January 1912, the powerful general Yuan Shikai quickly took over the reins of government and became president of the Republic. He was certainly not the most democratic of all presidents – he tried to proclaim himself emperor in 1915. But he was strong enough to hold in check the local military rulers that became increasingly powerful in the provinces. Consequently, the decade after Yuan Shikai's death in June 1916 saw continuous power struggles and intrigues between the various warlord cliques, in attempts to rule the 'republic.'[133]

One of the most important warlords for the story of this thesis was Duan Qirui. Duan Qirui had been premier of Yuan Shikai and after Yuan's death, he became the leader of the warlord faction Anhui Clique (*Wan xi* 皖系) – named after Duan's native province Anhui.[134] Duan Qirui quickly made many enemies. In 1917, he fell out with President Li Yuanhong over the question if China should enter World War I. As mentioned above, in that year Sun Yat-sen even set up an alternative government in Canton, in protest against Duan's treatment of parliament.[135] The quarrel between Duan Qirui's Anhui Clique and its strongest rival faction, the Zhili Clique (*Zhi xi* 直系), was also aggravating around 1917. At this time, members of parliament close to the Anhui Clique came into the habit of spending time at the house of Liang Shitang 梁式堂 (1871-1937) in the Anfu Hutong 安福胡同. This, one version of the story reads, gave Duan Qirui the idea to formally organise

[132] Lew and Leung, s.v. Beiyang Army, 19.
[133] Nathan, 'A Constitutional Republic', 256.
[134] Ibid., 272; Liang Yiqun, s.v. 'Duan Qirui'.
[135] Liang Yiqun, s.v. 'Duan Qirui'; Bergère, *Sun Yat-Sen*, 1994, 269–272.

these parliamentarians into a club, the Anfu Club (*Anfu julebu* 安福俱樂部). Its declared aim was to gain control over Chinese politics and topple the rival Zhili Clique. Duan's protégé Xu Shuzheng 徐樹錚 (1880-1925) was entrusted with implementing this idea, and the Anfu Club was formally established on 8 March 1918.[136] As I show in Chapter Two, Xu Shuzheng was the warlord with whom, newspaper stories had it, Lin Shu was plotting to oust the 'New Faction' from Beijing University.

The Anfu Club came to an end soon after 1919. Ever since Yuan Shikai's death in 1916, China's warlords were engaged in countless coups and skirmishes. In 1920, the Zhili and Fengtian Cliques (*Feng xi* 奉系) joined forces to destroy the Anhui Clique, just to fight each other in the two big Zhili-Fengtian Wars in 1922 and 1924.[137] It was only after Chiang Kai-shek's Northern Expedition (*Beifa* 北伐, 1926-1928) that the country was unified again.

Educational politics

The most unsurprising interface between academia and politics was educational politics. The post of minister of education was usually given to scholars. The minister of education in 1919, for example, was Fu Zengxiang 傅增湘 (1872-1949), an old Hanlin (*Hanlin* 翰林) scholar without political affiliations.[138] One of his predecessors had even been Cai Yuanpei. Cai had taken office in 1912, but he resigned in July, after Yuan Shikai had become president of the Republic.[139]

---

[136] Liu Jingquan, *Beijing minguo zhengfu, yihui, zhengzhi yanjiu*, 499–500.
[137] Sheridan, 'The Warlord Era', 297; Liang Yiqun, s.v. 'Duan Qirui'; Wu Xiang, 'Lun Xu Shuzheng yu Wanxi junfa de xingshuai', 63.
[138] Fu Zengxiang was minister of education from 1917 to 1919. He was an educator and scholar from Sichuan, had been compiler for the Hanlin Academy and was very active in women's education. See Nathan, *Peking Politics, 1918-1923*, 145; Kaske, *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education*, 394; Guo Fengqi and He Huanzhen, s.v. 'Fu Zengxiang'.
[139] Yu Wenzao, s.v. 'Cai Yuanpei'; *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. Cai Yuanpei.

The Ministry of Education drew upon various local institutions to implement its policies in the provinces. Among them were the Educational Associations (*Jiaoyu hui* 教育會). The members of these Associations were educators, appointed by the Associations themselves. They existed on the levels of provinces, counties and towns or villages, and their tasks included making policy suggestions to the Ministry or Education and the provincial Departments of Education. They also organised events that should promote Ministry-sponsored projects.[140]

The Educational Association in Jiangsu Province was among the earlier groups to use the expression 'New Culture Movement' in writing (it did so on 24 October 1919) and I use it as my case study in Chapter Three to show how lesser-known intellectuals shaped the buzzword 'New Culture Movement.'[141] A precursor of the Jiangsu Educational Association emerged in the mid-1900s. When the Qing Dynasty's ban on the formation of societies was relaxed and finally lifted in 1904, as Gu Xiuqing has shown, several societies concerned with education were founded. In Shanghai, a group called Chinese Educational Association (*Zhongguo jiaoyu hui* 中國教育會) was established under the aegis of Cai Yuanpei in 1902. It was suppressed by the government in 1903, but it had motivated people to form similar groups. One of them became recognised as the leading educational society and called 'General Jiangsu Provincial Association for Educational Affairs' (*Jiangsu xuewu zonghui* 江蘇學務總會) in 1906.[142] It was headed by Zhang Jian 張謇 (1853-1926) and Huang Yanpei 黃炎培 (1878-1965), who would be president and vice president of the Jiangsu Educational Association in 1919.[143]

[140] Zhang Kaiyuan, s.v. 'Jiaoyu hui zhangcheng'; Gu Xiuqing, *Qing mo Min chu Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yanjiu*, 49–53.
[141] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', October 1919, 45.
[142] Translation reworked from Bastid and Zhang, *Educational Reform in Early Twentieth-Century China*, 128.
[143] Ibid.; Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 129, 137; Gu Xiuqing, *Qing mo Min chu Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yanjiu*, 35–45.

In July 1906, the Qing Board of Education stipulated that all existing educational societies had to be called 'Educational Association' (*jiaoyu hui* 教育會). The group in Jiangsu was therefore renamed 'General Jiangsu Educational Association' (*Jiangsu jiaoyu zonghui* 江蘇教育總會). Following a new set of regulations in the Republican Period, the association in Jiangsu was finally called 'Jiangsu Educational Association' (*Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui* 江蘇省教育會) in 1912. Its headquarters were in Shanghai.[144]

Academia, education and politics merged particularly in the person of the Jiangsu Educational Association's vice president, Huang Yanpei. Huang Yanpei was a *Xiucai* (秀才)- and *Juren* (舉人)-degree holder, who in his youth often helped out in the family's shop. When the civil-service examinations were abolished in 1905, he started receiving a new-style education at Nanyang Public School, where Cai Yuanpei was a teacher. Over the next few years, Huang was member of various committees, associations and government institutions concerned with educational politics. In the first few years of the Republic (when Cai Yuanpei was minister of education), Huang was even minster of education of Jiangsu Province.[145] Although he was only vice president of the Jiangsu Educational Association in 1919, it appears from the meeting protocols that it was he, rather than President Zhang Jian, who ran everyday business in the Association.[146]

The Media

The third force in the nexus that created the New Culture Movement was the press. The media gained importance in the years around 1919.[147] At that time, the sales numbers of

[144] Bastid and Zhang, *Educational Reform in Early Twentieth-Century China*, 128; Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 129, 137; Gu Xiuqing, *Qing mo Min chu Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yanjiu*, 35–45.
[145] Chen Zhuyun, Xu Jilin, and Chen Qicheng, s.v. 'Huang Yanpei'; Yeh, *Shanghai Splendor*, 36–37.
[146] See, for example, Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', June 1919; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', October 1919.
[147] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 163–68.

individual newspapers rose.[148] According to *Shanghai News*' own indications, its sales increased from 20,000 issues in 1917 to 30,000 in 1920.[149] The number of periodicals rose dramatically too, from under around 15 different periodicals prior to 1895, to just under 500 in 1913, to somewhere between 840 and 2,000 in the late 1910s and early 1920s.[150]

Newspapers and journals were run by various institutions, such as schools and universities – as in the case of *Beijing University Daily* (*Beijing Daxue rikan* 北京大學日刊) and *Alumnae of the Second Women's Normal School of Jiangsu Province* (*Jiangsu shengli di er nüzi shifan xuexiao xiaoyou hui huikan* 江蘇省立第二女子師範學校校友會彙刊). Others were managed by intellectual interest groups (*New Youth* and so forth). The *Morning Post* (*Chenbao* 晨報) was a Beijing newspaper owned by the political party Research Clique.[151] The *Public Voice* (*Gongyanbao* 公言報) belonged to the warlord clique Anfu Club in Beijing.[152] There were also papers run by religious communities, like the American Catholic *Social Welfare Tiensin* (*Yishibao* 益世報) in Tianjin,[153] as well as independent and commercial papers like the *Shanghai News* in Shanghai or *Impartial* (*Dagongbao* 大公報) in Changsha. *Impartial* had split off from the *Hunan Gazette* (*Hunan gongbao* 湖南公報) in 1915, and its editors made a point of being free from any political affiliations.[154]

Although some periodicals belonged to political parties, the press generally benefitted from the political chaos produced by warlord politicking. One of its results was the

[148] As I show below, a reason for this may have been the inability of warlord governments to efficiently censor publications.
[149] 'Ben bao de guanggao, faxing ji qita', *Shenbao*, 20 September 1947; Wang Runian, *Yuwang de xiangxiang*, 69.
[150] Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity', 52.
[151] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 173, 183. For more information on the *Morning Post*, see p. 236 of this thesis.
[152] Nathan, *Peking Politics, 1918-1923*, 147.
[153] 'Yingyin Shuoming'.
[154] Yu Chunmei, *Dadao wei gong*, 23; Liu Jianming, s.v. 'Xuanchuan yulun xue da cidian'.

government's inability to effectively control and censor the media and publishing world.[155] Moreover, China's division into a number of warlord territories and foreign concessions made it possible to flee to the land of one ruler to avoid persecution or censorship by another. This was not only an option for publishers, but for government critics in general. Many warlords had their powerbases in a certain region. In 1920, for example, Beijing, Zhejiang and Shanghai were controlled by the Anhui Clique (Duan Qirui's clique), whereas Jiangsu and parts of Zhili (roughly today's Hebei Province) belonged to their rival Zhili Clique.[156] Chen Zhongping has shown that, when students protested against the government during the May Fourth demonstrations of 1919, the Anfu Club/ Anhui Clique advocated a strong crackdown on the demonstrators. In Jiangsu, however, the Zhili military governor Li Chun 李純 (1867-1920) and his civilian colleague Qi Yaolin 齊耀琳 (1863-?) opposed the government during the May Fourth demonstrations, whether for opportunistic or patriotic reasons. Consequently, they were more cautious with reprisals on the students.[157]

However, fleeing to the territory of another warlord clique was no watertight solution. The fact that China was divided into warlord spheres of influence did not mean that it was split into different independent countries. Yeh Wen-hsin has described the Republican Educational Associations as relatively independent from the state.[158] However, the Jiangsu Educational Association (Zhili territory) regularly reported to the cabinet, the president or the Ministry of Education, all of which were in Beijing and under the influence of the Anhui Clique. Jiangsu's military governor, Li Chun (Zhili), and the civilian governor, Qi

[155] Lin, *A History of the Press and Public Opinion in China*, 117; Lary, 'Warlord Studies', 444; MacKinnon, 'Toward a History of the Chinese Press in the Republican Period', 16.
[156] Sheridan, 'The Warlord Era', 298; Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 148; Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 126. In the Qing Dynasty, Zhili Province comprised today's Beijing, Tianjin, Hebei, Henan and Shandong. In 1914, Zhili's territory was limited to the areas south of the Great Wall and in 1928, it was renamed into Hebei Province. See Dai Junliang, Liu Baoquan, and Zou Yilin, s.v. 'Zhili'.
[157] Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 147–48.
[158] Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 123.

Yaolin, were in regular contact with the 'centre' (*zhongyang* 中央), and they still felt obliged to communicate orders of this 'centre' to their population.[159] Similarly, the governor and the Jiangsu Educational Association often got in touch with their counterparts in Zhejiang and Shanghai, both Anhui territory.[160]

Another option to escape repression by the Chinese government was to go to the foreign concessions. For example, when Cai Yuanpei fled from Beijing during the May Fourth demonstrations, he lodged in the French Concession in Shanghai.[161] Rudolf Wagner has shown how the freedom from censorship by the Chinese government in the Foreign Settlement of Shanghai benefitted the newspaper industry.[162] However, even though the production sites of journals and newspapers could not easily be closed down here by the government, the routes of distribution could be restricted. This happened to the Shanghai publisher East Asia Library (*Yadong tushuguan* 亞東圖書館) in 1915, when it tried to send an issue of *Tiger* to its subscribers by post. This issue contained an article that criticised Yuan Shikai, and consequently the post refused to send it.[163] It also happened to the *Shanghai News* years later, in 1932, when Chiang Kai-shek's government, having been criticised by the *Shanghai News*, intercepted huge numbers of the newspaper issues that were being sent to subscribers in other cities, and burnt them.[164]

This form of censorship was not peculiar to works printed in the foreign concessions. Member of the New Tide Society (*Xinchao zazhi she* 新潮雜誌社) Li Xiaofeng 李小峰 (1897-1971) claimed that this journal, which was at the time published in Beijing, did not

[159] Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 148. For the designation 'centre,' see Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919, 24.
[160] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919, 23.
[161] Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 1:253. Another factor may have been that this part of Shanghai was very popular with intellectuals and artists. I would like to thank Isabella Jackson for her comments on this at the Joint East Asian Studies Conference on 5-7 September 2013 at the University of Nottingham.
[162] Wagner, 'The Role of the Foreign Community in the Chinese Public Sphere'.
[163] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 29.
[164] Wang Shiqing, 'Shen bao "Jinzhi youdi" shijian', 98.

sell many issues in its early months because local booksellers refused to distribute it out of fear of government reprisals.[165] Nevertheless, China's political chaos in 1919 did open up spaces within which intellectuals could pursue their anti-government or otherwise nonconformist agendas, and the press flourished at that time.

How important the press became under these circumstances is evidenced by the fact that political and educational actors took it very seriously in 1919, and that they were concerned about their image projected in the press. The Beijing University professor Liu Shipei 劉師培 (1884-1919), for example, was outraged when the Beijing newspaper *Public Voice* described his person in a way that did not agree with him. He therefore published an open letter to the newspaper in *Beijing University Daily*, asking to correct the mistakes.[166] Contemporaries in 1919, moreover, had an attitude towards the press comparable to popular opinion today: People were aware that newspaper stories could not be taken at face value.[167] But for want of better alternatives, they often accepted them as the only source of information.[168]

The press was also important in shaping the New Culture Movement, as its readership was the sort of people who were potentially interested in the Movement. As stated above, the label 'New Culture Movement' was mainly negotiated by students, teachers, academics and educators, and this was the group of people at whom newspapers and journals were targeted. The *Shanghai News*, for example, was mentioned in the reading list of a student in Beijing and in a diary entry of Cai Yuanpei.[169] This shared readership was also reflected

[165] Li Xiaofeng, 'Xinchao she de shimo', 209. For information on Li Xiaofeng, see Xu Youchun, s.v. 'Li Xiaofeng'.
[166] Liu Shipei, 'Liu Shipei zhi Gongyanbao han', *Beijing daxue rikan*, 24 March 1919; Guogu yuekan she, 'Guogu yuekan shi zhi Gongyanbao han', *Beijing daxue rikan*, 24 March 1919. This is also cited in Chen Qi, *Liu Shipei nianpu changbian*, 351.
[167] Qi Yaolin and Li Chun, 'Li dujun Qi shengzhang fudian'; Jiaoyubu, 'Jiaoyubu shu quandao shang xue liang jie dian'.
[168] Hunan sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Hunan sheng jiaoyu hui, qing zhaoji quanguo jiaoyu hui lianhe hui kai linshi hui daidian', 5.
[169] Zung, 'Contemporary Drama of China', 3; Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 1:254.

in advertisements. The *Shanghai News* contained an advertisement of *New Tide* in November 1919.[170] This implied that the *New Tide* publisher, who would have paid good money for this advertisement, would have expected potential *New Tide* readers to also read the *Shanghai News*.[171] Vice versa, newspapers liked placing advertisements in school journals. For example, the *Shanghai Gazette* (*Yingwen Hu bao* 英文滬報) promoted itself in the school journal *McTyeirean* (*Moti* 墨梯*)* of the missionary school in Shanghai McTyeire.[172] This would have made little sense if the *Shanghai Gazette* had not regarded students as its potential readers.

Focus on the Shanghai News

I analyse various types of newspapers, including the American Catholic *Social Welfare Tiensin*, the independent *Impartial* and the Anfu Club's *Public Voice*. However, my main focus is on the *Shanghai News*, a newspaper published in Shanghai.[173] *Shanghai News*' influence, readership and economic outlook make it a suitable case study. First of all, the *Shanghai News* was an independent and commercial newspaper. It had to finance itself through advertisements and newspaper sales,[174] which implies that it needed its readers to like what it wrote. This suggests that the *Shanghai News* may have largely reflected an opinion that its readers could accept.

The *Shanghai News* was, moreover, one of the biggest newspapers at the time. Although it sold only between 20,000 and 30,000 issues around 1919, it was read by many more

[170] 'Advertisement for *New Tide*', *Shenbao*, 3 November 1919, 3 November 1919.
[171] On expenses connected with advertisements in newspapers, see Pang Ju'ai, *Kua wenhua guanggao yu shimin wenhua de bianqian*, 52–53; 'Ben bao de guanggao, faxing ji qita'.
[172] 'The *Shanghai Gazette*', *Moti*; 'Read the *Shanghai Gazette*', *Moti*.
[173] Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Shenbao'; Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?*, 3–4.
[174] Pang Ju'ai, *Kua wenhua guanggao yu shimin wenhua de bianqian*, 52; Yu Chunmei, *Dadao wei gong*, 23.

readers.[175] The reason was that one issue of a newspaper or journal was usually read by more than one person. Li Xiaofeng, for example, remembered about *New Tide*:

> After they [the people who had bought *New Tide*] had read the magazine themselves, they lent it to their classmates so they could read it, they sent it to their friends so they could read it, they sent it to their brothers and sisters so they could read it. In this way, one was given to ten, and ten were given to a hundred …
>
> 他們自己看過雜誌之後,借給同學看,寄給朋友看,送給兄弟姊妹看,如此一傳十,十傳百 ……[176]

The same mechanisms were at work with newspapers, and therefore reader numbers were higher than sales numbers.[177]

Moreover, the phenomenon that people potentially involved in the New Culture Movement tended to be newspaper readers also applied to the *Shanghai News*. As mentioned above, students in Beijing or the chancellor of Beijing University, Cai Yuanpei, read this newspaper, and the *Shanghai News* advertised the New Culture journal *New Tide*.[178]

The *Shanghai News* was also very influential in associating people like Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu with the demonstrators of May Fourth, which I describe in Chapter Two. When someone writing under the pseudonym 'Cha An from Xiaoshan' 蕭山嗇盦 (no dates) published the *Chronicle of the Student Protests* (*Xuejie fengchao ji* 學界風潮紀) in September 1919, he almost literally repeated the *Shanghai News* articles.[179] It is impossible to trace the identity of Cha An or the *Shanghai News* journalists, and their possible relationship, since they all wrote under pseudonyms. However, this phenomenon suggests that *Shanghai News*' reportage was circulating widely.

---

[175] Wang Runian, *Yuwang de xiangxiang*, 69; 'Ben bao de guanggao, faxing ji qita'.
[176] Li Xiaofeng, 'Xinchao she de shimo', 209.
[177] Paul Bevan, citing Lin Yutang, see Bevan, 'Paul Morand, the Chinese "New-Sensationists" and Pictorial Magazines'; Lin, *A History of the Press and Public Opinion in China*.
[178] Zung, 'Contemporary Drama of China', 3; Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 1:254; 'Advertisement for *New Tide*', 3 November 1919. On *Shanghai News* readership, see also Wang Runian, *Yuwang de xiangxiang*, 108.
[179] Cha An, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang 7–9. Xiaoshan was a place in Zhejiang. The *Chronicle of the Student Protests* was published with Zhonghua Books (*Zhonghua shuju* 中華書局) in September 1919. See Zhongguo kexue yuan lishi yanjiu suo di san suo jindai shi ziliao bianji zu, *Wu si aiguo yundong ziliao*, 238.

Finally, the *Shanghai News* reflected the cross-regional outlook and mobility of the educated strata in China. Although it was published in Shanghai, it had a postal service, and was also read in other parts of the country.[180] In other words newspapers in general, and the *Shanghai News* in particular, were very influential in shaping opinion in the year 1919.

Public Sphere

When analysing the *Shanghai News* reportage on the academic debates and on May Fourth in the Chapters One and Two, I do not use the concept of a 'public sphere.' However as Tang Xiaobing has pointed out, academic trends in scholarship on the press require a remark on the 'public-sphere' debate.[181]

A public sphere and, closely related, a civil society, is often seen as a prerequisite for democratisation. The question of whether China developed a public sphere, for example, in the 19th and 20th centuries was therefore particularly pressing in the 1980s and 1990s. At the time, hopes for an imminent democratisation in mainland China had just crumbled after the crackdown on the student demonstrations on Tiananmen Square of 1989. Scholars put the simultaneous democratisation of Eastern Europe down to a civil society that had developed there prior to the fall of the Berlin Wall. Consequently, the 1990s saw a number of academic symposia and conferences on 'Civil Society in People's China,' or 'Did China Ever Enjoy a Civil Society?'[182]

Another factor that buoyed up the 'public-sphere' debate in the 1990s was the translation into English of Jürgen Habermas' book *The Structural Transformation of the Public*

[180] On the postal service, see 'Chuban jie xiaoxi', *Shenbao*, 31 March 1925; Pang Ju'ai, *Kua wenhua guanggao yu shimin wenhua de bianqian*, 53. On the *Shanghai News* being read in other parts of the country, see Zung, 'Contemporary Drama of China', 3; Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 1:254. I would like to thank Paul Bevan for his comments at the Joint East Asian Studies Conference, on 5-7 September 2013 at the University of Nottingham.
[181] Tang Xiaobing, *Xiandai Zhongguo de gongong yulun*, 2.
[182] Wakeman, Jr., 'The Civil Society and Public Sphere Debate', 108.

Sphere in 1989.[183] When discussing the 'public sphere,' scholars like Rudolf Wagner, Joan Judge and Barbara Mittler have usually drawn upon this Habermasian discussion.[184] According to Habermas, a space (the 'public sphere') developed in 18th-century Europe, in which 'citizens' discussed issues of common concern independently from the state. Newspapers came into mix because Habermas saw them as vehicles of 'dissemination and influence.'[185]

Concerns, however, have been raised that that the Habermasian definition does not reflect the Chinese situation very well. Consequently, scholars like Eugenia Lean, Bryna Goodman and Tang Xiaobing have moved away from this definition. Rejecting Habermas' binary of state and public, Goodman emphasised the 'interpenetration' of these two spheres in China at the time.[186] Lean criticised Habermas' focus on rationality and emphasised the role emotions played in public opinion.[187] Tang claimed that in Republican China the public sphere was not merely populated by the 'literary people of the capitalist strata' (*zichan jieji wenren* 資產階級文人), which Habermas had described.[188] Instead, the Republican press aimed at 'enlightening' (*qimeng* 啓蒙) all people, not only the capitalists. It strove for 'public profit' (*gonggong liyi* 公共利益) from the very beginning.[189] This stands in contrast to Leo Lee's argument that the New Culture Movement was too elitist to foster a 'public sphere.'[190] David Strand has described Beijing's various urban associations

[183] Lean, *Public Passions*, 6.
[184] Judge, 'Public Opinion and the New Politics of Contestation in the Late Qing, 1904-1911'; Wagner, 'The Role of the Foreign Community in the Chinese Public Sphere'; Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?*.
[185] Mukerji and Schudson, *Rethinking Popular Culture*, 398–99.
[186] Goodman, *Native Place, City, and Nation*, 120.
[187] Lean, *Public Passions*, 10.
[188] Tang Xiaobing, *Xiandai Zhongguo de gongong yulun*, 2.
[189] Ibid., 4.
[190] Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity', 57.

and guilds, which did not form a 'fully autonomous public sphere,' but which operated in a 'public realm (*gong* [公])' that found ways of 'expressing political views in public.'[191]

My decision not to draw upon a 'public-sphere' framework is equally based on the concern that it glosses over certain historical peculiarities. The most important one of these for this thesis is the 'factions of learning,' into which newspapers categorised the academic debates at Beijing University. 'Factions of learning' or comparable constructions, however, do not play a role in the 'public sphere.' This theoretical model would therefore not add any explanatory value and would be more obscuring than elucidating.

Nevertheless, this thesis does speak to scholars interested in the 'public-sphere' debate, as it reverses the direction of inquiry most common in this discourse. Very often, scholarship on the 'public sphere' explores how the 'public' participates in, and shapes, politics. I show, however, that it is worth moving away from this focus on state politics and approaching the issue from a different angle. I ask how a group of intellectuals (part of the potential 'public') had a certain opinion about individual politicians (the pro-Japanese ministers in the government), and how this opinion boomeranged back to another subsection of a potential 'public,' shaping intellectual discourses, careers and the rhetoric of the buzzword 'New Culture Movement.'

This unravelling of the 'who did what' mirrors an overall theme of this thesis: the problematisation of agency and the complex interaction between actors at the 'centre' and the 'periphery,' those in the spotlight and those in the shadows of attention, which shaped the New Culture Movement and by implication 20th-century China.

[191] Strand, *Rickshaw Beijing*, 168.

CHAPTER I: ACADEMIC DEBATES IN EARLY 1919

Introduction

In the autumn months of 1919, intellectuals at the periphery of the New Culture cosmos negotiated the meaning of the buzzword 'New Culture Movement.' At its centre, they felt, stood a couple of star academics, who have since entered history as the famous 'New Culture' intellectuals and as the visionary initiators of the New Culture Movement. Among them were Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu, Fu Sinian, Luo Jialun and so on. I refer to them as the 'circle around Hu Shi,' although by this I do not mean to focus on Hu Shi specifically.

In this chapter, I explore the image and standing of these future stars, and I argue that, before the May Fourth demonstrations, their professional situation was considered bleak. In the early months of the year 1919, Hu Shi and his circle, which was a small group of students and professors at Beijing University, were already supporting ideas that would later be known as 'New Culture.' For example, they already endorsed abandoning to write in *wenyan* and to write in *baihua* instead. This idea would be central to the New Culture Movement later. However, in early 1919, the expression 'New Culture Movement' was not yet invented.

When the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu supported ideas like *baihua* at the time, newspapers regarded this as the ivory-tower[1] idea of a 'faction of learning' (*xuepai* 學

[1] I use the term 'ivory tower' in the meaning it developed in the 1970s, namely, as a pejorative description of academic seclusion and irrelevance. By doing so, I commit an anachronism, as 'ivory tower' was not used in this sense in the 1910s. At the time, it designated instead 'a place of disengagement,' positive or negative, mostly in 'art and literature.' The idea of academia as the ivory tower *par excellence* only developed in the 1930s and 1940s and it adopted its pejorative meaning since the 1970s. I nevertheless use it in this thesis, because it evokes an image very similar to the opinion newspapers like the *Shanghai News* had of the debates at Beijing University. See Shapin, 'The Ivory

派), which they called the 'New Faction' (*xinpai* 新派).[2] By constructing this academic group into a 'faction of learning,' the newspapers did not only indicate how irrelevant they deemed it. Just like many 'factions of learning' before it, the story went on, the 'New Faction' was embroiled in a squabble with another 'faction,' the 'Old Faction' (*jiupai* 舊派). By this newspapers designated another small circle of academics at Beijing University around Liu Shipei and Huang Kan 黃侃 (1886-1935), who wanted to maintain *wenyan* as written language.[3]

Although the New Culture Movement later came to be associated with Beijing University, only a minority of students and faculty were involved in the debates in early 1919. Moreover, a look at the arguments of this debate shows how abstract and theoretical this debate was, and how little it fitted with the newspapers' clear-cut compartmentalisation into 'factions.' In its core, the quarrel revolved around different understandings of the concepts of evolution and Darwinian ideas that had been circling the globe over the preceding half century. The circle around Hu Shi endorsed *baihua* on the premise that cultural evolution called for a completely renewed language in each new time period. The group around Liu Shipei supported *wenyan*, following its understanding that evolution showed the connection between past and present. Therefore, it was important that written language remained stable over time, so that scholars in the present could understand scholars from the past.

Tower', 6, 13–14, 23–27.

[2] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang'.

[3] This group of intellectuals has often been called 'National Essence group' (*guocui pai* 國粹派). However, this term lumps together various groups which sometimes opposed each other. Among them were the Taiyan Disciples and the Tongcheng Scholars (for details on these classifications, see pp. 66-70). Moreover, according to Luo Zhitian, the expression '*guocui*' had even become unpopular by 1919. I therefore refer to these people as the 'circle around Liu Shipei' or, when describing the newspaper narrative, as 'Old Faction.' See Luo Zhitian, 'Xin wenhua yundong shiqi guanyu zhengli guogu de sixiang lunzheng', 226.

The famous Shanghai Newspaper *Shanghai News* did not delve into these scholarly intricacies in its reportage. In April 1919, it even declared that the 'New Faction' had lost the debate with the 'Old Faction' and had already been 'elbowed out' (*paiji* 排擠) of Beijing University.[4] The reason was that the famous translator Lin Shu had taken sides with the 'Old Faction' and published tirades against Hu Shi's circle in newspapers in February and March 1919. As I show in Chapter Two, he was even said to have instigated his friends in the government to oust the 'New Faction' from Beijing University. Had someone told the *Shanghai News* or the academics at Beijing University that only a few months later Hu Shi and his circle would be praised as the 'centre of the New Culture Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong de zhongxin* 新文化運動的中心) people would have been very surprised.[5]

State of the Field: When Did the New Culture Movement Begin?

As shown in the Introduction of this dissertation, a lot of attempts have been made to date the New Culture Movement. It has been suggested that it began in 1917 with Hu Shi's publication of 'Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature' or with the foundation of the journals *New Youth* in 1915 or *Tiger* in 1914.[6] What these suggestions have in common is the assumption that the New Culture Movement was the name of an intellectual trend that developed over a long period of time. Under this premise, it makes sense to trace the origins of this development to its earliest manifestations. As this trend, the narrative continues, came into its own at some point after these start dates, it is reasonable to assume that its victory was obvious from the very beginning. Any opposition against this trend must have therefore been doomed to fail. This stance was taken by Lydia Liu, for example, when she called the Beijing University student

[4] Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing'.
[5] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[6] For details, see pp. 23-24.

magazine *National Heritage*, which opposed ideas like *baihua* in early 1919, a 'last-ditch attempt' of the 'short-lived' magazine 'to counteract the New Culture Movement' ('movement' spelled with a lower-case letter).[7]

I choose a conceptually different approach. Instead of seeing the New Culture Movement as a name for a trend, I see it as a buzzword. Instead of exploring how ideas later labelled 'New Culture Movement' came into being, I explore how the buzzword and its rhetoric emerged. This perspective allows me to see that, as Elisabeth Kaske has pointed out, things like *baihua* were considered ivory-tower ideas endorsed by a small number of professors and students at Beijing University in early 1919.[8] It also allows me to go beyond Kaske's argument and show that before the May Fourth demonstrations, opposition to the circle around Hu Shi was anything but a stubborn 'last-ditch attempt.'[9] On the contrary, it seemed like a promising course of action that was in line with political and broader intellectual positions. It was the ideas of Hu Shi and his circle that did not seem to have a future on the eve of May Fourth.

Newspapers Report about Two 'Factions of Learning'

'New Faction'

In March 1919, two prominent newspapers, the *Shanghai News* in Shanghai and the *Public Voice* in Beijing, reported that two 'factions of learning' were having an academic dispute at the prestigious Beijing University.[10] Both were 'equally strong'

[7] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 247.
[8] Kaske, *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education*, 458.
[9] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 247.
[10] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang'. According to Fabio Lanza, Beijing University was not as glamorous in early 1919 as it would be only a few years later. Nevertheless, Beijing University was prestigious enough for newspapers to report on it on occasion. *Social Welfare Tiensin* reported in January 1919 that a Beijing University student came to Tianjin to inspect educational and business institutions, and that he was going to write an article about his observations in the *Citizen*. The *Shanghai News* mentioned Beijing University in nine

(*qigu xiangdang* 旗鼓相當), and they had equally irrelevant and absurdly extreme positions. The topic of their debate was mainly written language.[11] The newspapers dubbed these groups 'New Faction' and 'Old Faction.'[12] In the following sections, I outline the narrative this newspaper story conveyed. In this story, the 'New Faction' consisted of several professors, among them Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, and a few students. Although the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* did not mention them by name, among these students were Fu Sinian, Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 (1893-1980) and Luo Jialun.[13] This was the circle of people who would a few months later be called 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[14]

In March 1919, however, the expression 'New Culture Movement' did not exist yet, and their ideas were not deemed as glamorous as the label would later suggest. The two newspapers explained laconically that the 'New Faction' mainly advocated 'new literature' (*xin wenxue* 新文學) and that it criticised a few 'thoughts that society has passed on' (*shehui suo chuanliu de sixiang* 社會所傳留之思想).[15] By the latter, the papers meant this circle's criticism of Confucian morality or its advocacy of Western ideas. 'New literature' referred to one of its most prominent agendas: the suggestion to give up writing in *wenyan* and to start writing in *baihua*.

---

articles in 1918, and even around 40 times in 1917. See Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 9; 'Daxuesheng lai Jin canguan zhiwen', *Yishibao*, 7 January 1919. This is also indicated by a search in *Shenbao 1872-1949*.

[11] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 6.

[12] It is interesting that this 'faction' was not called '*gupai*' (古派). According to the *Great Chinese Dictionary*, '*jiu*' had a pejorative connotation and was close to '*chenjiu*' (陳舊, 'obsolete'). The *Great Chinese Dictionary* cited instances for this connotation from the Han Dynasty through to the late Qing/ Republican Period. By contrast, '*gu*' referred more positively to '*gu shi de*' (古時的, 'belonging to old times'). See Hanyu da cidian bianji weiyuan hui and Luo Zhufeng, s.v. 'Jiu'; Hanyu da cidian bianji weiyuan hui and Luo Zhufeng, s.v. 'Gu'.

[13] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3.

[14] Technically speaking, this expression only referred to Hu Shi in Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

[15] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3.

Calls to replace *wenyan* with *baihua* went back to the 19th century. This phase of *baihua* advocacy, however, had started when Hu Shi wrote a letter to Chen Duxiu, making eight suggestions for reforming written language. Only the last one suggested writing in the vernacular. In 1917, Hu Shi published these suggestions in *New Youth*, a journal edited by Chen Duxiu, under the title 'Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature.'[16] The article itself was also written in *wenyan* and could well have been read as a proposal for a reformed *wenyan*. The editor of *New Youth*, Chen Duxiu, however, commented in February 1917 that this article by 'my friend Hu Shi' (*wu you Hu Shi* 吾友胡適) launched a 'literary revolution' (*wenxue geming* 文學革命).[17] A couple of comments and reprints of the article followed in *New Youth* and other publications, and soon advocating *baihua* was one of the central tenets of *New Youth* and its authors.[18]

New Youth

New Youth was the main mouthpiece of the 'New Faction,' according to this newspaper story.[19] Chen Duxiu had founded the journal in September 1915 in Shanghai.[20] Originally, *New Youth* was called *Youth Magazine* (*Qingnian zazhi* 青年雜誌). Soon, however, its publisher, Qunyi Book Company (*Qunyi shushe* 群益書社), received a letter from a Shanghai Chinese Young Men's Christian Association (*Shanghai jidujiao Zhongguo qingnian hui* 上海基督教中國青年會), complaining that the name of Chen

[16] Hu Shi, 'Wenxue gailiang chuyi', January 1917.
[17] Chen Duxiu, 'Wenxue geming lun', 1.
[18] Hu Shi republished his 'Modest Proposals' in the spring edition of the *Chinese Students' Quarterly* of 1917, which he was editing at the time. Qian Xuantong commented on it in an open letter to Chen Duxiu in *New Youth*, and parts of Chen Duxiu's comments were printed in the *Popular Newspaper Weekly* (*Tongsu zhoubao* 通俗周報). See Hu Shi, 'Wenxue gailiang chuyi', spring 1917; Qian Xuantong, 'Chen Duxiu xiansheng jian ...'; Chen Duxiu, 'Hu Shi jun wenxue gailiang chuyi', *Tongsu zhoubao*, 10 April 1917. On the importance of *baihua* advocacy for *New Youth*, see Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 70–75; Wang, 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937', 467–471.
[19] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3.
[20] Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Xin qingnian'.

Duxiu's *Youth Magazine* sounded too similar to their own *Shanghai Young Men* (*Shanghai qingnian* 上海青年). Consequently, Chen Duxiu had to change the title. From 1916 onwards, which was also when the magazine went into its second volume, it was therefore called *New Youth* (*Xin qingnian* 新青年).[21]

New Youth has entered history as *the* most famous 'New Culture' journal. However, until early 1919, *New Youth* had a very low reach. It sold so badly that it almost ceased publication at the end of 1918.[22] Even people generally interested in *New Youth*-style ideas were not aware of it. Lan Gongwu 藍公武 (1887-1957), the editor of the *Citizen Gazette* (*Guomin gongbao* 國民公報), was such a person. He was very supportive of the *baihua* project and exchanged letters in *baihua* with Fu Sinian and Hu Shi.[23] But even he only became aware of *New Youth* in 1919. In January 1919, he confessed to Fu Sinian that he had only read four issues so far.[24]

When Chen Duxiu came up with the idea to publish *New Youth* in 1913, he had troubles finding a publisher for it. His friend and the owner of the Shanghai publishing house East Asia Library, Wang Mengzou 汪孟鄒 (1878-1953), refused to publish it. As Wang Mengzou's nephew, Wang Yuanfang 汪原放 (1897-1980), wrote in his book *Remembering East Asia Library* (*Huiyi Yadong tushu guan* 回憶亞東圖書館), Chen Duxiu often hung out in the Library's bookshop in 1913, because 'he had nothing to do'

[21] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 32–33. Wang Yuanfang only talked about a '*Shanghai qingnian hui* 上海青年會,' which had a 'absolutely strong religious flair' ([lit. 'the religious atmosphere was absolutely thick'] *zongjiao qifen shifen nonghou* 宗教氣氛十分濃厚). But as the National Index of Chinese Newspapers and Periodicals identifies the YMCA as founders of the *Shanghai Young Men* journal, '*Shanghai qingnian hui*' must be an abbreviation for the Christian association. See Ibid., 32; *Quanguo baokan suoyin, qikan daohang*.

[22] Letter from Lu Xun from 1 January 1918, cited in Chen Shuping, *Bei xin shuju yu Zhongguo xiandai wenxue*, 20.

[23] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 131.

[24] Ibid., 135. Lan Gongwu's courtesy name was Lan Zhixian 藍志先. See Eglauer, *Wissenschaft als Chance*, 144.

(*ta meiyou shi* 他沒有事). At the time, he was not yet a professor at Beijing University.[25]

One day in that year, he came rushing into the shop and announced that he wanted to publish a magazine that 'would certainly have a great impact after the effort of only ten or eight years' (*zhiyao shi nian, ba nian de gongfu, yuiding hui fasheng hen da de yingxiang* 只要十年、八年的功夫，一定會發生很大的影響). In spite of Chen's visionary self-confidence, Wang Mengzou refused to publish *New Youth*, because he 'really did not have the capacity to do so' (*shizai meiyou liliang zuo* 實在沒有力量做).[26] Although this may have been true for East Asia Library, which was not doing well at the time, it also implied that Wang did not expect *New Youth* to yield a lot of profit. He therefore introduced Chen Duxiu to Qunyi Book Company, who then published *New Youth*. When Chen Duxiu was appointed to Beijing University in late 1916, he took *New Youth* with him.[27]

New Tide

At Beijing University, *New Youth* was a magazine in which teachers published, but some of their student supporters soon started founding their own magazines. One of them, the *Public Voice* and the *Shanghai News* continued their story, was *New Tide*, launched in January 1919.[28] *New Tide*'s editor, the Beijing University student Fu Sinian, remembered in September 1919 that he, his dorm-mate Gu Jiegang (the later famous historian) and another friend called Xu Yanzhi 徐彥之 (1897-1940) talked a lot about 'the future of Beijing University' (*Beijing daxue de jianglai* 北京大學的將來) back in

[25] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 32. On Wang Yuanfang being Wang Mengzou's nephew, see Xu Jilin, *Jindai Zhongguo zhishi fenzi de gongong jiaowan*, 91.
[26] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 32.
[27] Shen Yinmo, 'Wo he Chen Duxiu'; Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Xin qingnian'.
[28] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3.

1917. They figured that they, as students, should run a magazine, since magazines had a lot of academic value, and also because they saw their future in academia and imagined that 'practicing a bit' (*lianxi yi hui* 練習一回) for that time would not do any harm. A few more friends joined their circle, among them Luo Jialun, but the journal was merely talk at that time.[29]

One year later, in autumn 1918, Fu Sinian talked again about this magazine with his friend Xu Yanzhi and this time they decided to give it a go. They applied for funding from Beijing University (the contact was Dean of Humanities [*wenke xuezhang* 文科學長] Chen Duxiu) and assembled a few more classmates to help them. They also persuaded Hu Shi to act as their 'advisor' (*guwen* 顧問). In their first official 'preparatory meeting' (*yubei hui* 預備會) of October 1918, they decided on the tenets of the magazine ('a critical spirit' [*piping de jingshen* 批評的精神], 'a scientific mindset' [*kexue de zhuyi* 科學的主義] and 'reformed language' [*gexin de wenci* 革新的文詞]) and on the title. Xu Yanzhi felt that the English 'The Renaissance' would be a good idea, and Luo Jialun suggested the Chinese '*Xinchao*' (新潮). Soon afterwards, Beijing University's librarian Li Dazhao allowed them to use a room in the library as an office. Li Xinbai 李辛白 (1879-1951), the head of Beijing University Publishing Department (*Beijing daxue chuban bu* 北京大學出版部), agreed to help them with printing and distribution.[30] In January 1919, the first issue of *New Tide* was launched.

[29] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 199. The article refers to Xu Yanzhi by his pseudonym Zi Jun 子俊, see Zhang Jingru, Xiao Sheng, and Jiang Huayi, s.v. 'Zi Jun'.
[30] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 199–200. On Li Xinbai, see Xu Youchun, s.v. 'Li Xinbai'.

The 'Old Faction' and the *National Heritage* Magazine

In all these activities, the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* explained, the 'New Faction' was opposed by the 'Old Faction,' or 'old-literature faction' (*jiu wenxue yi pai* 舊文學一派). The 'Old Faction' also consisted of students and professors at Beijing University, and they rallied around Liu Shipei, Huang Kan and Ma Xulun 馬敘倫 (1885-1970).[31] Their most distinguishing feature was their opposition to the *baihua* project and their preference for *wenyan* as written language.

For a long time, the people whom the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* classified as 'Old Faction' lacked a mouthpiece comparable to *New Youth*. But this changed in March 1919, when a few students founded the magazine *National Heritage* at Beijing University. It is unclear who really ran *National Heritage*. Formally, the teachers Huang Kan and Liu Shipei were listed as its 'main editors' (*zong bianji* 總編輯).[32] Consequently, the newspapers claimed that it was they who ran it. The National Heritage Society (*Guogu yuekan she* 國故月刊社), however, explained that the teachers were only nominal editors, and the real editors were students. Among these students were Zhang Xuan, Yu Shizhen 俞士鎮 (no dates) and Xue Xiangsui 薛祥綏 (no dates). The professors were only supervising and helping the students a little. The newspapers, of course, merely regarded this as an excuse.[33]

The process of founding *National Heritage* was very similar to *New Tide*, and the National Heritage Society recorded it like this: In early 1919, Yu Shizhen, Xue Xiangsui, Yang Shisheng 楊湜生 (no dates) and Zhang Xuan were worried about the

[31] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3.
[32] 'Guogu yuekan sheyuan lu', *Guogu*.
[33] The letter from the National Heritage Society to the *Public Voice* is cited in Chen Qi, *Liu Shipei nianpu changbian*, 351. For the newspapers, see Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 6.

'decline of national learning' (*guoxue lun yi* 國學淪夷) and decided to launch an academic journal (*xuebao* 學報) to 'rescue' (*wanjiu* 挽救) it. They drafted up some regulations, asked for the approval of their teachers and approached the chancellor of Beijing University, Cai Yuanpei, for funding. They got their funding, and on 26 January 1919, they held a meeting in Liu Shipei's home, in which six teachers and over ten students participated. They decided on a mission statement (the aim of the journal was to 'promote China's traditional scholarship' [*changming Zhongguo guyou zhi xueshu* 昌明中國固有之學術]), they got teacher Kang Xinfu 康心孚 (1884-1917) to take charge of printing and distribution and a few other teachers and members of the National Historiography Institute (*Guoshi guan* 國史館) to advise them. In March 1919, the journal, ironically based at Beijing University's Humanities Department (*wenke* 文科), whose dean was Chen Duxiu, could go underway.[34]

The Usual 'Factional' Nitpicking at Beijing University

Only a few months later, the people the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* called 'New Faction' would be praised as the 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[35] Scholars classed as 'Old Faction' would be condemned to academic obscurity. However, in March 1919, the newspapers agreed that Beijing University was merely experiencing the nitpicking of two academic 'factions or learning,' which were 'equally strong.'[36] With this story, the two papers were by no means alone. Although not reporting in such detail, *Social Welfare Tiensin* in Tianjin seconded the classification into competing 'old

[34] 'Ben she jishi lu', *Guogu*. Kang Xinfu had studied with Zhang Taiyan in the 1900s and he had been professor at Beijing University since 1912. See Liao Gailong, Sun Liancheng, and Chen Youjin, s.v. 'Kang Xinfu'. The National Historiography Institute in the Republican Period was founded in 1912 and commissioned to record the history of the country. In April 1917, it was incorporated into Beijing University, but put under the command of the cabinet again in August 1919, see Liu Jianye, s.v. 'Guoshi guan'. For the implications of this integration into Beijing University, see Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 91–92.
[35] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[36] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 6.

[learning] people' (*jiu ren* 舊人) and 'new [learning] people' (*xin ren* 新人) in April 1919.[37] In the same month, the *Beijing New Post* (*Beijing xin bao* 北京新報) and the *Government by the People Daily* (*Minzhi ribao* 民治日報) also respectively talked about 'all the scholars of the New Faction' (*xin pai zhu zi* 新派諸子) and about 'the conservative faction' (*baoshou yi pai* 保守一派) at Beijing University.[38]

By classifying the academics in this way, the newspapers implied that there was nothing very innovative about their debate. After all, Chinese academia had seen its fair share of 'factions of learning' over the course of the century. Only earlier in the decade, the newspapers reminded their readers, two factions at the University had competed with each other for academic positions. This was when the students of the famous scholar Zhang Taiyan had driven the school of the Tongcheng 桐城 Scholars from their positions at Beijing University in the early 1910s. So while it could not do any harm if the debates 'twisted the scholars' brains' (*jiao xuezhe zhi naojin* 絞學者之腦筋), the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* concluded laconically that a middle position between 'Old' and 'New Faction' would be more desirable than either of their preposterous suggestions.[39]

According to the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice*, this factional competition had started when Cai Yuanpei had been appointed chancellor of Beijing University in December 1916.[40] Beijing University had been founded in the wake of the Hundred Days' Reforms of 1898. At the time, it was called Imperial University (*Jingshi daxue*

[37] Yun Chao, 'Lun Daxue xin jiu zhi zheng', *Yishibao*, 7 April 1919.
[38] For the *Bejing New Post*, see Yisheng, 'Zuijin zhi xueshu xinchao', 107. For *Government by the People Daily, see* Wang, 'Xin jiu sichao pingyi', 107.
[39] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3, 6. The comment on 'twisting the scholars' brains' only appears in the *Shanghai News* article. For more details on these two earlier 'factions,' see pp. 66-70 of this thesis.
[40] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3. According to Wang Guangyuan, Cai Yuanpei was invited to become chancellor on 26 December 1916 and he started the job on 4 January. See Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 33, 35.

tang 京師大學堂),[41] but it was renamed into Beijing University (*Beijing daxue* 北京大學) in 1912. Almost constantly, Beijing University experienced personnel and curriculum changes, and when Cai Yuanpei became chancellor in December 1916, he overhauled the university again.[42]

Cai Yuanpei had spent time in Germany from 1907 to 1911 and from 1912 to 1913, and he now sought to transform Beijing University institutionally according to the German model. For example, he introduced elements of 'independent research, administrative self-rule, and individual autonomy' for students and faculty.[43] He also tried to sever the connection between university and state, which had shaped Chinese scholarship for so long under the imperial civil-service examinations. Instead of seeing education as a stepping stone to a political career, he hoped his students would seek knowledge for its own sake. Continuing a trend that had started in the Qing Dynasty, Cai Yuanpei gave the curriculum a more 'scientific orientation.'[44] He even excluded applied sciences like engineering and economics from Beijing University in 1917 and incorporated them into other schools or dissolved them completely.[45]

Most importantly for this chapter, Cai Yuanpei also appointed new professors to Beijing University, who would be the protagonists of the debates of early 1919. As the *Public Voice* pointed out, this was 'particularly [the case] in the humanities' (*you yi wenke wei shen* 尤以文科為甚).[46] Among these new professors were Chen Duxiu, the editor of *New Youth*, Hu Shi, Liu Shipei, who was a friend of Chen Duxiu's, and Qian

[41] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 7.
[42] Yu Wenzao, s.v. 'Cai Yuanpei'.
[43] Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 76–78. For the dates of Cai Yuanpei's stays in Germany, see Yu Wenzao, s.v. 'Cai Yuanpei'.
[44] Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 81.
[45] Ibid., 82. For more information on changes launched by Cai Yuanpei, see Lin, *Peking University*, 47–60; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 79–98.
[46] 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3.

Xuantong 錢玄同 (1887-1939).[47] Chen Duxiu became dean of humanities because Cai Yuanpei admired his publication *New Youth*.[48]

Cai was apparently very keen on hiring Chen. Together with the Shanghai publisher Wang Mengzou, Chen Duxiu went on a fund-raising trip to Beijing in November 1916.[49] Chen Duxiu lived in Shanghai at the time. After his return to Shanghai, Wang Mengzou told his family that Chen and he were having a good time in Beijing, visiting friends, going to parties and to the theatre. However, Cai Yuanpei made use of this visit to try and discuss university matters with Chen Duxiu. Consequently, he visited Chen and Wang 'almost every day' (*chabuduo tian tian* 差不多天天), 'sometimes he came very early and we had not yet gotten up' (*youshi lai de hen zao, women hai meiyou qilai* 有时来得很早，我们还没有起来). While Chen and Wang were getting dressed, Cai Yuanpei waited on a chair 'at the door of our room' (*zai fang menkou* 在房门口). At some point, this became too embarrassing for Chen Duxiu and Wang Mengzou, and they decided: 'We should go to bed early in the evenings and get up early in the mornings.' (*Wanshang zao shui, zao shang yao qi de zao xie cai hao*. 晚上早睡，早上要起得早些才好。)[50] Although Cai Yuanpei was thus interfering with Chen Duxiu's activities, Chen accepted the job offer.

Taiyan Disciples

Many of the new faculty were also Cai Yuanpei's acquaintances. According to Diana Lin, some of them were recruited from the anti-Qing Revolutionary Alliance

[47] On Liu Shipei's friendship with Chen Duxiu, see Li Fan, 'Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue', 108. On Qian Xuantong's appointment, see Wei Qiao, s.v. 'Qian Xuantong'. See also Lin, *Peking University*, 57. According to Wang Guangyuan, Chen Duxiu was appointed on 11 January 1917. In the same month, he sent a letter to Hu Shi, asking him to join Beijing University after his return from the United States. See Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 35.
[48] Shen Yinmo, 'Wo he Chen Duxiu', 90; Lin, *Peking University*, 56.
[49] According to a letter from Chen Duxiu to Hu Shi, the original purpose of the trip was 'to raise capital for the bookshop' (*wei shuju zhaogu* 為書局招股). See Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 35.
[50] Ibid., 36. Wang Yuanfang remembered this as the story his uncle Wang Mengzou told him.

(*Tongmeng hui* 同盟會), whose member Cai Yuanpei had been. Among them was Liang Shuming 梁漱溟 (1893-1988). Others came from the work-study programme (*qin'gong jianxue* 勤工儉學) in France, which Cai had supported. Among them was Li Shizeng 李石曾 (1881-1973). A third cohort was revolutionaries who had studied with the famous scholar Zhang Taiyan (also known as 'Zhang Binglin' 章炳麟). Among the latter were Liu Shipei, Zhou Zuoren 周作人 (1885-1967) and Ma Yuzao 馬裕藻 (1878-1945).[51] These people were often classified as 'Taiyan Disciples' (*Taiyan dizi* 太炎弟子). As the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* mentioned, Taiyan Disciples had already entered Beijing University earlier in the decade, when Cai Yuanpei's two predecessors, He Yushi 何燏時 (1878-1961, chancellor from December 1912 to November 1913) and Hu Renyuan 胡仁源 (1883-1942, chancellor from January 1914 to December 1916) had hired a number of them. Among these earlier arrivals was Huang Kan, who had been at Beijing University since 1914.[52]

The designation 'Taiyan Disciple' referred very broadly to everyone who had studied with Zhang Taiyan. As a member of the Revolutionary Alliance, Zhang Taiyan had been arrested in 1903. He had fled to Japan after his release in 1906, where he had met many of his future 'disciples.'[53] As having studied with Zhang Taiyan was the only criterion necessary for applying to oneself the label 'Taiyan Disciple,' these disciples included people with as varied ideas as Huang Kan, Liu Shipei, Qian Xuantong and

[51] Lin, *Peking University*, 55–56. In 1915, Cai Yuanpei founded a 'Work-study alliance' (*qin'gong jianxue hui* 勤工儉學會) in France, see Yu Wenzao, s.v. 'Cai Yuanpei'. On Zhou Zuoren being a Taiyan Disciple, see Gao Yun, s.v. 'Zhou Zuoren'.
[52] On the appointment of the Taiyan Disciples to Beijing University, see Lin, *Peking University*, 46; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 81. For the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* reports, see Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3. On Huang Kan's appointment during this wave of hiring, see Pei Xiaowei, s.v. 'Huang Kan'.
[53] *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. Zhang Binglin.

even Lu Xun.[54] In spite of this variety, Taiyan Disciples were often said to engage in evidential research and historical phonology, and to write in the prose-style of the Six Dynasties. These were also the attributes the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* ascribed Liu Shipei and Huang Kan.[55]

Tongcheng Scholars

Huang Kan's wave of appointees was also what the *Public Voice* and the *Shanghai News* referred to when they mentioned how the Taiyan Disciples had replaced the Tongcheng Scholars.[56] The Tongcheng Scholars were considered a 'faction of learning' famous for their *guwen* (古文, 'old written language'), a writing style, and for their preference of the eight-legged essay in the civil-service examinations.[57] The eight-legged essay was a very formalised form of writing. The name 'Tongcheng Scholars' derived from the fact that many of them came from Tongcheng, a county in Anhui. Among their more prominent members at the time were Wu Rulun 吳汝綸 (1840-1903), Yao Yonggai 姚永概 (1866-1923), Yao Yongpu 姚永樸 (1862-1939) and Ma Qichang 馬其昶 (1855-1930).[58] The famous translator of Western works Lin Shu is often

[54] Lin, *Peking University*, 46; Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 25. On Lu Xun being a Taiyan Discples, see Semanov and Alber, *Lu Hsün and His Predecessors*, 15–16. The wide range of ideas supported by people classified as 'Taiyan Disciples' suggests that this designation was equally a franchise. Although it would be interesting to explore this further, this is beyond the scope of this thesis.

[55] Lin, *Peking University*, 46; Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3. The *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* claimed that the Taiyan Disciples favoured the style of the Eight Dynasties (*ba dai* 八代). However, the Eight and the Six Dynasties refer to the same time period, as they overlap. The Eight Dynasties are the Han (206BC-220AD), Wei (220-265), Jin (265-420), Liu Song (420-479), Qi (479-502), Liang (502-557), Chen (557-589) and Sui Dynasties (581-618). The Six Dynasties are the Wu (220-280), Eastern Jin (317-420), Liu-Song (420-479), Qi (479-502), Liang (502-557) and Chen Dynasties (557-589). See Liu Xuelin and Chi Duo, s.v. 'Ba dai'; Emmerich, *Chinesische Literaturgeschichte*, xiv–xv.

[56] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3.

[57] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 43. On the concept of *guwenjia* ('master of old-style writing'), see Ibid., 156–57.

[58] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 25.

mentioned as one of them, although strictly speaking he was not from Tongcheng, but from Fujian.[59]

According to Michael Gibbs Hill, there are two ways of recounting the origins of the Tongcheng Scholars. One option traces a lineage starting from Fang Bao 方苞 (1668-1749), who liked Han Yu's 韓愈 (768-824) Tang/Song style of prose and who argued for the 'unity between moral purpose and style.'[60] His teachings were transmitted to Zeng Guofan 曾國藩 (1811-1872), Wu Rulun, Yan Fu 嚴復 (1854- 1921) and then Lin Shu. Another option, which Hill preferred, is to see Yao Nai 姚鼐 (1732-1815) in the 18th and early 19th centuries as its inventor. He endorsed Tongcheng teaching in order to counteract the rise of *kaozheng* (考證, 'evidential learning')-style learning. In order to give his ideas more gravitas, he claimed to stand in the tradition of Fang Bao and so on, and he did this by writing an anthology of the works of previous 'Tongcheng Scholars.'[61]

People regarded as Tongcheng Scholars were hired to Beijing University under Chancellor Zhang Baixi 張百熙 (1847-1907, tenure January 1902 to February 1904).[62] Among them were Wu Rulun, who died before he could start his appointment, Yao Yonggai, Ma Qichang and Yao Yongpu. Lin Shu also taught at Beijing University from 1910 to 1913.[63] However, as the *Shanghai News* explained and as outlined above, in the early 1910s, these Tongcheng Scholars were replaced by the 'Zhang Taiyan faction of learning' (*Zhang Taiyan xuepai* 章太炎學派).[64] Upon his appointment in 1916, Cai

[59] Lin, *Peking University: Chinese Scholarship and Intellectuals, 1898-1937*, 45.
[60] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 41.
[61] Ibid., 41–44. On the origins of the Tongcheng School, see also Elman, *Classicism, Politics, and Kinship*, 12–13.
[62] Lin, *Peking University*, 20; Li Fan, 'Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue', 111.
[63] Boorman, s.v. Lin Shu, 383; Li Fan, 'Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue', 111; Lin, *Peking University: Chinese Scholarship and Intellectuals, 1898-1937*, 20, 45; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 170–71.
[64] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'.

Yuanpei then restructured the faculty again and hired *New Youth* authors, such as Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi. Although many of these old and new faculty members were personal friends,[65] they soon developed the outlined differing trends of scholarly opinions about questions like written language.

Beijing University's Opinion on 'Factions of Learning'

Newspapers made short work of this situation and classified it as a struggle between two 'factions of learning.' As scholars like Benjamin Elman and Michael Gibbs Hill have pointed out, however, 'factions of learning' are usually not so clear-cut.[66] It is therefore unsurprising that the academics at Beijing University framed their debates in more complex and also contradictory ways.

Some people at Beijing University reproduced the classification into 'factions.' Chen Duxiu, for example, did this when he called the circle around Liu Shipei and Huang Kan 'National Heritage party' (*guogu dang* 國故黨) on 16 March 1919 in the Beijing University student journal *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*). Chancellor Cai Yuanpei was not reluctant either to talk about 'factions of learning' (*xuepai* 學派) in the context of his university.[67] But he had found a formula through which he justified accommodating both 'factions' at Beijing University. This formula was *jianrong bingbao* (兼容並包), sometimes translated as 'broad-minded tolerance'[68] or as 'broad-

[65] For example, Tang Er'he and Shen Yinmo had recommended Chen Duxiu as dean of humanities. Tang Er'he was principal of Beijing Special Medical School (*Beijing yixue zhuanmen xuexiao* 北京醫學專門學校) at the time. Shen Yinmo had been professor at Beijing University since 1912. Chen Duxiu was also friends with Liu Shipei and had recommended him. See Shen Yinmo, 'Wo he Chen Duxiu', 90; Lin Lüjian, s.v. 'Tang Erhe'; Wei Qiao, s.v. 'Shen Yinmo'; Li Fan, 'Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue', 108.
[66] Elman, *Classicism, Politics, and Kinship*, 4; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 156–57.
[67] Zhi Yan, 'Guanyu Beijing daxue de yaoyan', 103; Cai Yuanpei, 'Da Lin Qinnan shu', 99. Zhi Yan 隻眼 was Chen Duxiu's pseudonym. See editor's remark in footnote 1 in Zhi Yan, 'Guanyu Beijing daxue de yaoyan', 103. Chen's article was published on 16 March 1919. The first issue of *National Heritage* only appeared on 20 March. It therefore makes sense to assume that by '*guogu*,' Chen Duxiu did not refer to the magazine, but to admirers of the 'national heritage' in general.
[68] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 123.

minded and encompassing tolerance of diverse points of view,'[69] and praised as his most outstanding and visionary educational policy.[70] In 1954, the former Beijing University student and member of the New Tide Society Yang Zhensheng 楊振聲 (1890-1956) remembered that *jianrong bingbao* made scenes like these possible at Beijing University:

> In [the light of] his lamp and window, someone was gluing his nose to the *Selections of Literature* [a text often studied by the Taiyan Disciples], reading Li Shan's small-print commentaries.[71] Outside of the window, someone was blaring out Byron's poems at the same time.[72] In one corner of the room, someone was bobbing his head self-complacently, reciting the *guwen* of the Tongcheng Scholars with modulations and rhythm. In another corner were a few people discussing how Nora provided for her livelihood after having left 'the doll's house' [a 'New Faction'-style activity].[73]
>
> 有人在燈窗下把鼻子貼在《文選》上看李善的小字注，同時就有人在窗外高歌拜倫的詩。在屋子的一角上，有人在搖頭晃腦，抑揚頓挫地念著桐城派古文，在另一角上是幾個人在討論著娜拉走出"傀儡之家"以後，她的生活怎麼辦？[74]

Others were less conciliatory about their academic differences. Leo Lee has pointed to the polemic nature of debates at the time,[75] and some of the debaters did indeed seem to confirm that 'academic politics are so bitter because so little is at stake.'[76] For example, the authors of *New Tide* scolded the *National Heritage* writers 'sticking to the deficient

---

[69] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 52.
[70] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 123; Chen, *Touches of History*, 154; Lin, *Peking University*, 57.
[71] Li Shan (?-689) was a commentator in the Tang Dynasty. See Dong Shaoke and Yan Junjie, s.v. 'Li Shan'.
[72] Lord Byron (1788-1924) was a Romantic English poet, whom Chinese intellectuals across the 'factional' spectrum admired at the time. See Marchand, s.v. George Gordon Byron, 6th Baron Byron; Liu, 'Creative Translation and Creativity via Translation', 172–184.
[73] This refers to Henrik Ibsen's (1828-1906) play 'A Doll's House' (1879), in which the protagonist Nora leaves her husband Torvald Helmer. The 'doll's house' is Nora's home with her husband. See *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. A Doll's House.
[74] Yang Zhensheng, 'Huiyi wu si', 53. When Yang Zhensheng remembered this in 1954, he interpreted this as a sign of how everybody fought with everybody at Beijing University at the time. On Yang Zhensheng's membership in the New Tide Society, see Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 203.
[75] Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity', 45.
[76] This quip is ascribed to the political scientist at Columbia University Wallace Stanley Sayre (1905-1972). Cited from Rhode, *In Pursuit of Knowledge*, 108. It became later associated with Henry Kissinger (b. 1923), who repeated it in a speech at the Ashbrook Center of Ashland University in 1997. See Kissinger, 'Transcript of Remarks at the 14th Annual John M. Ashbrook Memorial Dinner'.

and fragmentary' (*baocan shouque* 抱殘守缺), that is, conservatives.[77] The *National Heritage* writers called the *New Tide* contributors murderers of the past and ignorant of it anyway.[78] These kinds of polemics later led historians to classify the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu as 'iconoclasts' and the one around Liu Shipei as 'conservatives.' Although this labelling was powerful for a long time, it has been challenged in the past two or three decades, particularly for the 'conservatives.'[79]

Some of the academics at Beijing University came up with even more drastic ways to proclaim their positions in the debate. In March 1918, Qian Xuantong (Hu Shi's circle) had created a fictional character named Wang Jingxuan 王敬軒 in *New Youth*, who vehemently attacked Qian's group of academics. This, of course, provided Qian's likeminded colleague Liu Bannong 劉半農 (1891-1934) with the opportunity to actively defend his position.[80] Huang Kan, moreover, was said to have employed his very specific humour to spoil life for Hu Shi. One day during a lecture, Huang Kan allegedly told his students this joke: It is very easy to decide if *baihua* or *wenyan* is better. If Hu Shi's wife died and a telegram should be sent to inform him, this would read in *wenyan*: '*Qi sang su gui*' (妻丧速归, 'Your wife has passed away, return

[77] Fu Sinian, 'Mao Zishui "Guogu he kexue de jingshen" shiyu', 1259; Mao Zishui, 'Guogu he kexue de jingshen', 2006, 198.
[78] Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 2A; Yu Shizhen, 'Gu jin xueshu goutong siyi', 1B. *National Heritage* did not number its pages consecutively throughout the journal. Instead, it assigned a number to each spread, starting anew with each article. I follow this numbering system and additionally refer to the right page of each spread as 'A' and to the left page as 'B.' As virtually all journals, *National Heritage* was of course read from right to left.
[79] As early as in 1976, the authors of Charlotte Furth's edited volume *The Limits of Change* have stated that the 'conservatism' of political and intellectual figures at the time was different from European definitions of 'conservatism.' See Furth and Alitto, *The Limits of Change*. Lydia Liu and the co-authors Ye Shixiang and Zhang Dongmei have furthermore broken this label up for the successor journal of *National Heritage*, the *Critical Review*. See Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 248; Ye Shixiang and Zhang Dongmei, 'Xiandaixing shiye zhong de "guocui pai" he "Xueheng pai"', 3. Nevertheless, this categorisation has not completely disappeared and continues being invoked for the mainstream of the 'New Faction.' See Schneider, *Ku Chieh-Kang and China's New History*, 33–34; Moller, 'Bellicose Nationalist of Republican China', 102; Schwarcz, 'A Curse on the Great Wall', 456, 458; Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 93; Schneider, *Wahrheit und Geschichte*, 149; Dai Yi, 'Ershi shiji Zhongguo xueshu gailun', 3; Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*, 10; Wang, *Fu Ssu-Nien*, 27; Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*, 9.
[80] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 220–21; Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 233.

quickly'). In *baihua*, however, this would read '*Ni de taitai si le, gankuai huilai ya*' (你的太太死了，趕快回來呀, 'Your wife is dead, come home quickly'). The *baihua* telegram would be infinitely more expensive.[81]

Another story read that Huang Kan once said to Hu Shi that he, Hu, did not really endorse *baihua*. When Hu Shi asked why, Huang Kan replied:

> If you were practicing what you are preaching, you would not be called 'Hu Shi' [lit. 'adjusting to what,' but also 'where to go'], but you should change your name to 'going where?' Only then it would be right.
>
> 如果你身體力行的話，名字就不叫'胡適'了，而應該改名'往哪裏去'才對呀！[82]

Huang Kan apparently felt that '*wang nali qu*' was the *baihua* version of '*Hu Shi*,' with '*wang nali*' ('where to') being the *baihua* equivalent to the interrogative '*hu*' (for example, 'where') and '*qu*' ('go') the equivalent to '*shi*' ('adjust,' but also 'go to,' as in *shicong* 適從). Obviously, '*wang nali qu*' would have been ridiculous as a name. This joke was apparently wide-spread. Cheng Ke 程克 (no dates), a Japan-educated politician who too was sceptical about ideas later classified as 'New Culture,' would tell this joke again to his family in later years.[83]

The joke was also an allusion to the fact that Hu Shi had created his name himself. According to Jerome B. Grieder, Hu's original name was Hu Hongxin 胡洪騂, although other sources mention as an additional birth name Hu Simi 胡嗣糜. When Hu read T.H.H. Huxley's (1825-1895) *Evolution and Ethics* in the late 1900s, he was so impressed by evolutionist theory that he changed his name (*ming* 名) to *Shi* 適 and his courtesy or style name (*zi* 字) to Shizhi 適之. This was meant as an abbreviation for 適

[81] Li Yuanxiu and Wu Di, *Shijie quanshi*, 41:11012.
[82] Ibid.
[83] 'Taotao Liu, conversation with the author'; 'Taotao Liu, e-mail message to the author'. Cheng Ke was Taotao Liu's grandfather.

之生存 (*shi zhi sheng cun*, 'survival of the fittest,' lit., 'the survival of him who adjusts himself'). He used this name from 1910 onwards.[84]

Other stories had it that the polemics even exceeded verbal bullying and threatened to become violent. Beijing University student Yang Zhensheng remembered that some students carried around little knives, so they could defend their scholarly positions should they run into members of the rival 'faction' on the corridors of Beijing University.[85]

On the other side of the spectrum, there were those who denied the existence of an academic squabble or of 'factions of learning.' Among them was Liu Shipei, who was outraged at the *Public Voice*'s above-mentioned article. Seconded by the National Heritage Society, he published a letter in the school journal *Beijing University Daily*. The letter was addressed to the *Public Voice* and explained that he was far too ill to team up with anyone to fight anyone else. Liu Shipei was indeed ill and he would die on 20 November 1919.[86] The *National Heritage*, Liu Shipei went on, was run only by students and its aim was not to attack *New Tide* or similar magazines.[87]

A similar denier of 'factions' was a student called Wu Ti 伍俶 (1897-1968). Years later, in 1951, Wu Ti claimed that he only participated in the debate on the side of *National Heritage* because he admired his teacher Liu Shipei. He 'relied on Liu' (*yi Liu* 依劉) and did not 'preserve the old' (*shou gu* 守故).[88] However, Wu Ti said this at a time when the group around Hu Shi enjoyed a higher reputation, so this may have been an

[84] Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, 7, 26–27; Wang Dapeng, s.v. 'Hu Shi'. For 'courtesy name' or 'style name' as translation for '*zi*,' see Chao, *Aspects of Chinese Sociolinguistics*, 317.
[85] Cited in Chen Pingyuan, '"Shaonian yiqi" yu "jiaguo qinghuai"', 7.
[86] Chen Qi, *Liu Shipei nianpu changbian*, 357.
[87] Liu Shipei, 'Liu Shipei zhi Gongyanbao han'; Guogu yuekan she, 'Guogu yuekan shi zhi Gongyanbao han'. This is also cited, for example, in Chen Qi, *Liu Shipei nianpu changbian*, 351.
[88] Wu Ti, 'Yi Mengzhen', 83. Wu Ti's essay was published in 1951 in the book *Obituaries of the Late Principal Fu* (*Fu gu xiaozhang aiwan lu* 傅故校長哀輓錄), see Ibid., 85; Guoli Taiwan daxue jinian Fu gu xiaozhang choubei weiyuanhui aiwan lu bianyin xiaozu, *Fu gu xiaozhang aiwan lu*.

excuse. The occasion was, moreover, an obituary of Fu Sinian, so Wu Ti could not very well have insulted Fu Sinian's circle.

To be sure, the stories about Huang Kan's jokes, the students' knives and the 'reliance on Liu' are anecdotal and mostly transmitted as memories decades later. Moreover, they gloss over the fact that only a minority of Beijing University's population was involved in the debate. The authors of *New Youth, New Tide, National Heritage* and so on, were a minority among the students and professors at Beijing University. Only around 16 people participated in the founding meeting of *National Heritage*. The New Tide Society counted barely more than 20 people.[89] But in sum it appears that it was down to individual tastes and dispositions how seriously the debate and the 'factions' were taken.

However, independently of what individuals at Beijing University may have thought, the newspapers' choice to compartmentalise them into rigid 'factions of learning' would become crucial later on. As I show in Chapter Two, this newspaper classification would take on a life of its own during the May Fourth demonstrations. In this way, it would decide over individual fates and careers independently of how seriously these individuals took the discussion.

An Academic Debate

A few months later, the people newspapers called 'New Faction' would be praised as the 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[90] The New Culture Movement and particularly its language programme would enter history as a watershed moment in Chinese history, and as a mission to tear down the boundaries between elite and

[89] 'Ben she jishi lu'; 'Sheyuan' *Xinchao*.
[90] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

'common man' and to popularise education and knowledge.[91] This stands in stark contrast to the newspapers' claim that the ideas of the two 'factions' were irrelevant to the world outside of the ivory tower.

A look at the debate between the two circles confirms the newspapers' impression. The debate was about two forms of language that were equally incomprehensible to the 'common man:' the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu advocated a *baihua* that was full of Western and Japanese loanwords and sentence structures.[92] The group around Liu Shipei and Huang Kan endorsed a reformed *wenyan*. The basis for their arguments was even more sophisticated. The debate revolved around two different understandings of how culture evolved. The idea that *baihua* was the language of the common people would only enter the debate after the May Fourth demonstrations, when local intellectuals co-opted the rhetoric of the 'New Faction' (see Chapter Three).

As Leigh Jenco has shown, this question of evolution was closely tied in with another central theme in this and other debates at the time: how to relate China and the West. Even debates that were 'ostensibly about the character of "Eastern" and "Western" culture,' Jenco wrote, often 'turned crucially on where participants located China in history.'[93] The China-versus-the-West question therefore keeps popping up in my discussion of understandings of evolution. Although a more detailed analysis of this would be interesting, it is not the focus of this chapter.[94] The past-versus-present issue was so crucial in the debate that it is sufficient in this thesis to drive home my point,

[91] This position has been held by Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 178; O.C. Wang, 'My Reflections and Queries on the Question of the Creation of the Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non Chinese', 467–471; Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 79.
[92] This has also been pointed out by Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese*, 217–296; Shi, *The Lure of the Modern*, 71.
[93] Jenco, 'Culture as History', 36.
[94] For an analysis of this issue in the *Critical Review*, see Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 248; Ye Shixiang and Zhang Dongmei, 'Xiandaixing shiye zhong de "guocui pai" he "Xueheng pai"', 3.

namely, that these debates between 'New Faction' and 'Old Faction' were highly academic and abstract.

In the following section, I outline the ideas within the debate of early 1919. As the clashes became most explicit in written form in the student journals *New Tide* and *National Heritage*, I use these as my sources. My focus is particularly on texts by *New Tide* editor Fu Sinian and the *National Heritage* editors Zhang Xuan, Yu Shizhen and Xue Xiangsui. To show that these students endorsed opinions more broadly held in their relevant circles, I also refer to other figures, such as Hu Shi or Liu Shipei.

Shared Concerns and Approaches

The authors of *New Tide* and *National Heritage* exchanged polemics and allegedly even carried around knives to defend their positions. Nevertheless, the differences in their ideas were anything but clear-cut. To be sure, one fairly clear distinguishing feature between *New Tide* and *National Heritage* was that the first advocated *baihua* and the second *wenyan* as written language. However, Zhang Xuan's very straightforward *wenyan* was full of neologisms.[95] It was therefore arguably as far removed from the very complicated *wenyan* of his friend Yu Shizhen, who hardly used any neologisms, as it was from the *baihua* of his opponent Fu Sinian. Fu Sinian's *baihua* was full of classical allusions, and sometimes he even wrote in *wenyan*.[96] The broader reaches of Hu Shi's circle were equally divided with diverging opinions on the introduction of a Romanisation system or Esperanto.[97]

A look at the arguments put forward in the two journals makes their differences seem even more blurred. It has often been stated that New Culture intellectuals were

[95] Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 2A.
[96] Fu Sinian, 'Zenyang zuo baihua wen', 1128; Meng Zhen, 'Qing Liang Yusheng zhi shiji zhi yi san shi liu juan'. Meng Zhen 孟真 was Fu Sinian's courtesy name (*zi*), see Boorman, s.v. Fu Ssu-nien, 43.
[97] Zhou, *Placing the Modern Chinese Vernacular in Transnational Literature*, 35–36; Sang, 'The Divergence and Convergence of China's Written and Spoken Language', 74, 77.

fascinated by evolutionist theory.[98] However, it was *National Heritage* author Zhang Xuan who affirmed that 'the world evolves' (*shijie jinhua* 世界進化),[99] and it was Zhang Xuan and his teacher Liu Shipei who admired the Western evolutionary theorist Herbert Spencer (1820-1903).[100] By making evolutionary narratives, they followed a generally popular mode of argumentation at the time.[101]

Moreover, *National Heritage* writers would be expected to show a concern for the past, but it was Fu Sinian who said that 'the old books must also be read' (*gu shu yi weichang bu ke du* 故書亦未嘗不可讀).[102] It was also Fu Sinian, who debated a new periodization system for history, clearly a concern with the past.[103] It was also he who justified his ideas with a Golden Age theory. For example, Fu Sinian's argument for writing in *baihua*, in his view the vernacular, was that in the Zhou Dynasty people had also written like they spoke.[104] This was not merely a neutral reference to the Zhou Dynasty, but Fu Sinian displayed it as a time when language was ideal.

In other words, the picture was not as clear-cut as the polemics suggested. The articles in *New Tide* and *National Heritage* revolved around the same central concerns: How were past and present related? And what did their relationship mean for academia – its language and scholarly methods – in the present? The historical background was

[98] Pusey, *Lu Xun and Evolution*; Jones, *Developmental Fairy Tales*.
[99] Zhang Xuan, 'Zhongguo wenxue gailiang lun', 4B.
[100] Ibid., 3B; Liu Shipei, 'Lunwen zaji', 711. *New Tide* editor Fu Sinian also claimed to be drawing upon Spencer. See Fu Sinian, 'Duiyu Zhongguo jinri tan zhexue zhe zhi gannian', 1254.
[101] Evolutionary narratives were, for example, made in the Beijing student journal *Commercial Student* or by the Chinese students of the American professor in Beijing Lewis Nathaniel Chase. See Jian Xianqi, 'Meiguo huobi shi tanlüe'; Chen, 'China Now and England in the 19th Century'; Chao, 'China Now and England in the 19th Century'. For more information on Lewis Chase and *Commercial Student*, pp. 208-209 and p. 213 of this thesis.
[102] Fu Sinian, 'Gushu xin ping', 145.
[103] Fu Sinian, 'Zhongguo lishi fenqi zhi yanjiu'.
[104] Fu Sinian, 'Zenyang zuo baihua wen', 1070, 1123.

obviously the abolition of the civil service examinations in 1905, which made it necessary to define the tasks of this new construct of a 'scholar' (*xuezhe* 學者).[105]

New Tide and *National Heritage* agreed that the scholar was rooted in both past and present: He[106] had to study the past, but he also had to prescribe the current and future criteria for the culture (in this conversation mostly academia and language, but also what Raymond Williams has called 'the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity').[107] They agreed that, in doing all this, a scholar had to draw upon one framework: evolutionism, a theory which they all felt was inspired by people like Herbert Spencer.[108] Finally, they even shared the same vocabulary to describe their theories: They wanted culture to be 'alive' (*sheng* 生, *huopo* 活潑), rather than 'dead' (*si* 死).[109] And they all referred to the culture they had inherited from old times (the 'national heritage' [*guogu* 國故]) as 'material' (*cailiao* 材料, or *cai* 材).[110]

In sum, the authors of *New Tide* and *National Heritage* shared central concerns, approaches and rhetoric. Their disagreement arose out of highly nuanced and academic differences in the way each side understood the workings of evolutionary development, and which lessons they derived from these patterns of change.

---

[105] Xue Xiangsui, 'Du gushu fa ju ou', 2B; Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 2A. On the social group of the 'scholar,' see also Harrison, *The Making of the Republican Citizen*, 120. On role the end of the civil-service examinations played, see p. 37 of this thesis.

[106] New Culture advocates supported women's rights. However, they probably envisioned male scholars, since women were not yet admitted to Beijing University. See Cai Yuanpei, 'Da Lin Qinnan shu', 97. When a female professor was employed in 1920, many New Culture advocates remained sceptical. See Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 75.

[107] Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 2B, 3A; Fu Sinian, 'Xiju gailiang gemian guan'; Williams, *Keywords*, 90. For a definition of 'culture' at the time, see pp. 34-36 of this thesis.

[108] Zhang Xuan, 'Zhongguo wenxue gailiang lun', 3B; Fu Sinian, 'Duiyu Zhongguo jinri tan zhexue zhe zhi gannian', 1254.

[109] For '*sheng*,' see Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 2A. For '*huopo*,' see Fu Sinian, 'Wen yan heyi caoyi', 1066. For '*si*,' see Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 2A; Fu Sinian, 'Wen yan heyi caoyi', 1065.

[110] For '*cailiao*,' see Fu Sinian, 'Mao Zishui "Guogu he kexue de jingshen" shiyu', 1258. For '*cai*,' see Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 2B.

Conflict: The Lessons of Evolution

The story Fu Sinian and Zhang Xuan told about the evolution of language had some things in common: Language had been good in the Zhou Dynasty, because written and spoken language had been identical, but things had gone wrong in the Han Dynasty. What had happened? According to Fu Sinian, written language had stagnated. According to Zhang Xuan, it had evolved into the wrong direction.[111]

For Fu Sinian, language in the Zhou Dynasty had been perfect because people wrote like they spoke, and because they did both in the language of their times. The downfall had come in the Han Dynasty, when Sima Xiangru 司馬相如 (179-127 BC) and Yang Xiong 扬雄 (53 BC-18 AD), who were keen on writing but bad at speaking, had started again to write in the language of the Zhou Dynasty.[112] In other words, spoken language continued evolving in keeping with the trend of times, whereas written language was virtually stuck in the Zhou Dynasty until the present day. In short, in China 'the living were being given the language of the dead to use' (*siren de hua gei huoren yong* 死人的話給活人用).[113]

Fu Sinian saw this problem of linguistic stagnation in broader terms and applied a similar critique to other aspects of Chinese culture. In the context of drama, Fu Sinian said, cultural evolution in China was 'as if an ape had evolved into a hairy man, stopped there, and could never change into man' (*hao bi houzi, jinhua dao maoren, jiu ting zhu le, zai ye bu neng bian ren le* 好比猴子，進化到毛人，就停住了，再也不能變人

[111] Fu Sinian, 'Zenyang zuo baihua wen', 1123; Zhang Xuan, 'Wen yan heyi pingyi', 1B–2A.
[112] Fu Sinian, 'Zenyang zuo baihua wen', 1123.
[113] Fu Sinian, 'Hanyu gaiyong pinyin wenzi de chubu tan', 1138.

了).[114] It was now the responsibility of a scholar to make sure that Chinese culture would stop stagnating and get back in touch with the times.

If Fu Sinian saw the virtue of the Zhou as people who wrote as they spoke, Zhang Xuan saw it in the exact opposite way. In his view, language was perfect in the Zhou Dynasty because people spoke like they wrote.[115] The downfall came in the Han Dynasty, when Han Gaozu 漢高祖 (256-195BC), an uneducated 'managing clerk' (*tingzhang* 亭長) became emperor, and people started writing like they spoke, that is, in mutually unintelligible dialects, which changed from generation to generation. As a result, a scholar in the north could not understand a scholar in the south, and a scholar in the Ming Dynasty could not understand a scholar from the Han Dynasty. Zhang Xuan therefore concluded that 'when the vernacular was introduced into written texts, they became quite difficult to understand.' (*Suyu ru wen. Jie zhi jiao nan.* 俗語入文。解之較難。)[116] Therefore the *baihua* project, he felt, was as wrong a development as were tendencies to use ever more complicated characters in *wenyan*, which nobody understood either.[117]

The position of Liu Shipei's circle was quite popular at the time. It was held outside the Beijing University circle, for example, by Zhang Shizhao 章士釗 (1881-1973), by foreigners and implicitly by commercial newspapers such as the *Shanghai News*, where articles in *wenyan* could be found until it ceased publication in 1949.[118] In other words,

[114] Fu Sinian, 'Xiju gailiang gemian guan', 1078.
[115] Zhang Xuan, 'Wen yan heyi pingyi', 1B.
[116] Ibid., 2B.
[117] Zhang Xuan, 'Zhongguo wenxue gailiang lun', 4B.
[118] On Zhang Shizhao, see Jenco, 'The Problem of the Culturally Unprecedented', 6. On the foreigners, see Sang, 'The Divergence and Convergence of China's Written and Spoken Language', 87. On the *Shanghai News*, see *Shenbao 1872-1949*.

evolution warned Fu Sinian against cultural stagnation, and it warned Zhang Xuan against wrong turns in cultural development.

Fu Sinian: Distinct Time Periods

For Fu Sinian, evolution meant a succession of individual time periods, in which each new time period was different from its predecessor. They were like a 'child [that] is born from its mother, [but] should develop distinct features of its own' (*zi sheng yu mu zi ying ju qi tezhi* 子生於母自應具其特質).[119] Another *New Tide* author, Mao Zishui 毛子水 (1893-1988), also used this metaphor.[120] That is, evolution showed Fu Sinian that each time period built upon its predecessor. It also showed him how different the old and the new were – an idea that, according to Leigh Jenco and Luo Zhitian, many New Culture advocates shared.[121]

In each time period, Fu Sinian held, 'the times forced' (*shishi ... po* 時勢 …… 迫) 'politics, society, customs, scholarship … and literature' (*zhengzhi shehui fengsu xueshu ... wenxue* 政治社會風俗學術……文學) to 'change' (*bianqian* 變遷)[122] and to 'respond to the demand of the times' (*ying shishi de yaoqiu* 應時勢的要求).[123] For instance, in the Zhou Dynasty, times were ripe for the literature of the Zhou; in the Ming Dynasty, times were ripe for the literature of the Ming; and today, times were ripe for the literature of today.[124] This meant that, in each new era, it was a scholar's task to grasp the 'demands of the times' and to implement them in culture. Consequently, Fu Sinian kept asking about methods of doing so: How should we write *baihua* texts?[125]

[119] Fu Sinian, 'Wenxue gexin shenyi', 1053.
[120] Mao Zishui, '"Bo Xinchao 'guogu he kexue de jingshen' pian" dingwu', 2006, 464.
[121] Jenco, 'The Problem of the Culturally Unprecedented', 15–16; Luo Zhitian, 'Xin wenhua yundong shiqi guanyu zhengli guogu de sixiang lunzheng', 230.
[122] Fu Sinian, 'Wenxue gexin shenyi', 1052–53.
[123] Fu Sinian, 'Duiyu Zhongguo jinri tan zhexue zhe zhi gannian', 1253.
[124] Fu Sinian, 'Wenxue gexin shenyi', 1053.
[125] Fu Sinian, 'Zenyang zuo baihua wen'.

How should we periodize history?[126] As a result, *New Tide* was full of theoretical discussions of all those new methods and theories, among them logic, science or the language of present times. Articles exclusively dedicated to actual research on China's past were rare. In short, the *New Tide* writers were very much concerned with exploring and expounding the theories and paradigms of this new age they lived in.

Where did these paradigms come from? From our perspective, they were obviously inspired from the West. But Fu Sinian believed they sprung more broadly from the trend of (global) times. Pragmatism, he claimed, had not been created by all those pragmatists like William James (1842-1910) and John Dewey (1859-1952). Instead, he said:

> In evolving to the present, the Western world of thought has undergone the kind of historical [process] in which it has been dominated by the present trends of the times. And [therefore it is] completely natural [that it] has produced this philosophy.
>
> 西洋思想界進化到現在，經那樣的歷史，受現代時勢的支配，自然而然有這主義產生。[127]

In other words, they had evolved in exact keeping with his 'mother-and-child' model of evolution. They needed the past as predecessors. But then they also developed a very unique quality – like a child does after it is born from the mother – which was directly crafted by the trend of the times.

What happened to culture when a new time had begun? The past culture was 'dead,' and the new one 'alive.' Fu Sinian explained that *wenyan* had in the past felt 'spontaneous' or 'natural' (*ziran* 自然).[128] But today it was 'outdated' (*guowang* 過往) and had become 'already stale and dead' (*yi cheng chen si* 已成陳死). *Baihua*, however,

[126] Fu Sinian, 'Zhongguo lishi fenqi zhi yanjiu'.
[127] Fu Sinian, 'Yi shu ganyan', 1169. I would like to thank Laura Newby for her comments on my translation.
[128] Fu Sinian, 'Wen yan heyi caoyi', 1070.

was ‘alive and full of *joie de vivre*’ (*huopo rao you shengqu* 活潑饒有生趣) because it ‘suited today’s world’ (*qiehe jinshi* 切合今世).[129] As Wang Guanghe has pointed out, these labels were also inspired by evolutionist theory.[130] In other words, evolution taught Fu Sinian that each time should have its own, ‘lively’ culture, and that the culture of a past time period was ‘dead’ and should be left behind.

What then happened to the culture of the past in the present? Fu Sinian had devised a special framework to reintegrate the past into the scholarship of the present, without making Chinese culture stagnate. His secret lay in this sentence:

> There are two ways to study our national heritage. First, to tidy up our national heritage. Secondly, to emulate our national heritage. I most admire the first way: Take the Chinese past scholarship, government, society and so forth as the material, to discover some systematic things – this will not only benefit the Chinese academic world, but some of it may also contribute to ‘global’ science.
>
> 研究國故有兩種手段，一，整理國故；二，追摹國故。由前一說，是我所最佩服的：把中國以往的學術，政治，社會等等做材料，研究出些有系統的事物來，不特有益於中國學問界，或者有補於《世界的》科學。[131]

The past culture was reintegrated into the present as source ‘material’ for study. This implied that Fu Sinian rejected the prescriptive functions of the past, an idea also expressed by Mao Zishui:[132] The past should not determine the way of presenting arguments, of writing texts and of behaviour in the present. However, calling the past ‘material’ did not only mean reducing it, as Laurence Schneider has suggested for Mao Zishui.[133] It also meant preserving it as ‘material’ for academic study. In Fu Sinian’s

[129] Ibid., 1065–66.
[130] Wang Guanghe, ‘Xifang yingxiang yu Hu Shi lun wenyan zhi “si” yu baihua zhi “huo”’, 263.
[131] Fu Sinian, ‘Mao Zishui “Guogu he kexue de jingshen” shiyu’, 1258.
[132] Mao Zishui, ‘“Bo Xinchao ‘guogu he kexue de jingshen’ pian” dingwu’, 2006, 465.
[133] Schneider, *Ku Chieh-Kang and China’s New History*, 29.

words, the study 'material' should be 'tidied up' (*tiaoli* 條理) or 'controlled' (*zaiyao* 宰要) with the paradigms that suited the current time period.[134]

Judging from how Fu Sinian integrated the study 'material' and contemporary theories, this seemed to mean that a scholar should examine how these up-to-date theories like logic or science had developed in China, or how Chinese culture had, or had not, responded to the 'demands of the times' over the course of its history. In this way, it was possible to determine China's current stage in evolution. The story usually read that evolution had started out well in the beginning, but then come to a point of stagnation. Language, for instance, had stagnated in the Han Dynasty. Drama had stagnated in the Yuan Dynasty and was now stuck at the 'hairy man' (*maoren* 毛人)-stage.[135] Similar things had happened to the notions of 'doubting antiquity' (*yigu* 疑古) or, according to Hu Shi, logic.[136]

This story of evolutionary stagnation sounds quite drastic. But it was, in fact, an alternative to an even more hopeless story, which was told in the West: the story that, 'in its innate nature, Eastern scholarship is unable to fully develop' (*Dongfang xueshu, zi qi taixing shang yan zhi, bu neng chongliang fazhan* 東方學術，自其胎性上言之，不能充量發展).[137] This narrative had been told by the Marquis de Condorcet (1743-1794), Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803), Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) or John Stuart Mill (1806-1873).[138] It had been reasserted in the context of evolutionary history,[139] and Fu Sinian was well

[134] Fu Sinian, 'Gushu xin ping', 145. As Vera Schwarcz has argued, Gu Jiegang held a similar opinion. See Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 126.
[135] Fu Sinian, 'Xiju gailiang gemian guan', 1078.
[136] On 'doubting antiquity,' see Meng Zhen, 'Qing Liang Yusheng zhi shiji zhi yi san shi liu juan', 147. On logic in China, see Hu, 'The Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China'.
[137] Fu Sinian, 'Zhongguo xueshu sixiang jie zhi jiben wumiu', 1213–14.
[138] Cohen, *Discovering History in China*, 59.
[139] Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation*, 22.

aware of it, since he cited a statement of this sort from the English journal *The Nineteenth Century and After*.[140]

What he said now was that China had indeed fallen back in evolution, but not because it was unable to develop, but just because evolution had temporarily stopped in China. Once a scholar had identified China's evolutionary stage and knew the current 'trends of the times,' he could resume this interrupted process of evolution, and China could get back in line with evolution again. This was what Fu Sinian called the 'first duty' (*di yi zeren* 第一責任) of *New Tide* in his manifesto to the magazine.[141] In sum, Fu Sinian and his circle learnt from cultural evolution that history was a succession of individual time periods. In each new time, a scholar had to explore the theories that suited the age and analyse their development in the past culture.

Zhang Xuan: The Tracks of Evolution

'Past and Present Are of One Tally'

If Fu Sinian was worried about evolutionary stagnation, the worst fear of *National Heritage* author Zhang Xuan was that culture could develop into the wrong direction. Through studying the past, a scholar had to make sure that this did not happen. This idea was based on a notion another *National Heritage* writer, Yu Shizhen, expressed most clearly when he said: 'Past and present are of one tally. They do of course not follow separated tracks.' (*Jin gu yi kui. Gu wu shu zhe.* 今古一揆。固無殊轍。)[142]

To be sure, Yu Shizhen did not specifically mention the word 'evolution.' Instead, he talked more broadly about patterns of change and the relationship between past and

[140] Fu Sinian, 'Zhongguo xueshu sixiang jie zhi jiben wumiu', 1213–14. Fu Sinian was not the only Chinese intellectual to engage with this accusation of stagnation. As Leigh Jenco has shown, Chen Duxiu also negotiated it. Jenco, 'Culture as History', 46.
[141] Fu Sinian, 'Xinchao fakan zhiqu shu', 1398.
[142] Yu Shizhen, 'Gu jin xueshu goutong siyi', 2B.

present. However, since his descriptions fit so well with his co-editor Zhang Xuan's argument, it makes sense to assume that they were exploring the same evolutionary discourse.[143] Past, present and future, Yu Shizhen held, followed the same patterns of development. So if evolution or the patterns of change was, for Fu Sinian, a succession of separate time periods, it was, for the *National Heritage* writers, a continuum of eternal 'trails.' If the patterns of change showed Fu Sinian how different past and present were, they showed the *National Heritage* writers the ways in which past and present were connected. It showed them the 'joints' or 'rhythm' (*jiezu* 節族) that linked the old and the new.[144]

This implied, Yu Shizhen went on, that 'if we try to understand [lit. 'strive for'] the present on the basis of the old, we will understand the system of the present [lit. the present will have a system].' (*Yu gu qiu jin. Ze jin si you tong*. 於古求今。則今斯有統。) Significantly, this also worked the other way around: 'If we want to try and preserve the old, we must comprehend the present.' (*Yu tu shou gu. Bi wu tong jin.* 欲圖守古。必務通今。)[145] Finally, if the knowledge of past and present was brought together, both past and future could be comprehended. Yu Shizhen wrote:

> If the subtle words have been lost, and if this obscures the earlier evidence, then you must sum up all instructions and link things together from past and present. And then you will facilitate the future and apprehend the past, so that things will become obvious.
>
> 微言絕義。昧于前徵。則綜其訓祠。貫其終始。援後稔前。俾即昭顯。[146]

[143] As mentioned above, Zhang Xuan was explicitly talking about 'evolution' (*jinhua* 進化). See, for example, Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 3A; Zhang Xuan, 'Zhongguo wenxue gailiang lun', 4B.
[144] Yu Shizhen, 'Gu jin xueshu goutong siyi', 1B.
[145] Ibid., 2B.
[146] Ibid., 1B. I translate 祠 as 辭, following Xu Zhongshu, s.v. 'Ci'. I would also like to thank Liu Qian for her help with this translation.

According to Zhang Xuan, for example, historical phonology could enable a scholar to uncover a 'general law of pronunciation change' (*shengyin bianhua zhi tongli* 聲音變化之通例). Since past, present and future all followed the same 'tracks,' it was possible to extrapolate and predict 'how the pronunciation of the future should actually be' (*jianglai zhi shengyin jiu ying ruhe* 將來之聲音究應如何).[147]

Zhang Xuan made this statement in an article that argued against Mao Zishui's *New Tide* article 'The National Heritage and the Scientific Spirit' (*Guogu he kexue de jingshen* 國故和科學的精神). Hu Shi and Fu Sinian would get involved in the debate by adding comments to Mao Zishui's article, as well as to Mao's counter-article to Zhang Xuan's critique.[148] The idea that the future could be anticipated through studying the past was a point where Hu Shi protested in his contribution to the debate. It was impossible, he claimed, to deduce 'future pronunciations' (*jianglai zhi shengyin* 將來之聲音) from the study of historical pronunciation.[149] The *New Tide* authors did indeed not support the idea that the 'trend of the times' followed any specific patterns. When it came to the future, Mao Zishui held, one could only 'blindly guess' (*xia cai* 瞎猜) it.[150]

Practical Implications for National Heritage

Their understanding of the way past and present were related had implications for what *National Heritage* writers actually did in their magazine. *New Tide* was full of theory

[147] Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 3A.
[148] Mao Zishui published his 'The National Heritage and the Scientific Spirit' in May 1919, and Zhang Xuan's article came out later in the same month. As *New Tide* was not published for a few months after the May Fourth demonstrations, Mao Zishui had to wait with this counter-article until the journal was resumed on 30 October 1919. Fu Sinian had added a comment to Mao's first article, Hu Shi attached his essay to the October article. See Mao Zishui, 'Guogu he kexue de jingshen', 1 May 1919; Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian'; Mao Zishui, '"Bo Xinchao 'guogu he kexue de jingshen' pian" dingwu', 30 October 1919; Hu Shi, 'Lun guogu xue'; Fu Sinian, 'Mao Zishui "Guogu he kexue de jingshen" shiyu'. On *New Tide* stopping publication after May Fourth, see Peng Peng, 'Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong', 1994, 256.
[149] Hu Shi, 'Lun guogu xue', 286.
[150] Mao Zishui, '"Bo Xinchao 'guogu he kexue de jingshen' pian" dingwu', 2006, 469.

discussions in an attempt to lay out the paradigms of the new era. Many articles in *National Heritage*, however, contained actual, often *kaozheng*-style, research on old texts, with the aim to uncover the 'tracks' of change.[151] Only two or three articles per issue explicitly discussed theoretical issues.

Zhang Xuan, moreover, found a rather different way to incorporate 'new,' Western concepts, such as causality, into his study of the past. As I have shown above, when Fu Sinian and Hu Shi deployed these new Western concepts, like 'logic,' on China's past, they asked when the development of these notions had stopped in China. Zhang Xuan did not use the new notions to show the limits of Chinese development, but to illustrate China's past more clearly. This was quite in keeping with Yu Shizhen's aforementioned motto that past, present and future could be better understood if they were brought together.[152]

One example would be Zhang Xuan's article 'New Explanations of the *Mozi'* (*Mozi jing shuo xin jie* 墨子經說新解).[153] The text looks like an old-style commentary. It starts with a citation from the *Mozi*, followed by Zhang Xuan's explanation. Part of this explanation is the 'new' concept of 'causality.'

> The *gu* [reason/cause] of something is what must happen before it will come about. [This is a citation from the *Mozi*, Canon I]
>
> 'Minor *gu*:' having this, it will not necessarily be so; lacking this, necessarily it will not be so. It is a part, like having a starting point. 'Major *gu*:' having this, it will necessarily [be so]; lacking [this, necessarily it will not] be so. Like the appearing bringing about the seeing. [This is a citation from the *Mozi*, Exposition of Canon I.]
>
> This paragraph talks about the *yin guo lü* – the law of causality. In it, as for the relationship between *yin*, cause, and *guo* [effect], *gu* [cause/ reason] is the same

[151] Xue Xiangsui, for example, reconstructed the original pronunciation of the ancient books. See Xue Xiangsui, 'Du gushu fa ju ou', 2B.
[152] Yu Shizhen, 'Gu jin xueshu goutong siyi', 1B.
[153] Zhang Xuan, 'Mozi jing shuo xin jie: xu'.

as *yin* [cause/ reason]. What comes about is the *guo* [effect]. What it must get before it will come about is the *yin* [cause].[154] [Zhang Xuan's commentary]

故所得而後成也。

故。小故。有之不必然。無之不必然。體也若有端。大故，有之必然無之必不然，若見之成見也。[155] [The highlighting is adopted from Zhang Xuan's original text.]

此條迺言因果律 The low [sic] of causolity [sic]. 中因 Cause 與果之關係者。故即因也。所成者為果。所得而後成者為因。[156]

Zhang Xuan did not, like Fu Sinian, ask how 'causality' had not developed in China. He asked how the notion of 'causality' helped him to understand the *Mozi* better.

Creating the Present and Future

Knowledge of the present could help understanding the past better, and a grasp of the past could be used to predict the future. But the past had an even more important role. According to Zhang Xuan, knowledge of the past could enable a scholar to *create* a good present and future. As I have shown above, Zhang Xuan believed that culture could develop into the wrong direction. The past helped him to see which turns were wrong and which were right. Not only was the introduction of the vernacular into written language such a wrong development. Also the 'general law of pronunciation change' was sometimes broken. This law, which was derived from both the Chinese and the Western past, read that over time pronunciation 'became less demanding' (*bian wei yong li shao* 變而為用力少). However, it had happened that this law was broken

[154] The translation of these two paragraphs is reworked from Graham, *Later Mohist Logic, Ethics, and Science*, 263.
[155] '*Ran*' and '*zhi bu bi*' were lost in transcription, see Graham, 'Jing shang'.
[156] Zhang Xuan, 'Mozi jing shuo xin jie: xu', 1B.

and pronunciation became more difficult. This usually occurred, Zhang Xuan had learnt from the past, when foreign words were introduced into a language.[157]

Zhang Xuan himself used numerous loanwords, to be sure. But Western loanwords and sentence constructions were much more frequent in his rivals' *baihua* texts. Zhang Xuan's logic must have read that *baihua* advocates could not identify this wrong development because they had failed to learn the, in his view, correct lessons from the past. As a result, *baihua* advocates were about to push China into the wrong direction again. They had indeed killed off the past. To avoid this mistake, a scholar had to use the past as a reference to identify good and bad turns in evolution, to abandon the bad ones, and to create a new culture in accordance with the 'true' laws of change. It was in this way that Zhang Xuan explained the following statement:

> From the viewpoint of a scholar, the 'European culture' of today and [our] 'national heritage' only give us [material for] reference, they provide us with material for transformation.
>
> 今日之所謂歐化者，與所謂國故者。在學者視之。不過供吾人參攷。備吾人改造之材。[158]

The past should be the 'material for reference' in that it could show a scholar the good and bad turns in evolution. Then a scholar should 'transform' his knowledge of the patterns of change into creating the present and future culture. The past was not study 'material' for Zhang Xuan, but, in Lu Yi's words, 'material' for 're-creating civilisation' ('*zaizao wenming' de 'cai'* '再造文明'的'料').[159]

In his refutation of Mao Zishui's article, Zhang Xuan therefore took issue with the idea of 'tidying up [the past] as material for the history of scholarship' (*zhengli zhi shi wei*

[157] Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 3A.
[158] Ibid., 2B. '*Ouhua*' literally means 'Europeanisation.' However, I agree with Axel Schneider that Zhang Xuan used '*ouhua*' in the sense of 'European education' (Europäische Bildung). Therefore I choose the translation 'European culture,' instead of 'Europeanisation.' See Schneider, *Wahrheit und Geschichte*, 151.
[159] Lu Yi, '"Guogu" yu "Xinchao" zhi zheng shuping', 42.

xueshu shi zhi cailiao 整理之使為學術史之材料). If a scholar simply 'tidied it up' and 'made stale lists of stale and dead people' (*wei chen si ren zhi chen lie* 為陳死人之陳列), without learning any lessons for the present, the past could not teach anything about the present and its potential was therefore wasted. 'Then,' Zhang Xuan said, 'I believe, it will already be dead' (*ze xin hu qi qie si yi* 則信乎其且死矣). But if a scholar 'inferred [knowledge] from what he already knew and sought what he did not yet know' (*tui yi zhi er qiu wei zhi* 推已知而求未知), that is, if he learnt something from the past about the present, the past would be relevant again in the present. It would be alive again. For Fu Sinian, 'dead' and 'alive' was a matter of times. For Zhang Xuan, it was a matter of 'how scholars study it [the past]' (*zhi zhi zhe zhi he ru* 治之者之何如).[160]

This means that the terms 'material,' 'alive' and 'dead' did not show something Fu Sinian and Zhang Xuan had in common, but revealed the different ways in which they perceived the relationship between past and present. For Zhang Xuan, past and present were connected, which was why a scholar had to create the present out of the 'references' the past had given him. For example, he had to make sure that language was stable over time, so scholars in the Zhou, the Han, the Republican Period and in the future could understand each other and maintain the knowledge about the eternal evolutionary 'trails.' For Fu Sinian, evolution indicated that past and present were fundamentally different, and that a scholar had to create a new culture in each time period, while reducing the past culture to study 'material.' For example, a scholar could study the language of the past, but he still had to create a very distinct language for his own day and age.

[160] Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 2A.

In other words, when students threatened to attack each other with knives and Huang Kan made his insensitive jokes, they were negotiating these highly theoretical intricacies at the core of two forms of language (Westernised *baihua* versus *wenyan*) that were incomprehensible to anyone who was not highly educated. They agreed upon a theoretical framework, general goals and even the vocabularies. But the nuanced differences in the way they defined the content of these things led them to a fierce and polemical debate. In short, the circle of people who would half a year later be constructed into the, as New Culture advocates would say, 'centre of the New Culture Movement'[161] was in early 1919 embroiled in an ivory-tower debate.

Lin Shu and the End of the 'New Faction'

Why did newspapers like the *Public Voice* and the *Shanghai News* cover this academic nitpicking at all? As explained above, Beijing University was prestigious enough for newspapers to report on it on occasion. However, the debates between Hu Shi's and Liu Shipei's circles mostly came into the public view when the 'New Faction' was attacked in the press by the prominent translator-scholar Lin Shu. Lin Shu's intervention also led the *Shanghai News* to conclude in April 1919 that the 'New Faction' had lost the debate and had been 'elbowed out' of Beijing University.[162]

[161] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

[162] Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing'. The journalist Xin Wei referred to Beijing University as 'our Beijing University' (*wo Beijing daxue* 我北京大學). This could, of course, indicate that he was affiliated with Beijing University. However, Xin Wei seemed to be the *Shanghai News*' Tokyo correspondent. A search for 'Xin Wei' in the database *Shenbao 1872-1949* indicates that he regularly published in the column 'Letters from Tokyo' (*Dongjin tongxin* 東京通信). Moreover, all the other '*wo*' (我) in the article referred to 'China,' in contrast to 'Japan,' for example, 'our new intellectual tide' (*wo xin sixiang* 我新思想), 'our country' (*wo guo* 我國), 'our special envoy' (*wo teshi* 我特使). I therefore do not think that the 'our' in 'our Beijing University' necessarily means that Xin Wei was an alumnus of Beijing University.

About Lin Shu

Lin Shu taught at Beijing University until 1913, when he was dismissed together with the Tongcheng Scholars.[163] He then found employment at Zhengzhi Middle School (*Zhengzhi zhongxue tang* 正志中學堂).[164] Nevertheless, he was still a very renowned intellectual, famous mostly for his translation of Western works, such as *Oliver Twist* and *The Lady of the Camellias* in the early 20th century.[165] From 1916 to 1918, he also engaged in activities such as giving a distance-learning course on Chinese literature for the publisher Zhonghua Editing and Publishing House (*Zhonghua bianyi she* 中華編譯社).[166]

Lin Shu is often counted as a Tongcheng Scholar, although as a native of Fujian he was not technically one of them. After the Tongcheng Scholars were *en masse* replaced with Taiyan Disciples at Beijing University in the early 1910s, newspaper stories and later memories of people stated that they distinctly disliked these Taiyan Disciples. It certainly did not help that many Taiyan Disciples felt that the scholarship of the Tongcheng men 'did not have a basis' (*wu suo gen* 無所根).[167] However, when people like Chen Duxiu or Hu Shi were appointed to Beijing University, the Tongcheng Scholars were said to have followed the popular 'enemy-of-my-enemy' logic and teamed up with the circle around Taiyan Disciple Liu Shipei. As Beijing University student Yang Zhensheng remembered in 1954:

---

[163] Boorman, s.v. Lin Shu, 383; Li Fan, 'Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue', 111; Lin, *Peking University: Chinese Scholarship and Intellectuals, 1898-1937*, 45; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 170–71.
[164] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 220.
[165] Boorman, s.v. Lin Shu, 384; 'Yingguo zhuming xiaoshuo shecheng yingju', *Shenbao*, 16 December 1922; '"Cha hua nü" xiaoshuo zhi xin dianying', *Shenbao*, 26 October 1923; Ting Hao, '"Gu er ku yu" zhi pinglun', *Shenbao*, 10 September 1924.
[166] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 173–185.
[167] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'. Similarly also in Lin, *Peking University*, 46; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 223.

> Most teachers at the time stood on the side of the Old [Faction], particularly those at the department for Chinese literature. Before the New Culture Movement, Mr Huang Kan was teaching parallel prose [a style favoured by the Taiyan Disciples] and railed against prose [favoured by the Tongcheng Scholars] in his classes. Mr Yao Yongpu [a Tongcheng Scholar] was teaching prose and railed against parallel prose in his classes. In the time of the new-literature movement, they did not rail against each other, but all railed against *baihua* literature in their classes.'
>
> 當時大多數的先生是站在舊的一面,尤其在中文系。在新文學運動前,黃侃先生教駢文,上班就罵散文; 姚永樸老先生教散文,上班就罵駢文。新文學運動時,他們彼此不罵了,上班都罵白話文。[168]

Lin Shu must have undergone the same transformation, since from February 1919 onwards he took position in the polemics that were being exchanged at Beijing University and started waging a verbal war against the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu.

'Scholar Jing'

Lin Shu's first action was a short story that attacked the *baihua* advocates. It was called 'Scholar Jing' (*Jing sheng* 荊生), and Lin published it in the newspaper *New Shanghai News* (*Xin Shenbao* 新申報) on 17 and 18 February 1919.[169] The story read like this: Scholar Jing was a very strong warrior and a 'giant' (*weizhangfu* 偉丈夫). One day he travelled to the capital and lodged in the 'Pavilion of Happiness and Carefreeness' (*Taoran ting* 陶然亭). Soon three new guests arrived: Tian Qimei 田其美, Jin Xinyi 金心異 and Di Mo 狄莫. The three newcomers sat down together and started blaming Confucian morality and 'written language' (*wenzi* 文字) for China's weakness. One of them, Scholar Jin, even admitted that he promoted *baihua* because he could not read

[168] Yang Zhensheng, 'Huiyi wu si', 53. The *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* reported the same phenomenon, see Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang', 3.

[169] Lin Shu, 'Jing sheng', 213. The *New Shanghai News* had been founded by a former manager of the *Shanghai News*, Xi Zipei 席子佩 (ca. 1851-192?) in Shanghai in November 1916. See Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Xin Shen bao'. The translation of 'Jing sheng' as 'Scholar Jing' is taken from Wang, 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937', 466.

wenyan, and, as his name (*jin* 金, 'gold') indicated, he was eager to make money. At some point, this became too much for Scholar Jing. He flung himself at the three friends and beat them up. Hereupon they scampered off.[170]

'Nightmare'

Soon afterwards, Lin Shu published a second short story, 'Nightmare' (*Yaomeng* 妖夢), from 18 to 22 March 1919 in the *New Shanghai News*.[171] In this story, a student dropped by at Lin Shu's house and said that one of his 'dreams was inauspicious' (*meng buxiang* 夢不祥) and that he was now worried that it might indicate his death. In his dream, he was invited to visit the 'netherworld' (*yincao* 陰曹), because something strange was going on there. 'Madmen' (*kuangren* 狂人) had established a school called 'Baihua Academy' (*Baihua xuetang* 白話學堂). On its gate, it was written:

> The vernacular is superhuman, and the *Dream of the Red Chamber* and *Water Margin* incredible; / The classical language is disgusting, and who anyway are Ouyang Xiu [1007-1072] and Han Yu?
>
> 白話通神，《紅樓夢》，《水滸》，真不可思議；古文討厭，歐陽修，韓愈，是甚麼東西。[172]

Inside the building were some other slogans, like the 'Kill Confucius Hall' (*Bi Kong tang* 斃孔堂), which made the student sweat. He also had the chance to meet the leaders of the Academy, Tian Heng 田恒, Tai Ershi 泰二世 and the principal, Yuan Xu 元緒. They all said things like *wenyan* 'is a dead language' (*si wenzi* 死文字). On his way out, the student saw how a demon attacked the academy and ate everybody

[170] Lin Shu, 'Jing sheng', 212–13. For a summary of this short story and the translation of '*wei zhangfu*' as 'giant,' see Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 217.
[171] Lin Shu, 'Yaomeng'.
[172] Ibid., 214. Translation taken from Lin, 'Nightmare', 147.

there.[173] Lin Shu closed with a commentary that unfortunately there was no such demon in real life, who would be eating up the advocates of *baihua*.[174]

Reactions from the 'New Faction'

The two short stories were not only regarded as a general criticism of people who endorsed *baihua* or criticised Confucian morality. Instead, they were quickly interpreted as personal attacks. The three friends from 'Scholar Jing' designated Chen Duxiu ('Tian Qimei, a man from Anhui,' *Tian Qimei, Wanren* 田其美，皖人), Qian Xuantong ('Jin Xinyi, from Zhejiang,' *Xin Xinyi, Zheren* 金心異，浙人), and Hu Shi ('Di Mo, recently returned from the States,' *Di Mo, xin gui zi Meizhou* 狄莫，新歸自美洲).[175] Yuan Xu in the 'Nightmare' referred to Cai Yuanpei, *Tian Heng* was Chen Duxiu and *Tai Ershi* was Hu Shi.[176]

According to Hill, 'Nightmare's' attack on Cai Yuanpei was particularly untimely. Cai Yuanpei had just agreed to introduce a publisher to Lin Shu. The idea was that Lin Shu might then write an introduction to a book on the Ming loyalist Liu Yingqiu 劉應秋 (1547-1620), which the publisher was preparing. Unfortunately, Lin Shu only received Cai Yuanpei's introduction letter after he had sent the 'Nightmare' off to the *New*

---

[173] Lin Shu, 'Yaomeng', 214–15. All translations in this summary of 'Nightmare' are taken from Timothy Wong's translation in Lin, 'Nightmare', 147–48.
[174] Lin, 'Nightmare', 150. Michael Gibbs Hill has given a similar summary. See Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 218.
[175] Lin Shu, 'Jing sheng', 212.
[176] These associations are widely cited in scholarly literature. See, for example, Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 226; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 217–18. However, it is difficult to find out how they worked. It is reasonable to conclude that the principal of the Baihua Academy, Yuanxu, referred to Cai Yuanpei, and that the student who had just returned from the US was Hu Shi. Chen Duxiu was also from Anhui and Qian Xuantong from Zhejiang. See Chow, s.v. Chen Duxiu; Wei Qiao, s.v. 'Qian Xuantong'. Michael Gibbs Hill, moreover, has argued that the fictional names were 'puns' on the real person's names. See Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 217. It is possible that this worked like this: Qian Xuantong's fictional counterpart was Jin Xinyi. '*Qian*' and '*jin*,' however, both mean 'money.'
The associations were created very quickly. The identification of the three 'Nightmare' characters, for example, is cited from an article in the *Beijing New Post*, which was reprinted in the *Weekly Review* on 13 April 1919. See Yisheng, 'Zuijin zhi xueshu xinchao', 107. They also became very popular. Lu Xun, for example, would refer to his friend Qian Xuantong as 'Jin Xinyi' in his preface to *Scream* (*Nahan* 吶喊). See Chen Mian, '"Lin Qinnan yi Jin xinyi yingshe gongji Qian xuantong" shi zenme yi hui shi'.

Shanghai News, and unsurprisingly it was considered rude to publicly scold someone under these circumstances. Lin Shu, who was in Beijing at the time, tried to prevent the publication of 'Nightmare' in Shanghai, but it was too late.[177]

Consequently, the reactions from Beijing University were sharp. Li Dazhao replied with an essay published in the *Morning Post*, in which he accused his opponents of 'always hiding behind other people's back' (*zongshi yin zai renjia de beihou* 總是隱在人家的背後) and 'holding on to the big legs of that giant' (*bao zhe na wei weizhangfu de datui* 抱著那位偉丈夫的大腿), instead of facing the debate like honourable academics.[178] On 16 March, Chen Duxiu wrote a similar piece in the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*), in which he railed against 'Scholar Jing.'[179]

Cai Yuanpei was outraged at a friend and student of Lin Shu's at Beijing University, Zhang Houzai 張厚載 (1895-1955). Zhang Houzai had apparently forwarded the manuscript of 'Nightmare' to the *New Shanghai News*.[180] According to Hill, he had also told the *Public Voice* that Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi were about to be dismissed from Beijing University, because their ideas had met with too much resistance.[181] Zhang Houzai wrote a very apologetic letter to Cai Yuanpei, defending Lin Shu and appealing to Cai's 'magnanimity and tolerance' (*dadu baorong* 大度包容).[182] Cai Yuanpei's tolerance, however, apparently had its limits when it came to public slander of Beijing University. He replied to Zhang Houzai in a very angry letter, accusing him of lacking

[177] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 218. See also Zhang Liaozi, 'Zhang Liaozi yuan han', 1093.
[178] Published on 4 and 5 March 1919, Li Dazhao, 'Xin jiu sichao zhi jizhan', 143.
[179] Zhi Yan, 'Guanyu Beijing daxue de yaoyan', 104.
[180] Zhang Liaozi, 'Zhang Liaozi yuan han', 1093. Since Cai Yuanpei addressed Zhang Houzai as 'Liaozi,' and Zhang signed off his own letter as 'Zhang Houzai,' Liaozi must have been Zhang Houzai's courtesy name. See Cai Yuanpei, 'Zhang Liaozi han', 1093; Zhang Liaozi, 'Zhang Liaozi yuan han', 1094.
[181] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 220.
[182] Zhang Liaozi, 'Zhang Liaozi yuan han', 1093.

the ‘heart to love and protect your alma mater’ (*aihu muxiao zhi xin* 愛護母校之心).[183] According to Hill, Zhang Houzai was soon expelled from Beijing University.[184]

Letter to Cai Yuanpei

Lin Shu’s third action in this verbal war was an open letter to Cai Yuanpei, which appeared on 18 March 1919 in the *Public Voice*.[185] It was printed right behind the aforementioned *Public Voice* article on the ‘factional’ squabbles at Beijing University.[186] According to Michael Gibbs Hill, this letter was meant as an apology for the debacle around ‘Nightmare’ and Cai’s introduction to the editor.[187] Consequently, Lin Shu referred to Cai’s ill-timed invitation and explained that he had received the letter too late. However, the apologetic tone ended soon. Instead, Lin Shu went on to declare his concern about recent developments at Beijing University, criticising again the argument that Confucianism was held responsible for China’s weakness, as well as the *baihua* project at Beijing University.[188] It was wrong, Lin Shu explained, to ‘transform the words of the ancient masters into speeches in *baihua*’ (*hua guzi zhi yan wei baihua yanshuo* 化古子之言為白話演說).[189]

Michael Gibbs Hill has described Cai Yuanpei’s reply as ‘masterful.’[190] Cai explained that Kongzi 孔子 (6th/5th century BC) and Mengzi (4th/3rd century BC) were not being ‘overthrown’ (*fu* 覆) at Beijing University, as Lin Shu feared.[191] Moreover, *guowen* 國文 (that is, Classical Chinese) was still being taught in Beijing University’s preparatory (*yuke* 预科) and undergraduate (*benke* 本科) courses. Only a minority of teachers was

[183] Cai Yuanpei, ‘Zhang Liaozi han’, 1093.
[184] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 222.
[185] Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 227.
[186] ‘Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang’.
[187] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 219.
[188] Lin Shu, ‘Da daxuetang xiaozhang Cai Heqing taishi shu’, 106–109.
[189] Ibid., 108. On this letter, see also Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 96.
[190] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 219.
[191] Cai Yuanpei, ‘Da Lin Qinnan shu’, 96.

writing in *baihua*. Besides, it was quite possible to teach the old texts in *baihua.*[192] This was very close to Fu Sinian's suggestion that the 'material' of the past should, and could, be explained through the methods and language of the present.[193]

Lin Shu's short stories and the letter exchange were not only published in the newspaper to which they had originally been submitted. They were frequently reprinted or commented on in other periodicals, and consequently they received considerable attention.[194] Hill has interpreted Cai Yuanpei's reply to Lin Shu as 'an important victory for the institutional independence of Beijing University and its faculty.'[195] In April 1919, however, the *Shanghai News* drew a different conclusion and deduced that, with Lin Shu, the circle around Liu Shipei had a strong defender outside of the University. For this reason the *Shanghai News* explained on the eve of the May Fourth demonstrations that the 'New Faction' had already been 'elbowed out [of Beijing University] by the Old-Learning Faction' (*wei jiuxue pai suo paiji* 為舊學派所排擠). The 'conservative faction has succeeded' (*shoujiu pai shengli* 守舊派勝利).[196]

Conclusion

The New Culture Movement has been dated as far back as 1914. But up until the May Fourth demonstrations, contemporaries would have been surprised to learn that they were in the middle of such a movement. Ideas like *baihua* which would later constitute the New Culture Movement were already being debated by the Movement's future stars. However, these arguments were highly academic and theoretical. Newspapers at the

[192] Ibid., 98.
[193] For details, see pp. 82-86.
[194] For example, 'Scholar Jing' was reprinted in the *Weekly Review*, see 'Jing sheng', *Meizhou pinglun*, 9 March 1919. A comment on 'Nightmare' appeared in the *Beijing New Post*, Yisheng, 'Zuijin zhi xueshu xinchao', 107. One article in the *Weekly Review* even analysed the logical and stylistic mistakes in 'Scholar Jing.' See 'Ping Lin Weilu zuijin suo zhuan "Jing sheng" duanpian xiaoshuo', *Meizhou pinglun*, 16 March 1919.
[195] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 219.
[196] Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing'.

time judged that such ideas were of little relevance outside of the ivory tower of Beijing University, and that they were merely the pipe dream of a 'faction of learning.'

Moreover, ideas like *baihua* and their advocates were strongly contested before the May Fourth demonstrations. The press talked about an opposing scholarly 'faction,' which was as articulate as the 'New Faction,' and which gave the circle around Hu Shi a hard time. Since this 'faction' had the famous scholar Lin Shu as its defender, the *Shanghai News* even judged in April 1919 that it had already gained victory over the 'New Faction.' In other words, in early 1919, there was no sign of a 'Movement' or of any visionary leaders. The situation of the future 'New Culture' ideas and stars looked bleak.

This was to change over the next few months with the May Fourth demonstrations. The circle around Liu Shipei would come to be regarded as unsuccessful academics. The image of Hu Shi's group would be upgraded and it would soon be seen as the 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[197] As I show in the next chapter, this did not happen because this circle took new actions or adopted a new strategy. It did not happen either because people suddenly found a reason that motivated them to see the (perceived) superiority of this circle's ideas. Instead, this image change occurred because the newspaper stories about 'factions' and Lin Shu's involvement took on a life of their own during the May Fourth demonstrations. They positioned the academics at Beijing University within the political polarisation of the May Fourth demonstrations, associated the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu with the May Fourth demonstrators, and in this way they set the course for the invention of the New Culture Movement.

[197] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

CHAPTER II: FROM ACADEMIC NITPICKING TO THE 'NEW CULTURE MOVEMENT'

Introduction

In the first four months of the year 1919, scholars at Beijing University debated the implications of cultural evolution for language and scholarship. Newspapers like the *Shanghai News* or the *Public Voice* framed the debating groups at Beijing University as 'factions of learning.' By this, they placed them in China's long tradition of similar 'factions of learning,' which had debated nuances in the writing style over the past centuries. In this way, and much to the dismay of some of the academics involved, the media had created the idea that there were two fixed entities at Beijing University. They were called 'New Faction' and 'Old Faction.'[1] Newspapers also conveyed the impression that there was a clear hierarchy of success between the two 'factions.' In April 1919, the *Shanghai News* declared the 'Old Faction' to have been victorious, while the 'New Faction' had, in the *Shanghai News*' view, lost the debate and was 'elbowed out' of Beijing University.[2]

Half a year later, after the May Fourth demonstrations, the power structure between what the *Shanghai News* or the *Public Voice* called 'New Faction' and 'Old Faction' was completely reversed. The 'Old Faction,' both as a designation and as the individuals subsumed under it, had virtually disappeared from the view of newspapers and magazines. The *Shanghai News* hardly ever talked about the 'New Faction' anymore either. Instead its individuals, such as Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, were identified

[1] See, for example, Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang'.
[2] Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing'.

as the 'centre' (*zhongxin* 中心) of a 'New Culture Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong* 新文化運動), an expression that was only invented in the summer of 1919.[3] According to Ouyang Junxi, one of its first mentions appeared on 31 August in the Shanghai magazine *Weekly Review* (*Xinqgi pinglun*).[4] As shown in the Introduction, the designation 'Movement' projected the fashionability of the debated ideas.[5] It also broke through the matrix of 'factions of learning.' Unlike a 'faction,' the 'Movement' in this story did not have any equally strong rivals.

The timing of this power reversal suggests that the May Fourth demonstrations of 1919 were instrumental in upgrading the 'New Faction' into the core of a 'New Culture Movement.' 'May Fourth' and 'New Culture' have often been used synonymously.[6] However, this linguistic habit has clouded the fact that the two had little in common. They were about different themes (May Fourth about anti-imperialism and New Culture about things like language) and largely led by different people. Most importantly, contemporaries could not pinpoint how they were connected. They either took it for granted that the 'New Culture Movement continues the May Fourth Movement,'[7] or, when reflecting upon how this had happened, they were confused and called it a 'historical puzzle.'[8]

In this chapter, I argue that newspapers were instrumental in upgrading the image of a small circle of academics at Beijing University from the 'New Faction' to the 'centre of

[3] Hu Shi's labelling as 'centre of the New Culture Movement' is cited from Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[4] Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 73; Xian Jin, 'Xin wenhua yundong de wuqi'; Bowles, 'Finding the Way', 33. For more details, see footnote 62 on p. 19 of this thesis.
[5] See pp. 31-34.
[6] See, for example, Schneider, *Wahrheit und Geschichte*, 151 et passim; Wang, 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937', 467–471. According to Yü Ying-shih, the same is the case for Chinese scholarship. See Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment', 312.
[7] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.
[8] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 18. For information on Philippe de Vargas, see footnote 80 on p. 119 of this thesis.

the New Culture Movement.'[9] After compartmentalising the debating academics into fixed *xuepai*, newspapers ascribed warlord-political allegiances to them. These made the 'Old Faction' look like government allies and the 'New Faction' like its victims. When the atmosphere turned anti-government during the May Fourth demonstrations, the 'New Faction' became associated with the equally victimised May Fourth demonstrators and their ideas came to be regarded as (now popular) expressions of anti-government sentiment. Increasingly, people started promoting ideas they claimed to be standing in the tradition of the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, and soon this was labelled as the 'New Culture Movement.'

Background Information: The May Fourth Demonstrations

Treaties with Japan

Since this chapter explores the connection between New Culture and May Fourth, it is appropriate to say a few words about the May Fourth demonstrations. The May Fourth demonstrations were student-led protests against a clause in the Treaty of Versailles that conferred rights on formerly German regions in Shandong to Japan, rather than returning them to China. The German presence in Shandong primarily went back to the 'Jiao'ao Concession Treaty' (*Jiao'ao zujie tiaoyue* 膠澳租界條約) of 1897. This treaty made the Jiaozhou Bay a German concession, allowed German military to be stations in the Jiao'ao (present-day Qingdao) region, and gave Germany railway rights in all of Shandong.[10]

At the instigation of the warlord Duan Qirui, China had entered World War I on the side of the Allies in 1917.[11] When the Central Powers were defeated in 1918, it was

[9] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[10] Huang Dexin, s.v. 'Jiao'ao zujie tiaoyue'.
[11] *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. Duan Qirui.

therefore expected that the German concessions would be returned to China. However, at the Paris Peace Conference, Japan asserted its claims to the formerly German regions. This was based on a number of Sino-Japanese agreements concluded in the preceding years. The first of them was the Twenty-One Demands (*Ershiyi tiao* 二十一條) from 1915. After entering World War I on the side of the Allies in 1914, Japan occupied the German concessions in Shandong, specifically Qingdao and the Qingdao-Jinan Railway (*Jiao Ji tielu* 胶济铁路). In January 1915, the Japanese government presented President Yuan Shikai with the Twenty-One Demands, one of whose clauses stipulated that Japan should inherit all German rights in Shandong. On 7 May, Japan gave Yuan Shikai a last ultimatum and on 9 May 1915, Yuan accepted.[12]

In the following years, Duan Qirui's warlord clique, the Anfu Club, signed a couple of follow-up agreements. Among them were the Nishihara Loans (*Xiyuan jiekuan* 西原借款), a series of loans from the Japanese government to Chinese banks and railway companies. Because of these loans, the Chinese and Japanese governments exchanged a diplomatic note entitled 'Exchange of Diplomatic Notes on All Questions Regarding [the Way of] Dealing with Shandong Province' (*Guanyu chuli Shandong sheng ge wenti huanwen* 關於處理山東省各問題換文) in September 1918. This note reconfirmed Japan's claims to Shandong. The Chinese representative Zhang Zongxiang 章宗祥 (1879-1962) replied to this, saying: 'The Chinese government gladly agrees to the above suggestions of the Japanese government.' (*Zhongguo zhengfu duiyu Riben zhengfu shanglie zhi tiyi, xinran tongyi.* 中國政府對於日本政府上列之提議，欣然同意。)[13]

[12] Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 139; Liang Yiqun, s.v. 'Ershiyi tiao'.
[13] Xiong Zhiyong and Su Hao, *Zhongguo jin xiandai waijiao shi*, 268; Li Songlin, s.v. 'Xiyuan jiekuan'.

After the Russian October Revolution of 1917, the Chinese and Japanese governments agreed on military cooperation in fending off potential assaults from Russia and Germany. For this purpose, and although over 2,000 Chinese students protested against the agreement, the governments signed Sino-Japanese Military Conventions (*Zhong Ri junshi xieding* 中日軍事協定) in 1918, which allowed Japanese military to be stationed on Chinese territory. As a basis for these agreements, the Chinese government reiterated its willingness to give Shandong to Japan.[14] As a result, Japan could make a strong case in Versailles that it should get the German concessions.

Demonstrations

That Japan was claiming Shandong in Versailles was known in China ever since the Paris Peace Conference had opened in January 1918.[15] But on 3 May, it became clear that China's diplomat in Versailles, Lu Zhengxiang 陸徵祥 (1871-1949), would not be able to negotiate this clause out of the Treaty of Versailles. Various associations gathered on Saturday, 3 May, to plan protests.[16] The Citizens' Diplomatic Association (*Guomin waijiao hui* 國民外交會), for example, intended to demonstrate on the

[14] Xiong Zhiyong and Su Hao, *Zhongguo jin xiandai waijiao shi*, 269; Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 140. According to Huang Dexin, the Sino-Japanese Military Conventions were a series of contracts signed over the course of 1918. The first of them was the 'Sino-Japanese Convention for Communal Defence through Ground Forces against Hostile Forces' (*Zhong Ri lujun gongtong fang dijun shi xieding* 中日陸軍共同防敵軍事協定) from 16 May 1918. This was followed on 19 May by the 'Sino-Japanese Convention for the Communal Defence through the Navy against Hostile Forces' (*Zhong Ri haijun gongtong fang dijun shi xieding* 中日海軍共同防敵軍事協定), on 6 September by the 'Convention about Necessary Details in Implementing the Sino-Japanese Convention for Communal Defence through Ground Forces against Hostile Forces' (*Zhong Ri lujun gongtong fang dijun shi xieding shishi zhi biyao zhi xiangxi xieding* 中日陸軍共同防敵軍事協定實施之必要之詳細協定). Additionally, there were follow-up 'explanatory documents' (*shuoming shu* 說明書) to these conventions. For details, see Huang Dexin, s.v. 'Zhong Ri junshi xieding'.

[15] 'Shandong wenti Zhong Ri huanwen zhi pilu', *Shenbao*, 22 February 1919; [] An, 'Shandong wenti zhi Beijing xiaoxi', *Shenbao*, 25 April 1919. On the Paris Peace Conference, see *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. Paris Peace Conference.

[16] Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 143.

symbolic 7 May, the National Disgrace Memorial Day (*Guochi jinian ri* 國恥紀念日). This day commemorated Japan's ultimatum for accepting the Twenty-One Demands.[17]

The students, however, were too impatient to wait.[18] The next day, on 4 May 1919, 4,000 of them therefore gathered on the symbolic Tiananmen Square, where in 1898 another cohort of students had demonstrated, and where students would demonstrate again in 1989. From there, they marched through the streets of Beijing, until some of them burnt down the house of Cao Rulin 曹汝霖 (1877-1966). As finance minister, Cao Rulin had helped negotiate the Nishihara Loans. Cao was having a guest in this house on that day. This was Zhang Zongxiang, who was also involved in the Nishihara Loans. During the attack on Cao's house, the students beat up Zhang Zongxiang.[19]

As a response, the police arrested a number of students. But this did not end the demonstrations. With the help of Cai Yuanpei, the chancellor of Beijing University, and Fu Zengxiang, the minister of education, who resigned soon afterwards, the students were quickly released.[20] A student union formed on 6 May, which organised further strikes. It called for a refusal to sign the Treaty of Versailles and for the dismissal of the 'country-selling traitors' (*maiguo zei* 賣國賊), by which they referred to Cao Rulin, Zhang Zongxiang and Lu Zongyu 陸宗輿 (1876-1941).[21] Lu Zongyu had been

[17] Ibid.; Yi Wan, 'Yi zhou Beijing de gongmin da huodong'. According to Rudolf Wagner, the Research Clique, a political party led by Liang Qichao, planned a meeting for the same day. It was because the students wanted to take action out of the hands of politicians that they started demonstrating first. See Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 107.
[18] Yi Wan, 'Yi zhou Beijing de gongmin da huodong', 1.
[19] Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 143; Huang Banghe and Pi Mingxiu, s.v. 'Cao Rulin', 1987; Huang Banghe and Pi Mingxiu, s.v. 'Cao Rulin', 1987.
[20] Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 144; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 137.
[21] 'Wu yue qi ri zhi guomin dahui', *Shenbao*, 8 May 1919; 'Waijiao jinji yu heju polie (si)', *Yishibao*, 19 May 1919. Cao Rulin and Lu Zongyu were members of the New Communications Clique (*Xin jiaotong xi* 新交通系). This group was supported President Xu Shichang 徐世昌 (1855-1939) and on good terms with the Anfu Club. See Huang Banghe and Pi Mingxiu, s.v. 'Cao Rulin', 1987; Li Songlin, s.v. 'Xin jiaotong xi'; Shen Xuanwu, *Zhongguo zhengdang, zhengtuan daguan*, 223.

ambassador to Japan, and in this function he had been among the signatories of the Twenty-One Demands.[22]

In spite of government prohibition and censorship, the students gave lectures on the streets and boycotted Japanese goods over the next few weeks. Soon the protests spilled over into other cities, among which Shanghai became particularly important in June.[23] Students received support from the media, from a number of provincial warlords and from other strata of society.[24] From 5 June onwards, merchants, workers and students in Shanghai joined ranks and entered a general strike.[25] As a result, the 'country-selling traitors' Cao Rulin, Zhang Zongxiang and Lu Zongyu were dismissed on 10 June, and China refused to sign the Treaty of Versailles on 28 June.[26] The protests and the heightened political tensions set the stage for the transformation of the popular perception of the 'factional' academics at Beijing University.

State of the Field: May Fourth and New Culture

The academic literature with which this chapter engages primarily is on the connection between the May Fourth demonstrations and the New Culture Movement. I use 'May Fourth' to refer to the demonstrations that started in Beijing on 4 May 1919 and then spread to other cities in China, and the 'New Culture Movement' to talk about cultural suggestions around the cluster of *baihua*, popular education, science, emancipation of women, 'free love' (*ziyou lian'ai* 自由戀愛), Marxism and so forth. I have argued in the Introduction of this thesis that the discourse created by the New Culture activists

[22] Xu Youchun, s.v. 'Lu Zongyu'.
[23] Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 153.
[24] On support from the warlords, see Ibid., 158. On the support from the media, see Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?*, 384–89.
[25] Wasserstrom, *Student Protests in Twentieth-Century China*, 56.
[26] Huang Banghe and Pi Mingxiu, s.v. 'Cao Rulin', 1987; Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 153.

themselves has long influenced academic narratives about the Movement.[27] As I show in this chapter, the perceived connection between May Fourth and New Culture was part of this discourse. As this narrative is still powerful, 'May Fourth' and 'New Culture' have often been used synonymously. Therefore it does not come as much of a surprise that May Fourth upgraded the 'New Faction' into the 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[28]

Nevertheless, scholars have noticed that technically May Fourth and New Culture were about two different things. May Fourth was political and anti-imperialist, New Culture was academic and Western-inspired. Fabio Lanza has argued that scholarship has employed two strategies to deal with this issue: Li Zehou and Vera Schwarcz have declared New Culture and May Fourth to be two separate events, one about 'enlightenment' (*qimeng* 啓蒙) the other one about 'national salvation' (*jiuguo* 救國).[29] Other scholars have claimed the opposite and argued that May Fourth and New Culture shared a general sense of 'newness' or 'modernity.'[30] They claimed that May Fourth made the New Culture agenda more plausible. *Baihua*, for example, came to be regarded as a worthwhile project because student demonstrators started communicating with the 'common people,' who did not understand *wenyan*.[31] Scholars have also pointed to the role of 'traditional' Chinese notions of cosmic government. This is the idea, for example elaborated in the *Great Learning* (*Da xue* 大學), that the moral and cultural condition of the realm will directly impact its political situation. This, the

[27] See the section 'State of the Field' in the Introduction of this dissertation.
[28] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[29] Lanza, 'Of Chronology, Failure, and Fidelity', 54.
[30] According to Lanza, the essays in the edited volume by Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and Oldřich Král fall into this category. See Ibid., 57; Doleželová-Velingerová and Král, *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital*.
[31] Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 178; Wasserstrom, *Student Protests in Twentieth-Century China*, 204–05.

argument goes, made it obvious for Chinese intellectuals in 1919 to connect a political event ('May Fourth') with a cultural agenda ('New Culture').[32]

However, neither story fits with the way contemporaries perceived May Fourth and New Culture. Contemporaries were convinced that May Fourth had promoted New Culture. The Jiangsu Educational Association, for example, claimed that the 'New Culture Movement continues the May Fourth Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong shi jixu wu si yundong* 新文化運動是繼續五四運動).[33] The Jiangsu Educational Association was a local group authorised to make policy suggestions to the Ministry of Education.[34] However, when reflecting upon the connection, contemporaries were surprised. The head of the History Department of Yanjing University and friend of Hu Shi, Philippe de Vargas, for example, called the connection a 'historical puzzle.'[35] This calls into question the notion that May Fourth and New Culture shared obvious ideas.

Moreover, neither the 'general-newness,' 'plausibility-of-*baihua*' nor the 'cosmic-government' theories explain why people previously classified as Beijing University's 'New Faction' were chosen to become the 'centre' of the New Culture Movement.[36] First of all, the *baihua* of Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu was not designed to be the language of the people. As I have shown in Chapter One, it was meant to be the (Westernised) language of globally envisioned present times.[37] As such it was full of Western and

---

[32] Lin, *The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness*; Weston, *The Power of Position*, 147; Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 144. A similar point is indicated by Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 79. Yeh Wen-hsin has used 'New Culture' and 'May Fourth' synonymously, without delving into any of these reasons, see Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 147–173. The *Great Learning* was traditionally attributed to Kongzi. It was originally a chapter of the *Collection of Rituals* (*Liji* 禮記) and made one of the *Four Books* (*Si shu* 四書) by Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200). See *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. Daxue (Confucian text).

[33] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.

[34] For more information about the Jiangsu Educational Association, see pp. 41-43 and 165-167.

[35] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 18. For more information on de Vargas and the manuscript, see footnote 80 on page 119 of this thesis.

[36] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

[37] See pp. 82-86.

Japanese loanwords and as incomprehensible to the common people as *wenyan*.[38] Consequently, it could not have been very useful in communicating with them. Secondly, *baihua* and *guoyu* had been promoted by other, even state-sponsored groups, such as the Committee for Research on the National Language (*Guoyu yanjiu hui* 國語研究會) or the Preparatory Committee for the Unification of the National Language (*Guoyu tongyi choubei hui* 國語統一籌備會).[39] *Guoyu* advocate Li Jinxi treated the 'new-literature faction' (*xin wenxue pai* 新文學派) as one 'faction of learning' among the *guoyu* proponents.[40]

Thirdly, in spite of Hu Shi's claims that he was the first to construct an evolutionary narrative around *baihua*, and although this narrative has been taken up in scholarship, very similar ideas about the evolution of language were held in broader academic circles at the time.[41] One example is Wei Tingsheng 衛挺生 (1890-1977), who published his ideas in the *Chinese Students' Quarterly* (*Liu Mei xuesheng jibao* 留美學生季報), and who was at the time reading for a Master's degree at Harvard University.[42] So even if May Fourth demonstrators became suddenly aware of the usefulness of *baihua*, they would not have needed to associate *baihua* with Beijing University's 'New Faction.'

[38] Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese*, 217–296; Shi, *The Lure of the Modern*, 71.
[39] On the Committee for Research on the National Language, see Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 133–34. On the Preparatory Committee for the Unification of the National Language, see Ibid., 144. The translation of the Preparatory Committee's name is taken from Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 20.
[40] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu xue jiangyi*, shang 43.
[41] For claims that Hu Shi invented evolutionary narratives for *baihua*, see Hu Shi, 'Jieshao wo ziji de sixiang', 18; Wang Guanghe, 'Xifang yingxiang yu Hu Shi lun wenyan zhi "si" yu baihua zhi "huo"', 264.
[42] For Wang Tingsheng's discussion of language, see Li Jinxi, *Guoyu xue jiangyi*, shang 29–30. For Wang Tingsheng's biography, see Xu Youchun, s.v. 'Ting Weisheng'.

Other ‘new’ ideas were also provided by groups other than the academics at Beijing University, among them socialists or anarchists outside of the University.[43] Minister of Education Fu Zengxiang supported women’s education.[44] There was no clear dividing line for conservatives either. Liu Shipei, classified as ‘Old Faction,’ was even married to one of China’s most famous feminists, He-Yin Zhen 何殷震 (1884-1920?).[45] The Confucian notion of cosmic government did exist, but often seemed to be a rhetorical tool, used particularly when intellectuals tried to sell their ideas to the government, for example in petitions, not when they were engaged in a dialogue with each other.[46]

Moreover, Vera Schwarcz stated that the need to enlighten the citizens became particularly apparent after May Fourth, when New Culture activists realised how ignorant the ‘common folk’ was.[47] In making this claim, she was presumably drawing upon her interviews with Beijing University student and ‘New Faction’ member Zhang Shenfu.[48] This may have been true for the circle around Hu Shi at Beijing University. But why would someone who had not subscribed to New Culture ideas before May Fourth suddenly feel the need to enlighten the people with just these ideas? In sum, claims about a direct connection or separation of New Culture and May Fourth leave too many questions open. The reaction of contemporaries indicates that the two Movements were connected through more roundabout mechanisms, which were powerful but not immediately obvious – mechanisms such as rumours about academia’s entanglement in politics.

---

[43] Shuang Yu, ‘Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai’; ‘Chajin “fanghai zhi”an’ de jihui, chuban zhi jingguo’, *Meizhou pinglun*, 27 July 1919.
[44] Guo Fengqi and He Huanzhen, s.v. ‘Fu Zengxiang’.
[45] Liu, Ko, and Karl, *The Birth of Chinese Feminism*, 51.
[46] Li Jinxi, ‘Duyin tongyi hui Zhili daibiao Wang Pu deng cheng jiaoyu bu qing banxing zhuyin zimu wen’, xia 19; Li Jinxi, *Guoyu xue jiangyi*, shang 25–26.
[47] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 128.
[48] Although these interviews formed the primary basis for her later book, *Time for Telling the Truth Is Running Out*, she was already conducting them when writing *The Chinese Enlightenment*. See Schwarcz, *Time for Telling the Truth Is Running Out*, 1.

‘New Faction’ Success after May Fourth

Someone reading the *Shanghai News* before May Fourth must have regarded the situation of what the paper depicted as the ‘New Faction’ as bleak. The ‘New Faction’ was not part of something called the ‘New Culture Movement.’ In fact, this expression was not yet invented. In March 1919, newspapers from the commercial *Shanghai News* in Shanghai to the Anfu Club’s *Public Voice* in Beijing framed the debates at Beijing University as the sophistry of two ‘factions of learning’ with little relevance to the ‘real world.’ At the time, it was anything but obvious that the ‘New Faction’ would be end up as victor of the debate. In March, both papers claimed that the two factions were ‘equally strong.’[49] In April, the *Shanghai News* even stated that the ‘conservative faction is victorious,’ and the ‘New Faction’ had lost.[50]

In September 1919, Fu Sinian claimed that in the past few months ‘the mood of society, however, has hugely changed’ (*shehui de kongqi que da gai le* 社會的空氣卻是大改了) in favour of ideas associated with his magazine, *New Tide*.[51] The power structure, as described by the *Shanghai News*, between the people classified as ‘Old Faction’ and as ‘New Faction’ was indeed completely reversed. The ‘Old Faction’ as an entity and the individuals categorised under it virtually disappeared from the gaze of newspapers, journals and their readers. People previously described as ‘New Faction’ were not anymore part of an ivory-tower academic faction, but the ‘centre’ (*zhongxin* 中心)[52] or ‘masters’ (*juzi* 鉅子)[53] of a ‘New Culture Movement,’ an expression that started

[49] Jing Guan, ‘Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao’; ‘Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang’, 6.
[50] Xin Wei, ‘Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing’.
[51] Fu Sinian, ‘“Xinchao” zhi huigu yu qianzhan’, 30 October 1919, 201.
[52] Ye Yun, ‘Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)’.
[53] Miao Jinyuan, ‘Suowei “xin wenhua yundong” de chachao yu pochan’, 2.

appearing in print in late summer 1919.[54] Discussing the 'New Culture Movement' was the topic of a lecture competition for middle-school students, organised and advertised on 24 October 1919 by the Jiangsu Educational Association.[55] This 'call for papers' received broad attention and was taken up by the *Shanghai News* and the missionary journal *Chinese Christian Advocate* in November.[56]

At around the same time, the female teacher trainee Zhu Daihen 朱黛痕 (no dates) discussed the 'New Culture Movement' in her school journal. Even before, on 31 August 1919, the author of the *Weekly Review* (*Xingqi pinglun*) who went by the name Xian Jin 先进 (no dates) cited educator Wu Zhihui's 吳稚暉 (1865-1953) discussion of it in his magazine.[57] Before May Fourth, only a small number of students and professors at Beijing University were interested in New Culture ideas. Now they incited increasing interest outside of Beijing University. The most frequently cited phenomenon of this is what Fabio Lanza has called the 'explosion of publications:'[58] In the second half of 1919 and in 1920, a huge number of journals in the style of *New Youth* or *New Tide* were founded, which promoted New Culture ideas and wrote in *baihua*. Although many of these publications were short-lived, and although this makes a precise calculation difficult, contemporaries often claimed there were about '400' of them.[59]

[54] See footnote 61 on p. 19.
[55] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', October 1919, 45.
[56] 'Yanshuo jingjin hui dingqi zai Ning kahui', *Shenbao*, 31 October 1919; 'Yanshuo jingjin hui yanti zhi jieshi', *Shenbao*, 2 November 1919; 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi jieshi'.
[57] Zhu Daihen, 'Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu'; Xian Jin, 'Xin wenhua yundong de wuqi'. For more information on Wu Zhihui, see footnote 62 on p. 19 of this thesis.
[58] Lanza, 'Of Chronology, Failure, and Fidelity', 57. This phenomenon has also been described in Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 178; Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 38; Spence, *The Search for Modern China*, 300; Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 161; Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 74.
[59] Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 2; de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 18; Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 137. Clarence H. Hamilton, who worked at the University of Nanjing at the time, estimated that there were 'between four and five hundred' new journals. See Hamilton, 'Religion and the New Culture Movement in China', 228.

The Shanghai publisher Wang Yuanfang remembered that these journals 'sprang up like spring bamboo after the rain' (*yu hou chunsun* 雨後春筍), that is, they 'sprang up like mushrooms.'[60] I will therefore refer to them as 'spring-bamboo journals.' Already established publications started endorsing a New Culture-style agenda too. According to Zhou Gang, even the 'politically conservative' *Eastern Miscellany* (*Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌) started accepting articles in *baihua* from 1920.[61] And famously, in the same year the Ministry of Education made *guoyu* a compulsory subject for the first two years of primary school, thereby replacing the subject of *guowen* (國文, the same as lit. 'national written language,' that is, *wenyan*).[62]

Upgrading the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu from a *xuepai* to the 'centre' of a Movement was not merely a matter of rhetoric. It also had tangible implications for the prestige and careers of scholars previously given the designation 'New Faction.' Being a 'faction of learning' meant having an equally strong rival. Once it had become the 'centre' of a Movement, a veritable star cult developed around the former 'New Faction,' while their rivals were condemned to academic obscurity. The *Shanghai News* reported about banquets given in Hu Shi's honour, but it merely described Liu Shipei, who died on 20 November 1919, as 'leader of the *National Heritage* faction' (*Guogu pai shouling* 國故派首領) in an obituary.[63] Similarly, when plays like *Oliver Twist* were staged, the *Shanghai News* usually remembered Lin Shu as their most prominent

[60] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 38.
[61] Zhou, *Placing the Modern Chinese Vernacular in Transnational Literature*, 117.
[62] Wang, 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937', 466; Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 22; Davies, *Lu Xun's Revolution*, 10.
[63] On the banquet for Hu Shi, see 'Xiju jia huanyan Hu Shizhi', *Shenbao*, 20 November 1923. For *Shanghai News*'s obituary of Liu Shipei, see Ye Yun, 'Jing xuejie yaoren zhi diaoxie', *Shenbao*, 27 November 1919. On Liu Shipei's death, see Chen Qi, *Liu Shipei nianpu changbian*, 357.

translator.[64] But neither he nor the 'Old Faction' were ever again talked about as 'stars' or people instrumental in shaping the culture of the future.

National Heritage ceased publication after four issues in the summer of 1919, while the sales numbers of *New Tide* soared up at around the same time. The transition to a new editorial cohort, which was necessary when people like its editor Fu Sinian graduated and went abroad in autumn 1919, apparently could not damage *New Tide*.[65] The first volume of *New Tide* (January to May 1919), originally published by Beijing University Publishing Department, was reprinted and sold out two times. The New Tide Society therefore commissioned the professional Shanghai publisher East Asia Library to run the third edition.[66]

This professionalization of the editorial process opened up new marketing strategies and avenues of sales for *New Tide*. Before May Fourth, *New Tide* had mainly been promoted through word-of-mouth recommendations.[67] After May Fourth, East Asia Library started advertising *New Tide* more broadly, for example, on the front page of the *Shanghai News*.[68] This did not only have the effect that a broader reach of *Shanghai News* readers was aware of *New Tide*. But, vice versa, East Asia Library must have also felt that there was sufficient interest for *New Tide*, otherwise it would not have afforded the advertisement, which would have cost the publisher good money.[69]

---

[64] 'Haishang xiaoshuo jia manping (yi)', *Shenbao*, 16 January 1921; 'Jimo Xu sheng', *Shenbao*, 20 February 1921; 'Xiaoshuo xianping', *Shenbao*, 20 February 1921; 'Yi xiaoshuo yi xi tan', *Shenbao*, 3 April 1921; 'Meiguo nü xiaoshuo jia Shituhuo furen xiaoying', *Shenbao*, 10 April 1921; 'Yingguo zhuming xiaoshuo shecheng yingju'; 'Weiwei gongsi xin dao da pi xiaoshuo', *Shenbao*, 3 February 1923; '"Cha hua nü" xiaoshuo zhi xin dianying'; Ting Hao, '"Gu er ku yu" zhi pinglun'; Qian Jian, 'Jiake Gegen zhuyan xinming jiang kaiyan', *Shenbao*, 5 September 1924.

[65] Boorman, s.v. Fu Ssu-nien, 44.

[66] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 44.

[67] Li Xiaofeng, 'Xinchao she de shimo', 209.

[68] 'Advertisement for *New Tide*', 3 November 1919.

[69] Pang Ju'ai, *Kua wenhua guanggao yu shimin wenhua de bianqian*, 52–53; 'Ben bao de guanggao, faxing ji qita'.

The New Culture Movement even became a marketing tool after late 1919, and businesses designed their marketing strategies to capitalise on the hype around it. This was particularly the case for companies that sold products, however loosely, related to education and academia. Unsurprisingly, publishers were among those who tried to benefit from the New Culture Movement. In 1921, Commercial Press (*Shangwu yinshu guan* 商務印書館) advertised its publications (books by Hu Shi, Zhou Zuoren and so forth) as the lighthouse that illuminated the dark world with the 'dawn of New Culture' (*xin wenhua zhi shuguang* 新文化之曙光, ironically written in *wenyan*).[70] This advertisement was placed in a magazine called *Life at Beida* (*Beida shenghuo* 北大生活).[71]

In 1919, even two opticians, Jingyi Glasses (*Jingyi yanjing gongsi* 精益眼鏡公司) and Mingming Glasses (*Mingming yanjing gongsi* 明明眼鏡公司), drew upon the New Culture craze for 'science.' They did so when arguing in their advertising slogan that, in light of recent progressive developments in education, 'sciency glasses' (*kexue xingzhi zhi yanjing* 科學性質之眼鏡 [lit. 'glasses of a scientific nature']) were called for.[72] The year before, Mingming's spectacles had simply been commendable because they had (in English) 'Eyes tested carefully … Prices charged moderately.'[73] The advertisements of the opticians were placed in a New Culture journal, *New Woman* (*Xin funü* 新婦女),

[70] 'Xin wenhua zhi shuguang', *Beida shenghuo*. Part of this advertisement was a picture that showed a lighthouse illuminating a dark world. The words 'dawn of New Culture' were written in the cone of light created by this lighthouse.

[71] *Life at Beida* called itself a 'collection of portraits' (*xiezhen ji* 寫真集) and was published and sold by societies that seemed to belong to Beijing University. These were the Society for Books on New Knowledge at Beijing University (*Beijing daxue xin zhi shu she* 北京大學新知書社) and Beijing University Life at Beida Society (*Beijing daxue Beida shenghuo she* 北京大學北大生活社). It seems to have been a one-off publication. '"Beida shenghuo" xiezhen ji', *Beida shenghuo*.

[72] 'Advertisement of Mingming Glasses', *Moti*; 'Jingyi yanjing gongsi jin qi', *Xin funü*.

[73] 'Advertisement for Mingming Glasses', *Moti*. In 1918, Mingming Glasses went by the English name 'The Oriental Optical Co., Ltd.' In 1919, it had renamed itself into 'Chinese Optical Co.,' see 'Advertisement of Mingming Glasses'; 'Advertisement for Mingming Glasses'.

and in a missionary-school journal, the *McTyeirean*. That is, with these slogans the opticians tried to appeal to the sort of people who were potential advocates of the New Culture Movement.

In sum, in late 1919 people like Hu Shi, who had previously been classified as part of one 'faction of learning' among many, were revalorised in the media and among lesser-known educators and intellectuals as the 'centre' of a 'Movement' for a New Culture.[74] The sales numbers of their magazines rocketed and the expression 'New Culture Movement' even became a marketing franchise used by businesses to sell all kinds of products to students, teachers and other intellectuals. At that point, it must have seemed utterly incredible that a few months earlier the circle around Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu had been regarded as nothing more than an ivory-tower 'faction of learning' with abstract ideas, and that this 'New Faction' was even said to have lost the battle with a much stronger rival 'Old Faction.'[75]

The Connection between May Fourth and New Culture

A 'Historical Puzzle'

The timing of the rise of people like Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu to academic stardom suggests that the May Fourth demonstrations had something to do with it, and contemporaries would have been convinced of this answer, too. The Jiangsu Educational Association claimed that the 'New Culture Movement continues the May Fourth Movement.'[76] The *guoyu* advocate Li Jinxi reminisced that May Fourth had advanced the cause of *baihua*.[77] Moreover, Fabio Lanza has pointed out that the

[74] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[75] Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing'.
[76] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.
[77] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 137.

expression ‘the school demonstrations of May Fourth’ could refer to the foundation of New Culture-style journals and political activities alike.[78]

Most significantly, for a young teacher in Shanghai who went by the name of Jing Guan, debating ‘New Faction’-style ideas was equivalent to demonstrating during May Fourth. He reported in 1920 that he really approved of the student protests of May Fourth. However, in his capacity as a teacher, he felt unable – maybe too dignified – to go onto the streets and demonstrate. Consequently, he got together with a few colleagues, and since school was closed because of the protests anyway, they ‘researched the question of the new woman’ (*yanjiu xin funü wenti* 研究新婦女問題). The ‘new woman’ of course referred to the New Culture ideal of emancipated women, who were free from what was regarded as stifling Confucian family morals. Later on, Jing Guan and his colleagues launched a ‘spring-bamboo journal’ named *New Woman*. This was as valuable an anti-government protest, he felt, as taking to the streets to demonstrate.[79]

Although contemporaries were convinced that May Fourth and New Culture were connected, they were surprised about this as soon as they started reflecting on it. After all, May Fourth was about politics, anti-imperialism and opposition to the government, whereas New Culture was about *baihua*, old versus new and culture. Philippe de Vargas called it a ‘historical puzzle’ in his manuscript ‘Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance.’[80]

---

[78] Lanza, ‘Of Chronology, Failure, and Fidelity’, 57. Lanza did not add a Chinese translation to ‘the school demonstrations of May Fourth.’ However, it is reasonable to assume that he translated *xuechao* (學潮) with ‘school demonstrations.’ This expression was, for example, used in *Social Welfare Tiensin*, see ‘Jiaoyu ting huiyi fangfan xuechao’, *Yishibao*, 2 December 1919.

[79] Jing Guan, ‘Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi’, 31–32. Technically, Jing Guan referred to general boycott in Shanghai on 5 June. As Jing Guan lived in Shanghai, this can be considered the local equivalent of Beijing’s 4 May.

[80] de Vargas, ‘Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)’, 18. Philippe de Vargas was a missionary and head of the History Department of Yanjing University at the time. He was also friends with Hu Shi. See Hu Shi, *Hu Shi riji quanbian*, 8:292; Keller, s.v. Philippe de Vargas; Egan, *A Latterday Confucian*, 91.

> And there we have an historical puzzle: how on earth could these students' and merchants' strikes affect the academic debate on the language of literature? Yet ~~such was the fact~~ {so they did.}[81]

Similarly, *guoyu*-advocate Li Jinxi would remember that he 'did not expect' (*bu liao* 不料) that May Fourth would have implications for culture rather than for politics.[82]

The Doom of the 'New Faction'

In the week after 4 May 1919, newspaper readers and people involved in the political and cultural events would have probably never guessed that May Fourth would promote the cause of what they knew as the 'New Faction.' At best, they would have regarded the two as completely unrelated, at its worst they would have believed that May Fourth had ushered in the end of the 'New Faction.' Although Huang Yanpei, the vice-president of the Jiangsu Educational Association, would spend the next few months managing the May Fourth demonstrations, he did not recognise the fatefulness of the event when the news reached him on 6 May. Then he laconically noted in his diary:

> In the morning, I heard that Cao Rulin's house has been burnt down, and that Zhang Zongxiang has been beaten up.

This manuscript, which is part of the Chase collection, is not dated. However, de Vargas gave a paper of that title before the 'Wen Yu Hui' (*Wenyou hui* 文友會), the 'Society of Friends of Literature,' on 15 February 1922, see Hu Shi, *Hu Shi de riji*, 1:65. (For more information on that Society, see footnote 65 on p. 162.) But as the note on the bottom of the manuscript, 'A paper read before the Wen Yu Hui, Peking, February 15, 1922,' is stroked out, it is also possible that this is the manuscript for a book of the same title, which de Vargas published in 1922. In this case, Chase must have received it in late 1921 or early 1922, as he only came to Beijing at the beginning of the new academic year 1921. See de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 1; 'Lewis Chase to Family', 16 December 1921; de Vargas, *Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance*. De Vargas was an accomplished linguist, but his native language was French (he was from the French-speaking part of Switzerland), not English, which was the language commonly used at the Society of Friends of Literature. Since the manuscript in the Chase Papers contains corrections on de Vargas' use of the English language, I suspect that de Vargas asked Lewis Chase to proofread his manuscript.

As for the name 'Chinese Renaissance' for 'New Culture Movement,' Yü Ying-shih has explained that 'renaissance' was the English expression the New Culture Movement was associated with originally, before it gave way to 'enlightenment' in the 1930/40s. See Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment', 299.

[81] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 18. In all the manuscripts I cite from the Chase Papers, strikethrough font indicates a word that was crossed out (as in '~~such was~~'), {} an insertion; […] means an unreadable word. I have not changed the wording or spelling to correct orthographic, grammatical, etc. mistakes. In this citation (although not in others), underlined text is handwritten, everything else is typewritten.

[82] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 137.

晨聞曹汝霖宅被焚，章宗祥被毆。[83]

He then went on to talk about a meeting he had with some school representatives on the same day.[84] Soon afterwards, the importance of the demonstrations would be apparent, but not how this would benefit the people the media had classified as 'New Faction.' On the contrary, a few days after 4 May, they even seemed to seal the fate of the 'New Faction.' Ironically this would, as I show below, be an important prerequisite for their later success. But nobody knew this at the time.

Cai Yuanpei resigned a few days after May Fourth because he feared government repressions against Beijing University.[85] *Impartial* in Changsha reported on 15 May about a rumour that was 'widely circulating' (*shengchuan* 盛傳), according to which 'a certain clique' (*mou pai* 某派), possibly the Anfu Club, wanted to replace Cai with Ma Qichang. Ma Qichang was a Tongcheng Scholar and Lin Shu's friend.[86] Chen Duxiu was arrested in June, and Hu Shi was generally very frustrated with these developments.[87] Geng Yunzhi has even noted that at that time people like Jiang Menglin 蔣夢麟 (1886-1964) and Huang Yanpei came up with the idea to move Beijing University's advocates of *baihua* down south to get them out of the reach of the Beiyang Government, and to leave Beijing University to the 'Old Faction.' However, the circle around Hu Shi did not agree with this plan, maybe because they were reluctant to give up the 'power of position' that came with Beijing University.[88]

[83] Huang Yanpei, *Huang Yanpei riji*, 2:62.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Cha An, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang 9.
[86] 'Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti', *Dagongbao*, 15 May 1919; Li Fan, 'Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue', 111; Weston, *The Power of Position*, 178.
[87] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 74–75.
[88] Ibid., 72. The expression 'power of position' was used by Weston, *The Power of Position*. Jiang Menglin was a US-trained educator. He was editor at Commercial Press, member of the Jiangsu Educational Association, and from July 1919 onwards, he took over various high-ranking posts at Beijing University. In 1930, he even became Beijing University's chancellor. See Wei Qiao, s.v. 'Jiang Menglin'.

The 'Schools in Beijing'

In 1921, the journal *Life at Beida* displayed Beijing University as the centre of the May Fourth demonstrations.[89] This myth is still maintained in the present, especially in non-academic documents such as the website of Beijing University. Here Beijing University is described as 'cradle of the "May Fourth" Movement' (*'wu si' yundong de ceyuan di* '五四' 運動的策源地).[90] But in May 1919, contemporaries would have been surprised about this idea. Newspapers and the Jiangsu Educational Association usually talked about how 'students of schools in Beijing' (*Jing xiao xuesheng* 京校學生)[91] or 'the institutes of higher education in Beijing' (*Beijing zhuanmen yishang xuexiao* 北京專門以上學校)[92] were protesting, not about how 'Beijing University' was protesting.

There was, moreover, not much reason to connect the May Fourth demonstrations to what media had called the 'New Faction.' To be sure, the 'New Faction' student Luo Jialun was the one who invented the expression 'May Fourth Movement' (*wu si yundong* 五四運動) when he published an article on the 'Spirit of the "May Fourth Movement"' (*'Wu si yundong' de jingshen* '五四運動'的精神) in the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) on 26 May 1919.[93] Chen Duxiu did hand out May Fourth leaflets, which led to his arrest in June 1919.[94] Fu Sinian, the editor of *New Tide*, did lead the students of Beijing University into the demonstrations on 4 May.[95]

---

[89] 'Wu si yundong de shikuang', *Beida shenghuo*.
[90] 'Beida jianjie', *Beijing daxue* [website].
[91] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi da zongtong, guowuyuan, jiaoyubu chenming Shanghai ge xiao xuesheng yin jiaoyu zongzhang yiren deng wenti qun yi bake, qing fuxun yuqing dian'; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919, 21; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', June 1919, 15–18; 'Jiang Zhe zhi jinian guochi yu zheng Qingdao', *Shenbao*, 11 May 1919.
[92] 'Bake zhong zhi Jing xuejie xiaoxi', *Shenbao*, 23 May 1919. '*Zhuanmen yishang xuexiao*' technically means 'schools of a level higher than professional [schools].' However since this is very clumsy, I follow the translators of *Touches of History*, where it is rendered as 'institutes of higher education,' see Chen, *Touches of History*, 25.
[93] Luo Jialun, '"Wu si yundong" de jingshen', 2011, 79.
[94] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 71.
[95] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 16.

Nevertheless, I agree with Joseph Chen and Chow Tse-tsung that the leaders of May Fourth were not the leaders of New Culture.[96] Li Quan has reported that 'over a thousand students of Beijing University' (*Beijing daxue xuesheng yi qian duo ren* 北京大學學生一千多人) participated in a meeting on 3 May to plan the demonstrations.[97] The members of the New Tide Society may have participated, but since they were barely more than twenty people, they were only a very small minority.[98] A few hours after the demonstrations had started, Fu Sinian was shocked at the violence and soon withdrew from the political sphere.[99] In September 1919, he would even write in *New Tide* that he and his New Tide Society did not want to have anything more to do with politics and had retreated to pure academia.[100]

The 'New Faction' icon Hu Shi and the 'Old Faction' defender Lin Shu officially expressed roughly the same opinion on the student protests: They approved of the patriotic spirit of the demonstrations, but despised the idea of students being outside the classroom – an opinion repeated by Cai Yuanpei one year later in the newspaper *Morning Post*.[101] The same opinion appears from the letters and meeting minutes of the Educational Associations of Jiangsu and Hunan.[102] As Lanza has pointed out, there was a longstanding debate on the role of student activism in politics. Cai Yuanpei – and this can also apply to Hu Shi, Lin Shu or the Educational Associations – held the view that 'there was something in the very definition of students that prevented them to act

[96] Chen, *The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai*, 22; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 119.
[97] Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*, 23.
[98] 'Sheyuan', *Xinchao*.
[99] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 16; Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*, 24–25.
[100] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 204.
[101] Hu Shi and Jiang Menglin published this article in the *Morning Post* on the anniversary of May Fourth in 1920, see Hu Shi and Jiang Menglin, 'Qunian wuyue si ri yilai de huigu yu jinhou de xiwang'. For Lin Shu's opinion on May Fourth, see Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 241; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 119. For Cai Yuanpei's opinion, see Cai Yuanpei, 'Qunian wuyue si ri yilai de huigu yu jinhou de xiwang', 90.
[102] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Lu hujunshi qing zhuangao ge xuesheng rexin aiguo wu wei hefa zhi yundong shu'; Hunan sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Hunan sheng jiaoyu hui, qing zhaoji quanguo jiaoyu hui lianhe hui kai linshi hui daidian', 6.

politically in a wider context.' Cai Yuanpei clearly stated that students should not be involved in politics: 'students, Cai implied, had to be students.'[103]

To be sure, it is impossible to know what these people really thought about the May Fourth demonstrations. All their statements were made in public. This even applies to diaries, which were often edited for publication.[104] Therefore, it is quite possible that, 'deep down,' Hu Shi and Lin Shu would have loved to demonstrate, or that they disapproved even of the patriotic spirit. But independently of what they really thought, contemporary May Fourth demonstrators and newspapers would not have been privy to this either. They would have only known Lin Shu's, Hu Shi's, Cai Yuanpei's and Huang Yanpei's public statements. These, however, did not suggest that the 'Old Faction' was uniformly against May Fourth and the 'New Faction' in favour of it. In sum, contemporaries' perception of May Fourth and New Culture was quite paradoxical. On the one hand, they were convinced that one had made the other popular. On the other hand they could not pinpoint how this had happened, and from the stories that were reported at the time, the connection was anything but obvious.

The Void around the 'New Culture Movement'

How, then, did May Fourth and New Culture come together? Unfortunately, there is a strange void around the emergence of the expression 'New Culture Movement.' It is very clear that the expression 'May Fourth Movement' was invented by Luo Jialun in an article in the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) on 26 May 1919 on occasion of the May Fourth demonstrations.[105] However, it seems untraceable who invented the term 'New Culture Movement' and why. I have therefore looked at diaries and 'chronologies

[103] Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 127.
[104] The editors of Huang Yanpei's diary, for example, noted that Huang Yanpei frequently edited and re-edited his own diary, see Huang Yanpei, 'Huang Yanpei riji zhengli fanli', 1. For a theoretical discussion of how diaries are shaped by social pressures or how they are 'strategies of … crafting of a public role,' see Dryburgh, 'The Fugitive Self', 111.
[105] Luo Jialun, '"Wu si yundong" de jingshen', 2011.

of lives' (*nianpu* 年譜) of people involved in the New Culture Movement, at prestigious New Culture journals, at newly founded 'spring-bamboo journals,' at established school journals that started discussing the New Culture Movement and at conference minutes and letters by the Jiangsu Educational Association, which employed the words 'New Culture Movement' at a very early stage.[106] However, nowhere is there any indication of the process through which these people became convinced of things like *baihua* after May Fourth, or of why they created the expression 'New Culture Movement' at this specific point in time.

References to the New Culture Movement appeared suddenly in late 1919 in lesser-known journals, and as I argue in Chapter Three, this indicates that it was intellectuals at the periphery who invented the expression. One of the first mentions, according to Ouyang Junxi, was in the Nationalist Party (*Guomindang* 國民黨, from now on GMD) journal *Weekly Review* (*Xinqgi pinglun*) on 31 August 1919.[107] Ouyang concluded from this that, 'seen from existing historical materials' (*cong xianyou shiliao kan* 從現有史料看), 'the probability is extremely great' (*kenengxing ji da* 可能性極大) that the expression 'New Culture Movement' was invented by 'GMD people' (*Guomindang ren* 國民黨人).[108] However, this conclusion is rather speculative. Contemporaries at the time never referred to the GMD as inventors of the 'New Culture Movement,' but described more vaguely how 'society' (*shehui* 社會) was suddenly talking about it.[109]

---

[106] Examples for *nianpu* are Huang Yanpei, *Huang Yanpei riji*; Xu Hansan, *Huang Yanpei nianpu*; Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*. Examples for prestigious New Culture journals are *Meizhou pinglun*; Chen Duxiu, *Xin qingnian*; *Xinchao*, 2006. An example for a 'spring-bamboo journal' is *Xin funü*. An example for an established school journal is *Jiangsu shengli di er nüzi shifan xuexiao xiaoyou hui huikan*. The sources about the Jiangsu Educational Association come from Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao*.

[107] Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 73; Xian Jin, 'Xin wenhua yundong de wuqi'; Bowles, 'Finding the Way', 33.

[108] Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 73.

[109] Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', 1963, 697. For a more detailed discussion of who was perceived to own the New Culture Movement, see Chapter Three of this dissertation.

The *Weekly Review* (*Xingqi pinglun*) article in question even cited a discussion of the New Culture Movement by Wu Zhihui, who at the time was an educator and not yet a GMD member.[110]

Moreover, the expression 'New Culture Movement' appeared suddenly in several publications across the intellectual and political spectrum in late summer and autumn of 1919, and people used it as if the expression was very obvious and the only issue was how to define or to promote it.[111] I therefore claim that it is impossible to say which group exactly invented the phrase. Instead I speculate more broadly that it was invented orally in discussion and study groups – some certainly affiliated with the GMD, others maybe not – in the summer of 1919, and then made it into print later.

When someone reflected on the connection between 'New Culture' and 'May Fourth' in the years to come, they would merely state how odd this apparent link was.[112] Only occasionally, someone like an author who went by the name of Zhong Jiu 仲九 argued vaguely in the GMD's 'spring-bamboo journal' *Construction* (*Jianshe* 建設) that the academic freedom promoted by Cai Yuanpei at Beijing University was a wider 'reason' (*yuanyin* 原因) for May Fourth.[113] However, although written relatively early, namely in October 1919, this must be evaluated as a retrospective analysis very much shaped by the outcome of events. Cai Yuanpei's academic freedom applied to the circles

[110] In 1918, Wu Zhihui became a teacher for Chinese literature at Tangshan Railway and Mining School (*Tangshan lukuang xuetang* 唐山路礦學堂). Only in 1924, Wu Zhihui became involved in the GMD. See Sun Youkui, s.v. 'Wu Zhihui'.

[111] For attempts to define it, see Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', 1963; Rendao, 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi jieshi'; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25. For efforts to promote it, see Zhu Daihen, 'Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu'; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919.

[112] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 18; Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 137.

[113] Zhong Jiu, 'Wu si yundong de huigu', 608. According to David Bowles, *Construction* was funded by the Guomindang. See Bowles, 'Finding the Way', 34. Zhong Jiu may have been the penname of Shen Zhongjiu 沈仲九 (1887-1968), an anarchist from Shaoxing, Zhejiang. See Zhang Jingru, Xiao Sheng, and Jiang Huayi, s.v. 'Shen Zhongjiu'; Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 129.

around Hu Shi and around Liu Shipei alike, and therefore Zhong Jiu's argument does not explain why the 'New Faction' became popular after May Fourth, not the 'Old Faction.'

This phenomenon contains important hints about the relationship between New Culture and May Fourth. It suggests that the two were not connected through obviously shared themes. Otherwise someone would have pointed to them somewhere and no one would have been surprised. The picture of the New Culture Movement, with its broad set of themes (*baihua*, popularisation of knowledge, enlightenment, science, democracy and so forth) and its narrow focus on a group of 'stars' (Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu, *New Youth*, *New Tide* and so forth) must have emerged in a roundabout way. It must have been created out of a multitude of factors and directions, about which no one at the time could know how they would play out when combined. In the following section, I show how stories circulated and elaborated in newspapers like the *Shanghai News* contributed to politicising the debates at Beijing University, so that in the end the circle around Hu Shi appeared as the heroes of May Fourth, and the group around Liu Shipei and Huang Kan as its villains.

Rumours

Rumours before May Fourth

As shown in Chapter One, the academic disputes about language and cultural evolution at Beijing University reached their pinnacle in February and March 1919, when the *National Heritage* magazine was founded and when Lin Shu started attacking the authors of *New Youth* and *New Tide* in newspapers. At that point, stories started emerging that entangled the two 'factions of learning' with warlord politics and cliques.

The *Shanghai News* did not create these stories, but it repeated them, often with the *caveat* that these were just rumours.

In March 1919, the *Shanghai News* had already observed that Lin Shu was siding with the group of academics the paper had described as the 'Old Faction.' The *Shanghai News* had also repeated a rumour that was 'being spread' (*xuanchuan* 喧傳) but, in the *Shanghai News*' view, untrue. This rumour stated that, at the instigation of 'one or two elderly gentlemen from the National Historiography Institute' (*Guoshi guan nei yi er qilao* 國史館內一二耆老), the government had demanded that Chancellor Cai Yuanpei dismiss the 'New Faction' members Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu and Qian Xuantong.[114]

On 5 April, this story became more specific. Lin Shu, the *Shanghai News* claimed now without any *caveats* about rumours, had persuaded the Censor Zhang Yuanqi 張元奇 (1858-1922) to threaten the minister of education, Fu Zengxiang, with an 'impeachment' (*tanhe* 彈劾) if he did not dismiss Cai Yuanpei immediately.[115] Zhang Yuanqi was in a good position to 'impeach' the minister of education, because he was employed in the *Suzheng ting* 肅政廳, a censor bureau of the Beiyang Government. In this capacity, he had the authority to 'impeach' ministers who had engaged in illegal actions.[116]

This story was similarly repeated in April in the *Morning Post*.[117] Twenty days later, the *Shanghai News* repeated the story, but at this point Zhang Yuanqi had already 'impeached' the minister, and Cai Yuanpei had already 'taken the blame and [offered] his resignation' (*yinjiu, cizhi* 引咎，辭職). When the *Shanghai News* declared the 'Old Faction' winner of the debates in April 1919, it was therefore not because of the 'Old

[114] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'.
[115] 'Jinghua duanjian', *Shenbao*, 5 April 1919. See also 'Fu jiaoyu tanhe shuo zhi youlai', *Shenbao*, 1 April 1919.
[116] Yu Lunian, s.v. 'Suzheng ting'; Xu Youchun, s.v. 'Zhang Yuanqi'.
[117] The *Morning Post* article was also reprinted in the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) in April 1919, see Yuan Quan, 'Jinggao shoujiu dang', 104.

Faction's' eloquence or sagacity, but because the debates had started 'affecting the political scene' (*qiandong zhengju* 牽動政局).[118]

Truth or Conspiracy Theories?

When reporting these stories, newspapers often employed a tentative tone and explained that they were repeating 'rumours' (*chuanshuo* 傳說 or *yaoyan* 謠言)[119] that were 'circulating widely' (e.g., *shengchuan* 盛傳).[120] Sometimes the academics at Beijing University sought to downplay these stories, but even the rejection of a rumour seemed to be official rhetoric at times. For example, Hu Shi stated on 10 March in *Beijing University Daily* that plans to dismiss him and Chen Duxiu were 'all unfounded rumours' (*quan wu genju de yaoyan* 全無根據的謠言). Cai Yuanpei made a similar statement in the same paper on 19 March.[121]

These 'rumours' had come up after Zhang Houzai, who was a student at Beijing University and had formerly studied under Lin Shu, had published such rumours in the *Public Voice*.[122] Nevertheless, Cai Yuanpei dismissed Chen Duxiu on 10 April 1919, suggesting that the previous refutations were untrue.[123] It is therefore difficult to know what was rumour at the time and what was really going on, particularly since the diaries of people like Cai Yuanpei and Hu Shi, who would have known it, stop in this period – either they preferred not to publish these sections or they were too busy to keep diaries.[124]

---

[118] Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing'.
[119] 'Chen Duxiu bei bu', *Shenbao*, 15 June 1919; Li Dazhao, 'Xin jiu sichao zhi jizhan', 144.
[120] 'Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti'.
[121] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 61.
[122] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 220.
[123] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 64.
[124] See Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 1:252–53; Hu Shi, *Hu Shi riji quanji*, 2:519–591.

Scholars have analysed the provenance of these stories about the government's attack on Beijing University and speculated what was true about them. Timothy B. Weston has granted them relative credibility.[125] Vera Schwarcz has claimed that Cai Yuanpei was sincerely astonished when a more politically minded Minister of Education Fu Zengxiang drew his attention to the political implications of 'New Faction' activities.[126] Zhang Juncai and Chen Sihe have argued that the stories were just rumours.[127] Chen Sihe's argument read that they were usually introduced with vocabulary like 'maybe … perhaps … if …' (*yexu ... keneng ... ruguo ...* 也許 …… 可能 …… 如果 ……).[128]

Michael Gibbs Hill even called the conspiracy theory about the government attacks a conspiracy of the 'New Faction.' In March 1918, Qian Xuantong had created a fictional character named Wang Jingxuan in *New Youth,* who sharply criticised the *baihua* project, the introduction of Western ideas and the new moral code (emancipation of women and so forth) suggested in that journal.[129] Liu Bannong replied to this fictional letter, taking apart all of Wang's arguments. Liu even insinuated that, had Wang Jingxuan met him face to face, 'you, sir, would have certainly wanted to swing that "stalwart hand" and hit me and my pals [lit. 'me and so on on'] on the mouth so that we would not have dared to open it [again], and hit us a second time on the mouth so that we would have started bleeding from between the teeth' (*xiansheng ding yao hui qi 'juling zhi zhang,' ba jizhe deng yige zuiba da de bu gan kaikou, liang ge zuiba da de yachi feng li chuxue* 先生定要揮起"巨靈之掌"，把記者等一個嘴巴打得不敢開口，兩個嘴巴打得牙齒縫裏出血).[130] When Lin Shu started railing against the 'New

[125] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 171–75.
[126] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 53.
[127] Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 223.
[128] Chen Sihe, 'Xu Shuzheng yu xin wenhua yundong', 274.
[129] Wang Jingxuan, 'Wang Jingxuan jun lai xin'.
[130] Liu Bannong, 'Fu Wang Jingxuan shu', 114. On the Wang Jingxuan debate, see also Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 233; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 221.

Faction' one year later in a very similar fashion, Beijing University's 'New Faction' could not believe its luck and constructed Lin Shu as 'the living incarnation of Wang Jingxuan.'[131]

If this intriguing argument was true, the 'New Faction' had misjudged the situation. While Hill has argued that being ascribed a government connection was harmful even before May Fourth, this story about political plotting led the *Shanghai News* to declare the failure of 'New Faction' arguments in April.[132] The point, moreover, is not what really happened in March and April 1919, but what a newspaper like the *Shanghai News* claimed to be happening, since this was the information people were getting at the time. The *Shanghai News*, however, held with increasing conviction that Lin Shu and the 'Old Faction' were plotting with the government to oust the 'New Faction.' People interested in this could read the story everywhere in the spring of 1919, with stronger or weaker warnings about its truthfulness.

Li Dazhao published an article on 4 and 5 March 1919 in the *Morning Post*, in which he called upon the 'Old Faction' to put a stop to the political intrigues and come out to face the debate.[133] Chen Duxiu claimed in March that Lin Shu was 'mobilising a member of parliament from his home region' (*yundong ta tongxiang de guohui yiyuan* 運動他同鄉的國會議員), possibly referring to Censor Zhang Yuanqi, who was like Lin Shu from Fujian.[134] When Cha An published his *Chronicle of the Student Protests* in September 1919, he repeated almost exactly the stories that the *Shanghai News* had expounded on.[135] The missionary and professor at Yanjing University Philippe de Vargas retold the

[131] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 221.
[132] Ibid., 220–21; Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing'.
[133] Li Dazhao, 'Xin jiu sichao zhi jizhan', 143–44.
[134] Chen Duxiu, 'Lin Shu de liusheng jiqi'. On Zhang Yuanqi's and Lin Shu's birth place, see Xu Youchun, s.v. 'Zhang Yuanqi'; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 3.
[135] Cha An, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang 7–9.

story about Lin Shu and the impeachment of Cai Yuanpei and Fu Zengxiang.[136] And in future years, 'New Faction' members would frequently remember the grave danger they were facing from the government through Lin Shu's connections. For example, Zheng Zhenduo 鄭振鐸 (1898-1958) repeated the story in 1935 in the influential *Compendium of New Chinese Literature* (*Zhongguo xin wenxue daxi* 中國新文學大係), and Hu Shi and Zhou Zuoren talked about it as late as the 1960s.[137] In short, whether the stories were true or not, the important point is that they were widely circulating and that they did not seem implausible at the time.

Cai Yuanpei's Resignation in Three 'Acts'

Before May Fourth, the *Shanghai News* felt that these rumours indicated the strength of the circle around Liu Shipei and Huang Kan. When the political atmosphere turned hostile towards the government during the May Fourth demonstrations, the opposite happened. Newspapers reported sympathetically about the May Fourth demonstrations.[138] Public statements even by people like Lin Shu or the semi-official Jiangsu Educational Association approved of the patriotic spirit of the demonstrations.[139]

In this situation, Cai Yuanpei, the chancellor of Beijing University, resigned. In the night of 9 May 1919, he secretly packed up his belongings in his office at Beijing University and at 5:30am, he sneaked out of Beijing. [140] The next day, Beijing University woke up and was shocked to find its chancellor gone. The story told in newspapers from the *Shanghai News* over *Social Welfare Tiensin* to the *Public Voice*,

[136] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 15–16.
[137] Chen Sihe, 'Xu Shuzheng yu xin wenhua yundong', 273–74.
[138] Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?*, 384–89.
[139] On Lin Shu's opinion about May Fourth, see Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 241; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 119. For comments by the Jiangsu Educational Association, see Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Lu hujunshi qing zhuangao ge xuesheng rexin aiguo wu wei hefa zhi yundong shu'.
[140] Cha An, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang 8; Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 1:253.

and repeated by Cha An later in 1919 in the *Chronicle of the Student Protests*, was that all he had left was a note that stated:

> I am tired. 'The murderers of the gentleman's horse are those who are standing next to the way [praising the horse, and thereby spurring it on to exhaustion].'[141] 'The people indeed are heavily burdened, but perhaps a little ease may be got for them.'[142] I want to rest a little. I have already formally resigned from the post of chancellor of Beijing University. Starting from 9 May, I end all contact with all other universities and assemblies that I used to be affiliated with. I merely explain this. Only those who know me will forgive me for this.
>
> 吾倦矣。'殺君馬者道旁兒，''民亦勞止，訖可少休，'吾願少休矣。北京大學校長之職已正式辭去。其他向有關係之各學校，各集會。自五月九日起。一切脫離關係。特此聲明。惟知我者諒之。[143]

Over the next few weeks, representatives of Beijing University sent countless letters to his abode, first in Tianjin, then in Shanghai, asking him to resume his post. But Cai Yuanpei remained unmoved. Even when government institutions, such as the Jiangsu Educational Association, or the minister of education himself asked him to return, he refused.[144]

This resignation caused a huge media storm all across the country. Newspapers, from the commercial *Shanghai News* in Shanghai, the Catholic *Social Welfare Tiensin*, the independent *Impartial* in Changsha to the speech organ of the Anfu Club, the *Public Voice* in Beijing, were fascinated by Cai Yuanpei's resignation and wrote countless articles speculating why he had left, where he was, and when and if he would return.[145]

---

[141] This is a citation from the *Common Meaning in Customs* (*Fengsu tongyi* 風俗通義), a text from the Eastern Han period, see Ge Wujue, *Shiguang you sheng*, 166.

[142] This is a citation from 'The Burden of the People' (*Min lao* 民勞) from the *Book of Odes* (*Shijing* 詩經), translation from Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 4: The She King:496.

[143] Cha An, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang 8. Similarly also in 'Beijing daxue you qi jueda bolan', *Shenbao*, 12 May 1919; 'Daxue xiaozhang zhi cizhi', *Yishibao*, 10 May 1919; 'Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti'. See also Gao Pingshu, *Cai Yuanpei nianpu changbian*, 2 (1917–1926):202–03. Cai Yuanpei's diary did not mention this note, but claimed that he sent 'a letter [explaining] the real reason for my resignation' (*cizhi zhenyin yi han* 辞职真因一函) on the 12th. See Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 1:253.

[144] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919, 23; Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'.

[145] Articles on the topic in *Impartial* were: 'Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti'; 'Jiaoyu zongzhang zhi zhulu', *Dagongbao*, 20 May 1919; 'Beijing jiaoyu jie xiaoxi xu wen', *Dagongbao*, 20 May 1919. *Social*

This made the eyes of newspaper readers in urban centres all over the country turn to Beijing University.

Moreover, newspapers tended to report about Cai's resignation and the May Fourth demonstrations together. *Social Welfare Tiensin*, for example, launched a column with the title 'Citizens Fight in the Diplomatic [Question]' (*Guomin lizheng waijiao* 國民力爭外交), where it reported about Cai's resignation next to articles on the 'Shandong question' (*Shandong wenti* 山東問題).[146] In this way, Cai's resignation provided an important catalyst for connecting the academic discourse at Beijing University with the political activism of the May Fourth demonstrations. It helped to reinforce the impression that the 'factions of learning' at Beijing University were entangled with warlord politics, and to turn the 'New Faction' into the 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[147]

In the following sections, I illustrate this by the example of a *Shanghai News* article from 13 May 1919, written by the reporter Shuang Yu 霜羽 (no dates). Shuang Yu's story was repeated almost literally in Cha An's *Chronicle of the Student Protests*, and similarly described in the other aforementioned newspapers in Beijing, Tianjin and Changsha.[148] First of all, the *Shanghai News* constructed Cai Yuanpei into a spokesperson for the 'New Faction.' Over and over again, Cai Yuanpei repeated that he

---

Welfare Tiensin wrote: 'Beijing xuesheng fu Cai Zimin liang dian', *Yishibao*, 12 July 1919; 'Daxue xiaozhang zhi cizhi'. The *Public Voice* wrote: 'Cai Zimin dumen yangke', *Gongyanbao*, 20 June 1919; 'Cai Yuanpei zhi xingxing zhizhi', *Gongyanbao*, 28 May 1919; 'Cai Yuanpei han ci hui Jing', *Gongyanbao*, 31 May 1919; 'Guanyu Beijing daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi suo wen', *Gongyanbao*, 21 June 1919.

[146] 'Daxue xiaozhang zhi cizhi'; 'Shandong wenti yi jiejue', *Yishibao*, 10 May 1919. The *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* also reported about May Fourth and Cai's resignation together, see 'Xuejie fengchao you qi', *Gongyanbao*, 10 May 1919; 'Hu Renyuan zhang daxue wenti', *Shenbao*, 10 June 1919; 'Jing xuejie jin xun', *Shenbao*, 11 August 1919.

[147] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

[148] Cha An, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang 7–9; 'Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti'; 'Jiaoyu zongzhang zhi zhulu'; 'Daxue xiaozhang zhi cizhi'. For the *Morning Post* from 13 May 1919, see Xie Yuanxue, *Zhongguo gongchandang lishi jishi*, 1A:734.

did not favour any one of the two 'factions,' but endorsed *jianrong bingbao*. This formula has been translated as 'broad-minded tolerance'[149] or as 'broad-minded and encompassing tolerance of diverse points of view.'[150] Nevertheless, the *Shanghai News* regularly displayed Cai Yuanpei as the defender of the 'New Faction,' to the extent that *jianrong bingbao* almost seemed to be a formula to defend his refusal to dismiss the 'New Faction' from Beijing University.[151] In short, Cai Yuanpei and the 'New Faction' must have looked like the same thing to *Shanghai News* readers.

After Cai Yuanpei had left Beijing on 10 May 1919, the *Shanghai News* told the story of Cai Yuanpei's resignation as a gradual fall in three 'acts' (*mu* 幕) that 'shook' (*dongyao* 動搖) Cai's position, because ruling warlord Duan Qirui from the Anfu Club tyrannised him.[152] In this way, the group described by the media as 'New Faction' must have looked to their readers as if it was a long-standing victim of government suppression.

The *Shanghai News* wrote that Cai Yuanpei had never been on good terms with Duan Qirui. Duan was temporarily dismissed from his post as premier in May 1917 over his advocacy to enter World War I, but plotted his way back into power later during the year.[153] According to the *Shanghai News*, Cai Yuanpei wanted to leave Beijing University on this occasion and join Sun Yat-sen in the south – as shown in the Introduction, Sun Yat-sen established an alternative government in south China in 1917.[154] However, Cai Yuanpei was not allowed to go.[155] In August 1918, a new parliament convened after an election in which Duan Qirui's Anfu Club had gained a

[149] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 123.
[150] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 52.
[151] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'.
[152] Ibid.
[153] *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. Duan Qirui; Liang Yiqun, s.v. 'Duan Qirui'.
[154] For details, see pp. 28-30.
[155] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'.

considerable majority.[156] It was at this time, the *Shanghai News* claimed, that Duan Qirui tried to oust Cai Yuanpei, by pinning an anarchist publication on Cai.

> When the third cabinet of Duan [Qirui] was formed [in 1918], Mr Duan promptly wanted to dismiss him [Cai Yuanpei] and said: A certain publication by elements at the University seems to be touching upon anarchism, and I suspect that Mr Cai has instigated it. But [the Minister of Education] Fu Zengxiang battled with him [Duan Qirui], providing all sorts of reasons why he could not dismiss Cai. This was the first act in which Mr Cai's position was shaken.
>
> 及三次段閣成，段氏即欲去之，謂：'大學分子之某種印刷品似涉於無政府主義，疑為蔡君所倡導，'而傅增湘則持種種不可去蔡之理由，以與之爭。此為蔡君位置動搖之第一幕。[157]

The second 'act' that shook Cai Yuanpei's position was the student demonstrations of 1918. On this occasion, Cai was only saved by the factional warlord rivals of Duan Qirui, the Zhili faction. It does not seem as if Cai Yuanpei was generally enjoying the favour of the Zhili Clique. One year later, in 1920, Cai was even attacked for his ideas by the leaders of both the Zhili and the Fengtian Cliques. Rather, Cai Yuanpei was, according to the *Shanghai News*, a sympathiser with Sun Yat-sen's government in the south. The *Shanghai News* must have envisioned that the Zhili Clique was supporting Cai in this instance because it saw it as another opportunity to oppose Duan's Anhui Clique.[158]

In May 1918, Duan Qirui's government signed the first of the 'Sino-Japanese Military Conventions', which allowed Japanese military to be stationed on Chinese territory.

---

[156] Andrew Nathan showed how in this election the warlords did not only actively buy votes. In February 1918, the government (with Duan Qirui as premier) had also changed the law in a way that favoured factions that were already strong in the cabinet. The clique around Duan Qirui was among those factions. See Nathan, *Peking Politics, 1918-1923*, 92–112.

[157] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'. Similarly in Cha An, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang 8.

[158] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 200; Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'; Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords'. A similar 'enemy-of-my-enemy' logic, for example, led former President Li Yuanhong (Zhili) to donate a considerable sum of money to the Zhejiang Educational Association in 1917, which was headed by a member of the GMD. See Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 130.

This convention incited student protests, in the wake of which Cai Yuanpei considered resigning.[159] The reason Cai gave later was that he did not approve of student protests, which kept the students from studying.[160] The *Shanghai News*, on the other hand, claimed that 'Old Faction' sympathisers in the government, who had peered suspiciously at the presence of the 'New Faction' at Beijing University all along, saw the protests as a welcome excuse to dismiss Cai Yuanpei. It was only because the Zhili faction did not approve of these plans that Cai Yuanpei stayed on.[161] In other words, before May Fourth, the *Shanghai News* had claimed that only Lin Shu had polarised the debates politically. Now it argued that the government's hostility towards the 'New Faction' was a long-standing and deeply ingrained problem.

The third 'act' in which Cai's position was 'shaken' was the academic dispute at Beijing University, which the *Shanghai News* and the *Public Voice* had identified as the dispute between 'Old' and 'New Faction,' and which had culminated in the spring of 1919. So far, the *Shanghai News*' story had only depicted Cai Yuanpei as the government's victim. With the third 'act,' it also associated the 'Old Faction' with the 'country-selling traitors.' In March, the *Shanghai News* had claimed that Lin Shu had contacted Censor Zhang Yuanqi in defence of the 'Old Faction.' Now the *Shanghai News* claimed that Lin Shu had reached out to Xu Shuzheng, a warlord in the Anfu Club who was widely labelled 'country-selling traitor.'[162]

---

[159] Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 140.

[160] Cai Yuanpei, 'Wo zai Beijing daxue de jingli', 159.

[161] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'. The expression the *Shanghai News* used was 'Hejian faction' (*Hejian yi pai* 河間一派). Hejian, today a city in Hebei, was the hometown of Feng Guozhang 馮國璋 (1859-1919), the leader of the Zhili faction. Therefore I conclude that 'Hejian faction' is another name for 'Zhili Faction.' See Yang Zhijiu, Wu Ze, and Zheng Tianting, s.v. 'Feng Guozhang'.

[162] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'. For Xu Shuzheng being labelled 'country-selling traitor,' see 'Wu yue qi ri zhi guomin dahui'; 'Xu Shuzheng fandui jujue qianzi', *Dagongbao*, 11 July 1919.

The *Shanghai News* did not flesh out what form this intervention took. But in this context scholars like Vera Schwarcz, Chen Sihe, Wang Feng and Gao Pingshu have cited a very apologetic letter by Minister of Education Fu Zengxiang to Cai Yuanpei from 26 March 1919. The letter read that some 'elderly people' in the government were criticising Cai, and that it would only cause trouble, if the dispute between 'Old' and 'New Faction' left the academic sphere.

> Since *New Tide* has been published, the elders in the capital have [expressed] some veiled criticism towards the gentlemen in charge [of *New Tide*] … If this goes slightly beyond the scope of academia, it will incite the factional struggle between new and old even more. [And] this could not but give rise to lurking dangers.
>
> 自《新潮》出版，輩下耆宿，對於在事員生不無微詞。 …… 徜 [sic, but '倘' in the version cited by Chen Sihe] 稍逾學術範圍之外，將益啟黨派新舊之爭，此則不能不引為隱憂耳。[163]

The *Shanghai News* went on reporting that, drawing upon his *jianrong bingbao*, Cai Yuanpei famously rejected any government intervention. He explained that the government had no business intervening at the University and 'he said that the highest institution of learning must be all-encompassing towards all sorts of schools of learning and cannot hold sectarian views' (*wei zui gao xuefu, yu zhongzhong xuepai bixu jianrong bingbao, bu ke chunu renzhu* 謂最高學府，於種種學派必須兼容幷包，不可出奴人主).[164]

Vera Schwarcz has displayed this as a sign of naivety, because Cai did not see 'the social danger inherent in the *jianrong bingbao* principle.'[165] Chen Pingyuan has

[163] Gao Pingshu, *Cai Yuanpei nianpu changbian*, 2 (1917–1926):186. See also Chen Sihe, 'Xu Shuzheng yu xin wenhua yundong', 277; Wang Guohua, *Xuelin sui hua*, 148; Wang Feng, 'Wu si qianhou de Lin Shu', 29; Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 53. It is unclear where this letter was first published. The above works only cite from an 'original of the letter by Fu Zengxiang' (*Fu Zengxiang lai han yuanjian* 傅增湘來函原件).

[164] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'. Similarly in Cha An, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang 9.

[165] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 53.

explained that Cai Yuanpei's experience in Germany, where he had seen a relatively state-independent academia, showed him that *jianrong bingbao* 'was a matter of life and death.'[166] But whatever Cai Yuanpei's motivation, the *Shanghai News* claimed that the government was enraged at his attitude. Ideas were forged to 'topple' (*dao* 倒)[167] Cai Yuanpei and the Premier Qian Nengxun 錢能訓 (1869-1924) even let himself be carried away to wonder:

> If Mr Cai was dead, would the University [not] be manageable?
>
> 蔡君如死，大學辦否[168]

The *Shanghai News* was not the only paper to report about the connection between Lin Shu and the warlord Xu Shuzheng. *Impartial* told a story that was 'widely circulating' (*shengchuan* 盛傳), according to which 'a certain general' (*mou shangjiang* 某上將) wanted to burn down Beijing University.[169] The *Morning Post* had 'certain news' (*queshi xiaoxi* 確實消息) that Cai Yuanpei had received death threats, and that he, Cai, had 'heard' (*wen* 聞) about schemes to 'burn down' (*fenhui* 焚毀) Beijing University.[170] There was also the suspicion that Xu was the 'giant' (*wei zhangfu* 偉丈夫) from Lin Shu's short story 'Scholar Jing,' who beat up *baihua* advocates identified as Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu and Qian Xuantong.[171] Being, in this way, brought into connection with the

---

[166] Chen, *Touches of History*, 154–55.
[167] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'.
[168] Ibid. For Qian Nengxun's biography, see Wei Qiao, s.v. 'Qian Nengxun'.
[169] 'Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti'.
[170] The *Morning Post* from on 13 May, cited in Xie Yuanxue, *Zhongguo gongchandang lishi jishi*, 1A:734.
[171] Lin Shu, 'Jing Sheng', 489; Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 223. For the translation of '*wei zhangfu*' as 'giant,' see Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 217. It is difficult to trace when and by whom this connection was first made. Liu Bannong wrote in 1933 that Lin Shu wanted to enlist the help of 'his "General Scholar Jing," namely, Xu Shuzheng, whom we called Little Xu' (*ta de 'Jing sheng jiangjun,' er women cheng wei xiao Xu de Xu Shuzheng* 他的'荊生將軍，'而我們稱為小徐的徐樹錚). See Liu Bannong, '"Chuqi baihua shi gao" xu mu', 206. I have not, however, found any references for this in 1919. The idea that the 'giant' from Lin Shu's short story referred to a real person from military circles was indicated by Chen Duxiu in March 1919, see Chen Duxiu, 'Lin Shu de liusheng jiqi'. But Chen Duxiu did not mention Xu Shuzheng's name. It is possible that the idea to identify 'Scholar Jing's' 'giant' with

'country-selling traitors' of the Beiyang Government must have been disadvantageous for people classified as 'Old Faction.'

Cai Yuanpei was not assassinated, but he abolished Chen Duxiu's position of dean of humanities, which forced Chen to leave Beijing University on 10 April.[172] As editor of *New Youth* and one of the most ardent and outspoken advocates of New Culture ideas, Chen Duxiu was in the limelight of attention and criticism. As Hu Shi remembered in 1935, Chen Duxiu was in 1919 accused of problems with his 'personal virtue' (*side* 私德). 'Tabloids' (*xiaobao* 小報) were claiming that he was frequenting prostitutes and had even, in unbridled passion, injured a woman.[173] Hu Shi claimed that, although even Cai Yuanpei had believed the stories, they were all 'unfounded talk' (*wuji zhi tan* 無稽之談), designed to attack the people known as 'New Faction' at Beijing University.[174] As a result, Cai Yuanpei abolished the post Chen Duxiu was holding at Beijing University, as a discrete way of dismissing Chen.

The May Fourth demonstrations then were, in the *Shanghai News* narrative, Cai Yuanpei's downfall. However, they also brought him and the 'New Faction,' which he defended, at the centre of the political events of May Fourth. When a number of Beijing University students were arrested for demonstrating, Cai Yuanpei employed all his authority to free them from prison. But, the story read, he knew that his position was no longer tenable. The *Shanghai News* claimed:

Xu Shuzheng was only circulating orally and not written down, possibly out of fear of government repressions. However, it is also conceivable that this connection was only made later, when Xu Shuzheng and Lin Shu had been tied together by stories as the one told in the *Shanghai News*.

[172] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'; Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 64.

[173] Letter from Hu Shi to Tang Erhe 湯爾和 (1878-1940) from 28 December 1925, cited in Gao Pingshu, *Cai Yuanpei nianpu changbian*, 2 (1917–1926):181.

[174] Ibid., 2 (1917–1926):181–82.

> On the night of 4 May, there was a big meeting in the house of Qian [Nengxun, the premier], to discuss the dissolution of the University and the dismissal of the chancellor.
>
> 五月四日之夜，錢宅開大會，議解散大學，罷免校長。[175]

Minister of Education Fu Zengxiang was trying his best to save Cai Yuanpei, 'but Mr Cai knew himself that he could not stay on' (*ran Cai jun zi zhi bu ke zai liu* 然蔡君自知不可再留). The 'average old officials in Beijing' (*Beijing yiban jiu guanliao* 北京一般舊官僚) and the 'personages belonging to the same faction as [the "country-selling traitors"] Cao [Rulin] and Lu [Zongyu]' (*Cao, Lu zhi tongpai renshi* 曹、陸之同派人士) all held the 'new-learning faction' (*xinxue pai* 新學派) and Cai Yuanpei responsible for the demonstrations.[176]

The reason for this belief was that, as the *Shanghai News* would explain later, they felt that the people who had been causing trouble over the past few months also had to be the troublemakers now.[177] With this argument in mind, the *Shanghai News* tied political and academic discourses together even more tightly, when reporting on 15 June about Chen Duxiu's arrest. The newspaper interpreted this arrest as the government's 'further destruction of the New Faction scholars' (*dui ... xinpai xuezhe jiayi cuican* 對 …… 新派學者加以摧殘), whom the government was using as a scapegoat for the troubles of May Fourth.[178]

To avoid the humiliation of being dismissed by the government, Cai Yuanpei therefore decided to resign before the government could take action. After he had procured the

[175] Shuang Yu, 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai'.
[176] Ibid.
[177] 'Chen Duxiu bei bu'.
[178] Ibid.

release of the students who had been arrested during the demonstrations, he packed up his belongings and sneaked out of Beijing in the morning of 10 May 1919.[179]

Lin Shu and the 'Country-Selling Traitors'

While displaying the 'New Faction' as brave government victims, this *Shanghai News* narrative put people classified as 'Old Faction' dangerously close to the 'country-selling traitors' of May Fourth when it claimed that Lin Shu had instigated Xu Shuzheng, rather than Censor Zhang Yuanqi, to defend the 'Old Faction' at Beida. I can only speculate why the narrative changed after May Fourth. Was this an intended blow against the 'Old Faction?' Or was it safe to repeat a generally circulating story about Xu Shuzheng, now that he was discredited by the May Fourth demonstrators anyway? Whatever the reason, this modified *Shanghai News* story cannot have been beneficial to people depicted as 'Old Faction,' even though they themselves were never called 'traitors.'

This connection between Lin Shu and the warlord government has often been repeated in scholarship, even though, as pointed out above, other scholars have doubted that Lin Shu really mobilised the government against the 'New Faction.'[180] How obvious was it for newspapers to make this connection between the 'Old Faction' and the warlords? Again, it is difficult to distinguish between fact and fiction. Lin Shu and Xu Shuzheng were indeed friends, they shared the ideal of *guwen*, and Lin Shu was employed at a school founded by Xu Shuzheng, the Zhengzhi Middle School.[181] Xu Shuzheng was, moreover, a member of the ruling warlord clique, the Anfu Club, and friends with the clique's head, Duan Qirui. It was also true that Xu was a pro-Japanese politician: in

[179] Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 1:253.
[180] Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 223; Chen Sihe, 'Xu Shuzheng yu xin wenhua yundong', 274; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 221.
[181] Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 223; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 21, 171, 220.

1918 he had signed follow-up treaties to the Sino-Japanese Military Conventions, which had caused the student demonstrations of that year.[182]

However, as mentioned before, his friendship with Xu Shuzheng did not keep Lin Shu from commending the students' patriotic spirit during May Fourth.[183] Besides, academia and politics were so entangled in the 1910s that it would not have been unthinkable to construct a connection between the 'New Faction' and the government as well. Cai Yuanpei had been the first minister of education of the Republic, and Hu Shi sat on government-sponsored committees that promoted *guoyu*.[184] Moreover, Liang Qichao's Research Clique, which had long supported the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, was even allied to the Anfu Club until only a short while earlier.[185] In other words, the warlord-political polarisation of 'Old' and 'New Faction' needed some interpretive help from newspapers like the *Shanghai News*. And when someone like Lin Shu expressed his opposition to the government's Shandong deal with Japan, this was apparently simply not reported.[186]

Victims of the Government, Unite!

At the same time, however, another group that was in the limelight of wide-spread urban attention came to regard itself as government victims: the May Fourth demonstrators. In this way, newspapers furthered the impression that the victimised 'New Faction' had something in common with these demonstrators. Vera Schwarcz has pointed out that an 'exhilaration of blood,' that is, an excitement about being violently suppressed by the government, emerged only after the May 30th demonstrations of

[182] Wu Xiang, 'Lun Xu Shuzheng yu Wanxi junfa de xingshuai', 18; Waldron, *From War to Nationalism*, 191; Huang Dexin, s.v. 'Jiao'ao zujie tiaoyue'.
[183] Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 241; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 119.
[184] *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. Cai Yuanpei; Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 144.
[185] Yuan Shuyi, s.v. 'Yanjiu xi'; Nathan, *Peking Politics, 1918-1923*, 239–244; Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 212.
[186] On Lin Shu's expression of opposition, see Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 241; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 119.

1925.[187] But Chen Pingyuan has cited Luo Jialun's 'Spirit of the "May Fourth Movement"' in the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*), in which Luo did not only invent the expression 'May Fourth Movement,' but also praised the students' 'spirit of sacrifice' (*xisheng de jingshen* 犧牲的精神) in 'battling with the powers of darkness with bare hands and empty fists' (*yang baishou, he hei'an shili xiangdou* 揚白手，和黑暗勢力相斗).[188] Luo Jialun specifically emphasised the suppression by the government when he wrote:

> There were some who were wounded and there were also some who were arrested. There were also some who were angered to death because of the wounds.
>
> 傷的也有，被捕的也有，因傷而憤死的也有。[189]

The students in Beijing were only in prison for a few days, and external observers like the publisher Wang Yuanfang felt that Chen Duxiu greatly exaggerated his suffering at the hands of the government:

> When Chen Zhongweng [i.e. Chen Duxiu] was in Shanghai, he would sometimes come to the shop. We were all very respectful towards him. [But] behind his back, we regularly said: 'What [is he going on about] prison and jail? He went straight in and straight out!'
>
> 陳仲翁在上海有時要到店裏來。我們大家對他非常恭敬，背後常談：'什麼監獄堅牢，他直進直出！'[190]

However, for privileged students, even a night in prison doubtlessly came as a shock. Consequently, the government suppression of the students was a big topic everywhere – for example, in newspaper reports and in the reports of the Jiangsu Educational

[187] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 153.
[188] Luo Jialun, '"Wu si yundong" de jingshen', 2011, 78. Translation from Chen, *Touches of History*, 53.
[189] Luo Jialun, '"Wu si yundong" de jingshen', 2011, 78.
[190] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 51.

Association, which tried to shield the students from the government.[191] Some students in Jiangsu, the *Shanghai News* noted, even took it upon themselves 'to be a vegetarian for a whole day, in order to give expression to their oath never to forget the disgrace' (*rusu yiri, yi shi shi bu wang chi* 茹素一日，以示誓不忘耻).[192] In other words, being victimised by the government was an important feature in the identity of May Fourth demonstrators.

Jing Guan's Perspective

What kind of impression, I would like to speculate, would all this have made on someone like Jing Guan, the young teacher who claimed that his way of showing opposition to the government was to discuss the 'question of the new woman?'[193] Since the *Shanghai News* and other newspapers were targeted at, and read by, Jing Guan's social group, there is a good chance that he was a newspaper reader, maybe even a *Shanghai News* reader.[194] Jing Guan would have read in the papers that an important part of the identity of May Fourth demonstrators was to be suppressed by the government. At the end of some articles on the demonstrations, he would have seen a note on Cai Yuanpei's resignation, and read how the resignation was the result of the continuous bullying by the government, because Cai had bravely defended the 'New Faction'.

When reading newspapers like this, Jing Guan may have concluded that discussing 'New Faction' ideas was tantamount to demonstrating against the government on the

[191] For newspaper discussions of the government crackdowns, see 'Xuejie fengchao zhong ge fangmian zhi taidu', *Shenbao*, 8 May 1919; 'Chajin "fanghai zhi"an' de jihui, chuban zhi jingguo'; 'Waijiao jinji yu heju polie (liu)', *Yishibao*, 21 May 1919; 'Ge xiao xiaozhang zhi jianjue', *Dagongbao*, 10 May 1919. For similar discussions by the Jiangsu Educational Association, see Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919, 21; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', June 1919.
[192] 'Jiang Zhe zhi jinian guochi yu zheng Qingdao'.
[193] Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 32.
[194] For more information on newspaper readership, see pp. 47-48.

streets. It may have been for this reason that he got together with his colleagues to 'research the question of the new woman,' while his students were marching in protest. And it may have been for this reason that it was important for him to point out that these ideas stood in the tradition of Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi, when a reference to other groups would have also been possible, or, as I show in Chapter Three, even more obvious.[195]

Conclusion

After the May Fourth demonstrations, the group of academics whom the media had classified as 'New Faction,' experienced a meteoric rise in popularity among students and educators in China's urban centres. The reason for this, as I have argued in this chapter, was not that May Fourth and the 'New Faction' had goals in common, or that May Fourth evidenced the necessity of ideas peculiar to the 'New Faction.' Instead, a cluster of stories that surrounded Beijing University and the Beiyang Government, which went viral in the press after the resignation of Cai Yuanpei, made the 'New Faction' look as if it was the same sort of anti-government activists as the May Fourth demonstrators.

These stories had been circulating in the months preceding May Fourth, and they had claimed that Lin Shu was mobilising his government connections to oust people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu from Beijing University. Before May Fourth, the *Shanghai News* had judged that this meant the imminent crumbling of the 'New Faction' under government pressure and the victory of the 'Old Faction.' After May Fourth, however, the atmosphere among intellectuals in the country, that is, among people who were potentially interested in the 'New Faction'-'Old Faction' debates, turned against the

[195] Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 31–32.

government. It is understandable that under these circumstances people did not want to identify with an 'Old Faction' that was now even ascribed direct connections with a warlord labelled 'country-selling traitor.'

The 'New Faction,' however, looked as if it had something in common with the May Fourth demonstrators: According to this narrative, it had been harassed by the government for a long time. Cai Yuanpei had bravely stood up against this government, although in the end the constant government bullying had forced him to resign. Discussing new-style ideas and ascribing them to the constructed entity of Beijing University's 'New Faction' therefore felt like an anti-government act. Consequently, a teacher like Jing Guan in Shanghai could say that, although he did not demonstrate during May Fourth, he did discuss the 'question of the new woman,' just like, in his view, Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu had done.[196] And he could argue that this showed his patriotic spirit and participation in the May Fourth and New Culture Movements just as well.

What this demonstrates is that May Fourth and New Culture were connected, but not through a neat argument, but because the media had constructed disputing academics at Beijing University into fixed 'factions of learning,' and then ascribed political allegiances to these 'factions.' These perceived allegiances had implications after May Fourth that were not anticipated before: Before May Fourth, they seemed to suggest the end of the 'New Faction'; afterwards they caused its dissolution as a 'faction of learning' and the rebirth of its members as stars of a 'Movement.'

The role this newspaper construction played in connecting New Culture and May Fourth is illustrated through the contrast with an alternative narrative told by the *Public Voice*, the mouthpiece of the Anfu Club. Speaking for a political group that held a

[196] Ibid.

grudge against people like Chen Duxiu, but at the same time unable to remain unimpressed by the patriotic spirit of the May Fourth demonstrations, the *Public Voice* could not have had any interest in stylising the 'New Faction' into the anti-government heroes of May Fourth.[197] It may therefore be no coincidence that the *Public Voice* told a story about Cai Yuanpei's resignation that would have never made it plausible to connect the academic circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu with the May Fourth demonstrations.

In March, the *Public Voice* had also constructed the debating academics at Beijing University into 'New Faction' and 'Old Faction,' and the paper had ascribed the same political allegiances to them as the *Shanghai News*.[198] But later the *Public Voice* did not claim that Cai Yuanpei resigned out of antagonism to Anfu politics. Instead, the paper reported that Cai Yuanpei and Fu Zengxiang quit because they 'shouldered the blame' (*yinjiu* 引咎) for the protests of May Fourth.[199] It cited Cai Yuanpei as saying that he had lost his influence over the students[200] and that 'the students' actions increasingly transgress the usual boundaries' (*xuesheng judong yu yue changgui* 學生舉動愈越常軌).[201] Moreover, the *Public Voice* emphasised how the 'government had repeatedly urged [Cai] to stay' (*zhengfu leici weiliu* 政府壘次慰留). The paper was even inclined to believe the story that Cai Yuanpei was 'suffering from neurosis' (*huan shenjingbing* 患神經病), and that his illness was not just the traditional 'pretext' (*tuoci* 托詞) for not assuming an office.[202]

[197] For *the Public Voice*'s admiration of the patriotic spirit, see 'Xuejie fengchao zhi yubo', *Gongyanbao*, 9 May 1919.
[198] 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang'.
[199] 'Beijing xuejie da fengchao xu zhi', *Gongyanbao*, 6 May 1919.
[200] 'Cai Zimin zai Hang zhi tanhua', *Gongyanbao*, 17 June 1919.
[201] 'Cai Yuanpei zhi lai dian yu xuejie fengchao', *Gongyanbao*, 21 May 1919.
[202] 'Cai Zimin zhen huan shenjingbing ye', *Gongyanbao*, 26 June 1919.

The *Public Voice* was not falsifying facts. Cai Yuanpei did indeed write these letters. He did claim that he was ill and his resignation could indeed be interpreted as 'shouldering the blame.' But if the teacher Jing Guan had read the *Public Voice*, he would probably never have gotten the idea that discussing 'New Faction'-style questions was an anti-government act. May Fourth and New Culture would have remained two separate things. The reason is that the *Public Voice* story did not politically polarise Cai Yuanpei, and with him the group of people known as 'New Faction.' The *Public Voice*'*s* Cai Yuanpei was not a hero who bravely stood up against the government. His resignation was not anti-government at all. Instead, he was psychologically ill and too weak to control the students. And with its repeated requests to return to his post, the government was even on Cai's side.

In other words, if all the newspapers had reported about Cai Yuanpei and May Fourth as the *Public Voice* did, intellectuals in China may have never come up with the idea of a 'New Culture Movement,' or at least they might have never regarded people like Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu as its 'centre.'[203] This shows how much the invention of the 'New Culture Movement' and the fate of academics at Beijing University depended on newspaper coverage in 1919.

Although they had faced dismissal from Beijing University in April 1919, Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were declared to be the stars of the newly invented notion of a 'New Culture Movement' over the next few months. New Culture activists at the periphery admired them, publishers and universities wooed them, newspapers gossiped about them in the way only celebrities are gossiped about. However, Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu did not enjoy their fame. Instead, they were unhappy about the ideas negotiated in their names and under the headline 'New Culture Movement.' Hu Shi did not even like the

[203] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

expression ‘New Culture Movement.’ The reason was, as I show in the next chapter, that it was lesser-known activists and intellectuals who created the ethos of the New Culture Movement and who controlled the ideas debated under it. They only constructed Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu into the ‘centre’ of this Movement in order to give it more glamour.

CHAPTER III: THE BUZZWORD 'NEW CULTURE MOVEMENT'

Introduction

Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were appointed to Beijing University in 1917.[1] Although this gave them a certain amount of prestige, their situation was precarious before the May Fourth demonstrations. As their ideas were vehemently attacked by influential people like the scholar-translator Lin Shu, Chen Duxiu was dismissed from Beijing University in April 1919.[2] Rumour had it that Hu Shi was facing a similar fate.[3] But much to everybody's surprise, the May Fourth demonstrations changed this situation. Chen Duxiu was admittedly involved in the political event, but Hu Shi did not have much to do with it at all. Nevertheless, newspapers reported about them and their circle in a way that made them look as if they were the same sort of anti-government activists as the May Fourth demonstrators. Hu Shi's and Chen Duxiu's circle at Beijing University therefore became very popular with intellectuals in China's urban centres.

These lesser-known intellectuals now declared to be supporting the ideas of what used to be called Beijing University's 'New Faction,' and they started founding journals avowedly in the tradition of Beijing University's journals *New Youth*, *New Tide*, *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) and so forth. Since the Shanghai publisher Wang Yuanfang said about these journals that they sprang up like 'spring bamboo after the rain,' that is,

[1] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 35.
[2] Ibid., 64.
[3] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 220.

they ‘sprang up like mushrooms,’ I have dubbed these newly founded magazines ‘spring-bamboo journals.’[4]

At some point, in the summer of 1919, people started frequently referring to a ‘New Culture Movement.’[5] It is impossible to trace when exactly this happened or who talked about the New Culture Movement first. But the fact that the expression first appeared in little-known journals, rather than in the famous *New Youth* or *New Tide*, suggests that it was coined by intellectuals at the periphery of the cosmos evoked by New Culture rhetoric. According to Ouyang Junxi, one of the Movement’s first mentions appeared on 31 August in the Shanghai magazine *Weekly Review* (*Xinqgi pinglun*). *New Youth* only started talking about the New Culture Movement in December 1919.[6] The first time *New Youth* dedicated an article to the Movement was in April 1920.[7]

People like Hu Shi came to be praised as the ‘centre of the New Culture Movement’ (*xin wenhua yundong de zhongxin* 新文化運動的中心) in 1920.[8] This new labelling turned Hu Shi into a national intellectual star. Nevertheless he was very frustrated about the New Culture Movement and he felt that his ideas were misunderstood. How could it happen that Hu Shi was so unhappy about a phenomenon that had brought him so much prestige?

The reason for this, I argue, was that the New Culture Movement was not a ‘movement’ initiated by its declared ‘centre’ Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu and so on, and spread to broader reaches of intellectual circles from there. Instead, the New Culture Movement was a label invoked by lesser-known intellectuals after the May Fourth demonstrations. It did conjure up a constellation of stars (Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu and their journals *New Youth*,

[4] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 38.
[5] See footnote 61 on p. 19.
[6] Ouyang Junxi, ‘Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong’, 73; Xian Jin, ‘Xin wenhua yundong de wuqi’; Bowles, ‘Finding the Way’, 33. See also footnote 62 on p. 19 of this thesis.
[7] Chen Duxiu, ‘Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?’, April 1920.
[8] Ye Yun, ‘Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)’.

New Tide and so on). But instead of following the 'centre's' ideas and arguments, the lesser-known intellectuals merely borrowed Hu Shi's and Chen Duxiu's prestige.[9] The aim was to sell their (the local intellectuals') own agendas more successfully. These agendas had, however, existed long before the invention of the buzzword 'New Culture Movement,' and they had done so fairly independently from the New Culture stars at Beijing University. The intellectuals at the periphery of the New Culture cosmos now subsumed all their various agendas under the buzzword 'New Culture Movement' and sold their old ideas under a new and snazzy name.

State of the Field: Agency in the New Culture Movement

This chapter engages with the literature on agency in the New Culture Movement, which asks if Beijing University's New Culture stars or lesser-known intellectuals drove the Movement. On the one hand, there is the huge corpus of literature on famous individual New Culture stars, such as Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu, Cai Yuanpei, Fu Sinian and so on.[10] Through their choice of research objects, these works implicitly agree with Jonathan Spence's statement that 'the formative thinking that lay behind the movement originated to a surprising degree with the faculty and students at Peking University.'[11]

Another strand of literature has emphasised the role that less famous intellectuals played in creating the New Culture Movement. Erik J. Hammerstrom, for example, has stressed the role of Buddhists in defining the New Culture concept of 'science.'[12] Yeh

[9] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ibid.
[10] Sun Changwei, *Cai Yuanpei xiansheng quanji*; Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*; Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*; Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*; Gao Pingshu, *Cai Yuanpei nianpu changbian*; Schneider, *Wahrheit und Geschichte*; Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*; Wang, *Fu Ssu-Nien*. Fabio Lanza's *Behind the Gate* focuses on Beijing University. However, Lanza has addressed the issue that Beijing University's image as '*the* place, a light in dark times, never failing to endlessly produce scholarly talent *and* political consciousness among its students' is largely a construction that was made after the May Fourth demonstrations. See Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 9.
[11] Spence, *The Search for Modern China*, 302.
[12] Hammerstrom, 'Buddhists Discuss Science in Modern China'.

Wen-hsin has shown how the New Culture Movement spread in Hangzhou.[13] Elisabeth Kaske has claimed that it was the establishment of a *guoyu* committee, the Preparatory Committee for the Unification of the National Language, that caused the breakthrough of spoken-style language during 1919. Contrary to the common view, she claimed, this was not down to the New Culture and May Fourth Movements.[14] Leo Lee has emphasised 'the larger context of cultural production' in creating the 'project of Chinese modernity.' By this context he meant the role played by 'publishers, editors, writers, and translators in a mushrooming number of new governmental and nongovernmental institutions.'[15]

Books on the political May Fourth Movement in the provinces are premised on the same assumption. Among these works are the various collections on 'the May Fourth Movement in a certain province,'[16] James H. Carter's analysis of the May Fourth Movement in Harbin[17] or Joseph T. Chen's argument that May Fourth as a popular movement was created in Shanghai, rather than in Beijing.[18] Similarly, Bryna Goodman has pointed to the role that native-place organisations played in coordinating the protests.[19]

However, there are problems with both models. My concern about the second model, which decentres the New Culture Movement, is that contemporaries declared figures like Hu Shi to be the 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[20] My concern about the

[13] Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 147–173.
[14] Kaske, *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education*, xii.
[15] Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity', 36–37.
[16] Tianjin lishi bowu guan and Nankai daxue lishi xi 'Wu si yundong zai Tianjin' bianxie zu, *Wu si yundong zai Tianjin: Lishi ziliao xuanji*; Zhonggong Jiangsu shengwei dangshi gongzuo weiyuan hui and Zhongguo di er lishi dang'an guan, *Wu si yundong zai Jiangsu*; Zhonggong Zhejiang shengwei dangxiao dangshi jiaoyan shi, *Wu si yundong zai Zhejiang*; Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiu suo, *Wu si yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji*.
[17] Carter, *Creating a Chinese Harbin*, 77–88.
[18] Chen, *The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai*, 1.
[19] Goodman, *Native Place, City, and Nation*, 260–277.
[20] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

first model, which affirms the importance of Beijing University's academics, is that these stars were unhappy about the ideas negotiated under the headline 'Movement.' In this chapter, I address this paradox and show that the central role of Beijing University's stars was a construction and a marketing ploy of local intellectuals, who sought to sell their ideas under a powerful franchise, namely, the 'New Culture Movement.'

Beijing-Shanghai Divide

In the remainder of this chapter, I show how 'stars' and lesser-known intellectuals differed in their conceptions of the New Culture Movement. As a considerable number of people were involved in the discourse, and as they endorsed a wide variety of ideas, it makes sense to show these mechanisms through case studies. I choose Hu Shi as an example for the 'stars,' as he was one of the figures whom intellectuals at the periphery frequently mentioned in connection with the Movement. My case study for the lesser-known intellectuals will be the Jiangsu Educational Association (*Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui* 江蘇省教育會), a local institution authorised to make policy suggestions to the Ministry of Education.[21]

One reaction to this could be the argument that the New Culture Movement developed differently in the various regions, and that any disagreements between the 'stars' in Beijing and the lesser-known intellectuals in Jiangsu were caused by locality.[22] However, as far as the intellectuals of Beijing and the Jiangsu/Shanghai region were concerned, there was hardly a divide. As I have shown in the Introduction, someone teaching in Beijing would hold summer schools in Jiangsu and even in Shandong

[21] Further research into the question how the ideas of the various 'stars,' as well as of the individual members of the Jiangsu Educational Association differed from each other would be worthwhile, but beyond the scope of this project.
[22] See Weston, *The Power of Position*, 10.

province, and correspond with colleagues in other cities throughout the year.[23] Academics in Beijing published their work with editors in Shanghai.[24] Scholars from Zhejiang found employment in Beijing, and students from Beijing in Shanghai.[25] Similarly, people could live in Beijing and read the newspaper *Shanghai News*, since this paper offered a postal service.[26] In other words, intellectuals at the time were a mobile community, and it would make little sense to draw a sharp distinction between intellectual events in Beijing and in Shanghai.

Hu Shi's Fame

In April 1919, Hu Shi and his circle were faced with vehement criticism. Chen Duxiu was even dismissed from Beijing University.[27] In the months after the May Fourth demonstrations, this situation changed. From newly founded 'spring-bamboo journals' to older school and association journals, authors explored the meaning of the 'New Culture Movement,' in articles titled 'What is the New Culture Movement?' (*Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme* 新文化運動是什麼？)[28] or 'The Spirit and Attitude of the New Culture Movement' (*Xin wenhua yundong de jingshen yu taidu* 新文化運動的精神與態度).[29] Zhu Daihen, a teacher trainee in Jiangsu, explored how she would explain the New Culture Movement to a fictional friend from her native village.[30]

[23] See pp. 30-31.
[24] Wang Yuanfang, *Yadong tushuguan yu Chen Duxiu*.
[25] Boorman, s.v. Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei; Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi'.
[26] On the postal service, see 'Chuban jie xiaoxi'; Pang Ju'ai, *Kua wenhua guanggao yu shimin wenhua de bianqian*, 53. On the *Shanghai News* being read in other parts of the country, see Zung, 'Contemporary Drama of China', 3; Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 1:254.
[27] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 64.
[28] Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', April 1920; Tang Xiu, 'Du Chen Duxiu de "Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme"'.
[29] Zheng Zhenduo, 'Xin wenhua yundong de jingshen yu taidu'. See also Rendao, 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi jieshi'.
[30] Zhu Daihen, 'Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu'.

In October 1919, the Jiangsu Educational Association announced a lecture competition for students. The topic of this competition was 'the various questions of the New Culture Movement and ways to promote it' (*xin wenhua yundong zhi zhongzhong wenti ji tuixing fangfa* 新文化運動之種種問題及推行方法).[31] These advocates of the New Culture Movement disagreed on a number of issues, as I show below. However, they did not see each other as competing 'factions of learning,' as had been the case for the academics at Beijing University in early 1919. Instead, they regarded each other as 'comrades of the New Culture Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi* 新文化運動的同志)[32] with some 'internal strife' (*neihong* 内訌).[33]

The intellectuals at the periphery of the New Culture cosmos could not envision the New Culture Movement without reference to figures like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, and their publications *New Youth*, *New Tide* and so forth.[34] Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were called the 'centre' (*zhongxin* 中心),[35] 'masters' (*juzi* 鉅子)[36] or 'core figures' (*zhongjian renwu* 中堅人物)[37] of the New Culture Movement, and when people talked about the Movement, their names usually came up.[38] For example, the missionary and head of the History Department at Yanjing University Philippe de Vargas explained that it was Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu who had started the *baihua* project, and he pointed to the

[31] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.
[32] Chen Duxiu, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de zhu tongzhi'; Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi'.
[33] Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', April 1920, 5.
[34] For references to Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, see Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 31; Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 3. For a reference to *New Tide*, see Ibid., 2.
[35] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[36] Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 2.
[37] Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 31.
[38] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 14; Cai Dun, 'Zhu Jingnong xiansheng yanjiang jilu', 9.

role *New Youth* had played in it.[39] When the Beijing University professor Zhu Jingnong 朱經農 (1887-1951) held a speech at the Second Women's Normal School of Jiangsu Province, he made mention of the 'first-class people, the New Culture activists Cai Yuanpei and Hu Shizhi' (*xin wenhua yundong zhe Cai Yuanpei, Hu Shizhi yideng ren* 新文化運動者蔡元、培胡適之一等人).[40]

The lesser-known intellectuals declared this 'centre' to be their role model. The aforementioned young teacher in Shanghai who went by the name of Jing Guan explained that, in his support for the New Culture Movement, he was just 'like the professors at Beijing University, Mr Chen Duxiu and Mr Hu Shizhi' (*xiang Beida jiaoyuan Chen Duxiu xiansheng he Hu Shizhi xiansheng* 像北大教員陳獨秀先生和胡適之先生).[41] When making their arguments, local New Culture activists often cited Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu. The Beijing University student Miao Jinyuan 繆金源 (no dates), for example, called upon his fellow New Culture activists to heed what Hu Shi had said in his 'Discussion of a Constructive Literary Revolution' (*Jianshe de wenxue geming lun* 建設的文學革命論), namely: 'You must have words to say, only then speak' (*Yao you hua shuo, fangcai shuo hua* 要有話説，方才說話).[42] He wrote this in *Criticism* (*Piping* 批評), a supplement to the Shanghai newspaper *Republic Daily* (*Minguo ribao* 民國日報) founded in 1920 in Beijing.[43] In other words, it was important for the lesser-known New Culture activists to point to their connection with the avowed 'centre' at Beijing University.

---

[39] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 14–15. Similarly in Clarence H. Hamilton, who worked at Nanjing University at the time, see Hamilton, 'Religion and the New Culture Movement in China', 226.
[40] Cai Dun, 'Zhu Jingnong xiansheng yanjiang jilu', 9.
[41] Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 31. For more information on Miao Jinyuan, see p. 240 of this thesis.
[42] Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 3.
[43] *Quanguo baokan suoyin, qikan daohang*. According to David Bowles, the *Republic Daily* belonged to the GMD. See Bowles, 'Finding the Way', 34.

Many of the newly founded 'spring-bamboo journals' made a point of resembling *New Youth* and *New Tide*. Not only did many of them use new-style punctuation like these two magazines. New-style punctuation marks were a way of expressing one's trendiness. When Chen Duxiu first planned *New Youth* in 1913, it was important for him to use 'punctuation marks' (*biaodian* 標點) – a technical challenge for the publishers who had to procure special types.[44] According to the modern academic Yuan Hui, Chinese scholars had used various forms of punctuation marks often for private use for many centuries, with the aim to make texts more comprehensible.[45] Punctuation as such was therefore not a hallmark of the New Culture Movement. *National Heritage* was, for example, largely punctuated, using the symbol '。' to mark the end of sentences or reading pauses.

Although *New Youth* was using this kind of punctuation in its early years,[46] new-style punctuation marks that were close to a Western punctuation system expressed trendiness in the late 1910s and early 1920s. In 1916, Hu Shi, for example, had suggested such punctuation when he promoted the now familiar '。', '、', '；', '：', '？'. '！', '（）', '“”', '《》', '……' and '——.'[47] Consequently, Qian Xuantong had the fictional Wang Jingxuan complain about the peculiar symbols that had replaced the mark '。' ('*quandian*', 圈點).[48] By 1919, *New Youth* deployed this system, in addition to a variety of options to underline names, book titles and so on. *New Tide* followed suit,[49] and so did many spring-bamboo journals after their foundation during mid-1919 and 1920.[50] Over the course of the year 1919, journal articles became ever

[44] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 32.
[45] Yuan Hui, *Hanyu biaodian fuhao liubian shi*, 5.
[46] Chen Duxiu, 'Jinri zhi jiaoyu fangzhen'.
[47] Yuan Hui, *Hanyu biaodian fuhao liubian shi*, 11; Yuan Hui, s.v. 'Jiushi biaodian fuhao'.
[48] Wang Jingxuan, 'Wang Jingxuan jun lai xin', 108.
[49] Chen Daqi, 'Gonghe xinxi'; Tan Mingqian, 'Laodong wenti zhi jiejue'.
[50] See, for example, 'Xin funü xuanyan', *Xin funü*.

more densely interspersed with punctuation marks, lines next to names and titles and with English words.[51]

Newly launched journals also drew inspiration from *New Youth* and *New Tide* when choosing their titles. Miao Jinyuan explained that as soon as 'there was a "New Tide Society" in Beijing, Shanghai also launches one accordingly' (*Beijing you 'Xinchao she,' Shanghai ye zhaoyang ban yi ge* 北京有《新潮社》，上海也照樣辦一個).[52] The phenomenon described by Miao did not only apply to Shanghai. In October 1919, former May Fourth student demonstrators launched a *Zhejiang New Tide* (*Zhejiang xinchao* 浙江新潮) in Zhejiang.[53] It is significant that Miao traced the origins of such titles back to the Beijing University journals. As I have shown in Chapter One, similar titles had been used independently by other groups as well. A YMCA journal was called *Shanghai Youth* before *New Youth* was ever founded.[54] However, the fact that the titles of 'spring-bamboo journals' were now associated with Beijing University magazines shows how significant the declared 'centre' at Beijing University was for the image of the New Culture Movement.

Moreover, people advocating the New Culture Movement usually also endorsed ideas that they attributed to the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu. Among these ideas was *baihua*. Consequently, 'spring-bamboo journals' were mostly written in this language. The Jiangsu Educational Association normally wrote its reports in *wenyan*. However, the announcement of the lecture competition on the New Culture Movement was composed in *baihua*. Moreover, the Association's definition of the New Culture Movement included *baihua* advocacy.[55] Similarly, teacher trainee Zhu Daihen's journal

[51] Mao Zishui, '"Bo Xinchao 'guogu he kexue de jingshen' pian" dingwu', 30 October 1919.
[52] Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 2.
[53] Yeh, *Provincial Passages*, 135.
[54] On the YMCA journal, see pp. 58-59.
[55] 'Yanshuo jingjin hui yanti zhi jieshi'.

was mostly in *wenyan*. Articles like hers, however, which dealt with the New Culture Movement, were in *baihua*, and she also regarded *baihua* as part and parcel of the New Culture Movement.[56]

This declared admiration for the 'centre of the New Culture Movement' soon led to a veritable star cult around figures like Hu Shi.[57] The number of *Shanghai News* articles that talked about Hu Shi soared up, from four mentions in 1918 to 81 in 1921.[58] Particularly after 1922, they also adopted a gossipy quality of the sort that only interests readers if it is about celebrities: Readers learnt that Hu Shi's old secondary school had found and published essays their now famous alumnus had written at the tender age of 13. They also read that a teacher remembered having a photo of Hu Shi at the age of 12 stored away somewhere, for which he was now frantically looking.[59] There was a detailed report about what Hu Shi had uttered at a banquet given in his honour.[60] An article from 1927 reported on 'Hu Shi's Arrival in Shanghai Yesterday' (*Hu Shi zuori di Hu* 胡適昨日抵滬), detailing who picked him up from the harbour, where he lodged, what he had in his suitcase (mostly books), how Commercial Press gave a banquet in his honour and where he was going to spend his subsequent holidays (at the West Lake).[61]

Hu Shi's fame was also celebrated at universities. According to the *Shanghai News*, Hu Shi's lectures at Beijing University became incredibly popular. The *Shanghai News* reported:

> Whenever he stepped onto the rostrum, students of other subjects and classes audited one after another. When there were not enough seats, they additionally

[56] Zhu Daihen, 'Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu', 37.
[57] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[58] This appears from a search of the database *Shenbao 1872-1949*.
[59] 'Chengzhong xiao zhi xin xun', *Shenbao*, 22 December 1922.
[60] 'Xiju jia huanyan Hu Shizhi'.
[61] 'Hu Shi zuori di Hu', *Shenbao*, 21 May 1927.

> [brought in] stools. Moreover, there were [students] who were standing while holding their notebooks under their arms.
>
> 每一登壇，他門、他班之學生相率旁聽，座位不敷，另行加櫈，且有挾册而立者。[62]

Hu Shi was, the *Shanghai News* went on, also invited to give a class on '*baihua* literature' (*baihua wenxue* 白話文學) at Women's Higher Normal School and one on the 'history of philosophy' (*zhexue shi* 哲學史) at Private Chinese University.[63] During a speech at Beijing University in autumn 1920, Hu Shi reported that, during his latest visit to Nanjing, 'over 800 heard me lecturing every day; over 30 guests I entertained every day' (*mei ri ting wo jiangyan de ren you ba bai yu, mei ri suo jiejian de ke you san shi yu* 每日聽我講演的人有八百餘、每日所接見的客有三十餘). It was on occasion of this visit to Nanjing in August 1920 that 'everybody who was making me compliments' (*fan gongwei wo de ren* 凡恭維我的人) called him 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[64]

Hu Shi's academic fame even reached beyond the Chinese scholarly network, and he was also known to foreign circles in Beijing. He was invited to give lectures at the Society of Friends of Literature (*Wen you hui* 文友會), which was also attended by foreigners.[65] In this way, Hu Shi became acquainted with Reginald F. Johnston (1874-

---

[62] Jing Guan, 'Dumen xuejie xiaoxi'.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[65] 'Invitation to Hu Shi's Lecture', 20 February 1924; 'Invitation to Hu Shi's Lecture', 17 November 1922. Very little information is available on the Society of Friends of Literature (at the time usually Romanized as 'Wen yu hui'). Johnston, the tutor of the Puyi Emperor, stated that its members 'met periodically to discuss the subjects in which we had a common interest.' Hu Shi was strongly involved in the Society and at some point, he was its president. In May 1921, he noted down in his diary that it had been founded 'the year before last' (*qian nian* 前年) and that it was for 'people from all nationalities in Beijing who like literature' (*Beijing ge guo ren xihuan wenxue de* 北京各國人喜歡文學的). In 1921, the Society wanted to found an Eastern Studies Library (*Dongfang xue tushu guan* 東方學圖書館), and for this purpose, he, E.A. Zucker, who will become important in Chapter Four, and a few others submitted a proposal to the US Envoy to China Charles Richard Crane to request his help. See Johnston, *Twilight in the Forbidden City*, 275; Hu Shi, *Hu Shi de riji*, 1:65.

1938), who was the tutor of the Puyi 溥儀 Emperor (1906-1967) and very active in the foreign community in Beijing.[66] Johnston then gave the emperor a few of Hu Shi's papers to read, so that, in May 1922, Hu Shi was invited to a private audience with Puyi. He was, Johnston remembered, much relieved when it turned out that 'the emperor would certainly not expect him to kneel.'[67] According to Geng Yunzhi, Hu Shi's and Chen Duxiu's fame even reached to Japan. As the Beijing University professor Gao Yihan 高一涵 (1884-1968) claimed in a letter, the authors of *New Youth* were regarded as 'angels' (*tianshi* 天使) of the New Culture Movement there.[68]

Hu Shi's Frustration

The *Shanghai News* suspected that Hu Shi was, 'in his spirit, extremely excited' (*jingshen gewai zhenfen* 精神格外振奮) about his sudden fame.[69] He did indeed perceive it as a 'compliment' or 'flattery' (*gongwei* 恭維) when people called him 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[70] Nevertheless, he was very frustrated about the New Culture Movement. His friend Zhu Jingnong even had to console him in August 1920 and say that he, Hu Shi, 'could not lose your courage because some people criticise [you]' (*bu ke yin you ren piping jiu xiaomo le yongqi* 不可因有人批評就消磨了勇氣).[71] Hu Shi was praised as the leader of the New Culture Movement. But Hu hardly ever used the expression 'New Culture Movement,' and spoke of the 'new

[66] Lewis Chase, for example, told his mother about the social adventures he had experienced with Johnston, among them an all-nighter they proudly pulled on occasion of the Puyi Emperor's wedding in 1922, see 'Lewis Chase to E.A. Chase', 3 December 1922, 3–4.
[67] Johnston, *Twilight in the Forbidden City*, 275.
[68] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 81. For a biography of Gao Yihan, see Xu Youchun, s.v. 'Gao Yihan'.
[69] Jing Guan, 'Dumen xuejie xiaoxi'.
[70] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[71] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 87. For examples of such criticism, see pp. 195-199 of this thesis.

intellectual tide' (*xin sichao* 新思潮) instead.[72] According to Yü Ying-shih, in later years Hu Shi even expressed that he regarded May Fourth as 'an unwelcome interruption' of cultural suggestions of the sort that were discussed in his academic circle.[73]

What Hu appeared to dislike about the Movement was his feeling that he could not control it. When Hu Shi wrote about the 'new intellectual tide' in *New Youth* in December 1919, he conveyed that it was others, primarily the media, who controlled what 'new intellectual tide' meant. This was not determined by him or his affiliates from *New Youth*, *New Tide* and so on. He said that 'recently a few articles have been published in newspapers that explain the "new intellectual tide"' (*jinlai baozhi shang fabiao guo ji pian jieshi 'xin sichao' de wenzhang* 近來報紙上發表過幾篇解釋《新思潮》的文章).[74] In the aforementioned speech in 1920, he further indicated that he was unable to control the New Culture Movement. He said: 'After it [the New Culture Movement] has already [started] moving, one cannot induce it not to move' (*ji dong zhi hou, bu neng shi ta bu dong* 既動之後、不能使他不動).[75]

Chen Duxiu was not so reluctant to use the expression 'New Culture Movement.'[76] However, he expressed similar feelings as Hu Shi, and he appeared to share the impression that the 'New Culture Movement' did not belong to him. Rather it was 'currently very popular in our society' (*xianzai women shehui li hen liuxing* 現在我們

[72] Hu Shi, 'Xin sichao de yiyi'. A similar point has been made by Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 182; Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 77.
[73] Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment', 308. In this context, Yü Ying-shih cited 'The May Fourth Movement is the Young People's Patriotic Movement' (*Wu si yundong shi qingnian aiguo de yundong* 五四運動是青年愛國的運動). This was an interview Hu Shi gave in 1960. See Hu Shi, 'Wu si yundong shi qingnian aiguo de yundong', 297.
[74] Hu Shi, 'Xin sichao de yiyi', 9.
[75] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[76] Chen Duxiu, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de zhu tongzhi'; Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', April 1920.

社會裏很流行).[77] 'Society,' moreover, misunderstood the Movement. Chen Duxiu therefore saw the need to write an article in the newspaper *Impartial* in Changsha in January 1920, in which he 'respectfully informed' (*jinggao* 敬告) 'all [his] comrades of the New Culture Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong de zhu tongzhi* 新文化運動的諸同志) about their, in his view, misconceptions.[78]

How could it happen that Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi disliked the Movement that had brought them so much prestige, and which had virtually saved their careers? The reason for this was that the intellectuals at the periphery of the evoked New Culture cosmos treated them as the figureheads of the New Culture Movement. But in fact, it was these lesser-known intellectuals who controlled the ideas. Rana Mitter has claimed that, after it had obtained its 'legendary' status many years later, 'May Fourth' became a 'brand name' used by political parties to justify their power.[79] I argue that the New Culture Movement was used in this fashion from its very beginning. It was never anything else. In the following section, I show by the example of the Jiangsu Educational Association how lesser-known intellectuals appropriated the New Culture Movement.

Case Study: Jiangsu Educational Association

About the Jiangsu Educational Association

The Jiangsu Educational Association is a useful example, as it was one of the earlier groups to use the expression 'New Culture Movement' in writing. It did so in the announcement of a student lecture competition on 24 October 1919. The topic of the

[77] Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', April 1920, 1.
[78] Chen Duxiu, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de zhu tongzhi', 224, et passim.
[79] Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 22–23.

competition was, as mentioned above, 'the various questions of the New Culture Movement and ways to promote it.'[80]

This announcement was reprinted in the *Shanghai News* and the Christian missionary paper *Chinese Christian Advocate* in November.[81] It was also sent to 'all [of Jiangsu's] educational institutions, from middle-school level and above' (*zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao* 中等以上各學校), out of which 28 schools sent altogether 45 students to the competition. Since it was stipulated that each school had to hold an internal lecture competition to choose their representatives, it can be assumed that a much higher number of students had seen the announcement and spent time thinking about it to prepare a speech.[82] The lecture given by Yu Tiandong 余天棟 (no dates), a student of Nanjing Higher Normal School (*Nanjing gaodeng shifan xuexiao* 南京高等師範學校), was even reprinted in 1920 in the journal *Students' Magazine* (*Xuesheng* 學生).[83] This means that the Jiangsu Educational Association was an important player in shaping opinions about the New Culture Movement in the Jiangsu region.

As I have shown in the Introduction of this dissertation, Educational Associations were local institutions authorised to make policy suggestions to the Ministry of Education or the provincial Departments of Education. They existed on the level of provinces, counties and towns or villages.[84] Precursors of the Jiangsu Educational Association had existed since the mid-1900s. Following a decree from the Republican Ministry of Education in 1912, the organisation received its name 'Jiangsu Educational Association'

[80] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.
[81] 'Yanshuo jingjin hui yanti zhi jieshi'; 'Yanshuo jingjin hui di er ci kaihui ji', *Shenbao*, 25 December 1919; 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi jieshi'.
[82] 'Yanshuo jingjin hui di er ci kaihui ji'; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 23.
[83] Yu Tiandong, 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi zhongzhong wenti ji tuixing fa', 5.
[84] Zhang Kaiyuan, s.v. 'Jiaoyu hui zhangcheng'.

and established its headquarters in Shanghai.[85] The Jiangsu Educational Association published monthly reports, which contained letters and telegrams it had exchanged with politicians or educators, as well as conference minutes that gave insights into its activities. I use these reports as my main source in this section.

The Jiangsu Educational Association supported the cluster of popular education, *guoyu* and vocational education, and by 1919, it had done so for many years. With this agenda, the Jiangsu Educational Association was not alone. Rather, the cluster around popular education was endorsed by broad circles since the Qing Dynasty, and it was often promoted by the state. The Ministry of Education frequently established official associations or delegated this task to institutions like the Jiangsu Educational Association or to private individuals. As Paul J. Bailey has shown, such popular-education activities comprised the establishment of evening and spare-time schools and of public libraries, the organisation of public lectures for common people, vocational education and the censorship of themes in popular culture deemed (mostly sexually) inappropriate.[86] In sum, in the 1910s ideas like popular education, *guoyu* and vocational education were supported by broad circles and independently from the group of academics at Beijing University or the later buzzword 'New Culture Movement.' By 1919, the Jiangsu Educational Association had participated in these projects for several years.

Selling the Jiangsu Educational Association's Agenda

The members of the Jiangsu Educational Association were pragmatic people, and over the course of 1919, they claimed repeatedly that current events evidenced the necessity of their educational agenda. As I show in this section, they sometimes even sold their

[85] Gu Xiuqing, *Qing mo Min chu Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yanjiu*, 34–45. For more details, see pp. 42-43 of this thesis.
[86] Bailey, *Reform the People*, 186–202.

programme to different groups of people under headlines that were mutually contradictory. In September 1919, the Association promoted its agenda to the government as 'remedy' against May Fourth.[87] In October, it sold it as 'the New Culture Movement that continues the May Fourth Movement.'[88]

The End of World War I

May Fourth and New Culture were only two among several buzzwords the Jiangsu Educational Association used. In a letter to the minister of education from January 1919, the Association pointed out that 'the European War has already come to an end. Afterwards, the establishment of the country will be based on scholarship' (*Ouzhan ji gao zhongzhi. Ci hou li guo, yi xueshu wei jichu* 歐戰既告終止。此後立國，以學術為基礎). This introduced an application for permission to establish a New-Education Society (*Xin jiaoyu she* 新教育社), which would need government funding.[89] Of course, the idea that scholarship was the basis for a strong country long predated the end of World War I, or even its beginning. It could be traced back to Confucian notions that the moral constitution of a country affected its political situation. This was, for example, expressed in the book *Great Learning*. It was also a common *topos* in petitions to the government that existed independently from World War I.[90] This suggests that the reference to the war was designed to give the funding application more weight.

May Fourth

Then the May Fourth demonstrations broke out in the spring of 1919, and the Jiangsu Educational Association would soon use it to market its educational agenda. However

[87] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Cheng Qi shengzhang chenshu taolun xuechao hou jiuji fangfa wen', 6.
[88] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.
[89] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Cheng jiaoyu zongzhang zuzhi Zhonghua xin jiaoyu she wen'.
[90] Li Jinxi, 'Duyin tongyi hui Zhili daibiao Wang Pu deng cheng jiaoyu bu qing banxing zhuyin zimu wen', xia 19.

at the beginning, the Association's vice president Huang Yanpei did not see how May Fourth could be of help. On the contrary, he was concerned that the demonstrations might distract public attention from his programme, and he had more hopes for the philosopher John Dewey's simultaneous visit to China.[91] He wrote in his diary:

> Now that the matter with the student protests is starting, the gaze of the whole country is focused on the actions of the average young people and on the changes in current affairs. This matter [Dewey's ideas] has consequently been laid aside. But once the student protests are over, the educators of the whole country will all urgently try and save what can be saved [lit. strive for dealing with the aftermath].
>
> 會學潮事發，全國視線集中于一般青年之動作與時事之變化，此問題遂擱置。乃者學潮過去，全國教育家咸亟亟焉謀所以善後。[92]

These were not only Huang Yanpei's private musings. In a telegram to the president, the cabinet and the minister of education, the Jiangsu Educational Association expressed its worries that, if the student protests continued to spread, 'not only the future of education will be in danger. We fear that the whole country will dissolve because of this.' (*Buwei jiaoyu qiantu weixian. Kong quanguo yin ci wajie.* 不惟教育前途危險。恐全國因此瓦解。)[93]

Nevertheless, the Jiangsu Educational Association soon ended up being involved in the May Fourth demonstrations, which must have eventually sparked the idea to harness them for the Association's own purposes. First of all, its members seemed concerned about the 'Shandong Question,' that is, the government's territorial deal with Japan.[94] On 7 May, the Jiangsu Educational Association co-organised a citizens' assembly

---

[91] Huang Yanpei, *Huang Yanpei riji*, 2:63–64.

[92] Ibid., 2:64. I translate '*hui*' here as synonymous to '適逢' (*shifeng*, 'just when'), following 'Gudai hanyu cidian' bianxie zu, s.v. 'Hui'.
These notes were written on the pages of the entries of 8 to 11 June, which the editors feel do not belong to the diary as such. See Huang Yanpei, *Huang Yanpei riji*, 2:64.

[93] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi da zongtong, guowuyuan, jiaoyubu chenming Shanghai ge xiao xuesheng yin jiaoyu zongzhang yiren deng wenti qun yi bake, qing fuxun yuqing dian'.

[94] For more details on this deal, see pp. 104-108.

(*guomin dahui* 國民大會) that opposed the government's deal.[95] Particularly from June onwards, the Jiangsu Educational Association repeatedly petitioned the government not to sign the Treaty of Versailles.[96]

Secondly, although May Fourth was a political protest, it was also an educational matter, because its most prominent protesters were students. This was almost a coincidence. When it became known on 3 May that Shandong should go to Japan, many groups held meetings to plan a protest.[97] As the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) reported, the Citizens' Diplomatic Association, for example, planned a big demonstration on the symbolic National Disgrace Memorial Day on 7 May. This was the day when, in 1915, Yuan Shikai had received an ultimatum from Japan to sign the Twenty-One Demands. It was only because the students were too impatient to wait that they decided to already demonstrate on 4 May, a Sunday.[98]

Soon political and educational demands were therefore mixed. When Cai Yuanpei resigned from Beijing University, Huang Yanpei noted in his diary on 15 May, the Shanghai Student Union threatened the 'final method' (*zui hou fa* 最後法) – probably strikes – if Cai was not reinstated.[99] They carried out this threat on 26 May, when students in Shanghai organised a huge demonstration, which marked the beginning of student strikes.[100] On 5 June, moreover, Shanghai started a general strike of students,

[95] Wasserstrom, *Student Protests in Twentieth-Century China*, 55.
[96] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi Mei zongtong, Mei guohui, Ying, Fa shouxiang, ji Ying, Fa guohui qing zhuchi gongdao dian'; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi da zongtong, guowuyuan qing duiyu Qingdao jiaoshe reng dian zhuanshi kangyi dian'.
[97] Yi Wan, 'Yi zhou Beijing de gongmin da huodong', 1; Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 143.
[98] Yi Wan, 'Yi zhou Beijing de gongmin da huodong', 1. On the ultimatum for the Twenty-One Demands, see Chen, 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords', 138. That 4 May 1919 was a Sunday becomes clear, for example, from the edition of the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*), which is dated to a 'Sunday' (*xingqi ri* 星期日), see 'Header', *Meizhou pinglun*, 4 May 1919.
[99] Huang Yanpei, *Huang Yanpei riji*, 2:62.
[100] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919, 23.

workers and merchants, in a protest against government crackdowns on students in Beijing.[101]

Thirdly, the Ministry of Education soon commanded the Jiangsu Educational Association to cool down the protests and to persuade the students to return to the classrooms.[102] Soon the Association therefore found itself in an unfavourable position, in which it simultaneously tried to dissuade the students from protesting and the government from cracking down on the students.[103] In this way, the Jiangsu Educational Association had to multitask and deal with Cai Yuanpei's resignation and the student protests all at the same time. A report from the Regular Secretaries' Meeting (*ganshi yuan changhui* 幹事員常會) of 23 May is a case in point:

> 1 Document - report: This association has gotten in touch with the Zhejiang Educational Association and [together we] sent a telegram on the 18th: [We asked] the government in Beijing to retain the Minister of Education Fu [Zengxiang, who had left Beijing on 11 May and whose resignation was accepted on 15 May].[104] Moreover, representing the educational field, we sent a letter to Mr Cai Zimin [i.e., Cai Yuanpei], asking him to return to Beijing and resume his post. Moreover, on the 21st, we sent a telegram to the Beijing government, the military governor and the [civilian] governor of the province: The students of all schools in Shanghai are all discussing to go on strike, due to questions such as the replacement of the minister of education and so forth. We ask the government to issue a clear order that submits to the public sentiment.
>
> 一件　報告：本會聯合浙江省教育會，於巧日電：北京政府挽留傅教育總長，又代表教育界致函蔡子民先生，請回京、任職。又馬日電北京政府、督軍、省長：上海各校學生，因教育總長易人等問題群議罷課，請政府發表俯順輿情之明令。[105]

[101] This strike ended on 12 June, when the people labelled 'country-selling traitors' had been dismissed, see Wasserstrom, *Student Protests in Twentieth-Century China*, 56.
[102] Gu Xiuqing, *Qing mo Min chu Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yanjiu*, 215; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919, 24; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', June 1919, 15.
[103] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi Mei zongtong, Mei guohui, Ying, Fa shouxiang, ji Ying, Fa guohui qing zhuchi gongdao dian'; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi da zongtong, guowuyuan qing duiyu Qingdao jiaoshe reng dian zhuanshi kangyi dian'.
[104] On Fu Zengxiang's resignation, see Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 137.
[105] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919, 23. The calendric system the Jiangsu Educational Association was using in its telegrams is called '*yunmu dai ri*' (韻目代日, lit. 'rhyme groups replace days'). This system was often used in telegrams, and it used the names of rhyme groups (taken from systems for poetry) to refer to days in the month. For example, '*ma ri*' (馬日) replaced '*er shi yi ri*' (二十

In this way, May Fourth and education must have grown together in the minds of the Jiangsu Educational Association's members.

Public Lecturing

Towards the end of May, the Jiangsu Educational Association seemed to recognise the favour of the hour and decided to make use of the demonstrations to promote one of its educational goals, namely, public lectures. In other words, the Jiangsu Educational Association used the May Fourth demonstrations as a stepping stone to promote its own ideals. For this purpose, the Association wrote a letter to middle schools, recommending that students give public lectures to raise the political awareness of the citizens. The declaration read that, 'after the failure in negotiating the Qingdao [question]' (*Qingdao jiaoshe shibai* 青島交涉失敗), a lot of actions have been undertaken to get Qingdao back. Among them were petitions and anti-Japanese boycotts. However, people in 'remote cities and villages' (*pianpi shixiang* 偏僻市鄉) did not have any awareness of political matters, and therefore the strikes were doomed to fail.[106] Therefore, the Jiangsu Educational Association recommended:

> As far as the people who have not yet received education are concerned, they [the students] should use lectures to enlighten them
>
> 其未受教育人民。當利用講演以啓發之.[107]

During the holidays, which were about to start, students were encouraged to 'form lecture groups' (*zuzhi jiangyan tuan* 組織講演團), to explain the political situation to the people in their native places.[108]

一日, 'the 21st'). The advantage of this system was, of course, that it saved money in telegrams, as dates could be expressed with fewer characters. See Zhang Zuoyao, s.v. 'Yunmu dai ri biao'; Ye Yonglie, *Chen Yun zhi lu*, 121.

[106] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi ge zhongdeng xuexiao qing tongzhi xuesheng yu shujia qi nei zuzhi jiangyan tuan shu', 13. This letter is not dated. However, its position at the end of the letter collection reprinted in the monthly report from May suggests that it was written towards the end of that month.

[107] Ibid.

Public lecturing has been depicted as one of the subversive May Fourth and New Culture activities. Vera Schwarcz, for example, has described the public lectures given by the Commoners' Education Lecture Society (*Pingmin jiaoyu jiangyan tuan* 平民教育講演團) at Beijing University around May Fourth as a manifestation of New Culture ideas.[109] This society was founded by students of Beijing University in March 1919. Its members gave lectures to the people on common knowledge, political awareness and social reform in the streets of Beijing, and later on they also attempted unsuccessfully to reproduce these efforts in the countryside.[110] Among its members were people who also wrote for *New Tide*.[111]

Nelson K. Lee has claimed that the Commoners' Education Lecture Society marked the beginning of public lecturing. He argued that this was 'the most inventive and flexible public action in the May Fourth period,' which confused the government considerably.[112] Dong Baoliang and Zhou Hongyu have even described the whole popular-education project as peculiar to 'May Fourth.'[113] Contemporary journals gave the same impression after May Fourth. The *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) mostly reported about how May Fourth lecturers were expelled by the government, and it even claimed that a 'Commoners' Lecture Group' (*Pingmin yanshuo tuan* 平民演說團) was the first to 'give lectures in the open air' (*lutian yanshuo* 露天演說).[114]

---

[108] Ibid.
[109] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 86–93.
[110] Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 189–198.
[111] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 89.
[112] Lee, 'How Is a Political Public Space Made?', 36–37.
[113] Dong Baoliang and Zhou Hongyu, *Zhongguo jin xiandai jiaoyu sichao yu liupai*, 356–58. A similar opinion is held by Goodman, *Native Place, City, and Nation*, 268.
[114] 'Chajin "fanghai zhi"an' de jihui, chuban zhi jingguo', 1. The name '*Pingmin yanshuo tuan*' only appears in this *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) article. But it is possible that it referred to the Commoners' Education Lecture Society, which also gave lectures 'in the open air.' See Dong Baoliang and Zhou Hongyu, *Zhongguo jin xiandai jiaoyu sichao yu liupai*, 371. Moreover, it is possible that 'open air' lectures were indeed first conducted by the Commoners' Education Lecture Society. Paul Bailey mentions temples and tea-houses as the usual venues for lectures. See Bailey, *Reform the People*, 194.

However, as Paul J. Bailey has shown, public lecturing existed as a state-sponsored and state-regulated endeavour long before May Fourth and the invention of the New Culture Movement, and even continued trends of the Qing.[115] In 1915, the Jiangsu Educational Association had founded a Popular Education Research Association (*Tongsu jiaoyu yanjiu hui* 通俗教育研究會), designed to 'improve society and popularise education' (*gailang shehui, puji jiaoyu* 改良社會、普及教育).[116] One of its tasks was to do research into public lectures as a tool to promote popular education.[117]

In the same year, the Ministry of Education issued regulations for Popular Lecture Institutes (*Tongsu jiangyan suo* 通俗講演所), which stipulated that public lectures could be given by anyone who felt comfortable with speaking in public.[118] They should 'enlighten and guide the people and improve society' (*qi dao guomin, gailiang shehui* 啓導國民，改良社會). Their topics should be on 'encouraging patriotism' (*guli aiguo* 鼓勵愛國), 'improving morality' (*zengjin daode* 增進道德) and 'advocating hygiene' (*quandao weisheng* 勸導衛生 – Bailey cited '[no] urinating in the streets' and queuing orderly when getting onto trains).[119] Over the following years, lecture institutes and educators expounded on this, adding that lectures should also raise the people's awareness of current political events or warn against inappropriate sexual behaviour.[120] Moreover, in theory, all lecture topics needed to be approved by various state or state-sponsored organisations.[121]

---

[115] Bailey, *Reform the People*, 194.
[116] Jiaoyubu, 'Tongsu jiaoyu yanjiu hui zhangcheng', 531; Bailey, *Reform the People*, 187.
[117] Jiaoyubu, 'Tongsu jiaoyu yanjiu hui zhangcheng', 531.
[118] Bailey, *Reform the People*, 194.
[119] Jiaoyubu, 'Tongsu jiaoyu jiangyan guize', 533. For the citation from Bailey, see Bailey, *Reform the People*, 200.
[120] On the ideals to raise political awareness, see Bailey, *Reform the People*, 194. On the hopes to warn against inappropriate sexual behaviour, see Ibid., 200.
[121] Bailey, *Reform the People*, 188.

Although scholars seem to agree that Beijing University's Commoners' Education Lecture Society was an independent initiative born out of John Dewey's educational programme, 'Russian populist theories' or a general May Fourth spirit,[122] the rhetoric of its mission statement was suspiciously in tune with the official popular-education project. For example, the *Beijing University Daily* cited as the Society's goal on 7 March 1919 the 'popularisation of education' (*jiaoyu puji* 教育普及).[123] Far from planning to engage in subversive actions, the Commoners' Education Lecture Society originally even cleared its activities with the local police bureau.[124] As shown above, during May Fourth, state-sponsored groups such as the Jiangsu Educational Association even encouraged public lectures. To be sure, the government soon banned lecturing on the streets.[125] However, this must have been down to the choice of topics (boycott of Japanese goods and so forth),[126] rather than to the chosen form of public engagement as such. If public lecturing has entered history as an invention of the May Fourth and New Culture Movements, this only shows the grip that the rhetoric created by the Movements' advocates is still having on much of present-day academia.

A 'Remedy' for May Fourth

When the academic year ended in the summer of 1919, the student protests cooled down. After all, most of the students had left for their hometowns. But in September,

---

[122] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 86–93; Lee, 'How Is a Political Public Space Made?', 36; Dong Baoliang and Zhou Hongyu, *Zhongguo jin xiandai jiaoyu sichao yu liupai*, 374. This idea seems to be supported by a retrospective narrative of people involved in the Commoners' Education Lecture Society, see Ibid., 274–75.

[123] *Beijing University Daily* from 7 March 1919, cited in Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindai shi yanjiu suo 'jindai shi ziliao' bianyi shi, *Wu si aiguo yundong*, 1:519; Hung, *Going to the People*, 10–11. Contrary to the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*), the *Beijing University Daily* unambiguously referred to the 'Beijing University Commoners' Education Lecture Society' (*Beijing daxue pingmin jiaoyu jiangyan tuan* 北京大學平民教育講演團). See Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindai shi yanjiu suo 'jindai shi ziliao' bianyi shi, *Wu si aiguo yundong*, 1:519.

[124] Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindai shi yanjiu suo 'jindai shi ziliao' bianyi shi, *Wu si aiguo yundong*, 1:521.

[125] 'Chajin "fanghai zhi"an' de jihui, chuban zhi jingguo', 1.

[126] 'Jing xuejie zhi zuijin xingdong', *Shenbao*, 27 May 1919.

the students were about to return for the new academic year. The government was therefore worried that new protests might flare up again – a fear that came true, particularly around the national holiday on 10 October. At this point, the Jiangsu Educational Association saw a second chance to capitalise on the student protests. However, this time it did not make suggestions on how to promote the cause of May Fourth, as it had done when it suggested public lectures to the students. In September 1919, it sent a letter to Provincial Governor Qi Yaolin, in which it offered a 'remedy' (*jiuji fangfa* 救濟方法, lit: 'a rescue method') against the May Fourth demonstrations.[127] One element in this 'remedy' was, surprisingly, internships.

The argument read that the Jiangsu Educational Association had convened a 'research conference' (*yanjiu hui* 研究會), to 'discuss rescue methods after the student demonstrations' (*taolun xuechao hou jiuji fangfa* 討論學潮後救濟方法).[128] This again appeared to be an explanation tailored to communication with the government. The invitation to this conference issued to educators in July 1919 had sounded somewhat different. Here the Jiangsu Educational Association had argued that, 'after the student protests had happened' (*xuechao fasheng hou* 學潮發生後), everybody agreed that teaching methods had to change, 'in the hope of adjusting to the trend of the times' (*yi qi shiying shishi* 以期適應時勢).[129]

Nevertheless, the Jiangsu Educational Association now wrote to Governor Qi that it believed the student protests to have partially been caused by 'patriotic enthusiasm' (*aiguo rechen* 愛國熱忱). But partially they were caused by the fact that, 'in school education, apart from book knowledge, the students [have] little opportunity to develop

[127] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Cheng Qi shengzhang chenshu taolun xuechao hou jiuji fangfa wen', 6.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', June 1919, 6–7.

skills' (*xuexiao jiaoyu, chu shu shang zhishi wai, xuesheng shao fazhan nengli zhi jihui* 學校教育，除書上知識外，學生少發展能力之機會). Therefore, a few methods to train such skills had to be introduced. For example, schools should promote 'internships at [places] like farms, factories and shops' (*nongchang, gongchang, shangdian deng zhi shixi* 農場、工場、商店等之實習). As it turned out, this letter was again an application for funding: to implement its suggestions, the Jiangsu Educational Association needed more 'provisional-equipment funds' (*linshi shebe fei* 臨時設備費) from the government.[130]

The Association's 'remedy' against student demonstrations was not only surprising, but also suspiciously congruent with its long-standing goal to promote vocational education. Internships were part of this programme. According to Dong Baoliang and Zhou Hongyu, vocational education dated back to 19th-century calls for practical learning. It followed the logic of a businessman who lamented: 'On the side of the unemployed, they sigh that ways to make one's living are hard to find. On the side of the realm of enterprises, they are worried that the talent they need is scarce.' (*Zai shiye zhe fang jietan huoji zhi nan xun, zai shiye jie fang youlü xuyao rencai zhi wu duo.* 在失業者方嗟歎活計之難尋，在事業界方憂慮需要人才之無多。)[131]

The Jiangsu Educational Association had long been committed to vocational education. Together with the Chancellor of Beijing University Cai Yuanpei, the future Chancellor Jiang Menglin and a few others, the Association's Vice President Huang Yanpei founded the Chinese Society for Vocational Education (*Zhonghua zhiye jiaoyu she* 中華職業教育社) in 1917. Its manifesto argued that universities produced a lot of unemployable graduates, and that consequently 'there are high-level vagrants

[130] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Cheng Qi shengzhang chenshu taolun xuechao hou jiuji fangfa wen', 6–7.
[131] Dong Baoliang and Zhou Hongyu, *Zhongguo jin xiandai jiaoyu sichao yu liupai*, 291.

everywhere' (*mandi jie gaodeng youmin* 滿地皆高等游民).[132] These graduates could not find employment, as they lacked the practical skills needed in the industry, in agriculture or in commerce. Unfortunately, however, universities continued 'emphasising theory in their classes, and they do not regard internships as important' (*qi gongke zhong lilun er qing shixi* 其功課重理論而輕實習).[133] If vocational education was promoted, the manifesto claimed, graduates would find jobs. Thereby they would 'serve society' (*fuwu shehui* 服務社會) and improve the country's economy as a whole.[134] Consequently, when the Chinese Society for Vocational Education founded a school in July 1918, its students had to do internships in the local industry.[135]

It is difficult to see what internships had to do with May Fourth, and the Jiangsu Educational Association did not explain the connection either. When the Association declared internships to be a 'remedy' against May Fourth in September 1919, this may therefore be seen as an attempt to advertise a longstanding agenda under a headline ('May Fourth') that would certainly get the governor's attention. Whether it was the reference to May Fourth or not is unclear, but the application was successful, and Governor Qi granted the money.[136]

'The New Culture Movement That Continues the May Fourth Movement'

This letter was sent shortly after the expression 'New Culture Movement' must have been invented. The Jiangsu Educational Association was clearly aware of these developments, and it must have decided to play both sides of the issue. Having

[132] Huang Yanpei, 'Zhiye jiaoyu shishi zhi xiwang', 6. Translation reworked from Bailey, *Reform the People*, 208.
[133] 'Zhonghua zhiye jiaoyu she xuanyan shu', *Dongfang zazhi*, 165.
[134] Huang Yanpei, 'Talks about Vocational Education' (*Zhiye jiaoyu tan* 職業教育談) from 1918, cited in Dong Baoliang and Zhou Hongyu, *Zhongguo jin xiandai jiaoyu sichao yu liupai*, 297.
[135] On the foundation of this school, see Yeh, *Shanghai Splendor*, 38; Bailey, *Reform the People*, 208; Dong Baoliang and Zhou Hongyu, *Zhongguo jin xiandai jiaoyu sichao yu liupai*, 296–97. On the requirement to do internships, see Yeh, *Shanghai Splendor*, 39.
[136] Qi Yaolin, 'Qi shengzhang pi'.

proposed their educational ideals to the government as a 'remedy' against the protests, on 24 October 1919, it tried to promote its agenda again to the group from which the protesters themselves had been recruited: the students.

This was the aforementioned announcement of a student lecture competition on the topic 'the various questions of the New Culture Movement and ways to promote it.' In this announcement, the Jiangsu Educational Association presented its agenda of popular education as the exact opposite to a 'remedy' for May Fourth. Its educational ideals, it claimed now, were the 'New Culture Movement [which] continues the May Fourth Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong shi jixu wu si yundong* 新文化運動是繼續五四運動). As a definition for the 'New Culture Movement,' it mentioned the 'spread of culture to the great majority of our countrymen' (*wenhua puji yu daduoshu zhi guomin* 文化普及於大多數之國民), which included 'promulgating *baihua* literature and establishing free schools and lecture groups' (*chuanbo baihua wen, sheli yiwu xuexiao, yanjiang tuan* 傳播白話文、設立義務學校、演講團).[137]

It is of course impossible to say from the available sources what was rhetoric and what people 'really' believed 'deep down.' However, the fact that some of the marketing strategies were mutually contradictory suggests that the Jiangsu Educational Association's intentions behind choosing labels and headlines were fairly pragmatic. Moreover, the Jiangsu Educational Association sold different elements of its agenda at different points during 1919 – public lectures in May, internships in September and popular education in October. However, these elements all belonged to one and the same cluster around popular education, and the Association managed to market it to the

[137] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25. '*Yiwu xuexiao*' does not seem to be a technical term for a specific type of school in the Republican Period, rather than a general description of tuition-free popular-education schools. It has been translated in different ways as 'free school' or as 'charitable school,' see Ma, *Women Journalists and Feminism in China, 1898-1937*, 199; Goodman, *Native Place, City, and Nation*, 254.

opposing camps of the demonstrations, and it called it a 'remedy,' a 'continuation' or a promotion of May Fourth as it saw fit. Moreover, this whole agenda had existed long before and had been sold under various labels over the course of time. This suggests that the 'New Culture Movement' was only a new buzzword used to sell older ideas more successfully.

'Signboard' Criticism

Contemporaries seemed to be aware that the New Culture Movement was a buzzword, filled with content as required. While the Jiangsu Educational Association never revealed its strategy explicitly, activists who were critical of this method did. For example, Wang Yinxue 王吟雪 (no dates) complained in the journal *New Buddhism* (*Xin fojiao* 新佛教) that the New Culture Movement was often used as a 'signboard' (*zhaopai* 招牌) to advertise the same ideas as before. This, Wang Yinxue felt, was tantamount to 'deceiving people' (*pianren* 騙人).[138]

The Beijing University student Miao Jinyuan explained that it was a sign of bad journals, of which there were many in his view, to 'pick up things from here and there and to plagiarise and to echo [others]' (*dong duo xi shi, chaoxi leitong* 東掇西拾，鈔襲雷同). He accused these journals of calling themselves 'new' (*xin* 新), even if they were clearly about the 'old' (*jiu* 舊). He went on to complain that these journals imitated everything that happened in Beijing, and all discussed the same limited set of questions, such as the 'liberation of women' (*funü jiefang* 婦女解放), 'free love' (*ziyou lian'ai* 自由戀愛) or 'the abolition of Chinese characters' (*fei hanzi* 廢漢字) over and over again. This was clearly 'bankruptcy' (*pochan* 破產), he felt.[139] Speaking from the opposite

[138] Wang Yinxue, 'Shishi xinbao'.
[139] Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 2–3.

perspective, Jing Guan, the young teacher in Shanghai, wrote in his journal *New Woman* that he had been accused of running a 'plagiarised publication' (*maopai de chuban wu* 冒牌的出版物). Naturally he rejected this accusation.[140]

The avowed 'centre of the New Culture Movement' agreed with this criticism.[141] Chen Duxiu sighed in October that the various 'new popular words' (*xin liuxing de mingci* 新流行的名詞), such as 'enlightenment' (*juewu* 覺悟), 'new intellectual tide' (*xin sichao* 新思潮) or 'new culture' (*xin wenhua* 新文化) were used as 'efficient instruments by cigarette companies, for medical prescriptions, by book sellers or by the lottery industry' (*xiangyan gongsi, yaofang, shugu, caipiao hang de liqi* 香煙公司、藥方、書賈、彩票行的利器).[142] As I have shown in Chapter Two, references to the New Culture Movement were indeed used to sell glasses and books to students.[143] Hu Shi remembered a question-and-answer session during one of his lectures in Nanjing, at which people had asked:

> Does merely using words like 'fighting,' 'universal love,' 'autonomy,' 'labour' or 'holy,' and expounding on [them] everywhere count as New Culture Movement?
>
> 僅僅用幾個奮鬪、博愛、自决、勞働、神聖等名詞、到處講解、就算新文化運動嗎？[144]

In other words, not everybody agreed with this strategy to use the New Culture Movement and its rhetoric as a franchise. However, the very existence and frequency of such criticism suggests that the practice was widespread.

[140] Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 33.
[141] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[142] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 94.
[143] For details, see pp. 117-118.
[144] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

Phenomena of Co-optation

A Plethora of Definitions

The New Culture Movement must have been a very powerful franchise, as many people tried to sell their ideas as 'New Culture Movement' in late 1919 and 1920. One result of this was the emergence of a huge range of definitions for the 'New Culture Movement,' and it is not always easy to boil them down to a common theme. The teacher trainee Zhu Daihen claimed that the New Culture Movement was about 'establishing free schools [and] compiling baihua texts' (*sheli yiwu xuexiao, bianji baihua wen* 設立義務學校，編輯白話文).[145] Beijing University student Miao Jinyuan claimed that the Movement was about being original and about 'enhancing the knowledge of the average people' (*jiang yiban renmin de zhishi tigao* 將一般人民的知識提高).[146]

Beijing University student Zhou Changxian 周長憲 (no dates) explained in the supplement *Criticism* to the newspaper *Republic Daily* that the New Culture Movement meant 'enlightenment' (*juewu* 覺悟). He also stated that China 'did not have any hope for progress' (*meiyou jinbu de xiwang* 沒有進步底希望) without 'the renewal of thought and the reform of scholarship' (*sixiang gexin he xueshu gaizao* 思想革新和學術改造). In Zhou's view, the New Culture Movement had fortunately 'breached the quietude of the old times, aroused our countrymen [from] their daze and guided them to go onto the road of light' (*chongpo jiushi de chenjing, jingxing guoren de miming,*

[145] Zhu Daihen, 'Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu', 37.
[146] Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 3.

yindao tamen xiang guangming de lu shang zou 衝破舊時底沉靜，警醒國人底迷蒙，引導他們向光明的路上走).[147]

Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were concerned that they could not control the New Culture Movement. However, writing in the 'spring-bamboo journal' *Emancipation and Reconstruction* (*Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放與改造), Jiang Qi 姜琦 (1886-1951) wanted to go even further.[148] *Emancipation and Reconstruction* was founded on 1 September 1919 by the New-Learning Society (*Xinxue hui* 新學會) in Beijing. It belonged to the political party Research Clique, and it ceased publication in 1922.[149]

In this journal, Jiang Qi explained in March 1920 that, as long as 'civilisation' (*wenming* 文明) was created by the elite, the New Culture Movement 'followed the old tracks of an overturned cart' (*dao congqian de fuzhe* 蹈從前的覆轍). The new 'civilisation' of the New Culture Movement should not be created 'from top to bottom, [by people] such as rulers, politicians, scholars, educators and so on' (*zi shang er xia de, liru tongzhi zhe, zhengzhi jia, xuezhe, jiaoyu yuan deng* 自上而下的，例如統治者，政治家，學者，教育員等). Instead, everybody should help creating it, 'within the scope of his own ability' (*zai ziji nengli fanwei nei* 在自己能力範圍內) and through 'mutual cooperation' (*huxiang xiezhu* 互相協助).[150] This sounded very similar to Karl Marx' (1818-1883) famous slogan 'from each according to his ability, to each

[147] Zhou Changxian, 'Piping de jingshen he xin wenhua yundong', *Piping*, 1920. Zhou Changxian must have been a student at Beijing University, since he also published in the *Beijing University Daily*. *Criticism* was, moreover, run by students at Beijing University. See Zhou Changxian, 'Zhou Changxian qishi', *Beijing daxue rikan*, 1919; Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Piping'; 'Ben she qishi san', *Piping*, 20 October 1920; 'Ben she tongxin chu', *Piping*, 20 October 1920.
[148] Jiang Qi, 'Xin wenhua yundong he jiaoyu'.
[149] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 248.
[150] Jiang Qi, 'Xin wenhua yundong he jiaoyu', 89–92.

according to his needs,' and to Kropotkin's model of 'mutual aid,' which also fascinated Li Dazhao.[151]

Many of these definitions sound familiar, as they have made it into later academic discourses about the Movement. Jiang Qi's explanation, for example, resembles Vera Schwarcz' claim that New Culture activists '[shook] the foundation of the authority of intellectuals.'[152] The definitions given by Zhu Daihen, Zhou Changxian and Miao Jinyuan also fit well with the lists of New Culture ideas, which, as I have shown in the Introduction, scholars have made in an attempt to define the New Culture Movement. Among these elements were enlightenment, *baihua*, science, democracy, Marxism and social reform.[153]

Some definitions of the New Culture Movement in 1919, however, seem to defy any scholarly attempts at classification. One of them was given by the vice principal of Nanjing Higher Normal School, Liu Boming.[154] Liu Boming would, in 1922, be among the founders of the *Critical Review*, the successor magazine of *National Heritage*.[155] The *Critical Review* would criticise the New Culture Movement as a whole.[156] However, in June 1920, Liu Boming did not make this attempt. Instead, he tried to graft the buzzword 'New Culture Movement' onto an agenda very close to ideas held by the circle around Liu Shipei.

The occasion was a talk Liu Boming gave when translating for John Dewey during a lecture in Xuzhou. The title of Liu's speech was 'The Meaning and Needs of the New

[151] Meisner, *Li Ta-Chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism*, 13.
[152] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 79.
[153] Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 72; Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*; Zheng Shiqu, 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun', 11–14; Spence, *The Search for Modern China*, 300–302. See also pp. 23-25 of this thesis.
[154] On Liu Boming's profession, see Xi Ping, 'Duiyu "Liu Boming jun yanjiang xin wenhua yundong zhi yiyi ji biyao" de piping'.
[155] Liu Guisheng and Zhang Buzhou, *Taiwan ji hai wai wu si yanjiu lunzhu xieyao*, 250. For more details on the *Critical Review*, see 227-231 of this thesis.
[156] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 250.

Culture Movement' (*Xin wenhua yundong de yiyi ji biyao* 新文化運動的意義及必要).[157] Writing for *Enlightenment* (*Juewu* 覺悟), a supplement of the *Republic Daily* founded in June 1919,[158] Xi Ping 希平, summed Liu's definition up in this way:

> The New Culture has emerged out of the old culture. If there is no old culture, there is necessarily no new culture. For example, if a man and a woman get together, there will be a new thing emerging. (It is far-fetched to make a comparison like this. [This was probably Xi Ping's comment]) Therefore the people who advocate New Culture can definitely not completely overthrow the old culture and create a different new culture.
>
> 新文化是從舊文化裏發生的，無舊文化則必無新文化，譬如一男一女，如一接觸，就有新事物發生出來，（按這樣比喻，擬於不倫）所以提倡新文化的人，斷不能把舊文化一齊推翻，另造一個新文化來。[159]

This sounded very similar to *National Heritage* ideas that, as I have shown in Chapter One, emphasised the connection between past and present. It was also reminiscent of a statement made by *National Heritage* author Zhang Xuan, who claimed that the (present) European culture 'was not water without a source, not a flower without a stalk' (*fei … wei wu yuan zhi shui, wu gen zhi hua* 非……為無源之水，無根之花).[160] Liu Boming then went on to argue that the New Culture Movement also implied scepticism towards *baihua*. His avowed fear was that, once students had learnt the easy *baihua*, they would not be motivated to learn the difficult *wenyan*.[161]

The journalist Xi Ping was outraged at Liu Boming's definition.[162] Moreover, Liu Boming seemed to be an exception. People like Huang Kan, who used to be classified

---

[157] Xi Ping, 'Duiyu "Liu Boming jun yanjiang xin wenhua yundong zhi yiyi ji biyao" de piping'. This issue of *Enlightenment* was published on 1 July 1920. However, the journalist Xi Ping explained that Liu Boming had given the speech 'the other day' (*qian tian* 前天). It must have therefore been in June. See Ibid.
[158] *Quanguo baokan suoyin, qikan daohang*.
[159] Xi Ping, 'Duiyu "Liu Boming jun yanjiang xin wenhua yundong zhi yiyi ji biyao" de piping'. Xi Ping may have been the penname of Liu Xiping 劉希平 (1873-1924), an educator and May Fourth activist from Anhui. See Xu Weiming, s.v. 'Xi Ping'; Rong Yuming, s.v. 'Liu Xiping'.
[160] Zhang Xuan, 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian', 1B.
[161] Xi Ping, 'Duiyu "Liu Boming jun yanjiang xin wenhua yundong zhi yiyi ji biyao" de piping'.
[162] Ibid.

as ‘Old Faction,’ had disappeared from the public gaze. Others, as I show in Chapter Four, continued attacking the circle around Hu Shi.[163] Opposition to the New Culture Movement would emerge particularly when the scholars Wu Mi 吳宓 (1894-1978), Mei Guangdi 梅光迪 (1890-1945) and Hu Xiansu 胡先驌 (1894-1894) founded the *Critical Review* in Nanjing in 1922.[164] Nevertheless, Liu Boming was close to people previously classified as Old Faction, and he did try to sell his ideas as ‘New Culture Movement’ in June 1920. This indicates the power the buzzword ‘New Culture Movement’ had acquired by that time.

A New Argument for ‘*baihua*’

The label ‘New Culture Movement’ did not only invoke a constellation of academic stars, to whom intellectuals at the periphery of the invoked New Culture cosmos sought to ascribe their own ideas. It also drew upon the rhetoric these stars had employed. One of these keywords was *baihua*, and consequently lesser-known New Culture activists started supporting this form of language. However, since groups like the Jiangsu Educational Association treated the New Culture Movement as a franchise to sell their own ideas, they modified the content of these keywords. Much to the dismay of Hu Shi’s circle, the argument behind *baihua* changed in this way.

As I have argued in Chapter One, the circle around Hu Shi argued for *baihua* on the grounds that it was the language best suited to present times. Weighing the advantages of *baihua* against *wenyan*, Hu Shi claimed that ‘[i]t is preferable to use the living words of the 20th century than the dead words of three millennia past’ (*yuqi yong san qian nian qian zhi si zi, … buru yong er shi shiji zhi huo zi* 與其用三千年前之死字，……

[163] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 78. For more details, see pp. 224-231 of this dissertation.
[164] Duan Huaiqing, *Baibide yu Zhongguo wenhua*, 146.

不如用二十世紀之活字).[165] His student Fu Sinian disliked *wenyan* because it was 'outdated' (*guowang* 過往) today,[166] and had become 'already stale and dead' (*yi cheng chen si* 已成陳死).[167] *Baihua*, on the other hand, was 'alive and full of *joie de vivre*' (*huopo rao you shengqu* 活潑饒有生趣), because it 'suited today's world' (*qiehe jin shi* 切合今世).[168] In his letter to Lin Shu from March 1919, the Chancellor of Beijing University Cai Yuanpei specifically explained that the *baihua* advocated by his professors was not the language of 'carriage pullers and jam sellers' (*yin che mai jiang zhe* 引車賣漿者).[169]

However, that *baihua* was the language of 'carriage pullers and jam sellers' was exactly what many lesser-known New Culture activists claimed. In its announcement of the student lecture competition, the Jiangsu Educational Association wrote:

> 2) The New Culture Movement wants to spread culture to the great majority of our countrymen. It does not limit itself to one single class or group. (For example, it popularises Bopomofo [that is, a Romanization system for Chinese characters]. It promotes *baihua* literature. It establishes free schools and lecture groups. All of them underline this point [lit. 'have this meaning'].)
>
> 二，新文化運動要文化普及於大多數之國民，不以一階級、一團體為限（例如，推廣註音字母、傳播白話文、設立義務學校、演講團，都是這個意思）。[170]

As early as July, the Association's Vice-President Huang Yanpei had, under his pseudonym Bao Yi 抱一, already promoted this idea in the Changsha newspaper *Impartial*. There he explained on 12 July 1919 that *baihua* should be used in publications that 'connect with common society' (*he putong shehui jiaojie* 和普通社會

[165] Hu Shi, 'Wenxue gailiang chuyi', January 1917, 10. Translation taken from Hu, 'Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature', 138.
[166] Fu Sinian, 'Wen yan heyi caoyi', 1070.
[167] Ibid., 1065.
[168] Ibid., 1066.
[169] Cai Yuanpei, 'Da Lin Qinnan shu', 98–99. Fabio Lanza has translated this this as the 'language of those who pull carts or sell drinks in the capital.' See Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 96.
[170] 'Yanshuo jingjin hui yanti zhi jieshi'.

交接).[171] Many agreed with this conception. *Baihua* was presented in the same way in the missionary journal *Chinese Christian Advocate*.[172] The teacher trainee Zhu Daihen talked about *baihua* in one breath with 'establishing free schools,' which suggests that she saw it as a tool for popular education too.[173] Moreover, the professor at Yanjing University Philippe de Vargas called *baihua* the 'popular language.'[174] Clarence H. Hamilton (no dates), at the time working at the University of Nanjing, called it the 'vulgar tongue.'[175]

The *guoyu* Project

This argument was much closer to the *guoyu* project than to the *baihua* of the academic circle at Beijing University. The origins of *guoyu* went back to the 19th century, when scholars like Wu Rulun saw that a national language had been successfully established in Japan, and started advocating a similar project for China. In 1911, the project went underway when the Qing Dynasty's Board of Education convened a conference to unify the national language. After the Republic was established one year later in 1912, the project was continued.[176] These efforts were interrupted when general Yuan Shikai lost interested in them, after he had become president of the Republic in 1912.[177]

But after his death in 1916, the *guoyu* project was resumed. According to *guoyu* activist Li Jinxi, the motivation for establishing a national language was now the idea that a republican form of state could only be maintained if the common people possessed a certain degree of education. A language that was both national and used for writing and

[171] Bao Yi, 'Wo duiyu baihua wenti de yijian', *Dagongbao*, 12 July 1919. On Bao Yi being Huang Yanpei's pseudonym, see Xu Weiming, s.v. 'Bao Yi'.
[172] 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi jieshi', 28.
[173] Zhu Daihen, 'Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu', 37.
[174] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 14.
[175] Hamilton, 'Religion and the New Culture Movement in China', 227.
[176] Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 14–17.
[177] DeFrancis, *Nationalism and Language Reform in China*, 59.

speaking was a useful tool to achieve this goal.[178] In January 1915, *guoyu* activist Wang Pu 王璞 (1875-1929) had already written in a petition to the government that 'this is a clear evidence that those who strive for the popularisation of education need to first start with the unification of written and spoken language' (*shi mou puji jiaoyu zhe bi xian zhuoshou tongyi yan wen zhi mingzheng ye* 是謀普及教育者必先著手統一言文之明證也). The 'popularisation of education,' he argued furthermore, was 'the fundament of strengthening the nation' (*qiangguo zhi ben* 強國之本).[179]

This argument was not only put forward in China. It was also very close to American motivations to establish a mass-education system, which had existed particularly since the 19th century.[180] In the 1910s, this idea was prestigiously endorsed by John Dewey.[181] In line with this, Li Jinxi argued in 1919 that *guoyu* would enable 'chauffeurs and maids' (*chefu xianü* 車夫下女) to 'read books and peruse newspapers' (*du shu yue bao* 讀書閱報).[182] This new wave of *guoyu* advocacy was, moreover, supported by the government. In March 1919, for example, the Ministry of Education established the Preparatory Committee for the Unification of the National Language.[183] According to Elisabeth Kaske, this committee, rather than the New Culture Movement, was what really made the *guoyu* project take off in 1919.[184]

The Jiangsu Educational Association was committed to *guoyu* too. In 1911, the Association had contacted the Educational Associations of other regions to discuss a 'Scheme to Unify the National Language' (*Tongyi guoyu fang'an* 統一國語方案). Over

[178] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 133.
[179] Li Jinxi, 'Duyin tongyi hui Zhili daibiao Wang Pu deng cheng jiaoyu bu qing banxing zhuyin zimu wen', xia 19. For the dating of this petition, see Ibid., xia 21.
[180] Brockliss and Sheldon, *Mass Education and the Limits of State Building, c.1870-1930*, 168.
[181] Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 83. This book was originally published in 1916, see Ibid., pt. Bibliographical Note.
[182] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu xue jiangyi*, shang 26.
[183] Gu Xiuqing, *Qing mo Min chu Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yanjiu*, 172.
[184] Wang, 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937', 466; Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 22.

the following years, the Association, as part of the National Union of Educational Associations (*Quanguo jiaoyu hui lianhe hui* 全國教育會聯合會), petitioned the government several times to introduce *guoyu*.[185] These petitions were successful in October 1919, and the Ministry of Education decreed on 12 January 1920 that *guoyu* become part of the primary-school curriculum starting in that year.[186]

The Jiangsu Educational Association also promoted *guoyu* locally. With the argument that 'unifying the language is the basis for popularising education' (*tongyi yuyan wei puji jioayu zhi jichu* 統一語言為普及教育之基礎), the Association convened educators to practice *guoyu* in 1918. In the same year, it launched *guoyu* training classes for teachers, edited new *guoyu* textbooks, and founded a *National-Language Daily Newspaper* (*Guoyu ribao* 國語日報) in Shanghai.[187] Moreover, one of the aims behind the aforementioned student lecture competition, which discussed the New Culture Movement in late 1919, was to practice *guoyu*.[188] This lecture competition had been launched in 1918, independently from the New Culture Movement.[189] In other words, the quest to further popular education through a language that could be used for writing and for speaking was now, in late 1919, inscribed into the keyword '*baihua*.' *Baihua*, however, was declared to be part of the New Culture Movement, at whose 'centre' avowedly stood Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu.[190]

---

[185] Gu Xiuqing, *Qing mo Min chu Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yanjiu*, 169–170. For a petition in 1914, see Quanguo jiaoyu hui lianhe hui, 'Tongyi guoyu fangfa'an'. For one in 1916, see Quanguo jiaoyu hui lianhe hui, 'Qing ding guoyu biaozhun bing tuixing zhuyin zimu yiqi yuyan tongyi'.
[186] Zhu Lin'gong, 'Guoyu yanjiu hui jianzhang', 6; Wang, 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937', 466; Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 22; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 279.
[187] Gu Xiuqing, *Qing mo Min chu Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yanjiu*, 170–71.
[188] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 23.
[189] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Fu yanshuo jingjin hui jianze', 7–8; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Yanshuo jingjin hui bisai jishi'.
[190] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

As mentioned above, *baihua* was displayed as the language of the common people by many New Culture supporters.[191] Since they cannot have adopted this argument from the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, I suspect that they received their ideas and rhetoric from groups such as the Jiangsu Educational Association, rather than from the declared 'centre' of the Movement. In other words, I argue that it was groups at the periphery of the evoked New Culture cosmos (such as the Jiangsu Educational Association) that shaped the opinions debated under the headline 'New Culture Movement.'[192]

Eventually, their discourse also made it into the academic narratives about the Movement. *Baihua*, for example, entered academia for a long time as the language of the people. It has often been translated as 'the vernacular.'[193] Vera Schwarcz has described it as a language designed to tear down the boundaries between intellectual elite and 'common folk.'[194] Chow Tse-tsung has explained that *baihua* became popular after May Fourth because the necessity to communicate with the 'common people' became apparent during the demonstrations and *baihua* was a good tool to do so.[195] Only in recent years, scholars have pointed out that New Culture *baihua* was anything but the language of the people. Shi Shumei, Perry Link and Edward Gunn have shown that this form of language was heavily Westernised or Japanised, and that it was as incomprehensible to the common people as *wenyan*.[196]

---

[191] 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi jieshi', 28; Zhu Daihen, 'Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu', 37; de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 14.

[192] I do not mean to suggest that the Jiangsu Educational Association itself shaped the discourse. Rather, I suggest that it was groups *like* it that did so. It would be interesting to explore this for other groups and regions. But this is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

[193] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 56; Zhou, *Placing the Modern Chinese Vernacular in Transnational Literature*.

[194] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 79.

[195] Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 178.

[196] Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese*, 217–296; Shi, *The Lure of the Modern*, 71.

Blurred Boundaries between 'Centre' and Periphery

To be sure, the boundaries between Beijing University's circle of academics around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, on the one hand, and the *guoyu* and popular-education advocates, on the other hand, were blurred. The word '*baihua*' had not been invented by Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu, and it could refer to 'the vernacular.' Moreover, in practical terms, there was little difference between the *baihua* written by Hu Shi and the lesser-known New Culture activists. As Leo Lee has argued, local New Culture activists soon became very elitist and the 'spirit of popularity was somehow lost' in the newly founded supplements to the newspapers *Shanghai News* and *Morning Post* in the 1920s and 1930s.[197]

Moreover, although it endorsed *baihua* as the language of present times, Hu Shi's circle at Beijing University was involved in the *guoyu* project and in various popular-education endeavours. As mentioned above, members of the New Tide Society were famously involved in the Commoners' Education Lecture Society, whom Lanza has ascribed a genuine interest in educating the people.[198] Fu Sinian explained in his *New Tide* manifesto that he wanted to 'awaken the self-awareness the countrymen had towards the scholarship of this country' (*huanqi guoren duiyu ben guo xueshu zhi zijue xin* 喚起國人對於本國學術之自覺心) and to 'be the pioneers for China's future society' (*wei weilai Zhongguo shehui zuo zhi xiandao* 為未來中國社會作之先導).[199] This was suspiciously close to the declared aim of the Ministry of Education's Popular Lecture Institutes, which sought to 'enlighten and guide the people.'[200]

[197] Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity', 56.
[198] On the New Tide Society's participation in the Commoners' Education Lecture Society, see Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 89. For Lanza's assessment, see Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 187–88.
[199] Fu Sinian, 'Xinchao fakan zhiqu shu', 1397–98.
[200] Jiaoyubu, 'Tongsu jiaoyu jiangyan guize', 533.

Chen Duxiu had long advocated vocational education.[201] Cai Yuanpei was head of the Committee for Research on the National Language[202] and Hu Shi was delegate to the Preparatory Committee for the Unification of the National Language.[203] *Guoyu* advocate Li Jinxi, moreover, argued that Hu Shi was the first to fuse *guoyu* and *baihua* when creating the slogan 'a literature in the national language – a literary national language' (*guoyu de wenxue – wenxue de guoyu* 國語的文學——文學的國語) in his article 'A Discussion of a Constructive Literary Revolution.'[204] Elisabeth Kaske, moreover, argued that the establishment of the subject 'linguistics' (*yuyan xue* 語言學) at Beijing University was an important step in the *guoyu* project.[205]

As mentioned above in the context of the Jiangsu Educational Association's marketing strategies, it is of course impossible to say for sure what the intellectuals 'really' believed and what was 'only rhetoric.' Nevertheless, it cannot be ignored that Hu Shi showed himself to be exceedingly unhappy about the New Culture Movement and Chen Duxiu agreed with him that it was others who defined it.[206] Hu's circle also did seem to take the change in the *baihua* argument very seriously. Hu's friend Lin Yutang 林語堂 (1895-1976), for example, sighed in a letter to Hu Shi that it was 'blasphemy' (*xiedu* 褻瀆) when New Culture activists regarded *baihua* as merely the language of the people.[207] In other words, from their public statements, it appears that the avowed

[201] Dong Baoliang and Zhou Hongyu, *Zhongguo jin xiandai jiaoyu sichao yu liupai*, 292–93.
[202] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 134.
[203] Ibid., 144.
[204] Ibid., 136; Hu Shi, 'Jianshe de wenxue geming lun', 289.
[205] Culp, 'Review of *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education, 1895-1919*, by Elisabeth Kaske', 390–405.
[206] Hu Shi, 'Xin sichao de yiyi', 9; Chen Duxiu, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de zhu tongzhi'.
[207] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 85.

'centre' felt that it did not have any control over the Movement that was ascribed to it, and that it was certainly not happy about this.[208]

Self-Confidence of the New Culture Activists at the Periphery

Lesser-known intellectuals praised Hu Shi's circle as 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[209] They cited its members and modelled themselves after them. However, that this was not so much born out of admiration for this 'centre,' but for the purpose of adding to their own ideas, is suggested by the fact that the intellectuals at the periphery could also be very self-confident about their own role in the Movement.

The Makers of the Movement

First of all, lesser-known intellectuals argued that it was they who had made the New Culture Movement. The expression 'New Culture Movement' did not only appear first in small journals, and only later in *New Youth*.[210] The intellectuals at the periphery also indicated their role as inventors of the Movement through the chronology they told about its birth. The story very often followed the narrative given by the Jiangsu Educational Association, which claimed that the 'New Culture Movement continued the May Fourth Movement.'[211] In other words, only after the May Fourth demonstrations, when the lesser-known intellectuals became involved, ideas like *baihua* became part of a 'Movement.' If the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu had advocated them before, this was not a 'Movement.'

The Jiangsu Educational Association's version of the story was very popular. When the student Yu Tiandong gave his presentation at the Association's lecture competition, he

[208] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[209] Ibid.
[210] Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 73.
[211] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.

argued as well that, 'since the student protests of May Fourth, the New Culture Movement is more advanced every day (*zicong wu si xuechao yihou, xin wenhua yundong, yi tian jinbu yi tian* 自從五四學潮以後，新文化的運動，一天進步一天).[212] Similarly, Zhou Changxian wrote in *Criticism* that, 'since the May Fourth Movement last year' (*zicong qunian wu si yundong yilai* 自從去年五四運動以來), the 'New Culture Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong* 新文化運動) had emerged in response to a general 'enlightenment' (*juewu* 覺悟).[213]

To be sure, this was not the only story about the emergence of the New Culture Movement. Zheng Shiqu has pointed out that some contemporaries also dated the New Culture Movement back to the end of World War I in 1918 or to the foundation of *New Youth* in 1915. The foundation of *New Youth* became increasingly popular as a starting point for New Culture later on.[214] Since a lot of people debated the New Culture Movement at the time, it is unsurprising that a variety of opinions existed. Nevertheless, the claim that the 'New Culture Movement continued the May Fourth Movement' was widespread in 1919 and 1920, and everybody who repeated it implied that the 'centre' alone did not make the New Culture Movement.[215]

The 'Popularisation'-versus-'Enhancement' Debate

Secondly, New Culture activists at the periphery of the New Culture cosmos did not hesitate to criticise the 'centre' if it disagreed with their own opinions. When Hu Shi remembered being called 'centre of the New Culture Movement' during his lectures in Nanjing, he also recalled being indirectly criticised by his fans at the same time. People

[212] Yu Tiandong, 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi zhongzhong wenti ji tuixing fa', 1.
[213] Zhou Changxian, 'Piping de jingshen he xin wenhua yundong'.
[214] Zheng Shiqu, 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun', 9.
[215] For the phrase 'the New Culture Movement continues the May Fourth Movement,' see Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.

at Beijing University, they commented, made no better contributions to the New Culture Movement than other activists. Everybody was 'merely using words like "fighting," "universal love," "autonomy," "labour" or "holy."' But not even Beijing University, with its 'over 200 professors and over 2,000 students' (*er bai duo jiaoyuan, er qian duo xuesheng* 二百多教員、二千多學生), had produced enough sound New Culture publications. Producing good publications was apparently how the discussant envisioned an ideal New Culture Movement.[216]

A lot of criticism of the 'centre of the New Culture Movement' arose over the question of whether the New Culture Movement should primarily be 'enhanced' (*tigao* 提高) or 'popularised' (*puji* 普及).[217] 'Enhancing' meant to conduct further academic research into it. 'Popularisation' meant to spread it among the common people. Disagreement over this question was one of the biggest stones of contention among the 'comrades of the New Culture Movement' in 1919 and 1920, and it has attracted a lot of scholarly attention.[218]

Zheng Shiqu, for example, has argued that the 'enhancement' camp was led by Hu Shi, and the 'popularisation' camp by Chen Duxiu.[219] Li Quan and Yü Ying-shih have held a similar opinion.[220] Chow Tse-tsung has talked about a split between leftists around Chen Duxiu, who 'advocated extreme social, economic, and political changes,' and

[216] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[217] Zheng Shiqu, 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun', 25; Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'; Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 470.
[218] For the phrase 'comrades of the New Culture Movement,' see Chen Duxiu, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de zhu tongzhi'; Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi'.
[219] Zheng Shiqu, 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun', 25; Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*, 18. Zheng Shiqu rephrased this as people in favour of 'expanding' (*kuoda* 擴大) and those in favour of 'deepening' (*shenhua* 深化).
[220] Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*, 18; Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment', 308–309. According to Yü Ying-shih, this split came about when Chen Duxiu moved *New Youth* to Shanghai in 1920 and started modelling it after the Communist pictorial magazine *New Russia*. See Ibid., 308.

liberals around Hu Shi, who 'advocated freedom of thought and expression.'[221] Fabio Lanza has observed a similar split, but he analysed it in terms of the construction of the notion of 'students.' After May Fourth, he said, one camp wanted to see students as a 'special class' that had the right to get involved in politics. Another camp, felt that students should not discuss politics outside of their classrooms.[222] The 'popularisation'-versus-'enhancement' debate has, moreover, been analysed in terms of broader ideology. It has been argued that the 'popularisers' were, or were about to become, Marxists,[223] and that the 'enhancers' were 'liberals,'[224] or more scientifically[225] or apolitically minded people.[226]

As one manifestation of this wider ideological clash, scholars have identified the famous debate about 'problems and isms' (*wenti yu zhuyi* 問題與主義). The debate was started by Hu Shi, who published an article called 'Research a Few More Question, and Talk a Bit Less about Isms' (*Duo yanjiu xie wenti, shao tan xie zhuyi* 多研究些問題，少談些主義) in the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) of 20 July 1919. Lan Gongwu and Li Dazhao then published counter-articles in the *Citizen Gazette* (*Guomin gongbao*) and the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*), to which Hu Shi responded with further defences.[227] In these articles, according to Leo Lee, Hu Shi opposed the idea of '"fundamental solutions" for all the problems of a society' in favour of 'attention to

[221] Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1967, 216.
[222] Lanza, 'Of Chronology, Failure, and Fidelity', 67.
[223] Zheng Shiqu, 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun', 21; Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*, 18.
[224] Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, xi.
[225] Barlow, *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*, 67–69.
[226] Li Quan, *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan*, 18; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1967, 217.
[227] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 76. Lan Gongwu published this article under his courtesy name 'Lan Zhixian.' See also See Eglauer, *Wissenschaft als Chance*, 144.

concrete situations.'[228] By 'fundamental solutions,' Jerome B. Grieder and Geng Yunzhi argued, Hu Shi meant Marxism.[229]

In the context of this 'enhancement'-versus-'popularisation' debate, many lesser-known New Culture supporters criticised their avowed 'centre.' One such instance was Hu Shi's speech at Beijing University's opening ceremony for the new academic year 1920. On this occasion, Hu Shi explained that 'enhancement' (*tigao* 提高) was the primary aim of the 'culture movement' (*wenhua yundong* 文化運動). Only after that, it could be 'popularised' (*puji* 普及).[230] This incited an outcry from the 'popularisation' camp. Miao Jinyuan, for example, explicitly criticised Hu Shi and said:

> What I am saying is just the opposite of [what] Mr Hu Shi [says]. He says: 'Only enhancement is true popularisation.' (Speech at Beida's term-opening ceremony, see the *Morning Post* in Beijing.) I say: 'Only popularisation is true enhancement.'
>
> 我的意思，正與胡適先生相反。他說：《惟有提高，才是真普及》。（北大開學演說詞，見北京，《晨報》。）我說：《惟有普及，才是真提高。》[231]

As mentioned above, Zheng Shiqu has claimed that 'enhancers' were the circle around Hu Shi and 'popularisers' the group around Chen Duxiu.[232] However, it was not just the case that Chen Duxiu's supporters criticised Hu Shi and vice versa. Chen Duxiu was not a pure 'populariser.' In his *New Youth* article 'Enhancement and Popularisation' (*Tigao yu puji* 提高与普及), Chen argued that culture needed both 'enhancement' and 'popularisation.' Besides, he claimed, culture at Beijing University was so underdeveloped that it first needed to be invented anyway, before it could be

[228] Lee and Goldmann, *An Intellectual History of Modern China*, 124.
[229] Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, 125. See also Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 76.
[230] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[231] Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 4.
[232] Zheng Shiqu, 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun', 25.

'enhanced.'[233] Moreover, only a few paragraphs before criticising Hu Shi, Miao Jinyuan had praised and cited him.[234] In other words, Miao was first and foremost following his own agenda, and only using Hu Shi to support it as necessary.

General Sense of Decline in Hu Shi's Circle

As a result of the appropriation of New Culture stars and keywords by the intellectuals at the periphery of the New Culture narrative, the circle around Hu Shi experienced a sense of decline at their new height of success. As mentioned above, Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu expressed that the New Culture Movement was out of their control. Lin Yutang called the new *baihua* arguments 'blasphemy.'[235] Moreover, Fu Sinian started sounding very defensive in *New Tide* in autumn 1919 when he stated that the New Tide Society was merely concerned with scholarship and unwilling to 'go and manage all matters in society' (*qu chuzhi shehui shang de yiqie shijian* 去處治社會上的一切事件).[236] 'Managing all matters in society,' however, was exactly what many local New Culture activists were interested in (at least in theory). Fu Sinian's autumn article was also a far cry from the proactive tone of his *New Tide* manifesto a few months earlier in January 1919, in which he had announced to 'awaken the countrymen' (*huanqi guoren* 喚起國人) and to teach the 'countrymen' about evolution.[237]

The stars of the New Culture Movement were not only unhappy about their admirers. Although the sales numbers of their journals had risen with the invention of the New Culture Movement, they felt their quality and finances were declining.[238] Chen Duxiu complained to Hu Shi that *New Youth* was losing its quality and the Beijing University

[233] Chen Duxiu, 'Tigao yu puji', *Xin qingnian*.
[234] Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan', 3.
[235] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 85.
[236] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 204.
[237] Fu Sinian, 'Xinchao fakan zhiqu shu', 1398.
[238] On the rise of sales numbers, see Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 37; Wang Yuanfang, *Yadong tushuguan yu Chen Duxiu*, 47.

professors their enthusiasm to supply articles to the journal, which had by then moved to Shanghai.[239] New Tide Society member Li Xiaofeng remembered that, after May Fourth, *New Tide*'s quality and financial situation deteriorated as well. After Fu Sinian had departed from the magazine in autumn 1919 because he went to study in England, his co-editor Luo Jialun took over. Unfortunately, Li Xiaofeng claimed, Luo Jialun was blinded by the post-May Fourth success and miscalculated the journal's funds.[240]

New Tide had always been funded by Beijing University, and it had made some profit in 1919. Since Beijing University was sorting out the finances, *New Tide*'s authors would have needed to check with the bookkeepers at the University to find out how much profit exactly they were making. However, no one could be bothered to do so. The New Tide Society therefore did not have precise numbers, but things seemed to be going fine financially. In late 1919, the New Tide Society decided to transform itself into a study society, which apparently meant that their funds became independent from Beijing University. The idea was to publish a few books (in addition to the *New Tide* journal) and to turn the profit made from them into a fund. This worked out well until the new editor Luo Jialun commissioned far too many copies for a collection of Cai Yuanpei's work *Record of Cai Zimin's Words and Deeds* (*Cai Zimin yanxing lu* 蔡子民言行錄). These copies then never sold. As a result, Beijing University had to bail out the New Tide Society and the *New Tide* magazine could not be published for a while.[241]

Li Xiaofeng also felt that the content of *New Tide* was never the same after Fu Sinian had left. The 'spirit' (*jingshen* 精神) of *New Tide* was never as 'brave and fierce' (*yongmeng* 勇猛) as in Fu Sinian's times, that is, before the May Fourth demonstrations. 'The writing style did not anymore have its previous sharpness' (*Bifeng meiyou yiqian*

[239] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 90.
[240] Li Xiaofeng, 'Xinchao she de shimo', 222–23.
[241] Ibid.

fengli le 筆鋒沒有以前鋒利了).[242] In short, as soon as Hu Shi's circle had been upgraded from a 'faction or learning' to the 'centre' of the Movement, it sensed decline and misunderstanding everywhere.[243] This was peculiar since only after this shift did these intellectuals' magazines gain a relatively broad readership. It adds to the impression that this circle of stars felt that they had lost the leadership over ideas debated in their names.

Conclusion

In sum, the New Culture Movement was not a movement created by its avowed visionary stars Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu and so on. This was merely the rhetoric with which less famous intellectuals filled the expression. Instead, the New Culture Movement was a franchise, invented and driven by the lesser-known intellectuals. These intellectuals used it to sell their own agendas more convincingly, by borrowing glamour from people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, and by co-opting keywords these stars had prominently used.

One such keyword was '*baihua*.' Lesser-known intellectuals widely supported writing in *baihua*. However, organisations like the Jiangsu Educational Association did not really change their position on language. Instead, they gave their long-standing commitment to *guoyu* a new name and started selling it as '*baihua*.' As a result, the argument behind *baihua* changed. While Hu Shi's circle at Beijing University had endorsed *baihua* as the language of present times, local New Culture activists now promoted it as the language of the people. This theoretical difference much distressed people like Hu Shi.

[242] Ibid., 217.
[243] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

To be sure, it is reasonable to assume that not all student activists, such as the teacher trainee Zhu Daihen or the Beijing University student Miao Jinyuan, had long held certain agendas and now marketed them as 'New Culture Movement.' However, the discrepancy between their ideas and those held by the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu suggests that they were influenced by players such as the Jiangsu Educational Association, rather than by the 'centre of the New Culture Movement' as they claimed.[244]

The most successful and durable advertising strategy that was attached to the New Culture Movement was certainly its designation as a 'movement.' As Rudolf Wagner has argued, theoretical writings about 'movements' at the time associated 'movements' with something important, something of broad social relevance and something highly dynamic and ground-breaking.[245] However, Wagner has also shown that the designation 'movement' became very popular after the May Fourth demonstrations. Sometimes phenomena were even labelled 'movements' before they had happened, that is, before they could reasonably be identified as 'movements,' drawing on a certain set of criteria.[246] The description 'movement' was therefore also an advertising label, which evoked the qualities the theoretical writings had outlined.

In spite of attempts to rename it, the New Culture Movement is until the present day called by this name. Sometimes, it is even spelled with a minor letter 'm,' which indicates that the event in question is 'objectively' identified as a 'movement,' based on whichever set of criteria. Rather than revealing something about New Culture, the designation 'movement' is therefore something that misleads. It suggests that the New Culture Movement was all the things that the discourse created by the lesser-known

[244] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ibid.
[245] Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 74, 78–80.
[246] Ibid., 70.

New Culture advocates claimed it to be. By showing that the New Culture Movement was an advertising label, I have challenged this aspect of the rhetoric and shown that any changes in the intellectual landscape were not down to a visionary Movement, but to pragmatic intellectuals who had found a clever way of marketing their longstanding agendas.

Another claim of the activists' discourse about the New Culture Movement was that 'all of society' was now committed to it, and that it was a broad social project. In the fourth chapter, I show that this too was rhetoric rather than reality. To be sure, the circles in which figures like Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu moved did care about the New Culture Movement. However, these were mostly intellectuals, a few related businesses like publishing houses and a couple of political interest groups. Outside of these circles, people even in urban areas were fairly unaffected by the franchise 'New Culture Movement' and some of its central tenets, such as *baihua*. In other words, the New Culture Movement was not only a buzzword, it was also a buzzword with a very limited reach.

CHAPTER IV: WHO CARED ABOUT THE NEW CULTURE MOVEMENT?

Introduction

In the 1920s, the circle around Hu Shi had come a long way since early 1919. After having been perceived as a losing 'faction of learning' in the early months of 1919, these academics' image was upgraded during the May Fourth demonstrations, and they came to be regarded as the stars of the anti-government protests. When the buzzword 'New Culture Movement' was invented in the summer or autumn of 1919, they were declared to be the 'centre' of this Movement.[1] As such, they were celebrated as intellectual stars by newspapers, universities and students. Nevertheless they were dismayed at their lack of influence on this Movement.

This ambivalence found expression in an article Hu Shi's student and *New Tide* editor Fu Sinian wrote in September 1919. In this article Fu Sinian appeared defensive when he declared that his New Tide Society was a study group and had no intention of 'going to sort out all matters in society' (*qu chuzhi shehui shang de yiqie shijian* 去處治社會上的一切事件).[2] As I have shown in Chapter Three, social questions were at the heart of lesser-known intellectuals' discourse about the New Culture Movement. Fu also expressed his dismay at New Culture activists when he declared that most of their newly founded spring-bamboo journals were of bad quality.[3]

[1] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[2] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 204.
[3] Ibid., 203.

On the other hand, Fu Sinian recounted how he and his associates had been attacked by their opponents in early 1919.[4] 'However,' he stated, 'the mood of society has hugely changed' (*shehui de kongqi que da gai le* 社會的空氣卻是大改了) since the May Fourth demonstrations and society was now celebrating them.[5] This assessment agrees with Rudolf Wagner, according to whom the expression 'movement' implied in both China and the West that the phenomenon in question was of broad social relevance.[6] It has also been claimed in many academic narratives that the New Culture Movement reached broad circles of people, at least within an urban setting.[7]

However, a number of facts indicate that Fu Sinian overstated 'society's' interest in the New Culture Movement. While Fu Sinian was writing about the 'mood of society' that had 'hugely changed,' a journal run by economics students in Beijing, *Commercial Student* (*Shangye xuesheng* 商業學生,) showed no signs of the New Culture Movement at all. Its authors wrote in *wenyan*, occasionally even unpunctuated. They completely ignored the label 'New Culture Movement' and told a version of the May Fourth demonstrations that did not feature Beijing University's 'New Faction.' This absence of the New Culture Movement says as much about it as the way it was negotiated.[8]

In this chapter, I therefore explore who negotiated the label 'New Culture Movement' in the 1920s. Although I trace whom Fu Sinian had in mind when he talked about 'society's' change of 'mood,'[9] it is not my aim to explore what the term 'society' meant in the 1910s and 1920s. A lot of scholarly attention has already been devoted to this question. This has mostly taken the form of discussions of how 'society' and 'the

[4] Ibid., 201.
[5] Ibid. This *New Tide* issue was published on 30 October 1919. However, Fu Sinian claimed to have written this article on 5 September 1919. See Ibid., 205.
[6] Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 74, 78–80.
[7] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 9; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 187.
[8] I would like to thank Isabella Jackson for her comments on this point.
[9] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 201.

common people' were related to the elite students and academics at Beijing University in that time period. As shown in Chapter Three, Vera Schwarcz has argued that New Culture advocates sought to tear down the boundaries between elite and the 'commoners' when advocating *baihua* instead of *wenyan*.[10]

Fabio Lanza, moreover, has explored how students asserted a role of being 'model[s] of citizen responsibility' (*guomin fuze zhi mofan* 國民負責之模範) during the May Fourth demonstrations.[11] Tang Xiaobing has claimed that the aim to 'enlighten' (*qimeng* 啓蒙) all people, not just 'literary people of the capitalist strata' (*zichan jieji wenren* 資產階級文人), was a central goal in the period.[12] In this chapter, I trace instead which groups of people Fu Sinian must have had in mind when he claimed that 'society' now supported ideas that were labelled 'New Culture Movement.'

As this chapter brings me to the margins of interest in the New Culture Movement, references to it are necessarily vague and sporadic. To make the most of the available sources, I therefore approach the phenomenon 'New Culture Movement' in the broadest possible sense: I trace the mentions of the expression 'New Culture Movement' and the appearance of ideas promoted under this label (for example *baihua*). I also examine references to figures at the avowed 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' such as Hu Shi.[13]

In the first part of this chapter, I argue that the New Culture Movement was not only a buzzword, as shown in Chapter Three. It was in fact a buzzword with a limited reach, powerful merely within humanities, educational and certain political circles in China's

[10] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 79.
[11] Lanza, 'Of Chronology, Failure, and Fidelity', 65.
[12] Tang Xiaobing, *Xiandai Zhongguo de gongong yulun*, 4, 2.
[13] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

cities.[14] Many of the New Culture activists in these circles even had personal connections to the intellectuals around Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi. Outside of these groups, the label 'New Culture Movement' and the ideas promoted under it were hardly visible. I show this by the example of business circles. This group was not only an important part of Republican urban society. As the Jiangsu Educational Association's promotion of vocational education indicates, they had also reason to be interested in the new educational developments.

In the second part of this chapter, I trace the routes along which information about ideas classed as 'New Culture Movement' was transmitted. I argue that these mechanisms of transmission fostered the formation of a discursive circle, within which the New Culture Movement was negotiated. There were mainly two such routes of transmission: advertisement and word-of-mouth recommendations. It is obvious why ideas and slogans would stay within a limited circle through the second method. Advertisements, on the other hand, had the potential to promote ideas as 'New Culture Movement' beyond this circle. However, the advertising strategies people employed encouraged the discourse about New Culture to stay within a limited group. Such a strategy was the journals' practice to give discounts for advertisements of publications that supported likeminded ideas. A fan of a certain journal was, in this way, mostly directed to journals with a similar content.

State of the Field: Who Cared about the New Culture Movement?

This chapter addresses a paradox in scholarship on the question of who cared about the New Culture Movement. On the one hand, the New Culture Movement has been displayed as an important and highly influential phenomenon. Chinese and Western

[14] Rana Mitter has argued that the New Culture Movement was an urban phenomenon. It could therefore not be expected that people in rural areas cared about it. See Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 18.

political and academic discourses have constructed the it into a starting point for 'Modern China,' which marked the beginning of Communism in China, of nationalism or the modern Chinese language and literature.[15] Scholars like Duan Huaiqing and Chen Ping have pointed to the 'victory' (*shengli* 勝利) *baihua* achieved in the 1920s and 1930s.[16] Moreover, the fact that a huge amount of academic literature on the New Culture Movement and related topics exists hints at the importance scholars attach to it.

On the other hand, comments have been made in academic literature that New Culture never reached the 'common people,'[17] that it was a matter for 'small circles of radical intellectuals,'[18] and that the literature of, for example, the 'Butterfly School' was much more popular than 'May Fourth' literature.[19] The 'Butterfly School' described a branch of literature that favoured romantic love stories over the political messages found in 'May Fourth' literature. Among people who dated the beginning of 'Modern China' to the Republican Period, there has also been a debate about which social group deserves the credit for it. Arthur Waldron, for example, has argued that the warlords were responsible for Chinese 'modernity.'[20] I address this conundrum by tracing the groups for whom the label 'New Culture Movement' and the ideas negotiated under it were visible in the 1920s and early 1930s.

[15] On May Fourth and the New Culture Movement as the starting point for a Western-style modernity, see Ibid., 103–104; Peng Peng, 'Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong', 1994, 174; Wang, *Fin-de-Siècle Splendor*, 1. For the New Culture Movement as multiple modernity, see Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*. For a Marxist modernity, see Jin Chongji, 'Wu si yundong'. See also Rudolf Wagner's, Yü Ying-shih's and Rana Mitter's comments on the CCP's appropriation of New Culture, Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 114; Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment'; Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 175–78.
[16] Duan Huaiqing, *Baibide yu Zhongguo wenhua*, 145; Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 75. The expression 'victory' is cited from Duan Huaiqing.
[17] Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 145.
[18] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 216.
[19] Perry Link cited in Liu, 'Creative Translation and Creativity via Translation', 16.
[20] Waldron, *From War to Nationalism*.

Notes on the Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers

I examine these groups and mechanisms of transmission through a variety of sources, including journals, advertisements, student essays and letters. Some of them come from the manuscript collection of Lewis Nathaniel Chase (1873-1937). As these manuscripts introduce a social group that has not featured prominently in this study so far, a few words on this collection and its relevance for this thesis are called for.

Lewis Nathaniel Chase was an American professor of English literature. The son of a Californian businessman without much enthusiasm for business himself, he left the US in the 1910s to travel the world, including India, England and France.[21] In autumn 1921 he arrived in Beijing for the new academic year, where he would stay until 1925[22] to teach at the missionary school Yanjing University, as well as at Beijing Normal University and Beijing University.[23] In China, Lewis Chase also met his future wife, the missionary Emma Lester (1883-?). Emma Lester was employed at the Shanghai missionary girl's school McTyeire from the late 1910s to 1929.[24] Among the sources for this chapter are student essays, letters and other documents from the Chase collection.

The Chase manuscripts give insight into a very specific group within Chinese society at the time. Lewis Chase and Emma Lester were American nationals, and foreigners tended to socialise a lot in foreign circles in China. They met in clubs that reproduced in China the life they had led in their various native countries. They read English-language magazines and newspapers that were targeted at the foreign population in China or

[21] 'Lewis Chase to Frank Chase', 1 May 1922; Manuscript Division, 'Biographical and Organizational Note: Lewis Nathaniel Chase'.
[22] 'Lewis Chase to Family', 16 December 1921; 'Lewis Chase to Frank Chase', 4 June 1925; 'Lewis Chase to Pearl Adell Chase'.
[23] Manuscript Division, 'Biographical and Organizational Note: Lewis Nathaniel Chase'; 'Lewis Chase to E.A. Chase', 19 November 1922, 1; 'Lewis Chase's Schedule at Beijing Normal University'.
[24] It is unclear when exactly Lester came to China. But she appears on a photo of McTyeire's teaching staff in a 1919 edition of the school journal *McTyeirean*. A stamp in her passport indicates that she left China in 1929. See 'Pictures of Staff', *Moti*; 'Passport of Emma Service Lester', 8.

other parts of Asia.[25] Lewis Chase, for example, reported about parties with Reginald F. Johnston, the tutor of the Puyi Emperor, and with Isabel Ingram (1902-1988), the tutor of the empress.[26] His manuscript collection contains a huge number of letters he wrote to fellow foreigners in China and invitation cards from institutions like 'The Anglo-American Association of Peking' and so on.[27]

Lewis Chase, moreover, did not speak much Chinese. Although he had tried his best to learn it, he had given up after a year because he found it too challenging.[28] He gave his classes in English, and all the documents in his collection are written in this language. The documents from Chase's and Lester's Chinese friends also reflect a subgroup within Chinese society. They were mostly from well-to-do backgrounds. Moreover, Emma Lester's former students, who became her friends after graduation, had received a missionary and Western-style education at McTyeire, although they were not all Christians themselves.

The Chase papers are nevertheless useful sources. First of all, although foreigners tended to socialise with foreigners, not all of them lived in hermetically sealed communities. Particularly in academic circles, foreigners were also interacting with Chinese nationals. Hu Shi, for example, claimed that he was very 'close' (*shu* 熟) with Philippe de Vargas,[29] the aforementioned missionary and head of the History Department of Yanjing University. Hu Shi also met Lewis Chase at the Society of

[25] Bickers, *Britain in China*, 81–82; Bickers, 'Shanghailanders and Others', 284; Clifford, *Spoilt Children of Empire*, 71.
[26] 'Lewis Chase to E.A. Chase', 3 December 1922, 3.
[27] For letters, see for example 'Lewis Chase to E.H. Cressy'; 'Lewis Chase to Shurman'. Chase received invitations to 'tiffins' by the Anglo-American Association of Peking and to the American Association of North China. See 'Donald Fraser to Lewis Chase', November 1923; 'Donald Fraser to Lewis Chase', February 1923; 'J.A. Goette to Lewis Chase'.
[28] Chase, 'My Ignorance of China', 3.
[29] Hu Shi, *Hu Shi riji quanbian*, 8:292.

Friends of Literature in Beijing.[30] Upmarket Chinese families like Emma Lester's friends lived in the French and Foreign Concessions in Shanghai.[31] One of Beijing University's admittedly short-term chancellors, Ma Liang 馬良 (1840-1939), was even Catholic. Ma Liang was chancellor for only three months in 1912.[32]

Secondly, the fact that some of the Chases' friends had received a missionary education did not make them outsiders in Chinese society. McTyeire School had produced important alumnae such as Madame Chiang (Song Meiling 宋美齡 [1897-2003])[33] and the famous artist Georgette Chen (Zhang Liying 張荔英 [1906-1993]), who counted Emma Lester among her friends.[34] As Yeh Wen-hsin has shown, missionary schools became important and popular institutions of learning in Republican China.[35] Moreover, even Hu Shi published in missionary journals such as *Chinese Christian Student*, and admitted that, in 1911 in America, he even considered becoming a Christian.[36] Thirdly, it is my aim in this chapter to trace how the label 'New Culture Movement' spread to broader circles. This group of Westernised Chinese and of foreigners in Chinese academia is therefore a useful case study.

The Circle That Did Not Care – The Business Community

In September 1919, Fu Sinian remembered how *New Tide*, the magazine he edited, had been vehemently attacked by the circle around Liu Shipei and by people like Lin Shu. 'However' since the May Fourth demonstrations, he claimed, 'the mood of society has

[30] 'Invitation to Hu Shi's Lecture', 20 February 1924; 'Invitation to Hu Shi's Lecture', 17 November 1922. For information on the Society of Friends of Literature, see footnote 65 on p. 162 of this thesis.
[31] 'Sze We Tsung to Emma Lester'. I would like to thank Isabella Jackson for her comments during the Joint East Asian Studies Conference 2013 in Nottingham.
[32] Lin, *Peking University*, 42.
[33] Leung, s.v. Song Meiling, 141.
[34] Georgette Chen wrote Emma Lester a huge number of very familiar letters in the 1920s. See Chase and et al., 'Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers'.
[35] Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 3–4.
[36] Hu, 'My Student Days in America', 11.

greatly changed.' Now the New Culture Movement was under way and Fu's magazine was celebrated.[37] Fu Sinian was not the only one to accredit such sweeping triumph to the New Culture Movement and ideas negotiated under its headline. In 1922 Hu Shi asserted that advocates of *baihua* had already subdued their opponents, who favoured *wenyan* as a written language. When the pro-*wenyan* *Critical Review*, *National Heritage*'s successor magazine, was founded in that year,[38] Hu Shi commented:

> The debates in the *Critical Review* are probably the epilogue of opposition to the literary revolution [that is, the *baihua* project]. I can boldly say that the literary revolution has already passed the period [in which it is under] debate and that the opposing party [which favours *wenyan*] has already been destroyed. From now on, it is completely a period in which the new literature is created.
>
> 《學衡》的議論，大概是反對文學革命的尾聲了。我可以大膽說，文學革命已過了討論的時期，反對黨已破產了。從此以後，完全是新文學的創造時期。[39]

The previous two chapters of this dissertation suggest that this rhetoric was warranted. Even though Hu Shi and his circle did not control ideas negotiated as 'New Culture Movement, they were praised as intellectual stars and as 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[40] Journals that claimed to be following in their footsteps 'sprang up like spring bamboo after the rain.'[41] Their formerly strong opponents around Liu Shipei and Huang Kan were condemned to academic obscurity. Powerful groups like the Jiangsu Educational Association regarded the New Culture Movement as so powerful a buzzword that they chose to sell their agendas under it.

Nevertheless, for broad reaches of urban society, the New Culture Movement was not a franchise worth using as a marketing tool. They did not even take note of one of its

[37] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 201. For the mention of the May Fourth demonstrations, see Ibid., 203.
[38] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 247.
[39] Wu Lichang, *Wenxue de xiaojie yu fan xiaojie*, 95.
[40] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[41] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 38.

most prestigious programmes: *baihua*. This was the case for both *baihua* with the argument that it was the language of present times (Hu Shi's position) and of *baihua* as the language of the people (the position of lesser-known New Culture activists).

Sticking to *wenyan*

One circle for which the New Culture Movement was hardly visible was business people. In Beijing, the student journal *Commercial Student* did not mention the expression 'New Culture Movement.' In December 1919, one of its authors, Zhong Hengxu 種恒續 (no dates), told a story about the May Fourth demonstrations that did not feature Beijing University's 'New Faction' or the subsequent 'New Culture Movement' at all. Instead, Zhong reported only about the anti-government and anti-Japanese nature of the demonstrations.[42]

Commercial Student was run by the Student and Young People Association (*Xuesheng qingnian hui* 學生青年會) of the Peking School of Commerce and Finance (*Beijing caizheng shangye zhuanmen xuexiao* 北京財政商業專門學校). This school had been founded in 1914 and was funded by Chinese businessmen. Its teaching staff consisted mainly of Chinese returned students from Ivy League schools in the US.[43] In other words, although the authors of *Commercial Student* were not, or not yet, business people, they were students interested in the world of commerce.[44]

This lack of interest in the New Culture Movement continued in business circles over the next decade. In the 1920s and 1930s, the missionary Emma Lester received numerous English-language letters from her former Chinese students. These were mostly affluent ladies from Shanghai, who were married to businessmen or politicians.

[42] Zhong Hengxu, 'The Triumph of the Students'.
[43] Zhang Jianming and Qi Dazhi, *Hua shuo Jing shang*, 37–38.
[44] I would like to thank Isabella Jackson for her comments on this issue.

In other words, these people came from the catchment area of the Jiangsu Educational Association. Nevertheless, the expression 'New Culture Movement' did not appear in their letters. Only once Lester's friend and colleague at McTyeire 'Bei' (her own Romanization: Sze Be Tsung, Pinyin: Xu Peizhen 徐佩珍 [no dates]) mentioned a 'May Fete' that had regrettably happened and caused her a lot of trouble.[45] However, it is impossible to say if she referred to the May Thirtieth Movement or the May Fourth Movement.[46] To be sure, just because these ladies did not mention the New Culture Movement in their letters to Lester does not necessarily mean that they were not interested in it. However, it is conspicuous that they discussed with her other intellectual and political events, such as the rise of Communism and the Sino-Japanese war,[47] but not May Fourth and New Culture.

Philippe de Vargas claimed that *baihua* was the most, if not the only, successful element of what he called 'the Chinese Renaissance.'[48] Similarly, the introduction of *guoyu* into the primary-school curriculum in 1920 has often been highlighted as a sign for New Culture success after 1919.[49] However, there was no sign of *baihua* or even of *guoyu* in either *Commercial Student* or in the letters to Emma Lester a few years later. *Commercial Student* was written in *wenyan*, on occasion even unpunctuated.[50] This fits well with Chen Ping's observation that *wenyan* continued being commonly used in business circles, and also in political and legal contexts.[51]

[45] 'Sze Be Tsung to Emma Lester', 17 October 1929, 3.
[46] Bei mentioned the 'May Fete' in a letter in 1929, after some of her current students at McTyeire had staged a protest because they had gotten only one, not two, days off during the national holiday on 10 October. It is therefore possible to speculate that by 'May Fete' Bei referred to political action, rather than to an intellectual project. See Ibid., 2–3. I would like to thank Isabella Jackson for her comments.
[47] See, for example, 'Chang Tuh Wei to Emma Lester', 1–2; 'Ting Vung Yuin to Emma Lester'.
[48] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 21.
[49] Wang, 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937', 466; Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 22.
[50] Dai Xian, 'Meiguo huobi shi tanlüe'.
[51] Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 77.

Guoyu and *baihua* were not widespread a few years later either, although the Ministry of Education had continued its efforts to promote it. As Chen Ping has shown, following the various *guoyu* committees of the 1910s and 1920s, the Ministry of Education set up another committee in 1935, designed to promote *guoyu* across the country. This was only stopped by the beginning of the Sino-Japanese War in 1937, but resumed as soon as the war was over in 1945.[52] Nevertheless, neither *guoyu* nor *baihua* seemed to play a role in the lives of Lester's Chinese friends in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

This is surprising since at least one of them, Sam Moy (Samuel Orne Moy, no Chinese characters, no dates), would have much benefitted from a national language. In 1933 Sam Moy moved to Shanghai with his wife, 'Ming' (Niu Minghua 鈕珉華 [no dates]), who had been born there.[53] Moy spoke a Chinese dialect as a native language that was incomprehensible to people in Shanghai and vice versa.[54] During the months after moving to Shanghai, Ming confided in her friend Emma Lester that Moy had considerable trouble gaining a foothold in Shanghai because he did not understand the dialect.[55] On occasion, when he inspected factories as part of his job, he even asked his wife to translate for him from Shanghai's Wu dialect into English. Understandably Ming sighed, 'Now what do I know about engineering & its technical terms. I had the worst time in the beginning, but getting to be quite an engineer myself now. Well, I'll

[52] Ibid., 22–23.
[53] 'Niu Minghua to Emma Lester', 12 October 1933, 1.
[54] 'Niu Minghua to Emma Lester', 23 July 1937, 2.
[55] 'Niu Minghua to Emma Lester', 6 February 1934, 3–4. The situation was aggravated for Sam Moy, because he seemed to have lived in the US with his family for a long time. See 'Niu Minghua to Emma Lester', 5 September 1933, 1. However, Sam and his family were Chinese and Ming reported that she did not undertand their dialect either. See 'Niu Minghua to Emma Lester', 23 July 1937, 2.

be glad when this touring around is over.'[56] Had *guoyu* reached business circles by 1933, Sam Moy would have had an easier time getting settled in Shanghai.

Another of Lester's friends, Wu (Sze Wu Tsung, no Chinese characters, no dates), had a similar experience. A Shanghai-born lady, her husband's work brought her to Shandong, where she had a hard time talking to people because she did not speak the local dialect.[57] Never once in her letters to Lester did she mention the option to overcome these difficulties by speaking *guoyu*. This fits well with the experience of Liu Yin 劉印 (1914-?), the daughter of the future mayor of Tianjin Cheng Ke. Liu Yin's daughter Taotao Liu remembered in 2014 that her mother learnt some *guoyu* at school, but that it had little impact on her life.[58]

A Propensity for English

Instead of *guoyu*, Emma Lester's friends used English to communicate with the speakers of different dialects. Since Sam Moy and Niu Minghua did not understand each other's Chinese dialects, it is quite possible that the couple conversed in English with each other, particularly since Sam Moy had lived in the US for a long time.[59] Sze Wu Tsung even treated English as a status symbol. In 1925 she described very proudly how she often spoke English with her American-born Chinese friend Marguerite (no dates). At the same time, she had nothing but contempt for the ladies of Shandong, who were unable to follow English conversations.[60] She similarly looked down on her friend Bei, who 'giggled' and 'said something half Chinese and half English' when addressed in English.[61]

[56] 'Niu Ming Hua to Emma Lester', 2–3.
[57] 'Sze Wu Tsung to Emma Lester', 3 June 1925, 3.
[58] 'Taotao Liu, conversation with the author'.
[59] 'Niu Minghua to Emma Lester', 5 September 1933, 1; 'Niu Minghua to Emma Lester', 23 July 1937.
[60] 'Sze Wu Tsung to Emma Lester', 3 June 1925, 4.
[61] 'Sze Wu Tsung to Emma Lester', 8 February 1934, 9.

This fits well with Yeh Wen-hsin's observation that, in secondary-school education, English-language training distinguished urban 'elite institutions' from 'their culturally "backward" and financially underprivileged counterparts in provincial towns.'[62] English was, moreover, increasingly acknowledged as the 'language of global commerce,'[63] and it became the primary language in the teaching of science or economics subjects. The reason for this was that teaching materials on these areas of knowledge did not exist in Chinese. Only humanities subjects drew upon textbooks in Chinese. It is important to note, however, that it was the science and economics subjects that drew in the great majority of the students, not the humanities.[64]

Consequently, as Zhang Jianming and Qi Dazhi have shown, the Peking School of Commerce and Finance, whose students ran *Commercial Student*, let its students focus on English-language studies for the first two years of their course, before more specifically including economic contents.[65] Parts of *Commercial Student* in 1919 were also written in English, the rest was in *wenyan*.[66] In other words, the role that *guoyu* activists had envisioned for the language they now marketed as the *baihua* was largely filled by English in business circles.

It may therefore be no coincidence that Lester's friends appeared to be also uninterested in the literary productions by 'New Culture' figureheads like Lu Xun. They never mentioned any of these works in their letters. Instead, they talked about the English-language books they had read. They made reference to George Bernard Shaw's (1856-

[62] Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 10.
[63] Ibid., 12.
[64] Ibid., 10–12, 17. Similarly, Diana Lin has shown that Beijing University's classes other than 'those in Chinese studies' were taught in English after 1912. See Lin, *Peking University*, 42. Taotao Liu has confirmed the impression that it was the sciences that attracted most students, 'Taotao Liu, conversation with the author'.
[65] Zhang Jianming and Qi Dazhi, *Hua shuo Jing shang*, 38.
[66] Dai Xian, 'Meiguo huobi shi tanlüe'; Zhong Hengxu, 'The Triumph of the Students'.

1950) *Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism & Capitalism*[67] and John Erskine's (1879-1951) 1925 novel *The Private Life of Helen of Troy*. This last book was particularly exciting, Lester's former student Chang Tuh Wei (no dates) assured her, because it used to be banned, presumably as it was deemed morally problematic.[68] To be sure, Emma Lester used to be these women's teacher, with whom they had learned English, and it therefore made sense to talk to her about English literature. Moreover, Lester's friends did not mention any other Chinese writers either. So they may simply not have mentioned their Chinese-language readings to their American friend, even though Lester had written her master's thesis at Columbia University on Chinese poetry.[69]

However, the absence of New Culture literature in the letters to Lester fits suspiciously well with the experiences of Liu Yin. According to her daughter Taotao Liu, Liu Yin never read Lu Xun in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Instead, she preferred the novels by Zhang Henshui 張恨水 (1897-1967), which were published in newspapers at the time, or the fiction by Mao Dun 矛盾 (1896-1981) and Ba Jin 巴金 (1904-2005). Only later, when she came to the United Kingdom in the 1950s, she started reading Lu Xun – mainly because she was helping British students of Chinese with reading the Chinese texts. Similarly, Taotao Liu suspects that her father, Liu Jung-en 劉榮恩 (1908/09-?), 'probably would not have bothered' to read 'New Culture' *baihua* literature. Like Emma Lester's friends, he read English books, since English was the language of the Western- and science-educated elite.[70]

[67] 'Sze Be Tsung to Emma Lester', 18 September 1929, 2.
[68] 'Chang Tuh Wei to Emma Lester', 3. On the censorship of books that were deemed immoral, see Bailey, *Reform the People*, 188–89.
[69] 'Lewis Chase to E. Margaret Phillips'.
[70] 'Taotao Liu, e-mail message to the author'; 'Taotao Liu, conversation with the author'. According to Taotao Liu, Zhang Henshui did read Lu Xun and his work was influenced by this author. Through this

Eva Chou has pointed out that it took intellectuals a lot of time and effort until they were able to enjoy reading Lu Xun. Before 1923, Chou argued, hardly anyone ever mentioned Lu Xun. Only when 'insiders,' that is, well-informed critics mostly with connections to Lu Xun or Beijing University,[71] had explained Lu Xun's writings to potential readers, China's now famous writer gained a certain degree of popularity.[72] However, the letters to Lester as well as Liu Yin and Liu Jung-en's experiences date to a time after 1923 and still do not mention Lu Xun or another 'New Culture' author. In other words, the New Culture Movement and its *baihua* project had not permeated into the personal or professional lives of business circles in the 1920s and the 1930s.

A Grey Area of Sporadic Interest – Humanities Circles

In early 1919, the *Shanghai News* had claimed that the academic squabbles between the 'factions of learning' at Beijing University were confined to the university's 'Humanities Department' (*wenke* 文科).[73] After the people previously classified as 'New Faction' had been upgraded into the 'centre of the New Culture Movement,'[74] humanities circles also showed a greater interest in the Movement than the business circles. However, even within the humanities, not everybody was charmed by New Culture.

Lewis Chase's Students

Instead there was a huge grey area of people who had heard of the New Culture Movement, but who were no New Culture activists. Among such people were the students of the American professor Lewis Nathaniel Chase at Yanjing, Beijing and

indirect way, Liu Yin therefore came into contact with the New Culture Movement again. See Ibid. For a further discussion of this sort of indirect transmission of knowledge, see pp. 256-258 of this thesis.
[71] Chou, 'Learning to Read Lu Xun, 1918-1923', 1045.
[72] Chou, 'Learning to Read Lu Xun, 1918-1923'.
[73] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'. For more information on the concept of 'humanities' in 1919 and on Beijing University's faculties and departments, see the Appendix of this thesis.
[74] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

Beijing Normal Universities. These students attended Lewis Chase's classes in English literature. It is impossible to trace these students' individual lives. However, their colleagues at these universities often went on to become teachers, academics or writers. It is therefore not unthinkable that this was the career trajectory of Chase's students too.[75] My sources for this section are English-language homework and examination essays, which they wrote between 1921 and 1925.[76]

Chase's students knew about the expression 'New Culture Movement'[77] or its English translation as 'the Chinese Renaissance.'[78] They also talked about people like 'Mr. Hu Shih' or 'Hu Shi Tze'[79] (that is, Hu Shizhi) in the context of this 'New Cultural movement.'[80] 'Hu Shizhi' was Hu Shi's courtesy name (*zi* 字).[81] They also knew about *baihua* advocacy. For example, a student from Beijing Normal University, who failed

[75] Philip West has described that some of the most famous Yanjing University alumni became writers or playwrights. See West, *Yenching University and Sino-Western Relations, 1916-1952*, 90. Chase's former student, probably at Yanjing University, Li Tien-yue (no characters, no dates) became a teacher. See 'Li Tien Yueh to Lewis Chase'. Similarly, the Beijing University graduate Liu Binglin became a teacher at Chinese Public School. See footnote 176 on p. 241 and *Xinchao*, 2006, 3:201. Fu Sinian, a graduate of Beijing University, became an academic. See Boorman, s.v. Fu Ssu-nien. Yeh Wen-hsin, moreover, has pointed out that normal schools were designed to train teachers. See Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 3–5.

[76] Most of these papers do not contain any information about their dating or the university they were written at. However, it is known that, between 1921 and 1925, Lewis Chase taught at three universities in Beijing, Yanjing University, Beijing Normal University and Beijing University. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that most of the essays come from these institutions as well. See Manuscript Division, 'Biographical and Organizational Note: Lewis Nathaniel Chase'; 'Lewis Chase to E.A. Chase', 19 November 1922, 1; 'Lewis Chase's Schedule at Beijing Normal University'. Since English was a foreign language for Chase's students, their essays contain some grammatical and orthographical mistakes. When citing passages from their essays, I copy their writing literally. I also maintain the spelling of Chinese names the students used themselves.

[77] Chen, 'China Now and England in the 19th Century', 3.

[78] Ibid., 2.

[79] Xu Guoyu, 'My Reflections and Queries on the Question of the Creation of the Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non Chinese', 1. The essays on 'My Reflections and Queries …' are written on an 'examination paper' (*shijuan* 試卷) of Beijing Normal University, that is, they were examination essays. The examination essay of the student Wen Shih-Ch'ang 溫世昌, moreover, notes that Wen was a 'first-year student' (*di yi nianji xuesheng* 第一年級學生) at the 'English research department' (*Yingyu yanjiu ke* 英語研究科). See Wen, 'My Reflections and Queries on the Question of Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non-Chinese'.

[80] Chen, 'China Now and England in the 19th Century', 3.

[81] For details on Hu Shi's courtesy name, see pp. 73-74.

to write his[82] name on his essay, elaborated his thoughts on the set question of how literature could 'reveal' China to foreigners. He introduced his reflections by recapitulating the 'Pai Hua' project, the invention of Romanised alphabets for the Chinese language and the changes to Chinese curricula (possibly referring to the introduction of *guoyu* into primary schools).[83] The creation of a Romanised alphabet was part of the popular-education and *guoyu* projects,[84] and it was also supported by people like the *New Tide* editor Fu Sinian.[85]

Some of Chase's students supported *baihua*. O.C. Wang (Wang Wenqi 王文祺 [no dates]), for example, reported about attempts that were being made to give literature a 'new and living spirit.' He also emphasised that 'spoken language' would make literature 'democratic and comprehensible' and 'education easily to be spread.'[86] In this way, he mixed *baihua* arguments brought forward by Hu Shi's circle and those of local New Culture activists like the Jiangsu Educational Association. Similarly Xu Guoyu 徐國俞 (no dates) approved of the suggestion to produce literature in the 'spoken language,' and he praised the 'Pai Hua wen' of 'Hu Shi Tze' as being one of the best.[87]

Most importantly, when introducing recent intellectual developments, Lewis Chase's students talked about the New Culture Movement, never about New Culture opponents or any other group. For example, the aforementioned anonymous student from Beijing Normal University wrote in January 1924:

---

[82] As this student's classmates had male names, such as 'Robert C. Lu,' it is reasonable to assume that he was male as well. See Li, 'My Reflections and Querries [sic] on the Question of the Creation of the Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non Chinese.', 3.
[83] 'My Reflections and Queries on the Subject of Revealing or Interpreting China and the Chinese to Non-China, by Means of Imaginative Literature', 1.
[84] Chen, *Modern Chinese*, 22.
[85] Fu Sinian, 'Hanyu gaiyong pinyin wenzi de chubu tan'.
[86] O.C. Wang, 'My Reflections and Queries on the Question of the Creation of the Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non Chinese', 1.
[87] Xu Guoyu, 'My Reflections and Queries on the Question of the Creation of the Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non Chinese', 1.

> Now the modern China becomes conscious of her own hindrance to communicate with non-Chinese and tries by every means to open a window, a gate if possible, on the thick wall between herself and others. Spelling letters of mandarin were invented, a modern language (Pai Hua) movement was started, the course of Chinese in schools was reformed, and even some people wanted to abandon their own language and adopt a foreign in stead [probably a reference to Esperanto, which people like Zhou Zuoren were very fond of].[88]

By contrast, Chase's students never mentioned any opposition to the New Culture Movement as an important trend. With this they were not alone. Similarly, Clarence H. Hamilton, who worked at the University of Nanjing at the time, talked about the 'New Culture Movement' as the only 'surprising intellectual movement' of the 'last two years' in an article in the *Journal of Religion* of 1921.[89]

In spite of this general awareness and appreciation of ideas and people associated with the New Culture Movement, Lewis Chase's students were by no means New Culture activists. For example, after reviewing the recent changes in language, the aforementioned anonymous student went on to explain that he did not agree with all this: 'But in my opinion so far as we have more than four thousand years tradition it is impossible for us to give up all we have kept for generations.'[90] Another student, Liu Te Yuan (Liu Deyuan, no Chinese characters, no dates), who wrote an essay about Chinese characters, explained that he neither agreed with the die-hard admirers of Chinese characters nor with the 'return [sic] students blindly in saying it is no good at all.'[91]

Sometimes Chase's students also showed themselves remarkably unaware of the arguments and counterarguments exchanged within the New Culture discourse. For people who criticised Chinese characters under the buzzword 'New Culture Movement,'

---

[88] 'My Reflections and Queries on the Subject of Revealing or Interpreting China and the Chinese to Non-China, by Means of Imaginative Literature', 1.
[89] Hamilton, 'Religion and the New Culture Movement in China', 225.
[90] 'My Reflections and Queries on the Subject of Revealing or Interpreting China and the Chinese to Non-China, by Means of Imaginative Literature', 1.
[91] Liu, 'The Educational Value of Chinese Character Writing', 5. The only indication for a date of this essay is 'November,' which the student Wang Tzu Li wrote onto his paper. See Wang, 'The Education Value of Chinese Character Writing'.

the alternative to characters was to write in a different system, for example, a Romanisation system.[92] But when Chase let his students write an essay on 'The Educational Value of Chinese Character Writing,' some of them appeared uninformed on this option. Instead, they argued from the standpoint that the only alternative to 'Chinese character writing' was to not write at all. Unsurprisingly, this led them to strongly advocate Chinese characters. Su K'e-Ju (Su Keru, no Chinese characters, no dates), for example, explained that 'we must hav[e] writings to express our thoughts.' Otherwise these thoughts could not be shared with 'mankind or the generation after us.' 'Character writing,' he therefore concluded, was 'a great contribution to the modern education.'[93] In short, although Chase's students in their English-literature classes were aware of the phenomenon 'New Culture Movement,' they would not have regarded themselves as New Culture activists.

Newspapers and School Journals

Chase's students were not the only ones to be merely sporadically interested in the New Culture Movement. The *Shanghai News* had mentioned the expression when reprinting the Jiangsu Educational Association's announcement of the lecture competition. It did so on 31 October and 2 November 1919.[94] Nevertheless, the *Shanghai News* had not become a passionate New Culture newspaper. It only mentioned the expression 'New Culture Movement' these two times in the whole of the year 1919, and it still largely wrote its articles in *wenyan*.

The same was the case for local school and association journals. The magazine *Alumnae of the Second Women's Normal School of Jiangsu Province* was among the first to publish an article on the New Culture Movement by teacher trainee Zhu Daihen

[92] Fu Sinian, 'Hanyu gaiyong pinyin wenzi de chubu tan'.
[93] Su, 'The Educational Value of Chinese Character Writing', 2.
[94] 'Yanshuo jingjin hui dingqi zai Ning kahui'; 'Yanshuo jingjin hui yanti zhi jieshi'.

in November 1919.[95] Nevertheless, this article was the exception, and most other pieces in the magazine were on different topics and written in *wenyan*. Moreover, Zhu Daihen's piece on the New Culture Movement was banished to the very end of the journal, into the *zazu* 襍俎 ('Miscellanea') section.

One of the very few other mentions of the 'New Culture Movement' in the school magazine was the reprint of a speech given in 1923 by Zhu Jingnong, a friend of Hu Shi's.[96] I have argued that the Jiangsu Educational Association was influential in shaping opinions about the New Culture Movement in its catchment area. Nevertheless, the announcement of the lecture competition in October 1919 was, to my knowledge, the only mention of the Movement in the Association's monthly reports.[97] In other words, even people who used the New Culture Movement as a buzzword were no full-time New Culture activists.

Upholding Opposition

Moreover, although the circle around Liu Shipei had disappeared from the gaze of newspapers after the May Fourth demonstrations, opposition against the New Culture Movement was still expressed within academia, and it often came from humanities quarters too.

Liu Shipei's Circle

As Chen Pingyuan has pointed out, Liu Shipei's circle never achieved the fame of Hu Shi and his group.[98] Nevertheless, it was still active in the humanities. Since the members of this circle did not become famous, it is difficult to trace their careers. But

[95] Zhu Daihen, 'Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu'.
[96] Cai Dun, 'Zhu Jingnong xiansheng yanjiang jilu'; Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 77.
[97] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.
[98] Chen Pingyuan, '"Shaonian yiqi" yu "jiaguo qinghuai"', 5.

judging from the sort of magazines in which they published over the next decades, they seemed to have found employment in smaller academic and government institutions. To be sure, journals are only a very approximate means to determine where an author lived and how he was employed. Zhang Xuan and his colleagues might well have published in cities in which they did not live and in the journals of institutions with which they were not affiliated. However, for lack of more precise information, I attempt to trace the fates of the former *National Heritage* authors through this method.

Liu Shipei, of course, had died on 20 November 1919.[99] Huang Kan left Beijing University in 1919 and served as principal and professor at various universities until his death on 8 October 1935.[100] Zhang Xuan continued publishing until around 1933. The journals in which his articles appeared suggest that he stayed in Beijing in 1920, moved to the Shanghai region in the mid- and late-1920s and lived in Guangzhou in the 1930s. There he may have had an academic position at National Sun Yatsen University (*Guoli Zhongshan daxue* 國立中山大).[101]

It seems as if Yu Shizhen remained in Beijing until 1940, when his trace is lost. Until then, he stayed active in scholarly circles. For example, he published in the *Critical Review*, the successor magazine to the *National Heritage*, in 1931.[102] In the 1930s, he

[99] Chen Qi, *Liu Shipei nianpu changbian*, 357.

[100] On Huang's departure from Beijing University, see Lin, *Peking University*, 47. According to Pei Xiaowei, he became head of the Qinghua Graduate School (*Qinghua yanjiu yuan* 清華研究院), of Dongnan University (*Dongnan daxue* 東南大學) or Wuchang Higher Normal School (*Wuchang gao shifan xuexiao* 武昌高示範學校). He was also professor at Jinling University (*Jinling daxue* 金陵大學). See Pei Xiaowei, s.v. 'Huang Kan'.

[101] Zhang Xuan published in the following magazines until 1933: 1920: *New China* (*Xin Zhongguo* 新中國), a monthly journal published in Beijing from 1919 to 1920; 1926: *Sound of the Tide* (*Haichao yin* 海潮音), a fortnightly journal (*xunkan* 旬刊) from Shanghai, run by the Buddhist Education Society (*Fohua jiaoyu she* 佛化教育社); 1932: *Southwest Research* (*Xinan yanjiu* 西南研究), run in Guangzhou by Southwest Research Group of the National Sun Yat-sen University (*Guoli Zhongshan daxue xinan yanjiu hui* 國立中山大學西南研究會); 1933: *Great Voice* (*Da sheng* 大聲), a monthly journal from Guangzhou. See *Quanguo baokan suoyin*; *Quanguo baokan suoyin, qikan daohang*.

[102] Yu Shizhen published until 1940 in these magazines: 1939 and 1940: *Collections of Ancient Learning* (*Guxue congkan* 古學叢刊), a fortnightly journal in Beijing founded in 1939. It was edited by the

may have been employed at the Old Learning Graduate School (*Beijing guxue yuan* 北京古學院) and taught at National Beijing Women's Teachers' Graduate School (*Beijing nü shi xueyuan* 北京女師學院). Xue Xiangsui may have also stayed in Beijing and he seems to have been involved in various study societies. In the early 1930s, he might have moved to Henan, Nanjing or Shaanxi, where he may have been affiliated with local educational-politics departments.[103]

Zhang Juncai has claimed that the intellectual developments after the May Fourth demonstrations left Lin Shu a frustrated old man.[104] Michael Gibbs Hill has argued that, after *guoyu* had been introduced into the primary-school curriculum in 1920, 'Lin Shu, Inc.,' that is, literary production sold under Lin Shu's name, 'would be shuttered for good.'[105]

Nevertheless, the individual Lin Shu continued being involved in institutions that were sceptical about ideas promoted under the label 'New Culture Movement.' In 1922, the American missionary Gilbert Reid (Li Jiabai 李佳白 [1857-1927]) founded the International Institute of China, in Chinese *Shangxian tang* 尚賢堂 ('Hall for the

---

Editorial Group of the Beijing Ancient Learning Graduate School (*Beijing gu xueyuan bianji zu* 北京古學院編輯組) and sold by Beijing Ancient Learning Graduate School (*Beijing gu xueyuan* 北京古學院); 1939: *Literature and Art* (*Wenyi* 文藝), an irregular journal from Beiping, founded in 1939, and run and sold by National Beijing Women's Normal Graduate School, Literature and Arts Research Group (*Guol*] *Beijing nü shifan xueyuan wenyi yanjiu hui* 國立北京女師學院文藝研究會); 1931: the *Critical Review* (*Xueheng* 學衡). See *Quanguo baokan suoyin*; *Quanguo baokan suoyin, qikan daohang*.

[103] Xue Xiangsui's publication can be traced until 1940 in the following journals: 1939: *Shiboh Review* (*Xibei lunheng* 西北論衡), a monthly journal from Beiping edited and sold by the Shiboh Review Society (*Beiping xibei lunheng she* 北平西北論衡社); 1932: *Northwest Research* (*Xibei yanjiu* 西北研究), a monthly journal from Beiping edited and sold by Northwest Research Society (*Xibei yanjiu she* 西北研究社); 1934: *Henan Education Monthly* (*Henan jiaoyu yuekan* 河南教育月刊), a monthly journal from Kaifeng, edited and sold by the Henan Education Department (*Henan jiaoyu ting* 河南教育廳); 1935: *Northwest Questions* (*Xibei wenti* 西北問題), a weekly journal from Nanjing launched in 1932, and edited and run by Nanjing Northwest Questions Newspaper Society (*Nanjing xibei wenti bao she* 南京西北問題報社); 1940: *Resistance and Construction* (*Kang jian* 抗建) from Shaanxi, founded in 1939 and edited and sold by the Shaanxi Provincial Government Education Department (*Shaanxi sheng zhengfu jiaoyu ting* 陝西省政府教育廳). See *Quanguo baokan suoyin*; *Quanguo baokan suoyin, qikan daohang*.

[104] Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 237.

[105] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 230.

Veneration of Worthies'). Originally, the *Shangxian tang* was a Confucian Society established after 1911. In 1922, Reid revived it together with people like Lin Shu. In 1923, Lin Shu wrote a text called 'Continued Discussion on the Debate on Treason' (*Xu bian jian lun* 續辨奸論). Here, Zhang Juncai has pointed out, he called the New Culture activists 'great traitors' (*ju jian* 巨奸).[106] In 1924, he was made head of the *guowen* department at Republican University (*Minguo daxue* 民國大學), and on 9 October 1924, Lin Shu died.[107]

The *Shanghai News*, moreover, had not forgotten about Lin Shu either and continued mentioning his name every time someone staged *Oliver Twist* or *The Lady of the Camellias*, which Lin Shu had translated.[108] To be sure, none of the people formerly classified as 'Old Faction' gained the same fame as Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu in the 1920s and 1930s. Yeh Wen-hsin has pointed out that they were not part of the new prestigious institutions such as the Academia Sinica (*Zhongyang yanjiu yuan* 中央研究院).[109] Nevertheless, they had not disappeared from academia and educational politics and they continued to oppose the circle around Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi, as well as the label 'New Culture Movement' that now surrounded this group.

The *Critical Review*

As I have shown in Chapter Three, for a while and in some circles, the New Culture Movement was so powerful a buzzword that even opponents of Hu Shi's and Chen Duxiu's circle sold their ideas under it. For example, although the vice principal of

[106] Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 239. I read '辨' as '辯,' following Zhonghua minguo jiaoyu bu, s.v. 'Bian'.
[107] On Lin Shu's appointment to Republican University, see Tiang Hao, 'Beijing zhi daxue xiaoxi', *Shenbao*, 3 July 1924. On his death, see 'Guonei zhuandian', *Shenbao*, 10 October 1924.
[108] 'Yingguo zhuming xiaoshuo shecheng yingju'; '"Cha hua nü" xiaoshuo zhi xin dianying'; Ting Hao, '"Gu er ku yu" zhi pinglun'.
[109] Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 303.

Nanjing Higher Normal School, Liu Boming, was sceptical about *baihua*, he tried to sell his ideas as 'New Culture Movement' in 1920.[110] However, this did not keep another *baihua* sceptic, Mei Guangdi, from pestering Hu Shi at around the same time.

In November 1919, Mei had just returned from the United States, and Hu Shi's friend Ren Hongjuan 任鴻雋 (1886-1961) told Hu in a letter from Nanjing that 'Old Mei is making a big noise there giving lectures on new literature. In passing, he is also attacking "Huism"' (*lao Mei zai nali dazhangqigu de jiangyan xin wenxue, hai dai zhe gongji 'Huism'* 老梅在那裏大張旗鼓的講演新文學,還帶著攻擊'Huism'). Ren Hongjuan expressed his hope that Hu Shi and 'Old Mei' would be able to refrain from quarrelling with each other.[111] According to Yi-tsi Mei Feuerwerker and Yü Ying-shih, Hu Shi and Mei Guangdi used to be close friends but developed insurmountable differences over the *baihua* project in 1917.[112]

Only one year after Liu Boming's attempts to sell *baihua* scepticism as 'New Culture Movement,' criticism of the New Culture Movement as a whole became vocal. This happened in 1921 in an exchange of articles between two Chinese students in the US, Qiu Changwei 邱昌渭 (1898-1956) and Wu Mi. Wu Mi, a master's student in comparative literature, attacked the New Culture Movement, while Qiu Changwei defended it.[113] According to Feuerwerker, Wu Mi lamented that the New Culture activists had chosen inferior Western elements to be imported into Chinese culture. *Baihua* poetry, for example, was modelled after the American 'Free Verse,' which American scholars like Irving Babbitt (1865-1933) despised.[114] Wu Mi, however, was

[110] Xi Ping, 'Duiyu "Liu Boming jun yanjiang xin wenhua yundong zhi yiyi ji biyao" de piping'.
[111] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 78.
[112] Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 143; Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment', 314.
[113] Qiu Changwei, 'Lun xin wenhua yundong (da Wu Mi jun]'; Wu Mi, 'Lun xin wenhua yundong (jielu Liu mei xuesheng jibao)'; Wu Mi, 'Zai lun xin wenhua yundong (da Qiu Changwei jun)'. On Wu Mi being a master's student, see Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 147.
[114] Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 157.

an admirer of Babbitt. Upon his return to China, Wu Mi went on to found the *Critical Review* (*Xueheng* 學衡) in Nanjing in 1922, together with Mei Guangdi, Hu Xiansu and Tang Yongtong 湯用彤 (1893-1964). Liu Boming was involved too.[115] According to Lydia Liu, the *Critical Review*'s 'mission' was to oppose the New Culture Movement and *baihua* literature.[116]

The *Critical Review* has been regarded as the successor magazine of *National Heritage*.[117] It shared a lot of ideas with that student journal and published articles by former *National Heritage* author Yu Shizhen.[118] According to Wu Lichang, the *Critical Review* rejected *baihua* in favour of *wenyan*.[119] Its author Hu Xiansu put forward an argument that had, as shown in Chapter One, already appeared in the *National Heritage* in 1919. Just like *National Heritage* author Zhang Xuan, Hu Xiansu said that spoken language was too unstable over time, and the vernacular of the present would not be comprehensible in the future. Therefore it was preferable to write in the more stable *wenyan*.[120]

The *Critical Review* was of course not simply an imitation of *National Heritage*. As demonstrated in Chapter One, a central difference between *National Heritage* and *New Tide* was the way both groups perceived the mechanisms of evolution. However, as Lydia Liu, Ye Shixiang and Feuerwerker have pointed out, one important difference between the *Critical Review* and its biggest opponent, *New Youth*, was which Western scholars they regarded as worthy models. While authors of *New Youth* admired figures like Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) and John Dewey, the *Critical Review* followed Irving

[115] Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Xueheng'; Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 140.
[116] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 250.
[117] Ibid., 246–256.
[118] *Quanguo baokan suoyin*.
[119] Wu Lichang, *Wenxue de xiaojie yu fan xiaojie*, 97.
[120] Ibid., 98; Zhang Xuan, 'Wen yan heyi pingyi', 2B.

Babbitt.[121] Feuerwerker has even suggested that the difference between the *Critical Review* and *New Youth* was down to the different universities they attended in the US, Columbia in Hu Shi's case, and Harvard in Mei Guangdi's or Wu Mi's case.[122]

An analysis of the *Critical Review* would go beyond the scope of this study. What is important here is that, after its launch, Hu Shi confidently called the *Critical Review* the 'epilogue of opposition to the literary revolution.'[123] By this he indicated that the magazine was espousing a cause that had already been lost. It is true that the *Critical Review* never seemed to gain the same traction as a magazine like *New Youth*. Its sales numbers were notoriously low,[124] and this made its editors resort to very desperate measures.

Zhang Shizhao, the editor of the *Tiger* magazine, once offered to help out with a cash injection. According to Timothy Weston, *Tiger* had been instrumental in constituting the later New Culture 'community' and their discourse in the early 1910s. Later, however, Zhang Shizhao became 'conservative' and a 'critic' of the New Culture Movement.[125] However, Wu Mi refused Zhang Shizhao's offer to help, because, Liu Kedi has argued, he feared for the autonomy of the magazine. Instead, he asked his friends to sell the magazine in their home provinces or to the libraries they worked at.[126] The *Shanghai News*, moreover, hardly ever reported about the *Critical Review* and its editors.[127] Soon the magazine also lost some of its most important supporters. Liu

[121] Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 145; Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 248; Ye Shixiang and Zhang Dongmei, 'Xiandaixing shiye zhong de "guocui pai" he "Xueheng pai"', 3; Yü, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment', 316–18.
[122] Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 145.
[123] Wu Lichang, *Wenxue de xiaojie yu fan xiaojie*, 95.
[124] Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 165.
[125] Weston, 'The Formation and Positioning of the New Culture Community', 125, 261.
[126] Liu Kedi, *Hua luo chun reng zai: Wu Mi yu 'Xueheng'*, 208–09.
[127] This is indicated by a search of the database *Shenbao 1872-1949*.

Boming died in 1923, and Hu Xiansu and Mei Guangdi left China for the US in 1924. Consequently, the *Critical Review* had difficulties getting articles.[128]

In spite of these challenges the *Critical Review* lasted until 1933 and produced 79 issues.[129] This was a considerable achievement, in Feuerwerker's view, at a time 'when hundreds of short-lived literary and scholarly journals came and went.'[130] The *Critical Review* was important enough to provoke sharp criticism from the New Culture stars Hu Shi, Zhou Zuoren, Lu Xun and Chen Duxiu. Moreover, Lydia Liu has acknowledged it as a serious force in '[t]he struggle between the two camps for recognition as the sole, legitimate voice of Chinese culture.'[131]

What this section shows is that, when Fu Sinian claimed that 'the mood of society'[132] had changed in favour of New Culture ideas in September 1919, he was overstating the success and reach of the Movement. For broad reaches of urban society, such as business circles, the New Culture Movement was not a powerful buzzword, and consequently they did not seek to sell their ideas under it. They did not even seem to be aware that it existed and ideas like *baihua* or *guoyu*, which were negotiated under it, did not affect them.

Even in the humanities, which the *Shanghai News* had identified as the battlefield of ideas that were later called 'New Culture,'[133] not everybody was a New Culture activist. There was a huge grey area of people who were only marginally aware of, and interested in, the phenomenon. Even opposition against the New Culture Movement had not been silenced and became particularly vocal with the foundation of the *Critical*

[128] Duan Huaiqing, *Baibide yu Zhongguo wenhua*, 146; Liu Kedi, *Hua luo chun reng zai: Wu Mi yu 'Xueheng'*, 207.
[129] Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Xueheng'.
[130] Mei Feuerwerker, 'Reconsidering Xueheng', 148.
[131] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 255–56.
[132] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 201.
[133] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'.

Review in 1922. This begs the question which groups Fu Sinian must have had in mind when he talked about a changed 'mood of society.'[134]

The Circle That Cared

The article in which Fu Sinian made his statement about the changed 'mood of society'[135] gives a hint at who really cared about the New Culture Movement. By this I mean people who debated it, who tried to market ideas with it or who wrote in *baihua*. Fu Sinian mentioned the spring-bamboo journals, that is, the many new magazines that had been founded after the May Fourth demonstrations avowedly in the tradition of *New Youth*, *New Tide*, *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) and so on. These journals were usually run by 'societies,' for example, the New Woman Society (*Xin funü zazhi she* 新婦女雜誌社) or the Social Reconstruction Society (*Xinqun zazhi she* 新群雜誌社). This high-sounding nomenclature, however, glosses over the fact that these 'societies' did not spring up all over the urban 'society.' Instead, these they consisted of students, teachers and other intellectuals from secondary schools, universities or political interest groups. Moreover, their editors and authors often had a humanities or educational background. Social and natural sciences were hardly represented.

The School Spring-Bamboo Journals

A publication that ran a lot of articles on the New Culture Movement was *Criticism*. *Criticism* was a supplement to the GMD newspaper *Republic Daily* and founded in October 1920.[136] In other words, *Criticism* can be classified as a spring-bamboo journal. Its mission statement declared that *Criticism* wanted to 'bravely and fearlessly appraise, analyse and test all things in mankind and society with the critical spirit, the scientific

[134] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 201.
[135] Ibid.
[136] On the *Republic Daily* being a GMD paper, see Bowles, 'Finding the Way', 34.

method and a questioning attitude (*yi piping de jingshen, kexue de fangfa, huaiyi de taidu, yongmeng wuwei de, guliang, fenxi, huayan, renlei shehui shang zhongzhong shiwu* 以批評的精神，科學的方法，懷疑的態度，勇猛無畏地，估量，分析，化驗，人類社會上種種事物).[137] *Criticism* was consistently written in *baihua*, and discussed the New Culture Movement in two articles in its first issue alone.[138] Although the *Republic Daily* was produced in Shanghai, the members of the Criticism Society (*Piping she* 批評社) were students of Beijing University and they merely used the *Republic Daily* as a medium to distribute their paper.[139] One of its more outspoken authors, Miao Jinyuan, was enrolled at the philosophy faculty of Beijing University.[140]

Another journal that grew, according to its own narrative, out of the New Culture Movement was *New Woman*. In its second issue from January 1920, one of its editors, Jing Guan, explained that he and his associates advocated the New Culture Movement 'just like the Beijing University teachers Mr Chen Duxiu and Mr Hu Shizhi' (*xiang Beida jiaoyuan Chen Duxiu xiansheng he Hu Shizhi xiansheng* 像北大教員陳獨秀先生和胡適之先生). He stated furthermore that the New Woman Society consisted of five teachers at a girls' school, who had started discussing the 'question of the new woman' (*xin funü wenti* 新婦女問題) while their students were busy with the May Fourth demonstrations. They themselves were fairly recent graduates from universities in Beijing and Shanghai. Jing Guan did not want to mention the name of his current

[137] 'Fakanci', *Piping*, 20 October 1920, 1.
[138] Zhou Changxian, 'Piping de jingshen he xin wenhua yundong'; Miao Jinyuan, 'Suowei "xin wenhua yundong" de chachao yu pochan'.
[139] Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Piping'; 'Ben she qishi san'; 'Banner', *Piping*, 20 October 1920.
[140] Miao Jinyuan, 'Miao Jinyuan zhi Hu Shi'.

school to keep it safe from the 'old forces' (*jiu shili* 舊勢力), that is, from people who opposed the New Culture Movement.[141]

Similarly, *Social Reconstruction* (*Xinqun* 新群), launched in December 1919, was a journal at Chinese Public School (*Zhongguo gongxue* 上海中國公學) and 'attached to this school' (*zai ben xuetang fushe* 在本學堂附設).[142] Its declared aim was to discuss the 'urgent' (*jipo* 急迫) issues of foreign politics, the 'chaos' (*fenrao* 紛擾) of domestic politics and the suffering of the people (*renmin* 人民).[143] Similarly, *New Student* (*Xin xuesheng* 新學生), launched in December 1919, held up the ideal to take 'responsibility' (*zeren* 責任) in a constantly changing world,[144] and it featured articles on 'The New Great Crest of the Young People's New Culture' (*Xin shaonian de xin wenhua da chaotou* 新少年的新文化大潮頭) or 'Love Marriages and No-Love Marriages' (*Lian'ai de jiehun he fei lian'ai de jiehun* 戀愛的結婚和非戀愛的結婚).[145]

New Student was run by the New Student Society (*Xin xuesheng she* 新學生社), which belonged to the newly founded Taicang Student Union (*Taicang xuesheng lianhe hui* 太倉學生聯合會). Taicang is a place in modern-day Jiangsu. Individual students from this Union came from Nanjing Higher Normal School, which trained teachers, or from Nanyang Public School, the school where the Jiangsu Educational Association's vice

[141] Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 21–32.
[142] Wang Jingfang, 'Fakan ci', 1. Chinese Public School was founded in 1906. In 1915, Liang Qichao became 'board chair' (*dongshi zhang* 董事長), but in 1916 the school was closed. It was restored in 1919, and in 1921 Zhang Dongsun, the founder of *Scholar's Lantern* and member of the Research Clique, became 'dean of studies' (*jiaowu zhang* 教務長), see Zhang Hongru, s.v. 'Zhongguo gongxue zai Shanghai chuangban'; Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 208.
[143] Wang Jingfang, 'Fakan ci', 1.
[144] 'Fakan ci', *Xin xuesheng*, 1.
[145] See 'Xin xuesheng di yi juan di yi hao muci', *Xin xuesheng*.

president, Huang Yanpei, had been a student and Cai Yuanpei a teacher.[146] In other words, many spring-bamboo journals were run by students or teachers at universities.

The Spring-Bamboo Journals of Political Interest Groups

Another type of publication that actively negotiated the New Culture Movement was periodicals managed by political interest groups. One of them was the GMD, whose role Ouyang Junxi and Davis Bowles have analysed.[147] Another one was the Research Clique, which has been studied by Peng Peng. According to Peng, a number of newspapers and magazines that most actively supported the New Culture Movement belonged to this party. Among them were the Beijing newspaper *Morning Post*, the journal *Emancipation and Reconstruction* and *Scholar's Lantern* (*Xuedeng* 學燈), a supplement to the newspaper *Current Affairs* (*Shishi xinbao* 時事新報).[148]

The Research Clique emerged after Yuan Shikai's death in 1916. One of its most prestigious leaders was Liang Qichao, the 19th-century reformer. After fleeing to Japan following the Hundred Days Reform of 1898, Liang assembled a number of 'disciples' from among Chinese intellectuals in Japan.[149] After his return to China in 1911, these disciples formed the political party Progressive Party (*Jinbu dang* 進步黨), which backed Yuan Shikai until they realised that Yuan had no intention of maintaining the republic. After Yuan Shikai's death, the Progressive Party changed its name into

[146] 'Fakan ci', 1; 'Ben she qishi yi', *Xin xuesheng*. On Nanjing Higher Normal School's teacher-training programme, see Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 5. On Huang Yanpei studying at Nanyang Public School, see Cai Zhiguang and Xie Zewei, *Pudong mingren shujian baiting*, 158.
[147] Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong'; Bowles, 'Finding the Way'. Although this would be fascinating, I do not explore the GMD here. First of all, a thesis project is of a limited scope. Secondly, the GMD under Sun-Yatsen spent large periods of time in south China, whereas I have chosen Beiyang China as focus of this study
[148] Peng Peng, 'Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong', 1994, 172. On the *Morning Post*, see also Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 124.
[149] Nathan, *Peking Politics, 1918-1923*, 241.

'Constitution Research Clique' (*Xianfa yanjiu hui* 憲法研究會) and became known as 'Research Clique.'[150]

The Clique supported Duan Qirui, for example, on the question if China should enter World War I (Duan and the Research Clique were in favour) and on a few constitutional questions. When Sun Yat-sen built his own government in the south in 1917, the Research Clique stayed with Duan in Beijing and formed an important force in parliament. However, it lost most of its seats in the parliamentary elections of 1918, whereupon many of its leaders travelled abroad. Liang Qichao, for example, went to Europe. During May Fourth, the Research Clique backed off from the Duan's Anfu Club.[151] But when the Anfu Club vanished after the warlord wars of the 1920s, the Research Clique ceased its activities as well.[152]

One active supporter of ideas promoted as New Culture Movement was the Research Clique's newspaper *Morning Post*. The *Morning Post* used to be edited by Li Dazhao, and it was then called '*Morning Bell*' (*Chenzhong bao* 晨鈡報). It was closed down in 1918, because it had reported about Duan Qirui's loans from Japan,[153] but was reopened a few months later, now under the name '*Morning Post*.' Li Dazhao remained as 'editor' (*zhubian* 主編). Its new 'director' (*dongshi* 董事) was Liang Qichao's friend Zhang Lan 張蘭 (no dates) and its 'head of society' (*shezhang* 社長) was Research Clique member Pu Dianjun 蒲殿俊 (1875-1934). Before 1925, the *Morning Post* was, moreover, funded by the Research Clique.[154]

[150] Ibid., 160.
[151] Ibid.
[152] On the warlord wars, see Wu Xiang, 'Lun Xu Shuzheng yu Wanxi junfa de xingshuai', 63; Liang Yiqun, s.v. 'Duan Qirui'; Sheridan, 'The Warlord Era', 297. On the end of the Research Clique, see Yuan Shuyi, s.v. 'Yanjiu xi'; Nathan, *Peking Politics, 1918-1923*, 239–244.
[153] For details, see pp. 104-106.
[154] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 207–208.

Even before the May Fourth demonstrations, the *Morning Post* had provided a platform for the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu.[155] For example, Li Dazhao had published his article of March 1919 here, in which he attacked the 'Old Faction's' alleged intrigues against Hu Shi's circle. After the May Fourth demonstrations, the *Morning Post* supported New Culture ideas even more actively. On 31 January 1919, it restructured its section 'Free Forum' (*Ziyou luntan* 自由論壇) to discuss ideas classified as 'New Culture Movement.' Among them were themes like 'new knowledge' (*xin zhishi* 新智識), 'new thought' (*xin sichao* 新思想) and so on.[156] This, Leo Lee has argued, turned the section into 'an arena for the New Culture Movement.'[157]

Scholar's Lantern also actively supported the New Culture Movement. The paper was a supplement to *Current Affairs*, another newspaper 'controlled' (*kongzhi* 控制) by the Research Clique. This 'control' was down to Liang Qichao's role in funding it.[158] *Scholar's Lantern* was founded in March 1918 and edited by Zhang Dongsun 張東蓀 (1886-1973), another leader of the Research Clique.[159]

As Peng Peng has shown, *Scholar's Lantern* endorsed ideas like *baihua* even before the May Fourth demonstrations, and afterwards its support increased. For example, it featured *baihua* texts by 'New Culture' poets like Mao Dun and Guo Moruo 郭沫若

[155] Peng Peng, 'Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong', 1994, 212.
[156] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 208–209.
[157] Lee, 'Incomplete Modernity', 55.
[158] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 163. *Current Affairs* was founded in 1907 and it was originally called *Current Affairs* (*Shishi bao* 時事報). It later merged with the paper *Public Opinion Daily* (*Yulun ribao* 輿論日報) and was then called *Public Opinion and Current Affairs* (*Yulun shishi bao* 輿論時事報). It was renamed into *Current Affairs* (*Shishi bao* 時事報) again in Republican times. On 18 May 1919, it changed its name into *Current Affairs* (*Shishi xinbao* 時事新報). In 1912, it became the mouthpiece of the Progressive Party, and when the Progressive Party transformed into the Research Clique in 1916, it became the mouthpiece of the Research Clique. *Current Affairs* ceased publication in 1949. See Ibid.; Wang Yinxue, 'Shishi xinbao'.
[159] Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Shishi xinbao'; Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 208.

(1892-1978).[160] It also negotiated the New Culture Movement in articles such as 'The Three Big Dangers to the New Culture Movement Today' (*Jinri xin wenhua yundong de san da weixian* 今日新文化運動的三大危險) from August 1920.[161] The newspaper *Current Affairs* was also the publication that, as I have shown in Chapter Three, Wang Yinxue criticised for using the New Culture Movement as a 'signboard' (*zhaopai* 招牌) to sell its old ideas.[162] To be sure, Wang's criticism was that *Current Affairs* did not fully realise the New Culture Movement. However, in order for this criticism to make sense, *Current Affairs* must have been regarded as one of the more prominent New Culture papers.

Emancipation and Reconstruction, finally, was another journal very active in debating the New Culture Movement. In March 1920, for example, Jiang Qi discussed 'The New Culture Movement and Education' (*Xin wenhua yundong yu jiaoyu* 新文化運動和教育) in it.[163] *Emancipation and Reconstruction* was a spring-bamboo journal, launched in September 1919 by the New-Learning Society in Beijing.[164] Fu Sinian called it one of the 'most valuable' (*zui you jiazhi* 最有價值) newly founded New Culture journals.[165]

Emancipation and Reconstruction was edited by Research Clique members Zhang Dongsun and Yu Songhua 俞頌華 (1893-1947). In September 1920, its name changed into *Reconstruction* (*Gaizao* 改造), and it was from then on edited by Liang Qichao himself, until it ceased publication in 1922.[166] The connection between *Emancipation and Reconstruction* and the Research Clique was not only born out of its editorship, but

[160] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 163–66.
[161] Ibid., 186.
[162] Wang Yinxue, 'Shishi xinbao'.
[163] Jiang Qi, 'Xin wenhua yundong he jiaoyu'.
[164] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 248.
[165] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 204.
[166] Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 2003, 248; Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Jiefang yu gaizao'.

it also had a close relationship to other Research Clique publications. For example, *Emancipation and Reconstruction* listed *Current Affairs* as its selling agent and announced that it would reprint an article from the *Morning Post* or *Current Affairs* in every issue.[167]

In sum, people who actively debated the New Culture Movement and who promoted ideas associated with it, such as *baihua*, were recruited from a limited circle. They were mostly intellectuals with a humanities or educational background or affiliated with political interest groups, such as the Research Clique. However, as I have shown by the example of Lewis Chase's students, this did not mean that all humanities students regarded the New Culture Movement as a powerful label. In other words, the New Culture Movement was a buzzword whose glamour was confined to a very small circle.

A Discursive Circle

This group was not only limited with regard to its members' intellectual background. It also formed a discursive circle: its members were aware of each other and cited each other, and many of them also had personal connections.

Citing Each Other

The circle of people who negotiated the New Culture Movement was very well informed about what was going on in the 'field.' Even intellectuals with only a sporadic interest read and then cited other texts on the Movement. For example, the missionary journal *Chinese Christian Advocate* reprinted the full definition of the New Culture Movement given by the Jiangsu Educational Association's announcement of the lecture competition.[168] In the journal *Fine Arts* (*Meishu* 美術) in Shanghai, Tang Xiu 唐隽

[167] 'Copyright Page', 15 October 1919; 'Ben kan qishi er', *Jiefang yu gaizao*.
[168] 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi jieshi'.

(1896-1954) referred to a lecture Chen Duxiu had given on the question 'What is the New Culture Movement' (*Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme* 新文化運動是什麼). Tang Xiu also mentioned Chen Duxiu's article in *New Youth* of the same title.[169]

People involved in negotiating the Movement also responded to each other's comments. The editor of *New Woman,* Jing Guan, defended himself against accusations that he, as a teacher, was not suited to participate in the New Culture Movement and that his journal was a 'plagiarised publication' (*maopai de chuban wu* 冒牌的出版物).[170] This criticism had most likely come from other New Culture activists. As mentioned before, Wang Yinxue, for example, criticised the newspaper *Current Affairs* for using the New Culture Movement as a 'signboard.'[171] Moreover, people contributed articles in each other's journals. Hu Shi published in the *Chinese Christian Advocate* and Huang Yanpei published in *China and Malaya* (*Zhongguo yu Nanyang* 中國與南洋) and in the newspaper *Impartial*.[172] In short, people actively involved in debating the New Culture Movement formed a discursive circle that was well informed about what was going on in the field, but which was also limited in its reach.

All Know Each Other

Many of these intellectuals who negotiated the New Culture Movement also knew each other. One of the authors of *Criticism* was Miao Jinyuan, a student at Beijing University's philosophy faculty, where Hu Shi was teaching. At '2 A.M.' on 16 December 1920, Miao wrote a letter to Hu Shi, complaining that he had not had the pleasure of attending Hu's classes, because Hu Shi was apparently ill for a while and

[169] Tang Xiu, 'Du Chen Duxiu de "Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme"', 105; Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', 1963.
[170] Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 31, 33.
[171] Wang Yinxue, 'Shishi xinbao'.
[172] Hu Shi, 'Women duiyu Xiyang jindai wenming de taidu'; Huang Yanpei, 'Nanyang huaqiao jiaoyu shangque shu'; Bao Yi, 'Wo duiyu baihua wenti de yijian'. Bao Yi was Huang Yanpei's pseudonym, see Xu Weiming, s.v. 'Bao Yi'.

was planning a trip to the US afterwards. Miao Jinyuan asked Hu Shi on this occasion not to undertake that trip, because students at Beijing University would miss him.[173]

In future years, Beijing University's Criticism Society would continue to give Hu Shi publicity, for example, by trying to make his books part of students' reading lists. Zhou Changxian, who had written another article on the New Culture Movement in *Criticism*, listed *Hu Shi's Selected Works* (*Hu Shi wencun* 胡適文存) and *An Outline of the History of Chinese Philosophy* (*Hu Shi Zhongguo zhexue shi dagang* 胡適中國哲學史大綱) as the '10 books young people must read' (*qingnian bi du shu shi bu* 青年必讀書十部) in 1925.[174] In other words, *Criticism* was run by students with very clear connections to Hu Shi's circle and the avowed 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[175]

Another spring-bamboo journal, *Social Reconstruction*, was co-edited by a former member of the New Tide Society. After his graduation, probably in summer 1919, the participant in the New Tide Society Liu Binglin 劉秉麟 (1891-1956) became a teacher at Chinese Public School in Shanghai. In November 1919, his new school launched *Social Reconstruction*. Liu Binglin was unsurprisingly among its editors.[176] It may have resulted from these personal acquaintances that many of these journals used the same publishers. *Social Reconstruction*, for example, was printed and sold by East Asia Library, the publisher who ran an edition of *New Tide*.[177] *New Woman* was sold by East

[173] Miao Jinyuan, 'Miao Jinyuan zhi Hu Shi'.
[174] Zhou Changxian, 'Fuyuan xuezhang dajian'.
[175] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[176] Liu Binglin appeared as former member on a membership list of the New Tide Society in the December 1919 edition of *New Tide* (the second issue of the second volume). As his new postal address, the magazine indicated 'Chinese Public School in Shanghai' (*Shanghai Zhongguo gongxue* 上海中國公學), see *Xinchao*, 2006, 3:201. In the January 1920 edition of *Social Reconstruction*, Liu Binglin appeared among the editors of this magazine. See 'Ben zazhi bianji renyuan', *Xinqun*.
[177] 'Copyright Page', *Xinqun*, November 1919. On the *New Tide* edition, see Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 44.

Asia Library, Qunyi Book Company (*New Youth*'s publisher) and the newspaper office of *Current Affairs*.[178]

Even groups of people that were only sporadically interested in the New Culture Movement, such as the Jiangsu Educational Association, often had connections to Beijing University's circle around Hu Shi. The vice president of the Jiangsu Educational Association, who, the conference protocols suggest, was the person actively running it, was Huang Yanpei.[179] Huang Yanpei used to be Cai Yuanpei's student at Nanyang Public School. Cai Yuanpei introduced Huang to the Revolutionary Alliance in 1904, and in 1916 Huang and Cai together founded the Chinese Society for Vocational Education.[180]

This member list of the Chinese Society for Vocational Education reads like a who's who of Republican intellectual leaders. Other members were Yan Fu, Liang Qichao, Zhang Yuanji 張元濟 (1867-1959) and Shi Liangcai 史量才 (1880-1934).[181] Zhang Yuanji was the manager of the Commercial Press in Shanghai since 1914, and he had also been teacher at Nanyang Public School.[182] Shi Liangcai was the manager of the *Shanghai News* since 1912, one of whose shareholders was Zhang Jian, the president of the Jiangsu Educational Association in 1919.[183] These people (Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu from Beijing University, Shi Liangcai from the *Shanghai News* and Huang Yanpei from the Jiangsu Educational Association) did not only meet in these societies, but also

[178] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 31; 'Copyright Page', *Xin funü*, 1920.
[179] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Kaihui jilu', May 1919.
[180] Cai Zhiguang and Xie Zewei, *Pudong mingren shujian baiting*, 158.
[181] Ibid.
[182] Liang Shu'an, s.v. 'Zhang Yuanji'. While in Germany, Cai Yuanpei edited textbooks for Commercial Press to cover to earn some money. This means that he had an additional connection to this publishing house. See Weston, *The Power of Position*, 80.
[183] Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, s.v. 'Shenbao'.

cultivated their acquaintanceships otherwise. Huang Yanpei, for example, mentioned dinner invitations extended to Hu Shi and received by Shi Liangcai in his diary.[184]

As this indicates, personal acquaintances did not only connect people negotiating the New Culture Movement. They also included publishers who printed and sold New Culture publications. Chen Duxiu, for example, had personal connections to East Asia Library that, as mentioned above, ran many spring-bamboo journals and a reprint edition of *New Tide*.[185] Chen Duxiu had known Wang Mengzou, the owner of East Asia Library, since 1903. At the time, Wang Mengzou had a book- and stationery-shop, which helped Chen Duxiu run his short-lived *Anhui Vernacular Newspaper* (*Anhui suhua bao* 安徽俗話報).[186]

As outlined in Chapter One, Chen had hoped that East Asia Library would publish *New Youth*. But according to Wang Yuanfang, Wang Mengzou's nephew, the Library's business was not going well at the time, and it was therefore unable to publish *New Youth*. Therefore, Wang Mengzou introduced Chen Duxiu to Qunyi Book Company, which then took care of the magazine.[187] When Chen Duxiu became dean of humanities at Beijing University, East Asia Library became the official Shanghai selling agent for books by Beijing University Publishing Department. This buoyed up its business.[188] When Chen Duxiu was dismissed from Beijing University in spring 1919, and when, after his arrest in June 1919, he went back to Shanghai, he continued his friendship and cooperation with East Asia Library.[189]

[184] On the invitation to Hu Shi, see Huang Yanpei, *Huang Yanpei riji*, 2:62. On the one by Shi Liangcai, see Ibid., 2:88.
[185] 'Copyright Page', November 1919; Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 44.
[186] Wang Yuanfang, *Yadong tushuguan yu Chen Duxiu*, 40.
[187] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 32.
[188] Ibid., 37.
[189] Ibid., 51.

Infrastructure, Not Ideological Conditioning

I do not mean to say that everybody who was interested in the New Culture Movement in the early 1920s had personal connections to people who used to be called Beijing University's 'New Faction,' or was involved in humanities or education. For instance, I have not been able to trace any connections between the journal *New Buddhism* and the circle around Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi. *New Buddhism* was written in *baihua*, it had a section on 'new poems' (*xin shi* 新詩) and its editor Wang Yinxue contributed an article about the way people used the expression 'New Culture Movement' as an empty 'signboard.'[190] It was published in Ningbo by the New Buddhism Society (*Xin fojiao she* 新佛教社), which had its correspondence address at the 'Plain Clothing Temple' (*Baiyi si* 白衣寺).[191] This indicates that *New Buddhism* was not run by members of a school or university. The Society must have been one of the few Buddhist groups that, as Erik J. Hammerstrom has shown, sought to connect a Buddhist with a New Culture discourse.[192] Moreover, there seems to be little connection between the spring-bamboo journal *New Student* from Taicang and Beijing University's New Faction.

It is also necessary to acknowledge the role of the database I am using. The database, the National Index of Chinese Newspapers and Periodicals (*Quanguo baokan suoyin* 全國報刊索引), comes from the Shanghai Library and therefore emphasises literature from the Shanghai/ Zhejiang/ Jiangsu region. This region had long been an intellectually prestigious place,[193] and many of Beijing University's staff were recruited

[190] Wang Yinxue, 'Shishi xinbao'.
[191] 'She gao', *Xin fojiao*.
[192] Hammerstrom, 'Buddhists Discuss Science in Modern China', 218. For a more detailed discussion of the ways in which Buddhist groups co-opted the New Culture concept of 'science' in the later 1910s and 1920s, see Ibid., 192–260.
[193] Elman, *From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China*.

from here.[194] This implies that they were very likely to have good connections to publishers and intellectuals in Shanghai.

Moreover, knowing people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu did not automatically result in support for the Movement either. Liu Shipei, for example, had long been friends with Chen Duxiu. It was Chen Duxiu who had suggested to Cai Yuanpei to hire Liu Shipei.[195] When Chen Duxiu was arrested in June 1919, Liu Shipei headed the signatories of a document that requested Chen's release, although Liu was already seriously ill at the time. Moreover, when Liu Shipei died in November 1919, Chen Duxiu held his memorial service at Beijing University.[196] Nevertheless, Chen Duxiu and Liu Shipei had very different opinions on language and belonged to what newspapers had classified as two different 'factions of learning.' Personal acquaintanceship was not ideological conditioning. However, it facilitated knowledge exchange. To explore this, I trace, in the second part of this chapter, the routes along which information about the New Culture Movement and ideas subsumed under it was transmitted.

Routes of Transmission

Advertisements

One popular way of promoting ideas in the 1910s and 1920s was to express them in a journal, newspaper or book. Information about such publications was often spread through advertisements in other journals and newspapers.[197] Of course, publications from all ideological spectrums used this method. In January 1919, that is, in the month when *New Tide* was launched, it was advertised in the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou*

[194] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 116–17.
[195] Li Fan, 'Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue', 108.
[196] Chen Qi, *Liu Shipei nianpu changbian*, 356–57.
[197] Li Xiaofeng, 'Xinchao she de shimo', 209.

pinglun).[198] When *New Tide* reprinted its third edition with the publisher East Asia Library, it advertised this reprint in the spring-bamboo journal *Social Reconstruction* in November 1919 and on the front page of the *Shanghai News* in the same month.[199]

Similarly, *Tiger* placed an advertisement in several newspapers in Shanghai.[200] So did East Asia Library when it became the official seller of books by Beijing University Publishing Department in 1917.[201] Vice versa, both *New Tide* and *National Heritage* featured advertisements of other publications. In its first issue, *New Tide* advertised the *Morning Post* and *New Youth* on its second page.[202] The first *National Heritage* issue promoted the *Mathematical Journal* (S*huli zazhi* 數理雜誌) and the *Citizen* (*Guomin* 國民).[203] *Criticism* advertised publications of the New Youth Society (*Xin qingnian she* 新青年社) and the journal *New Woman* in its first issue.[204]

Just like today, advertisements were very popular with journal and newspaper owners, not only as a means to gain publicity, but also to make money by selling advertising space to the owners of other publications. The *Shanghai News* was a newspaper that had perfected this second method. As Wang Runian has pointed out, selling advertising space was the *Shanghai News*' 'most important source of income' (*zui zhongyao de zhouru laiyuan* 最重要的收入來源). The newspaper had always featured advertisements of local and national companies. However, against the background of economic development, they became ever more sophisticated, garish and numerous after the 1870s. The 1920s and 1930s were, according to Wang Runian, a heyday of

[198] 'Advertisement for *New Tide*', *Meizhou pinglun*, 5 January 1919, 5 January 1919.
[199] 'Advertisement for *New Tide*', *Xinqun*, November 1919; 'Advertisement for *New Tide*', 3 November 1919.
[200] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 28.
[201] Ibid., 38.
[202] 'Advertisement for the *Morning Post*', *Xinchao*; 'Advertisement for *New Youth*', *Xinchao*.
[203] 'Advertisement for the *Mathematical Journal*', *Guogu*; 'Advertisement for *Citizen*', *Guogu*.
[204] 'Xin qingnian she chuban …', *Piping*, 20 October 1920; 'Advertisement for *New Woman*', *Piping*, 20 October 1920.

Shanghai News advertising. Advertisements were expensive and their price depended on their size and location within the newspaper. An advertisement on the front page, for example, cost particularly much.[205]

Other periodicals also used this method. In the spring-bamboo journal *Emancipation and Reconstruction*, a 'first-class' (*yi deng* 一等) advertisement, that is, one on the cover and of the size of a whole page cost 20 Yuan. A 'third-class' (*san deng* 三等) advertisement, that is, one 'in front or behind the texts or in the middle of the texts' (*zhengwen qianhou ji zhengwen zhong* 正文前後及正文中) covering one fourth of a page only cost 3 Yuan.[206]

Advertisements had the potential to spread information about journals to broader circles. However, even the reach of advertisements was confined. First of all, the audience of the advertisement's carrier was limited. For example, although the *Shanghai News* was a large newspaper, it was by no means read by every person in China. By definition, its readers had to be literate, and, according to Wang Runian, they were mainly business people and intellectuals.[207] Even an advertisement in the *Shanghai News* would have therefore only reached a limited circle of people.

Secondly, the reach of advertisements was confined by a pricing strategy that granted more favourable conditions to advertisements of likeminded publications. Both *New Tide* and *National Heritage* printed the same, presumably standardised, 'Advertising Price List' (*Guanggao jiamu* 廣告價目).[208] It stated that the advertising price for '[publications] that this journal regards as beneficial will be calculated at a fifty-percent discount' (*jing ben zhi renwei you yi zhe, yi duizhe jisuan* 經本誌認爲有益者，以對折

[205] Wang Runian, *Yuwang de xiangxiang*, 70–96.
[206] 'Guanggao jia mubiao', *Jiefang yu gaizao*.
[207] Wang Runian, *Yuwang de xiangxiang*, 108.
[208] 'Guanggao jiamu', *Xinchao*, 1 January 1919; 'Guanggao jiamu', *Guogu*, 20 March 1919.

計算).[209] In other words, although *New Tide* and *National Heritage* were prepared to advertise publications they did not agree with, it is reasonable to assume that people tried to promote their journals in congenial magazines, since this would save them money.

Moreover, magazines followed the practice to 'introduce' (*jieshao* 介紹) new publications they found particularly commendable (and agreeable).[210] In these cases, the 'Price List' stated, no money would be charged.[211] In January 1919, *Beijing University Monthly* (*Beijing daxue yuekan* 北京大學月刊) introduced *National Heritage*.[212] Luo Jialun in *New Youth* recommended *Pacific* (*Taipingyang* 太平洋), *Tiger* and *Science* (*Kexue* 科學) in April 1919.[213] In August, the *Weekly Review* (*Meizhou pinglun*) introduced two new 'little brothers' (*xiao xiongdi* 小兄弟), the spring-bamboo journals *Xiang River Review* (*Xiang jiang pinglun* 湘江評論), run by Mao Zedong in Changsha, and *Sunday* (*Xingqi ri* 星期日) from Chengdu.[214]

East Asia Library employee Wang Yuanfang even remembered that journals had a policy to 'exchange advertisements' (*jiaohuan guanggao* 交換廣告). This meant that two journals advertised each other for free. *Construction*, a journal controlled by Sun Yat-sen, even explicitly stated that it would only engage in this 'advertisement exchange' with journals that supported the 'New Culture Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong* 新文化運動).[215]

---

[209] 'Guanggao jiamu', 1 January 1919.
[210] Li Xiaofeng, 'Xinchao she de shimo', 209.
[211] 'Guanggao jiamu', 1 January 1919.
[212] Chen Qi, *Liu Shipei nianpu changbian*, 349.
[213] Luo Jialun, 'Jinri Zhongguo de zazhi jie', 77–78.
[214] 'Xiang jiang pinglun', *Meizhou pinglun*, 24 August 1919.
[215] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 41. *Piping* also employed this policy, see 'Ben she qishi san'. On *Construction* being controlled by Sun, see Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 81.

Moreover, as stated above, many New Culture journals were printed or sold by the same publishers. The spring-bamboo journals *New Woman* and *Social Reconstruction*, for example, were managed by East Asia Library.[216] Consequently, they promoted a number of other East Asia Library publications. In its first issue, *Social Reconstruction* advertised a book with the title *The World after the Paris Peace Conference and China* (*Bali hehui hou zhi shijie yu Zhongguo* 巴黎和議後之世界與中國), which was sold by East Asia Library.[217] It also advertised the third edition of *New Tide*, which was printed by East Asia Library.[218]

In short, advertisements had the potential to introduce journals and the ideas they transported to broader circles. However, many of the pricing strategies suppliers of advertising space employed caused likeminded journals to advertise each other. As a result, information about journals tended to be limited to an audience that was already inclined to agree with them. It also promoted the formation of a discursive circle, which was aware of ideas and actors in the field, and cited and negotiated them.

Getting Hold of a Journal

After publications had been advertised, readers of course also needed to get hold of a copy. These could be bought from selling agents, but very often personal networks also played a role here.

In order to obtain a copy of a journal, you could go to the place where it was produced. For example, *New Tide* was published in Beijing and could be bought from Beijing University Publishing Department. [219] However, even before the May Fourth demonstrations, *New Tide* had 'selling agents' (*daimai chu* 代賣處, lit. 'places that sell

[216] 'Copyright Page', 1920; 'Copyright Page', November 1919.
[217] 'Advertisement for "Bali heyi hou zhi shijie yu Zhongguo"', *Xinqun*.
[218] 'Advertisement for *New Tide*, Vol. 1, ed. 3', *Xinqun*.
[219] 'Copyright Page', *Xinchao*, 1 January 1919.

on one's behalf') that sold it in other places and cities. The number of *New Tide*'s selling agents increased particularly after the May Fourth demonstrations, when *New Tide* listed agents from Beijing and Shanghai, to Tokyo, Changsha and Guangzhou.[220] Moreover, from the very beginning, readers could also request *New Tide* and *National Heritage* by post, even to be sent abroad.[221] Similarly, *Criticism* was distributed as a supplement to the newspaper *Republic Daily*, but could additionally be bought from the New Youth Office in the French Concession of Shanghai.[222] *Tiger* was also sold by agents in cities all over China.[223]

However, a popular method was also to borrow a copy a friend had bought. In order to obtain a journal or newspaper on this route, personal acquaintances were of course essential. As the member of the New Tide Society Li Xiaofeng remembered, this file-sharing was very popular in the Republican Period. He wrote about *New Tide*:

> After they [the students who had bought *New Tide*] had read the magazine themselves, they lent it to their classmates so they could read it, they sent it to their friends so they could read it, they sent it to their brothers and sisters so they could read it. In this way, one was given to ten, and ten were given to a hundred…
>
> 他們自己看過雜誌之後,借給同學看,寄給朋友看,送給兄弟姊妹看,如此一傳十,十傳百 ……[224]

Reading the copies of friends must have also been a good way of circumventing censorship. According to Li Xiaofeng, *New Tide* had difficulties to recruit selling agents before the May Fourth demonstrations since the government was allegedly sceptical

[220] *Xinchao*, 2006, 2:175. This was the edition of *New Tide*'s first volume, which was published by *East Asia Library* in late 1919. Similarly in 'Copyright Page', *Xinchao*, 30 October 1919.
[221] 'Copyright Page', 1 January 1919; 'Copyright Page', *Guogu*, 20 March 1919.
[222] 'Banner', *Piping*.
[223] Weston, 'The Formation and Positioning of the New Culture Community', 271.
[224] Li Xiaofeng, 'Xinchao she de shimo', 209. This was also the case for newspapers, see Bevan, 'Paul Morand, the Chinese "New-Sensationists" and Pictorial Magazines' citing Lin Yutang; *A History of the Press and Public Opinion in China*.

about the sort of idea *New Tide* was promoting. Potential selling agents therefore feared government crackdowns.[225]

These fears were not unwarranted. East Asia Library's bookshop once got into trouble for selling – a highly popular – anarchist publication. Apparently at the instigation of foreign nationals in Shanghai, East Asia Library's owner Wang Mengzou was arrested during a Chinese-foreign police intervention and had to pay a high fine.[226] As a result of similar events, Li Xiaofeng claimed, the selling agents for *New Tide* were, at the beginning, only a handful of schools and bookstalls in Beijing, as well as shops in Shanghai that were already selling *New Youth*. Among them was East Asia Library.[227]

Li Xiaofeng claimed that this kind of file-sharing let the *New Tide* 'spread to the whole nation' (*bianji dao quanguo* 遍及到全國).[228] Although this practice was certainly a useful method in increasing the circulation of a journal like *New Tide*, it must have limited the *New Tide* readers to a network, however wide, of friends and acquaintances. Only if you knew someone who knew someone who knew someone who had bought a *New Tide* issue, could you get hold of one through this route.

Case Study: Lewis Nathaniel Chase

The Lewis Nathaniel Chase papers provide an excellent case study on how ideas could spread through personal networks in the 1920s. Through Lewis Chase, information about New Culture people and ideas reached not only his students in Beijing, but also foreign circles in other parts of China and even the US. Since the Chase papers refer to the New Culture Movement extremely sporadically, I approach the New Culture Movement in this section in an even broader sense than in the rest of this chapter. I

[225] Li Xiaofeng, 'Xinchao she de shimo', 209.
[226] Wang Yuanfang, *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan*, 48–49.
[227] Li Xiaofeng, 'Xinchao she de shimo', 209.
[228] Ibid.

trace ideas that people generally marketed under its headline (*baihua*) and intellectual agendas of the Movement's avowed 'centre,' Hu Shi.[229]

As I have shown above, Lewis Chase's students had an at least general interest in the New Culture Movement. Although, of course, it is difficult to compare student essays and journal articles, it seems as if they negotiated the New Culture Movement more actively than, say, Zhu Daihen's co-authors in the publication of Second Women's Normal School of Jiangsu Province. To be sure, Chase's students in Beijing had a closer geographical proximity to the 'centre of the New Culture Movement' at Beijing University.[230] However, since a lot of New Culture journals, including *New Youth*, were published with Shanghai's many publishers, locality should not have had this impact. Instead, Lewis Chase's interest in the New Culture Movement may have been one factor.

Lewis Nathaniel Chase and the New Culture Movement

Shortly after his arrival in Beijing in autumn 1921, Chase encountered the New Culture Movement. This happened in form of a paper by the Swiss missionary Philippe de Vargas titled 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance.'[231] De Vargas gave a paper of that title before the 'Society of Friends of Literature' on 15 February 1922.[232] The event was even attended by Hu Shi, who also participated in the subsequent question-and-answer session.[233] De Vargas was an accomplished linguist, but his native language was French, not English, which was the language commonly used at the Society of Friends of Literature.[234] It seems that he therefore gave his lecture script to Lewis Chase beforehand, with the request to proofread it for him. In other words, Lewis Chase came

[229] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[230] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ibid.
[231] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)'.
[232] For more information on the Society of Friends of Literature, see footnote 65 on p. 162.
[233] Hu Shi, *Hu Shi de riji*, 1:267.
[234] For example, the invitation cards and the titles of lectures announced on them were in English.

into first contact with the New Culture Movement very shortly after his arrival in Beijing.

I do not know if Lewis Chase met Hu Shi at de Vargas' lecture before the Society of Friends of Literature. But he would do so over the next few years. As invitation cards to the Society indicate, Chase attended at least two of Hu Shi's lectures, one in 1922 and one in 1924.[235] Hu Shi was, moreover, also aware of Lewis Chase, as he invited him to take up a teaching post at Beijing University.[236] Chase was furthermore personally acquainted with Lu Xun's brother Zhou Zuoren. Zhou, an advocate of Esperanto, sent Lewis Chase a Christmas card in this language.[237]

Another man whom Lewis Chase met at the Society of Friends of Literature was A. E. Zucker (*Zhuo Ke* 卓克). Zucker was very active in the Society. When the Society planned to found an Eastern Studies Library (*Dongfang xue tushu guan* 東方學圖書館) in 1921, Zucker, Hu Shi and a few others submitted a proposal to the US Envoy to China Charles Richard Crane (1858-1939) to request his 'help' (*bangzhu* 幫助).[238] Zucker also seemed to fulfil an administrative function in the society. When Chase gave a lecture at the Society on 14 June 1922, for example, it was Zucker who sent out the invitation cards.[239]

This acquaintanceship may have drawn Lewis Chase's attention to a book Zucker had authored and to which Hu Shi had written an introduction. It was this book through which Lewis Chase spread information about Hu Shi's ideas to his students and to foreign circles in China. This book was Volume One of a series called *Western*

[235] 'Invitation to Hu Shi's Lecture', 20 February 1924; 'Invitation to Hu Shi's Lecture', 17 November 1922.
[236] 'Chen L.Y. to Lewis Chase'.
[237] 'Zhou Zuoren to Lewis Chase'.
[238] Hu Shi, *Hu Shi de riji*, 1:65.
[239] 'Invitation to Lewis Chase's Lecture'.

Literature: Specimens of Literature with Introductions Embodying the Chief Traditions of Europeans and Americans. Its topic was 'Greece and Rome,' and it was published with Commercial Press in 1922.[240] The book was designed as a textbook that should introduce Chinese students to the Greek and Roman classics, such as the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, the *Aeneid* and the *Apology* by Plato. It contained selected excerpts of these works in English translation, accompanied by introductions by Zucker.[241]

Hu Shi, who knew Zucker through the Society of Friends of Literature, wrote an introduction to this book. Here Hu Shi naturally praised the 'great service' Zucker had done to 'the Chinese students,' by providing them with such an excellent selection of works and such valuable introductions.[242] But Hu Shi also used the opportunity to promote his idea that novels and dramas should be more appreciated and developed in China. His argument was that Zucker's book enabled Chinese students to engage in 'comparative study' of Western and Chinese literature. As a result of 'comparative study,' they would come to an appreciation of Western novels, which would lead them to value Chinese novels more highly.[243] Moreover, by comparison with Western drama, they would find out at which evolutionary stage Chinese drama was at the moment. All of this would 'help the student in his appreciation of the literature of both the West and the East.'[244]

To be sure, discussing evolutionary narratives was not peculiar to the New Culture Movement. As I have pointed out in Chapter One, *National Heritage* authors debated evolution too. Evolutionary narratives seemed to have been a very common mode of

[240] Zucker and Hu, *Western Literature*; Hu Shi, 'Introduction to "Western Literature, Volume 1: Greece and Rome, by A. E. Zucker"'; 'Western Literature'.
[241] Hu Shi, 'Introduction to "Western Literature, Volume 1: Greece and Rome, by A. E. Zucker"', 290; Chase, 'Western Classics for Chinese Students', 1, 3.
[242] Hu Shi, 'Introduction to "Western Literature, Volume 1: Greece and Rome, by A. E. Zucker"', 289.
[243] Ibid., 291.
[244] Ibid., 297. The section on comparative literature is on pp. 291-97.

inquiry at the time. Even *Commercial Student*, which showed no interested in the New Culture Movement whatsoever, drew upon such narratives.[245] But especially the discussion of drama in Hu Shi's introduction is very reminiscent of a piece by his student Fu Sinian, who had explained in *New Youth* that Chinese drama was currently at the 'hairy-man' (*maoren* 毛人) stage of evolution.[246] In other words, someone reading Hu Shi's introduction to Zucker's book would have become acquainted with ideas associated with the avowed 'centre of the New Culture Movement.'[247]

Zucker's Book in Chase's Classroom

Lewis Chase apparently agreed with Hu Shi on the usefulness of Zucker's *Western Literature* and used it in his own English-literature classes at Beijing University. To be sure, it is impossible to say what motivated Chase to do so and if he would have also used this textbook had he not known Zucker and Hu Shi. However, it is not unthinkable that his acquaintanceship with these two men was at least a contributing factor in drawing his attention to the book.

Whatever the motivation, *Western Literature* became an integral part of Chase's curriculum at Beijing University. A lecture list of the Faculty for English Literature (*Ying wenxue xi* 英文學系) for the academic year 1923-1924, printed in *Beijing University Daily*, shows that Chase based his course on 'European Literature' (*Ouzhou wenxue* 歐洲文學) for third- and fourth-year students on it.[248] In the second term of that academic year, Chase set an exam question for his students, which treated Zucker's book. It read: 'Is a knowledge of ancient Greek and Roman literature such as indicated by Dr Zucker's book of interest to you either personally or as [a] Chinese?' When

[245] See for example Jian Xianqi, 'Meiguo huobi shi tanlüe'.
[246] Fu Sinian, 'Xiju gailiang gemian guan', 1078.
[247] For the phrase 'centre of the New Culture Movement,' see Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[248] Ye Juan, *Deyu wenxue yanjiu yu xiandai Zhongguo*, 117.

discussing this question, students should also, the examination paper stated, express if '[i]n your opinion is a knowledge of ancient Greek and Roman literature desirable in order to increase your just appreciation of Chinese literature?'[249] This was a very close reflection of Hu Shi's expressed hope for the book, namely, that it would 'help the student in his appreciation of the literature of both the West and the East.'[250]

Hu Shi would have certainly been delighted to know that this seemed to have worked for Chase's student Hsi Chen (Xi Zhen 奚偵 [no dates]). In his conclusion to the essay question, Hsi wrote:

> So I am of opinion that we should study Greek and Roman literature very carefully in order to appreciate their value. When we appreciate the best of the west, we can discover the defects of our own. Then we may reform our literature. Why does Dr Hu Shih take the ~~literature~~ {literary} revolution? It is because he appreciates the literature of both west and China. Thus, to study Greek and Roman literature is the fundamental step of literary revolution in China.[251]

By giving them Zucker's book to read, Chase had made his students engage with Hu Shi's thought. Interestingly enough, Chase was only teaching these students because Hu Shi had employed him at Beijing University.

Knowledge Transmission beyond the New Culture Movement

The way Chase's students worked with Zucker's *Western Literature* also reveals how people at the time acquired knowledge generally, not only about the New Culture Movement. This was particularly the case for knowledge about the West. When discovering a reference to a Western thinker or author, it is tempting to assume that the person making the reference had actually read the Western thinker himself. However, as Chen Weiping has pointed out, a lot of knowledge about evolutionism came to China,

[249] Hsi, 'Is a Knowledge of Ancient Greek and Roman Literature such as Indicated by Dr Zucker's Book of Interest to You Either Personally or as Chinese?', 1.
[250] Hu Shi, 'Introduction to "Western Literature, Volume 1: Greece and Rome, by A. E. Zucker"', 297. The section on comparative literature is on pp. 291-97.
[251] Hsi, 'Is a Knowledge of Ancient Greek and Roman Literature such as Indicated by Dr Zucker's Book of Interest to You Either Personally or as Chinese?', 4.

not through Huxley or Spencer, but through 'popular literature' (*tongsu duwu* 通俗讀物).[252]

Moreover, Emma Lester's student and friend Bei got at least some of her knowledge about socialism and capitalism, not from Marx, but from George Bernard Shaw's *Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*.[253] Similarly, Chase's students were quite able to talk about the Trojan War in their essays. But, as it turned out, they had gotten their information not from the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, but from Zucker's anthology and comments. Chang Ying-shu (Zhang Yingshu 張瑩書 [no dates]), for example, explained that he was 'interested very much in the passages of Odyssey in Dr. Zucker's book.'[254] In other words, when referring to a famous author, people had often gained their information through intermediaries, such as Zucker for Homer and George Bernard Shaw for Marx.

It is unsurprising that Chase, as a teacher, should influence his students. But influence also seemed to work the other way around. Chase was apparently interested in Chinese marriage customs and the way they had changed in recent years. One way in which he collected information about the topic was to read publications such as newspaper articles.[255] Another one was to discuss it with his students. On at least one occasion he asked them to write an essay on marriage customs in their home region.[256]

Chase actively engaged with the opinion of his students. One important issue in marriage customs for one of his students, Tsou Szu-Ju (no Chinese characters, no dates), was the question if the young people could choose their marriage partners themselves or

[252] Chen Weiping, '"Wu si" xin wenhua yundong zhong de jinhualun', 14.
[253] 'Sze Be Tsung to Emma Lester', 18 September 1929, 2.
[254] Chang Ying-shu, 'Is a Knowledge of Ancient Greek and Roman Literature such as Indicated by Dr Zucker's Book of Interest to You Either Personally or as Chinese?', 3.
[255] Chen, 'Chinese Marriage System'.
[256] Tsou, 'The Marriage Customs in My Own Community, Soochow'.

if they were chosen by the parents. In the 'old form' of marriage, the choice lay with the parents, Tsou explained. This implied that, in the 'new form,' which he called 'free marriage,' the young people could choose their partners themselves.[257] It may have been this student to whom Chase referred when he said in a lecture on 'The Theory of Chinese Marriage' later on:

> The term free love, by this way, I use in the sense in which it is known to my present audience, and not as it was naively defined to me by one of my Chinese students. By free love, he said, I mean that our parents should allow us xxxx young Chinese more freedom in choosing our own wives.[258]

Although Chase did not exactly learn from his student in this case, he took up his statement and reflected upon it. Knowledge had been transmitted from teacher to student and from student to teacher.

Beyond Chase's Classroom

Chase's students at Beijing University would have certainly also learnt about Hu Shi from sources other than their American teacher. After all, Hu Shi was professor at their university. However, through Chase's interest in Zucker's book, knowledge about Hu Shi and his ideas reached broader circles, to which Hu Shi did not seem to have a connection.

Chase seemed to enjoy *Western Literature* so much that he wrote a very positive review on the first volume, which treated 'Greece and Rome.' Chase's emphasis seemed to differ slightly from Hu Shi's. For Hu Shi, the value of Zucker lay in enabling Chinese students to develop and appreciate Chinese literature. For Chase, it lay in dissuading Chinese students from their opinion that their culture was superior to all others, and in

[257] Ibid., 1–3.
[258] Chase, 'The Theory of Chinese Marriage', 1. Chase wrote 'xxxx' with his typewriter to cross out a word he had written previously.

convincing them that there was some value in Western literature too.[259] He also expected that *Western Literature* would help his students with answering the question if Chinese and Western culture should ultimately form one 'single civilization of the world' (which Chase seemed to be hoping).[260] However, Chase also discussed Hu Shi's introduction at great length, and he particularly repeated and affirmed Hu Shi's advocacy of novels.[261]

Through Chase, Zucker's *Western Literature* did not only reach his students at Beijing University. Chase also published his review of the book in the English-language newspapers *Japan Advertiser* and *Peking Leader* (*Beijing daobao* 北京導報).[262] Chase's review furthermore reached a Chinese-speaking audience when it appeared in the school journal of Yanjing University, the *Yen Ching Students' Weekly* (*Yanda zhoukan* 燕大周刊). As mentioned before, Chase was employed at Yanjing University.[263] For this publication, Chase had his review translated into Chinese by someone called Shao Ming 紹明.[264] This meant that Chase's review of Zucker's book was accessible even to students who did not read English and who were not in his class. As this Chinese translation of the review discussed Hu Shi's introduction in as much

[259] Chase, 'Western Classics for Chinese Students', 1–2.
[260] Ibid., 4. Hu Shi pointed out as well that '[t]here are still numberless scholars who think that the Chinese literature is unsurpassed in the whole world,' and he expressed his hope that this 'self-conceit' might be redressed through Zucker's book. However, for Hu Shi the appreciation of novels and dramas as a genre seemed to be more important than the re-evaluation of the worth of Western literature. See Hu Shi, 'Introduction to "Western Literature, Volume 1: Greece and Rome, by A. E. Zucker"', 292. As Leigh Jenco has shown, the wish to create a 'single civilization of the world' was not peculiar to Lewis Chase, but was also aspired to by Li Dazhao and Du Yaquan. See Jenco, 'Culture as History', 42.
[261] Chase, 'Western Classics for Chinese Students', 2–3.
[262] The *Peking Leader* was one of the most important newspapers in Beijing. Egan, *A Latterday Confucian*, 105; Huang Guangyu, s.v. 'Beijing daobao'. The *Japan Advertiser* had been founded in Yokohama in 1909 by the American Benjamin Fleischer. French, *Carl Crow - A Tough Old China Hand*, 60.
[263] Manuscript Division, 'Biographical and Organizational Note: Lewis Nathaniel Chase'.
[264] Chase, 'Xifang wenxue jiezhu', *Yanda zhoukan*, 10 November 1923. Shao Ming may have been Dong Qiusi 董秋斯 (1899-1969), who used this penname. Dong studied at Yanjing University in the 1920s and became a translator later. See Jiao Zhongping, s.v. 'Dong Qiusi'.

detail as the English-language version, the article in the *Yen Ching Students' Weekly* was another way of spreading knowledge about the avowed New Culture star Hu Shi.

In other words, from Chase's circle at the Society of Friends of Literature, where he had probably met Hu Shi and Zucker, Chase transported knowledge about Hu Shi's ideas to another one of his circles: to Yanjing University.

Beyond Beijing

So far, I have described how information about Hu Shi was transmitted within Beijing. But Chase also helped to transport this knowledge out of the capital, where Hu Shi lived at the time, to a completely new circle: a circle of foreigners in Suzhou. Chase sometimes travelled into different parts of China, for example, to give summer schools in Suzhou and in Jinan.[265] Moreover, foreigners in China tended to gather in various 'luncheon clubs,' where they socialised with fellow foreigners at 'tiffins' or other events, and reproduced in China the social and cultural environment of their native countries. Some clubs, like the prestigious Shanghai Club, even excluded Chinese nationals.[266]

This was not the case for all clubs, of course. One of Emma Lester's friends, Sze Wu Tsung, for example, told Lester about a dance which the 'American Community' was giving at the 'Tsingdao [Qingdao] International Club' in 1926.[267] Some, like the Union Club, Nicholas R. Clifford has explained, were specifically founded in 1919 'to improve relations between Chinese and foreigners.'[268] Moreover, Westernised Chinese nationals also established their own clubs. Emma Lester's friend and former student

[265] On the summer school in Suzhou, see 'Lewis Chase to E.H. Cressy'. On the summer school in Jinan, see 'Lewis Chase to E.A. Chase', 17 June 1923, 3.
[266] Clifford, *Spoilt Children of Empire*, 71; Bickers, *Britain in China*, 83.
[267] 'Sze Wu Tsung to Emma Lester', 5 July 1926.
[268] Clifford, *Spoilt Children of Empire*, 71.

Niu Minghua reported about a 'Chinese Woman's Club Ball.'[269] Nevertheless, this club world may have provided Chase with a platform for transmitting ideas to which he, as a foreigner, had special access.

One day, Chase attended an 'Anglo-American tiffin' in Suzhou, where he met a Dr Shurman (no dates).[270] At this 'tiffin,' Chase discussed with Dr Shurman the differences and similarities of ancient Greece and old China. Back in Beijing, he wrote a letter to Shurman in June 1924, enclosing a 'type-script copy of my review of Zucker's book which bears on the same question.'[271] This may have been a case of academic self-advertisement – Chase was very much aware of the importance of networking and always in search of opportunities to give lectures and earn some extra money in the wake of it.[272] But it also had the effect that information about both Zucker and Hu Shi reached a new circle of people in Suzhou, which may have been easier to reach for Chase, as a foreigner, than for Hu Shi and his Chinese colleagues. The Chase Papers do not contain any information about what Dr Shurman did with Chase's review of Zucker. But if he liked it, he may well have informed his own friends about Zucker's book and Hu Shi's introduction. In this way, knowledge of the New Culture Movement may have again hopped over to new circles.

The American physician John W. Colbert (1895-1966), who lived in Tianjin for seventeen years from 1920 to 1937, mocked that many tourists who had only briefly visited Shanghai or Hong Kong went home after their short trip, 'convinced that they knew China, and the Chinese, – and wrote magazine articles, and gave lectures before

[269] 'Niu Minghua to Emma Lester', 18 May 1936, 3. On clubs in China, see Bickers, *Britain in China*, 82–83.
[270] The letter that contains this information does not state where Shurman lived. However, as the letter is filed in the Chase Papers in a folder labelled 'Soochow,' it is quite probable that this is where Chase and Shurman met. Moreover, as Chase only mentions Shurman's surname, I am unable to find any more information about him.
[271] 'Lewis Chase to Shurman'.
[272] 'Lewis Chase to Family', 16 October 1921, 2.

Rotary, and other luncheon clubs, – on this fascinating world.'[273] Lewis Chase had certainly seen more of China than a tourist. But when he returned to the US in 1925 – he did so, because his 86-year-old mother asked him to finally come home[274] – he did exactly that: he gave lectures on China before various clubs. For example, on 6 January 1926, he gave a lecture on China before the 'Ladies Aid Society of Calvery Presbyterian Church, Riverside,' California.[275] Chase settled for a while in Riverside because his mother lived there.[276]

In this lecture before the Ladies Aid Society, Chase again briefly mentioned ideas promoted as New Culture Movement when he explained that there was now a new written language. This 'is known as the spoken language whcih [sic] recently has been made literary.'[277] To be sure, the New Culture Movement was not the main topic of the lecture. Chase did not delve into the argument behind *baihua* either. It is therefore not possible to determine if Chase was talking about Hu Shi's (*baihua* as the language of present times) or the lesser-known activists' (*baihua* as the language of the people) *baihua*. Nevertheless, the members of the Ladies Aid Society learnt in this way about *baihua* through Lewis Chase. Chase's interest in the New Culture Movement and *baihua*, however, may have been incited because he met Hu Shi at the Society of Friends of Literature in Beijing. In other words, Hu Shi's extended network reached all the way to a charitable society in the US, and his ideas were spread along this route.

[273] Colbert, 'Journey on the Yangtze'. For biographical details on Colbert, see Gernand, 'Biographical and Organizational Note: John W. Colbert'.
[274] 'Lewis Chase to Frank Chase', 4 June 1925; 'Lewis Chase to Pearl Adell Chase'.
[275] Chase, 'My Ignorance of China', 1.
[276] 'Lewis Chase to E.A. Chase', 1 May 1923, 1.
[277] Chase, 'My Ignorance of China', 5.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have not only traced the presence of the New Culture Movement, but also its absence. The fact that broad circles of China's urban and even intellectual society were not, or only marginally, interested in the New Culture Movement says as much about the Movement as the way it was negotiated, which I have shown in Chapter Three.[278] I have therefore shown in this Chapter that the New Culture Movement was a buzzword which was powerful only within a certain circle. This circle was limited to a group of intellectuals within the humanities, education and politics. Outside of these fields, the label 'New Culture Movement' and ideas promoted under it were hardly visible. Even within the humanities, there was a considerable number of people who were only sporadically and marginally interested in the Movement. Moreover, opposition against the Movement soon gained a platform with the *Critical Review*. In other words, when Fu Sinian claimed in September 1919 that 'society' stood behind the New Culture project, he was exaggerating.[279]

Many of the people who were negotiating the New Culture Movement more or less actively knew each other, or at least they knew of each other. The formation of this discursive circle was promoted by the mechanisms through which knowledge of the New Culture Movement, or ideas in general, travelled. Among these routes of transmission were advertisements and personal connections. It is obvious why ideas stayed within a confined circle when they were transmitted through personal acquaintances. After all, in order to learn about an idea on that route, one had to be friends with a friend of a friend of a friend of the author of the idea. Moreover, advertisements were a medium that had the potential to carry the word beyond a circle

[278] I would like to thank Isabella Jackson for her comments on this point.
[279] Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 201.

of acquaintances. However, since people tended to place their advertisements in likeminded journals, for reasons that are economically understandable, advertisements again fostered the emergence of a limited, but well informed, group of New Culture sympathisers.

The circle of people who negotiated the New Culture Movement, however, was very well connected and powerful. Hu Shi actively socialised in foreign circles in Beijing, and consequently his connections reached all across the Pacific. I have shown this by the example of Lewis Chase, who met Hu Shi in Beijing and later even talked about *baihua* to a charitable society in California. It seems, moreover, that it was foreign nationals in China like Chase who first introduced the New Culture Movement into the English-language academic discourse. For example, Clarence H. Hamilton from the 'University of Nanking' published an article on the New Culture Movement in 1921. The missionary and president of St John's University in Shanghai, Francis Lister Hawks Pott (1864-1947), wrote about the '"new thought" movement in China' in 1922.[280]

As Yeh Wen-hsin and Chen Pingyuan have argued, the avowed 'centre of the New Culture Movement' would secure prestigious positions in Chinese academia over the next few decades.[281] Hu Shi, for example, would become president of the Academia Sinica in 1958, and even ambassador of the Nationalist government to the US in 1938.[282] This enabled them to incorporate the New Culture Movement into intellectual and academic canons. Not only could they transmit their version of events to their students. Since success is often self-replicating, they were also asked to write memoirs, they were in a position to publish anthologies of their works, or their friends

[280] Hamilton, 'Religion and the New Culture Movement in China', 225; Hawks Pott, 'The Intellectual and Social Crisis in China', 291.
[281] Chen Pingyuan, '"Shaonian yiqi" yu "jiaguo qinghuai"', 7; Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 306.
[282] Lien, s.v. Hu Shih.

remembered May Fourth and the New Culture Movement in obituaries when they died.[283]

Although, as Rudolf Wagner has shown, the GMD had an ambiguous relationship to the Movement, it became part of the CCP's founding narrative.[284] After all, some of its official founders had negotiated the Movement in 1919, among them Chen Duxiu and, on a local level, Mao Zedong. To trace all these developments would be fascinating, but is beyond the scope of this thesis. At this point, however, I would like to conclude that, although the New Culture Movement was only of interest to a limited circle in the early 1920s, this circle occupied key positions in China's academia and politics. This may have contributed to the Movement's transformation into a canon and a standard narrative for 'Modern China.'

[283] Hu Shi published his *baihua* poems in a collection called *Experiments* (*Changshi ji* 嘗試集), for which he enlisted the prestigious help of people like Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren. See Chen, *Touches of History*, 275–77. Hu also published an *Autobiography at Forty* (*Sishi zi shu* 四十自述) in the 1930s and *Hu Shi's Spoken Autobiography* (*Hu Shi koushu zizhuan* 胡適口述自傳) in the 1950s. See Ibid., 314. Fu Sinian and Yu Pingbo were asked to write down their reminiscences of May Fourth and the New Culture Movement. See Chen Pingyuan, '"Shaonian yiqi" yu "jiaguo qinghuai"', 7. When Fu Sinian died in 1950, his friends published obituaries, in which they remembered the events of the 1910s. See, for example, Wu Ti, 'Yi Mengzhen'.

[284] On the GMD, see Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 108–109. On the CCP, see Ibid., 112–14; Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 175–78.

CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, I have examined the mechanisms through which a powerful narrative – the New Culture Movement – emerged in the year 1919. I have asked: Who or what drove the New Culture Movement and its rhetoric? How did the rhetorical cosmos it conjured up (keywords like '*baihua*,' stars like Hu Shi at its centre) emerge? How was it used? And what were its limits?

These questions were inspired by a number of tensions I have observed in contemporary opinion about the New Culture Movement. There was the conundrum that Hu Shi was the Movement's declared star, but that he nevertheless disliked the Movement. There was contemporaries' surprise that they did not doubt New Culture's connection to the political May Fourth, but that they could not put their finger on how they were connected. There was also the simultaneous omnipresence and absence of the New Culture Movement: it was debated in a broad range of documents, but was missing from even more. Led by these questions, I have explored academic and educational discourses, political activism and opinion as well as media coverage. In doing so, I have analysed a wide range of sources, including famous and lesser-known journals, newspapers, diaries, student essays, advertisements, telegrams, conference reports and personal letters.

Busting the Myth

The expression 'New Culture Movement' was invented in the late summer of 1919. Many elements that keep popping up in the various political, academic and popular narratives about the New Culture Movement until today were already present in the discourse about the Movement in 1919 and the early 1920s: the connection between

New Culture and the May Fourth protests; the claim that the New Culture Movement was driven by Beijing University's academics; the assertion that it was a 'movement' that swept away all of Chinese 'society.'

However, this network of association crumbles under closer scrutiny. It was a construct, shaped by newspaper stories and pragmatic intellectual marketing strategies. The New Culture Movement was, in fact, a buzzword, which intellectuals at the periphery used to market agendas they had supported long before its invention. Its evocation of May Fourth nationalism and star academics at now glamorous Beijing University made it a powerful buzzword. At the same time, only some agendas could be sold under it. Therefore it catalysed the plethora of intellectual programmes that had emerged since the 19th century and set the course for 20th-century China. The momentum in the New Culture Movement, however, came from intellectuals at the periphery, whose pragmatic marketing strategies were to shape China in the 20th century. In the following sections, I recapitulate my argument in more detail and elaborate on some of the broader themes to which it points.

A Buzzword

Over the course of the year 1919, the Jiangsu Educational Association promoted its educational agenda under three different headlines: In January 1919, the Association recommended it as the programme best suited for the end of World War I.[1] In September, it advertised it to the local government as a 'remedy' (*jiuji fangfa* 救濟方法, lit: 'a rescue method') against student demonstrations, such as those of May Fourth.[2] When addressing students in October 1919, the Association claimed that its agenda embodied the 'New Culture Movement,' and that this 'continued the May Fourth

[1] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Cheng jiaoyu zongzhang zuzhi Zhonghua xin jiaoyu she wen'.
[2] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Cheng Qi shengzhang chenshu taolun xuechao hou jiuji fangfa wen', 6.

Movement' (*jixu wu si yundong* 繼續五四運動).[3] The second and the third advertisements were obviously mutually contradictory.

Moreover, most people who negotiated the New Culture Movement advocated *baihua*. However, in 1920 Liu Boming, an intellectual opponent of Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, tried to argue that the New Culture Movement meant advocacy of *wenyan* rather than of *baihua*.[4] It is therefore clear that the New Culture Movement functioned as a buzzword, used by lesser-known individuals and groups like the Jiangsu Educational Association to market their own agendas under a snazzy name. After the label 'New Culture Movement' was created, these lesser-known intellectuals filled it with a lot of self-advertising rhetoric – including the aforementioned elements that have long shaped the narratives about the New Culture Movement. Rana Mitter has argued that the New Culture Movement was deployed as a brand name by political parties like the CCP in later years.[5] I have pushed this further and argued that this was already its usage in 1919, the year in which the expression 'New Culture Movement' was invented.

Framing the New Culture Movement as a label explains why it has proven so difficult to find a definition or a start and end date for it. As I have shown in the Introduction, a lot of scholarship has been applied to both efforts and many conflicting suggestions have been made. My conceptualisation of the New Culture Movement as a buzzword has shown that trying to define it misses the point. The designation 'New Culture Movement' was grafted retrospectively onto a variety of agendas. These agendas did therefore not have an overarching goal or a common birth date.

[3] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.
[4] Xi Ping, 'Duiyu "Liu Boming jun yanjiang xin wenhua yundong zhi yiyi ji biyao" de piping'.
[5] Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 22–23.

New Culture as a buzzword also points to academic and intellectual practices at the time. Instead of drawing a picture of visionary intellectuals who sought to save China in the 'traditionally Chinese' way through culture,[6] this thesis confirms a newer image of Republican intellectuals as pragmatic people. This image, advocated, for example, by Michael Gibbs Hill, suggests that intellectuals, then as now, were intent on promoting their agendas through clever marketing strategies.[7] In this way, this thesis contributes to shifting the image of academia and its inhabitants from an unworldly ivory tower to a busy, competitive place, in which the products sold are theoretical ideals and educational agendas.[8]

The Limits

I have not only explored the invention of the New Culture Movement as a buzzword, but I have also exposed its limits. The New Culture Movement was negotiated in a limited circle, which mostly consisted of intellectuals employed in the humanities, involved in education or in certain political interest groups. In business circles, for example, the New Culture Movement was hardly visible. The Movement's rhetoric, which claimed to possess the support of all of 'society,' has glossed over these limitations of the buzzword.[9]

The confinement to a small circle was favoured by the routes along which information about it was transmitted. On the one hand, these were personal networks, and even the most extended network is limited. I have shown this by the example of the American professor in Beijing, Lewis Chase. Chase probably met Hu Shi at a literary society,

[6] This has most famously been suggested by Lin, *The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness*.
[7] Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*
[8] This image of academia in the 21st century has been depicted in Billig, *Learn to Write Badly*, 12–39.
[9] Fu Sinian, for example, claimed that 'the mood of society, however, had hugely changed' in favour of the New Culture Movement. See Fu Sinian, '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan', 30 October 1919, 201.

introduced his Chinese students to Hu Shi's thoughts, informed fellow foreigners about them and finally even mentioned them in a lecture at a charitable society in California.

On the other hand, information could be transported through advertisements, and even this route fostered the formation of a limited discursive circle. To be sure, if the *New Tide* magazine was advertised on the front page of the *Shanghai News*, it had the potential to reach broad circles of people. However, although the *Shanghai News* was one of the biggest newspapers at the time, its readership was obviously limited to literate people. This effect was reinforced by a popular strategy of journals to sell advertising space on their pages at a discounted rate to likeminded magazines.[10] This directed readers of one journal to a set of congenial journals. Although readers therefore had a thorough knowledge of ideas circulating in the field, journals would not have extended their reach beyond this circle.

Some shrewd advertisers were aware of this situation and they exploited it to full advantage. The company Mingming Glasses advertised its spectacles in the school journal *McTyeirean* as being particularly 'sciency glasses' (*kexue xingzhi zhi yanjing* 科學性質之眼鏡 [lit. 'glasses of a scientific nature']).[11] By this, the company tapped of course into the New Culture craze around 'science.' Moreover, the publishing house Commercial Press promoted its books as 'dawn of the New Culture Movement' in the journal *Life at Beida*, which was run by members of Beijing University.[12] The magazines where these advertisements were placed suggest that these companies did not hope to sell their products to broader circles by calling them 'New Culture Movement.' They apparently expected to sell them better to the circle of students and intellectuals, which was of course the circle that cared about the Movement. In other

[10] 'Guanggao jiamu', 1 January 1919.
[11] 'Advertisement of Mingming Glasses'; 'Jingyi yanjing gongsi jin qi'.
[12] 'Xin wenhua zhi shuguang'.

words, the New Culture Movement was a buzzword with a limited reach, but it developed a certain attraction within its circle of advocates.

The Movement's limited reach begs the question why we still talk about it today. Why does it still appear on Sina Weibo, in the *People's Daily* and in Chinese Studies undergraduate curricula?[13] In other words, how did it enter the political and academic canon of 20th-century China? Rana Mitter, Rudolf Wagner, Lydia Liu, Yeh Wen-hsin, Chen Pingyuan and Yü Ying-shih have traced part of the Movement's journey in and into this canon. In the late 1930s, it became part of the founding narrative of the CCP.[14] At around the same time, anthologies of *baihua* literature were published.[15] Lu Xun was stylised as model author by the CCP in the 1940s, and particularly in the 1960s.[16] Hu Shi, Fu Sinian and Gu Jiegang became influential academics and thus had the opportunity to transmit their narrative of New Culture.[17] I have speculated that, although the circle of New Culture enthusiasts was small, it consisted of people who would become powerful in the ensuing decades. To examine how the New Culture Movement transformed from a buzzword with a limited reach into a part of a canon would be a fascinating topic for further research.

[13] For Sina Weibo, see Shexie xiaolang, 'Fuxi zhengzhi ...'; Laohu bu chi fanfan, 'Wu si yundong yihou …'. For the *People's Daily*, see Jin Chongji, 'Wu si yundong'.
[14] Wagner, 'The Canonization of May Fourth', 112; Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 175–78.
[15] Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 216.
[16] Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 201–203.
[17] Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 306; Chen Pingyuan, '"Shaonian yiqi" yu "jiaguo qinghuai"', 7; Chen, *Touches of History*, 175–76, 314.

Revealing New Things about 20th-Century China

Who Made the New Culture Movement? Agency and the Making of 20th-Century China

In this thesis, I have debunked the myth of the New Culture Movement by calling it a buzzword with a limited reach. As I recapitulate in the following sections, even some of the most central elements associated with it – its origin from Beijing University's star academics and its connection to May Fourth – were a construct. However, far from rendering the New Culture Movement meaningless, this argument says something deeper about the making and the study of this Movement, and, to a certain extent, of China in the 20th century.

One point it shows is how complex agency was in the New Culture Movement. The New Culture Movement was made by broad circles of intellectuals, not by a few key figures. Hu Shi disliked the New Culture Movement. He was reluctant to use the expression, and he agreed with Chen Duxiu that it was driven by 'society' (*shehui* 社會) and the media, not by him and his circle of likeminded associates.[18] This is not only surprising because, then as now, the New Culture Movement was associated with people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu.[19] Its invention had even brought them considerable fame.

In early 1919, Hu Shi's and Chen Duxiu's academic situation was precarious and they were constantly facing dismissal from Beijing University – Chen Duxiu was dismissed in April 1919.[20] They and a small circle of students and professors around them were embroiled in debates with opposing academics, a group of professors and students

[18] Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', April 1920; Chen Duxiu, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de zhu tongzhi'; Hu Shi, 'Xin sichao de yiyi'.
[19] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[20] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 64.

around Liu Shipei and Huang Kan. This debate was so theoretical that newspapers decided that this was the usual irrelevant ivory-tower nitpicking of yet another 'faction of learning' (*xuepai* 學派), of which China had seen many in its history. They labelled the circle around Hu Shi 'New Faction' (*xinpai* 新派), and the one around Liu Shipei 'Old Faction' (*jiupai* 舊派).[21] In April 1919, the *Shanghai News* even diagnosed that the 'Old Faction' had won the debate.[22]

After the emergence of the phrase 'New Culture Movement' in late summer of 1919, Hu Shi was turned into an intellectual star. Newspapers gossiped about him, students crowded into his lecture rooms, and he even received an audience with the Puyi Emperor.[23] People labelled as 'Old Faction' were condemned to academic obscurity. Nevertheless, Hu Shi complained about how his ideas were misunderstood.[24]

It appears indeed that the expression 'New Culture Movement' was coined by lesser-known intellectuals. One of its earliest mentions in writing was in the GMD journal *Weekly Review* (*Xingqi pinglun*) on 31 August 1919, and it subsequently appeared in many lesser-known journals. The famous 'New Culture' magazine *New Youth* only started using the phrase in December 1919 and only dedicated an article to the Movement in April 1920.[25] These intellectuals at the periphery then declared the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu to be 'centre' (*zhongxin* 中心) of the Movement.[26] But they only borrowed these stars' names and the vocabulary ('*baihua*') favoured by them to sell their own agendas better.

---

[21] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'; 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang'.
[22] Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing'.
[23] 'Chengzhong xiao zhi xin xun'; 'Xiju jia huanyan Hu Shizhi'; 'Hu Shi zuori di Hu'; Jing Guan, 'Dumen xuejie xiaoxi'; Johnston, *Twilight in the Forbidden City*, 275.
[24] Geng Yunzhi, *Hu Shi nianpu*, 87.
[25] Xian Jin, 'Xin wenhua yundong de wuqi'; Ouyang Junxi, 'Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong', 73; Chen Duxiu, 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme?', April 1920.
[26] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.

One result of this, which particularly dismayed Hu Shi and his friends, was a change in the arguments behind the use of *baihua*. Hu Shi and his circle had argued for *baihua* on the grounds that it was the language of the present times.[27] It was not, Beijing University's chancellor, Cai Yuanpei, had confirmed, the language of the people.[28] *Baihua* as the language of the people, however, was exactly what the majority of the New Culture activists found so promising.[29] By holding this opinion, they inscribed into the word '*baihua*' an agenda that had been supported for a long time (for example, by the Jiangsu Educational Association): namely, *guoyu*, a form of language that was designed to tear down the boundaries between common folk and elite. The shift was so powerful that even academic narratives regarded New Culture *baihua* as the language of the common people,[30] until this was challenged by people like Shi Shumei and Edward Gunn.[31] In other words, our picture of the New Culture Movement has been strongly shaped by the actors at the periphery, rather than by the avowed 'centre' of the New Culture Movement.

Decentring agency in the making of the New Culture Movement – away from a few star academics to a larger number of lesser-known intellectuals – indicates that more people than only a few key figures were involved in making contemporary China's founding myth. Since these people also promoted ideas that would become influential (Marxism, *guoyu* and so forth), this thesis also shows that more than a handful of historical stars were responsible for making Republican and 20th-century China. But it would also be wrong to write the 'centre' out of history. Reference to the star academics was central in making the buzzword 'New Culture Movement' powerful – at least this was the implicit

[27] Hu, 'Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature', 138.
[28] Cai Yuanpei, 'Da Lin Qinnan shu', 98–99. Fabio Lanza has translated this this as the 'language of those who pull carts or sell drinks in the capital.' See Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 96.
[29] 'Yanshuo jingjin hui yanti zhi jieshi'.
[30] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 79; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 1964, 178.
[31] Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese*, 217–296; Shi, *The Lure of the Modern*, 71.

opinion of people who put Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu at the centre. The New Culture Movement and China's 20th century were therefore created out of a complex interplay between centre and periphery, stars and lesser-known actors, and when exploring 20th-century China, all these groups need to be taken into account.

A Unique Mixture for 20th-Century China: Newspapers, New Culture and May Fourth

The New Culture Movement was not only invented out of complex and broad agency. Its invention also drew upon the (almost-)full register of Republican society: academia, education, the press, time-honoured academic practices (the classification of scholars into 'factions of learning'), urban associations, interaction with the West and politics. Some of these elements were specific to the early 20th century, some had a longer history in China – and it was out of this mixture that China's founding narrative 'New Culture Movement' and a few important elements of 20th-century China emerged. Although I have not employed the framework of 'modernity,' this observation also resounds with claims about a very specific 'multi-centred' modernity that developed in China.[32] The best example for this conglomeration of 'old' and 'new China' is the birth of one of the most central notions of the New Culture Movement: its connection to the political May Fourth protests.

This connection was down to a newspaper construction. It was in the second half of 1919 that the expression 'New Culture Movement' was invented and that the image of people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu changed. This timing suggests that the May Fourth demonstrations had something to do with it. Since in today's academic, popular and political discourse May Fourth and New Culture are often thought of as belonging

[32] This has, for example, been done in Wang, *Fin-de-Siècle Splendor*; Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*.

together, this seems unsurprising. However, this lack of surprise is the result of the discourse which was created by New Culture activists and which has so long shaped academic narratives about the Movement. I have used 'New Culture' to refer to cultural suggestions for the cluster around *baihua*, Marxism, opposition against Confucian morality and so on. By 'May Fourth,' I have pointed to the political demonstrations that started on 4 May 1919.

The most strident indication for the complexity of the relationship between May Fourth and New Culture was contemporary opinion. On the one hand, the circle around Hu Shi, the New Culture Movement and May Fourth were conflated into a powerful complex of themes. This happened when, for example, the Jiangsu Educational Association claimed that the 'New Culture Movement continues the May Fourth Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong shi jixu wu si yundong* 新文化運動是繼續五四運動),[33] and when attendees of one of Hu Shi's lectures called him the 'centre of the New Culture Movement' (*xin wenhua yundong de zhongxin* 新文化運動的中心).[34] On the other hand, contemporaries could not pin down where this connection between May Fourth and New Culture lay. *Guoyu* advocate Li Jinxi reported that he 'did not expect' (*bu liao* 不料) that political May Fourth would promote the cause of *guoyu*/ *baihua*.[35] The missionary-scholar and head of Yanjing University's history department Philippe de Vargas called the same phenomenon a 'historical puzzle.'[36]

The newspaper stories about 'factions of learning' at Beijing University were instrumental in merging the academic discourse with political activism, thereby giving glamour to Hu Shi's and Chen Duxiu's names and setting the parameters for the New

[33] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 'Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu', October 1919, 25.
[34] Ye Yun, 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu)'.
[35] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 137.
[36] de Vargas, 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)', 18.

Culture Movement with these academics at its 'centre.' I have shown this by the example of the *Shanghai News*. Following a time-honoured academic practice, the *Shanghai News* had compartmentalised the debating academics at Beijing University into fixed 'factions of learning.' It had then ascribed warlord-political allegiances to them – in a country where academia and politics had long been connected through the civil-service-examination system, this was maybe a fairly obvious thing to do. When, in February 1919, the veteran scholar and translator Lin Shu became involved in Beijing University's academic debates and took sides with people classified as 'Old Faction,' rumours started emerging. These rumours claimed that Lin Shu was mobilising his friends in the government to oust the 'New Faction' from Beijing University. The *Shanghai News* repeated these stories.

The alleged government involvement was seen as a sign of strength for the 'Old Faction' before the May Fourth demonstrations. It was for these reported political intrigues that the *Shanghai News* announced the end of the 'New Faction' in April 1919. However, during the May Fourth demonstrations, intellectuals in China's urban centres became increasingly hostile towards the government. The government was held responsible for the clause in the Treaty of Versailles that awarded the formerly German regions in Shandong province to Japan, which had caused the demonstrations. Being ascribed a government connection became now a liability for the circle around Liu Shipei. Being stylised as government victims simultaneously became an asset for people classified as 'New Faction,' and their ideas came to be regarded as expressions of anti-government sentiment.

In this way, Jing Guan, the young teacher in Shanghai, explained in 1920 that he had not demonstrated during May Fourth, but had followed Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu in discussing the 'question of the new woman' (*xin funü wenti* 新婦女問題) with some of

his colleagues.[37] This was as potent an anti-government protest as demonstrating in the streets would have been. Jing Guan and many like him then founded journals to support what they called Chen Duxiu's and Hu Shi's ideas. At some point in summer 1919, people started calling this 'New Culture Movement.'

This does not only show how the New Culture Movement and 20th-century China were born out of an amalgamation of elements specific to a – global – 20th century (newspapers) and of those originating in earlier centuries in China ('factions of learning'). It also says something about the long-standing debate about 'factions of learning' as real or constructed entities. I have shown that they were both constructed and real. As scholars like Benjamin Elman and Michael Gibbs Hill have pointed out, 'factions of learning' were not as clear-cut as their labelling suggests.[38] They could simply mean a 'shared a textual tradition,' geographical location, agreement on certain issues or personal acquaintance.[39] Sometimes a 'faction of learning' was, according to both Elman and Hill, a franchise like the New Culture Movement, designed to legitimise or polish up the image of a group of scholars.[40]

My discussion of the connection between May Fourth and New Culture has shown that a 'faction of learning' could indeed be a construction – in this case largely a media construction. However, as such it could develop a life of its own and gain very real meaning for people's individual careers and for the question of which phenomena ended up being regarded as historically important. Had Hu Shi's circle not been compartmentalised into a 'faction,' and had this 'faction' not been politically polarised, the academics of this circle may have never become associated with the May Fourth demonstrations.

---

[37] Jing Guan, 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi', 31–32.
[38] Elman, *Classicism, Politics, and Kinship*, 4; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 156–57.
[39] Elman, *Classicism, Politics, and Kinship*, 4.
[40] Ibid.; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 41–44.

The agents who undertook the construction – the newspapers – were, however, not entirely aware of the implications of their stories. This becomes most obvious from *Shanghai News*' diagnosis in April 1919 that the 'New Faction' had lost the debate against the rival 'Old Faction.'[41] The *Shanghai News* was drawing upon stories about 'factions' and political allegiances, which the paper itself was reporting. Nevertheless, it appeared unable to anticipate the life these stories would develop after May Fourth, a political event that was maybe not completely unforeseeable after the anti-Japanese demonstrations of 1918 and the long-standing nation-wide concern about the Treaty of Versailles.[42] In other words, newspapers had great power to shape realities. However, their writers and editors were not always cognisant of the implications their constructions would have.[43]

Future Research on the New Culture Movement

I have not only called the New Culture Movement a 'buzzword,' but also examined the mechanisms through which powerful labels can emerge in the intersections between media, academic discourse, political activism and intellectual marketing strategies. In tracing these mechanisms, however, there are still many things that are not yet well understood. Was the New Culture Movement negotiated differently in different regions? How was it transmitted from pragmatic and important players like the Jiangsu Educational Association to individuals like the young teacher in Shanghai Jing Guan? Did different New Culture keywords, such as 'Mr Science' and 'Mr Democracy,' have similar journeys as those of *baihua* and *guoyu*? Were other social circles that did not care about the New Culture Movement, such as the business community, still influenced indirectly by the buzzword? For example, the women in this community

[41] Xin Wei, 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing'.
[42] See, for example, 'Shandong wenti Zhong Ri huanwen zhi pilu'.
[43] I would like to thank Howard Goodman for his input on this issue.

were emancipated and Westernised. Did the emergence of the label 'New Culture Movement' make a difference for them? And, as mentioned before, how did the New Culture Movement become part of the evolving canon of 20th-century China? These are all important topics for future research. Through the example of the New Culture Movement, they would elucidate how powerful rhetoric is created and spread, and how it can shape people's lives.

How to Teach the New Culture Movement

Taking up the fact that the New Culture Movement is part and parcel of undergraduate curricula on 20th-century China, I would like to conclude this thesis by saying a few words about how the Movement should be taught in light of my new narrative. Instead of recounting the New Culture Movement as an inevitable culmination of long-standing, global trends towards modernity, I suggest teaching the New Culture Movement like this:

After the semi-colonisation in the 19th century, many social groups in China sought to find a solution to China's political and economic weakness. The intellectuals among these people turned to culture to find an answer. In this approach, they were supported by a time-honoured *topos* in China, which claimed that the political condition of a country was connected to its cultural situation. Consequently, broad reaches of literati created a plethora of new agendas and notions that competed with each other. Among these ideas were suggestions to introduce a national language (*guoyu*), to make education accessible to broad reaches of people not just to an elite (popular education), to write in a Westernised and up-to-date language (*baihua*), to write in a reformed *wenyan*, to give people a more practically oriented education (vocational education), to

reject Confucian values of morality, to embrace new political ideas (Marxism, anarchism) and so on.

Actors in the field were educational and intellectual groups who all tried to sell these ideas to the relevant authorities (the Ministry of Education, their peers and so on). For example, the intellectual Chen Duxiu founded the journal *New Youth* in 1915 to promote his ideas. In this journal, Hu Shi published his article 'Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature' which Chen Duxiu declared to be a 'literary revolution' (*wenxue geming* 文學革命), calling for the end of *wenyan* and for advocacy of *baihua*.[44] However, until 1919 none of these groups could gain the upper hand.

On occasion of protests against a clause in the Treaty of Versailles ('May Fourth'), a powerful franchise was created. This franchise fused together various facets of Republican society and evoked urgent and highly visible themes: newspaper gossip about victimised star academics, disillusionment with scheming politicians, quests for national salvation. Many intellectuals marketed their ideas as the 'New Culture Movement,' and as some of them could do so convincingly, the franchise 'New Culture Movement' had the power to catalyse and fuse together the competing agendas. In later years, the New Culture Movement was not only made into a founding narrative of 'Modern China.' Some of these themes (Marxism, emancipation of women, the modern Chinese language) are visible in China until the present day.

This brings me back to the question of the watershed narrative. I have demythologised the New Culture Movement and called it a buzzword, most of whose rhetoric was constructed rather than described. Nevertheless, as a buzzword, the New Culture Movement did facilitate shifts in the intellectual landscape of the Chinese humanities, politics and education: the CCP *was* founded at around that time; *guoyu was* introduced

[44] Chen Duxiu, 'Wenxue geming lun', 1.

into the curricula. Even though the New Culture Movement did not introduce these ideas, it catalysed them and made some more successful than others. This is not the only reason why calling the New Culture Movement a buzzword does not make it less important. I would further argue that my approach to the Movement increases its significance for our understanding of Republican China: it can be seen as microcosm for society at the time. It points to the pragmatic academic practices, the contributions of large reaches of society to the project '20th-century China,' to the power of buzzwords and rhetoric and to the fascinating mixture of 'old' and 'new,' 'Chinese' and 'global' that made China what it is today.

APPENDIX: 'HUMANITIES' IN 1919 AND THE DEPARTMENTS OF BEIJING UNIVERSITY

When the *Shanghai News* claimed in March 1919 that the 'factional' strife at Beijing University was strongest in the 'Humanities Department' (*wenke* 文科),[1] it must have meant a field of study similar to what we associate with the term today. In the West, the roots of the word and the concept of the 'humanities' go back to ancient Greece and Rome, and its meaning shifted over the centuries.[2]

In its current sense, it developed in the 19th century, when the humanities came to be seen in contrast to the natural sciences. At the time, Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911) and Heinrich Rickert (1863-1936) debated whether the 'humanities' should be defined by their subject or their method. Dilthey argued that the humanities were 'those areas of knowledge that lay outside of, and beyond, the subject matter of the physical sciences.' Heinrich Rickert claimed that the humanities had a specific 'method of investigation' that distinguished them from the 'physical sciences.' Since the application of the 'scientific method' (*kexue de fangfa* 科學的方法) was the declared goal of people involved in negotiating the New Culture Movement, Dilthey's definition is more apposite here.[3]

In 1919, Beijing University had a 'humanities department,' to which the *Shanghai News* referred in March of that year. At the time, Beijing University was organised into 'departments' (*ke* 科), whose precise arrangement kept changing. However, in 1909 there was the 'classics department' (*jingke* 經科), the aforementioned 'humanities

[1] Jing Guan, 'Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao'.
[2] *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v. Humanities.
[3] Ibid.; 'Fakanci', 1.

department' (*wenke* 文科), the 'medical department (*yike* 醫科), the 'department for the study of natural phenomena' (*gezhi ke* 格致科, renamed *like* 理科, 'science department,' in 1912), the 'engineering department' (*gongke* 工科) and the 'commerce department' (*shangke* 商科).[4]

Just like in today's universities, different schools classed different subjects under department names. According to Fabio Lanza, the humanities department at Beijing University consisted of 'Western philosophy, Chinese philosophy, English, and Chinese.' However, speaking more generally about humanities departments in China, Yeh Wen-hsin claimed that they could also include 'political science, education, journalism, business, and sociology.'[5]

When the *Shanghai News* was writing about the humanities department at Beijing University in early 1919, it was just being dissolved. The humanities, science and law departments (*fake* 法科) were replaced by 'faculties' (*xi* 系), because, according to Diana Lin and Fabio Lanza, Cai Yuanpei wanted to foster 'cross-disciplinary' learning.[6] It was on this occasion that Chen Duxiu was dismissed on 10 April 1919, because his position as 'dean of humanities' (*wenke xuezhang* 文科學長) no longer existed.[7]

Beijing University's new faculties were now the 'mathematics faculty' (*shuxue xi* 數學系), the 'physics faculty' (*wuli xue xi* 物理學系), the 'chemistry faculty' (*huaxue xi* 化學系), the 'geology faculty' (*dizhi xue xi* 地質學系), the 'history faculty' (*shixue xi* 史學系), the 'faculty for Chinese literature' (*Zhongguo wenxue xi* 中國文學系), the 'faculty for English literature' (*Yingguo wenxue xi* 英國文學系), the 'faculty for French

[4] 'Beida de yange', *Beida shenghuo*, 1.
[5] Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 81; Yeh, *The Alienated Academy*, 16.
[6] Lin, *Peking University*, 57; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 10.
[7] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu Nianpu*, 64.

literature' (*faguo wenxue xi* 法國文學系), the 'faculty for German literature' (*Deguo wenxue xi* 德國文學系), the 'faculty for Russian literature' (*E'guo wenxue xi* 俄國文學系), the 'economics faculty' (*jingji xue xi* 經濟學系), the 'politics faculty' (*zhengzhi xue xi* 政治學系) and 'law faculty' (*falü xue xi* 法律學系). These faculties were again arranged into 'groups' (*zu* 組). The various literature subjects (Chinese and foreign) were 'group 4,' law, politics and economics were 'group 5,' philosophy, education and psychology were 'group 3,' and physics, mathematics and astronomy were 'group 1.[8]

[8] 'Beida de yange', 1–2; 'Xueke he kecheng', *Beida shenghuo*, 13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[] An, ?安. ‘Shandong wenti zhi Beijing xiaoxi 山東問題之北京消息 (News from Beijing on the Shandong Question)’. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 25 April 1919.

Baidu baike, 百度百科. s.v. ‘Xin wenhua yundong 新文化運動 (The New Culture Movement)’. Accessed 2 December 2013. http://baike.baidu.com.

Beida shenghuo 北大生活 (*Life at Beida*). ‘Wu si yundong de shikuang 五四運動的實況 (The True Situation of the May Fourth Movement)’ (December 1921).

Beida shenghuo 北大生活 (*Life at Beida*). ‘Xin wenhua zhi shuguang 新文化之曙光 (The Dawn of New Culture)’ (December 1921).

Beida shenghuo 北大生活 (*Life at Beida*). ‘Xueke he kecheng 學科和課程 (Courses and Curricula)’ (December 1921): 13–18.

Bailey, Paul John. *Reform the People: Changing Attitudes towards Popular Education in Early Twentieth-Century China*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990.

Bao Yi, 抱一. ‘Wo duiyu baihua wenti de yijian 我對於白話文體的意見 (My Opinion on the *baihua* Style of Writing)’. *Dagongbao* 大公報 (*Impartial*). 12 July 1919.

Barlow, Tani E. *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.

———. ‘Zhishifenzi [Chinese Intellectuals] and Power’. *Dialectical Anthropology* 16, no. 3–4 (1991): 209–232.

Bastid, Marianne and Zhang, Jian. *Educational Reform in Early Twentieth-Century China*. Translated by Bailey, Paul John. Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1988.

Beida shenghuo 北大生活 (*Life at Beida*). ‘Beida de yange 北大的沿革 (The Evolution of Beida)’ (December 1921): 1–2.

‘Beida jianjie 北大簡介 (A Short Introduction to Beida)’. *Beijing daxue* 北京大學 (*Peking University*). Accessed 7 November 2013. http://www.pku.cn/about/bdjj.jsp.

Beida shenghuo 北大生活 (*Life at Beida*). ‘“Beida shenghuo” xiezhen ji 《北大生活》寫真集 (*Life at Beida*: A Collection of Portraits)’ (December 1921).

Bergère, Marie-Claire. *Sun Yat-Sen*. Paris: Fayard, 1994.

———. *Sun Yat-Sen*. Translated by Lloyd, Janet. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Bevan, Paul. ‘Paul Morand, the Chinese “New-Sensationists” and Pictorial Magazines’. Paper presented at the Chinese Studies Seminar Series, University of Oxford, 17 October 2013.

Bickers, Robert A. *Britain in China: Community, Culture and Colonialism 1900-1949*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

———. ‘Shanghailanders and Others’. In *Settlers and Expatriates: Britons over the Seas*, edited by Bickers, Robert A., 269–301. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Billig, Michael. *Learn to Write Badly: How to Succeed in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Bol, Peter K. *This Culture of Ours: Intellectual Transitions in Tʿang and Sung China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Boorman, Howard L. s.v. ‘Fu Ssu-nien’. *Biographical Dictionary of Republican China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
———. s.v. ‘Hu Shih’. *Biographical Dictionary of Republican China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
———. s.v. ‘Lin Shu’. *Biographical Dictionary of Republican China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
———. s.v. ‘Ts’ai Yuan-p’ei’. *Biographical Dictionary of Republican China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
Bowles, David. ‘Finding the Way: The Nationalist Party Appropriation of Confucius and the Challenges of Revolutionary Traditionalism in China, 1919–1934’. PhD. University of Oxford, 2013.
Brockliss, L. W. B. and Sheldon, Nicola. *Mass Education and the Limits of State Building, c.1870-1930*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
Cai Dun, 蔡惇. ‘Zhu Jingnong xiansheng yanjiang jilu 朱經農先生演講紀錄 (A Record of Mr Zhu Jingnong’s Lecture)’. *Jiangsu shengli di er nüzi shifan xuexiao xiaoyou hui huikan* 江蘇省立第二女子師範學校校友會彙刊 (*Alumnae of the Second Women’s Normal School of Jiangsu Province*) no. 16 (November 1923): 6–13 (Section: Jiaoyu 教育 [Education]).
Cai Yuanpei, 蔡元培. *Cai Yuanpei riji* 蔡元培日記 (*Cai Yuanpei’s Diary*). Edited by Wang Shiru, 王世儒. Vol. 1. Beijing: Beijing daxue chuban she, 2010.
———. ‘Da Lin Qinnan shu 答林琴南書 (Reply to Lin Qinnan)’. In *Wu si yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji* 五四運動在上海史料選輯 (*The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: A Selection of Historical Materials*), edited by Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiu suo, 上海社會學院歷史研究所, 95–100. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chuban she, 1980.
———. ‘Fu Zhang Liaozi han 復張繆子函 (Reply to Zhang Liaozi)’. In *Cai Yuanpei xiansheng quanji* 蔡元培先生全集 (*Collected Works of Mr Cai Yuanpei*), edited by Sun Changwei, 孫常煒, 1093. Taibei: Taiwan shangwu yinshu guan, 1968.
———. ‘Qunian wuyue si ri yilai de huigu yu jinhou de xiwang 去年五月四日以來的回顧與今後的希望 (A Review of [Events] since 4 May of Last Year and Hopes For the Future)’. In *Minguo shiqi mingren tan wu si: lishi jiyi yu lishi jieshi* 民國時期名人談五四：歷史記憶與歷史解釋（1919-1949） (*Famous People of the Republican Period Talk about May Fourth: Historical Reminiscences and Historical Explanations*), edited by Yang Hu, 楊琥, 90–91. Fuzhou: Fujian jiaoyu chuban she, 2011.
———. ‘Wo zai Beijing daxue de jingli 我在北京大學的經歷 (My Experiences at Beijing University)’. In *Gongyuan 1919 wangshi huishou: jinian wu si yundong jiu shi zhounian* 公元 1919 往事回首：纪念五四运动九十周年 (*Turning Back to Past Events of 1919: Recollections of May Fourth [on Occasion of] its 90th Anniversary*), edited by Hu Xiaowei, 胡晓玮, 153–160. Beijing: Zhongguo huaqiao chubanhe, 2009.
Cai Zhiguang, 柴志光 and Xie Zewei, 謝澤為. *Pudong mingren shujian baitong* 浦東名人書簡百通 (*Collection of Letters by Famous People of Pudong*). Shanghai: Shanghai yuandong chuban she, 2010.
Carter, James Hugh. *Creating a Chinese Harbin: Nationalism in an International City, 1916-1932*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Cha An, 嘗盦, ed. *Xuejie fengchao ji* 學界風潮紀 (*Chronicle of the Student Protests*). Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1919.

Chang, Tuh Wei. 'Letter to Emma Lester', 15 December 1931. Container 214. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Chang Ying-shu, 張瑩書. 'Is a Knowledge of Ancient Greek and Roman Literature such as Indicated by Dr Zucker's Book of Interest to You Either Personally or as Chinese?' Student essay. Beijing, n.d. Container 220. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Chao, Hsi Yü. 'China Now and England in the 19th Century'. Student essay. Beijing, 6 December 1922. Container 216. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Chao, Yuen Ren. *Aspects of Chinese Sociolinguistics: Essays*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1976.

Chase, Lewis Nathaniel. 'Letter to E. Margaret Phillips', 3 September 1923. Container 191. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to E.A. Chase', 19 November 1922. Container 171. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to E.A. Chase', 3 December 1922. Container 171. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to E.A. Chase', 1 May 1923. Container 171. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to E.A. Chase', 17 June 1923. Container 171. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to E.H. Cressy', 26 March 1925. Container 222. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to Family', 16 October 1921. Container 171. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to Family', 16 December 1921. Container 171. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to Frank Chase', 1 May 1922. Container 173. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to Frank Chase', 4 June 1925. Container 191. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to Pearl Adell Chase', 23 July 1925. Container 205. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Letter to Shurman', 2 June 1924. Container 222. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'My Ignorance of China'. Lecture notes. El Centro, California, 5 November 1925. Container 216. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'The Theory of Chinese Marriage'. Beijing, n.d. Container 221. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Western Classics for Chinese Students: Appreciation of Ancient Greece by Chinese May Lead to Single World Civilization'. Beijing, 1923. Container 220. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Chase, Lewis Nathaniel (柴義思). 'Xifang wenxue jiezhu: wei Zhongguo xuesheng xuan de 西方文學傑著：為中國學生選的 (Classics of Western Literature: Chosen for Chinese Students)'. Translated by Shao Ming, 紹明. *Yanda zhoukan* 燕大周刊 (*The Yen Ching Students' Weekly*). 10 November 1923. Container 220. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Chase, Lewis Nathaniel and et al. 'Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers'. Manuscript Collection, 1947 1836. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Chen Daqi, 陳大齊. 'Gonghe xinxi 恭賀新禧 (Happy New Year)'. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*) 6, no. 1 (15 January 1919): 1–5.

Chen Duxiu, 陳獨秀. 'Gao xin wenhua yundong de zhu tongzhi 告新文化運動的諸同志 (To All the Comrades of the New Culture Movement)'. In *Cai Yuanpei, Chen Duxiu, Hu Shi* 蔡元培、陳獨秀、胡適 (*Cai Yuanpei, Chen Duxiu, Hu Shi*), edited by Gong Haiyan, 龔海燕, 14:224–29. Shanghai: Shanghai wenyi chuban she, 2010.

———. 'Hu Shi jun wenxue gailiang chuyi 胡適君文學改良芻議 (Mr Hu Shi's "Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature")'. *Tongsu zhoubao* 通俗周報 (*Popular Newspaper Weekly*). 10 April 1917.

———. 'Jinri zhi jiaoyu fangzhen 今日之教育方針 (Contemporary Guiding Principles in Education)'. *Qingnian zazhi* 青年雜誌 (*Youth Magazine*) 1, no. 2 (15 October 1915): 113–18.

———. 'Lin Shu de liusheng jiqi 林紓的留聲機器 (Lin Shu's Mouthpiece)'. In *Duxiu wencun* 獨秀文存 (*Selected Works of Duxiu*), edited by Wang Guangquan, 王觀泉, 192. Guiyang: Guizhou jiaoyu chuban she, 2005.

———. 'Tigao yu puji 提高與普及 (Enhancement and Popularisation)'. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*) 8, no. 4 (1920): 5–6.

———. 'Wenxue geming lun 文學革命論 (A Discussion of Literary Reform)'. Edited by Chen Duxiu, 陳獨秀. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*) 2, no. 6 (February 1917): 1–4.

———. , ed. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*). Vol. 6. 14 vols. Tokyo: Taian, 1963.

———. 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme? 新文化運動是什麼？ (What is the New Culture Movement?)'. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*) 7, no. 5 (April 1920): 1–6.

———. 'Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme? 新文化運動是什麼？ (What is the New Culture Movement?)'. In *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*), edited by Chen Duxiu, 陳獨秀, 8:697–702. Tokyo: Taian, 1963.

Chen, Joseph T. *The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: The Making of a Social Movement in Modern China*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Chen, L.Y. 'Letter to Lewis Chase', 1923. Container 216. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Chen Mian, 陳勉. 'Jin Xinyi de laili 金心異的來歷 (The Origins of Jin Xinyi)'. *Yu wen xuekan* 語文學刊 (*Journal of Chinese*) no. 1 (1986): 1.

Chen, Nai Yi. 'China Now and England in the 19th Century'. Student essay. Beijing, 6 December 1922. Container 216. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Chen, Ping. *Modern Chinese: History and Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Chen, Pingyuan. *Touches of History: An Entry into 'May Fourth' China*. Translated by Hockx, Michel. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Chen Pingyuan, 陳平原. '"Shaonian yiqi" yu "jiaguo qinghuai" – Beida xuesheng de "wu si" jiyi 少年意氣'與'家國情懷——北大學生的"五四"記憶 ("Youthful Impulse" and "Patriotic Feelings" – Beida Students Remember May Fourth)'. Paper presented at the Guangming jiangtan 光明講壇 (Guangming Forum), Beijing University, 29 April 2012.

———. *Zhongguo xiandai xueshu zhi jianli: yi Zhang Taiyan, Hu Shi wei zhongxin* 中國現代學術之建立：以章太炎、胡適為中心 (*The Establishment of Modern Chinese Scholarship: With a Focus on Zhang Taiyan and Hu Shi*). Beijing: Beijing daxue chuban she, 2010.

Chen Qi, 陳奇. *Liu Shipei nianpu changbian* 劉師培年譜長編 (*A Comprehensive Chronology of the Life of Liu Shipei*). Guiyang: Guizhou renmin chuban she, 2007.

Chen Shuping, 陳樹萍. *Bei xin shuju yu Zhongguo xiandai wenxue* 北新書局與中國現代文學 (*New Northern Press and China's Contemporary Literature*). Shanghai: Shanghai sanlin wenhua chuanbo youxian gongsi, 2008.

Chen Sihe, 陳思和. 'Xu Shuzheng yu xin wenhua yundong 徐樹錚與新文化運動 (Xu Shuzheng and the New Culture Movement)'. *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue yanjiu congkan* 中國現代文學叢刊 (*Studies on Modern Chinese Literature*) no. 3 (1996): 272–287.

Chen, Tung-yuan. 'Chinese Marriage System: Its Custom, Reforms and Injurious Effects'. *The Peking Leader*. n.d. Container 222. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Chen Weiping, 陳偉平. '"Wu si" xin wenhua yundong zhong de jinhualun "五四"新文化運動中的進化論 (Evolutionism in the New Culture Movement of "May Fourth")'. *Zhexue yanjiu* 哲學研究 (*Philosophical Research*) no. 4 (1996): 11–17.

Chen, Zhongping. 'The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords: A Reexamination'. *Modern China* 37, no. 2 (March 2011): 135–169.

Chen Zhuyun, 陳竹筠, Xu Jilin, 許紀霖 and Chen Qicheng, 陳起誠. s.v. 'Huang Yanpei 黃炎培 (Huang Yanpei)'. Edited by Hu Hua, 胡華. *Zhong gongdang shi renwu zhuan* 中共黨史人物傳 (*Biography of Personages in CCP History*). Xi'an: Shaanxi renmin chuban she, 1988.

Chou, Eva Shan. 'Learning to Read Lu Xun, 1918-1923: The Emergence of a Readership'. *The China Quarterly* 172 (December 2002): 1042–1064.

Chow, Tse-tsung. s.v. 'Chen Duxiu'. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, 2014. Accessed 6 June 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/109115/Chen-Duxiu.

———. *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.

———. *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1967.

Clifford, Nicholas Rowland. *Spoilt Children of Empire: Westerners in Shanghai and the Chinese Revolution of the 1920s*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1991.

Cohen, Paul A. *Discovering History in China: American Historical Writing on the Recent Chinese Past*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Colbert, John W. 'Journey on the Yangtze', n.d. Container 2. John W. Colbert Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Culp, Robert. 'Review of *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education, 1895-1919*, by Elisabeth Kaske'. *The China Journal* no. 62 (July 2009): 248–250.

Dagongbao 大公報 (*Impartial*). 'Beijing jiaoyu jie xiaoxi xu wen 北京教育界消息續聞 (News about Academia in Beijing, Part Two)'. 20 May 1919.

Dagongbao 大公報 (*Impartial*). 'Ge xiao xiaozhang zhi jianjue 各校校長之堅決 (The Determination of the Principals of All Schools)'. 10 May 1919.

Dagongbao 大公報 (*Impartial*). 'Jiaoyu zongzhang zhi zhulu 教育総長之逐鹿 (The Minister of Education's Bid for Power)'. 20 May 1919.

Dagongbao 大公報 (*Impartial*). 'Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti: Beijing daxue xiaozhang chuzou 京學界又發生大問題：北京大學校長出走 (Big Problem Happens Again in Beijing's Academia: The Chancellor of Beijing University Walks Out)'. 15 May 1919.

Dagongbao 大公報 (*Impartial*). 'Xu Shuzheng fandui jujue qianzi 徐樹錚反對拒絕簽字 (Xu Shuzheng against the Refusal to Sign the Treaty)'. 11 July 1919.

Dai Junliang, 戴均良, Liu Baoquan, 劉保全 and Zou Yilin, 鄒逸麟, eds. s.v. 'Zhili 直隸 (Zhili)'. *Zhongguo gu jin diming da cidian* 中國古今地名大詞典 (*Great Dictionary of Chinese Place Names in Past and Present*). Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chuban she, 2010.

Dai Xian, 呆僊. 'Shangye xuesheng di er ji bianyan 商業學生第二集弁言 (Foreword to the Second Issue of *Commercial Student*)'. *Shangye xuesheng* 商業學生 (*The Commercial Student*) no. 2 (December 1919): 1–3 (Section: bianji yu mo 編輯餘墨 [The Editors' Remaining Ink]).

Dai Yi, 戴逸. 'Ershi shiji Zhongguo xueshu gailun 二十世紀中國學術概論 (Chinese Scholarship in the Twentieth Century)'. In *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan* 傅斯年學術思想評傳 (*A Critical Biography of the Scholarship and Thought of Fu Sinian*), by Li Quan, 李泉著, 1–6. Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chuban she, 1999.

Daruvala, Susan. *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000.

Davies, Gloria. *Lu Xun's Revolution: Writing in a Time of Violence*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2013.

De Vargas, Philippe. *Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance*. Shanghai, 1922.

———. 'Some Elements in the Chinese Renaissance (Manuscript)'. Beijing, 15 February 1922. Container 221. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DeFrancis, John. *Nationalism and Language Reform in China*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, 2004.

Doleželová-Velingerová, Milena and Král, Oldřich, eds. *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

Doleželová-Velingerová, Milena and Wang, David Der-wei. 'Introduction'. In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, edited by

Doleželová-Velingerová, Milena and Král, Oldřich, 1–27. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

Dong Baoliang, 董寶良 and Zhou Hongyu, 周洪宇. *Zhongguo jin xiandai jiaoyu sichao yu liupai* 中國近現代教育思潮與流派 (*Intellectual Tides and Schools in Education in China's Modern and Contemporary Period*). Beijing: Renmin jiaoyu chuban she, 1997.

Dong Shaoke, 董紹克 and Yan Junjie, 閻俊傑, eds. s.v. 'Li Shan 李善 (Li Shan)'. *Hanyu zhishi cidian* 漢語知識詞典 (*Chinese Dictionary of Knowledge*). Beijing: Jingguan jiaoyu chuban she, 1996.

Dongfang zazhi 東方雜誌 (*Eastern Miscellany*). 'Zhonghua zhiye jiaoyu she xuanyan shu 中華職業教育社宣言書 (Manifesto of the Chinese Society for Vocational Education)' 14, no. 7 (1917): 163–169.

Dryburgh, Marjorie. 'The Fugitive Self: Writing Zheng Xiaoxu, 1882-1938'. In *Writing Lives in China, 1600-2010: Histories of the Elusive Self*, edited by Dryburgh, Marjorie and Dauncey, Sarah, 110–132. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Duan Huaiqing, 段懷清. *Baibide yu Zhongguo wenhua* 白璧德與中國文化 (*Babbitt and Chinese Culture*). Beijing: Shoudu shifan daxue chuban she, 2006.

Duara, Prasenjit. *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Duignan, Brian. s.v. 'Postmodernism'. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, 2014. Accessed 25 February 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/1077292/postmodernism.

Egan, Susan Chan. *A Latterday Confucian: Reminiscences of William Hung (1893-1980)*. Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1987.

Eglauer, Martina. *Wissenschaft als Chance: das Wissenschaftsverständnis des chinesischen Philosophen Hu Shi (1891-1962) unter dem Einfluss von John Deweys (1859-1952) Pragmatismus (Science as an Opportunity: The Understanding of Science of the Chinese Philosopher Hu Shi [1891-1962] under the Influence of John Dewey's [1859-1952] Pragmatism)*. Münchener ostasiatische Studien 79. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001.

Elman, Benjamin A. *Classicism, Politics, and Kinship: The Ch'ang-Chou School of New Text Confucianism in Late Imperial China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

———. *From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China*. Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1984.

———. 'Review of *The Power of Position: Beijing University, Intellectuals and Chinese Political Culture 1898-1929*, by Timothy B. Weston'. *The China Quarterly* no. 179 (September 2004): 841–43.

Emmerich, Reinhard. *Chinesische Literaturgeschichte (A History of Chinese Literature)*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2004.

Encyclopædia Britannica Online. s.v. 'A Doll's House'. Accessed 26 March 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/168294/A-Dolls-House.

———. s.v. 'Cai Yuanpei'. Accessed 21 March 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/607574/Cai-Yuanpei.

———. s.v. 'Daxue (Confucian text)'. Accessed 18 December 2013. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/579524/Daxue.

———. s.v. ‘Duan Qirui’. Accessed 19 October 2013. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/608084/Duan-Qirui.
———. s.v. ‘Humanities’. Accessed 25 February 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/276026/humanities.
———. s.v. ‘May Fourth Movement’. Accessed 3 February 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/370739/May-Fourth-Movement.
———. s.v. ‘Paris Peace Conference’. Accessed 23 October 2013. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/443901/Paris-Peace-Conference.
———. s.v. ‘Zhang Binglin’. Accessed 26 March 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/105615/Zhang-Binglin.
Fraser, Donald. ‘Letter to Lewis Chase’, February 1923. Container 187. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
———. ‘Letter to Lewis Chase’, November 1923. Container 187. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
French, Paul. *Carl Crow – A Tough Old China Hand: The Life, Times, and Adventures of an American in Shanghai*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2006.
Fu Dehua, 傅德華, Pang Rongdi, 龐榮棣 and Yang Jiguang, 楊繼光, eds. *Shi Liangcai yu ‘Shenbao’ de fazhan* 史量才與《申報》的發展 (*Shi Liangcai and the Development of the Shanghai News*). Shanghai: Fudan daxue chuban she, 2013.
Fu Sinian, 傅斯年. ‘Duiyu Zhongguo jinri tan zhexue zhe zhi gannian 對於中國今日談哲學者之感念 (Feelings on people who talk about philosophy in China today)’. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 4:1250–257. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.
———. ‘Gushu xin ping 故書新評 (A Re-evaluation of Old Books)’. In *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*), 1:145. Beijing, 2006.
———. ‘Hanyu gaiyong pinyin wenzi de chubu tan 漢語改用拼音文字的初步談 (Abandoning Characters in Favour of Pinyin in Chinese: A Preliminary Discussion)’. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 4:1138–165. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.
———. ‘Mao Zishui “Guogu he kexue de jingshen” shiyu 毛子水《國故和科學的精神》識語 (Editor’s Note on Mao Zishui’s “The National Heritage and the Scientific Spirit”)’. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 4:1258–259. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.
———. ‘Wen yan heyi caoyi 文言合一草議 (The Integration of Written and Spoken Language)’. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 4:1065–1074. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.
———. ‘Wenxue gexin shenyi 文學革新申義 (And Explanation of the Reform of Literature)’. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 4:1051–1064. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.
———. ‘Xiju gailiang gemian guan 戲劇改良各面觀 (A Comprehensive View of the Reform of Drama)’. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 4:1075–1097. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.
———. ‘Xinchao fakan zhiqu shu 《新潮》發刊旨趣書 (Aims behind the Publication of *New Tide*)’. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 4:1397–1401. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.

———. '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan 《新潮》之回顧與前瞻 (*New Tide*: Looking Back and Looking Ahead.)'. In *Wu si yundong huiyi lu* 五四運動回憶錄 (*Records of Memories of the May Fourth Movement*), edited by Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 中國社會科學院近代史研究所, 171–76. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chuban she, 1979.

———. '"Xinchao" zhi huigu yu qianzhan 《新潮》之回顧與前瞻 (*New Tide*: Looking Back and Looking Ahead)'. *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*) 2, no. 1 (30 October 1919): 199–205.

———. 'Yi shu ganyan 譯書感言 (Reflections on Translating Books)'. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 4:1166–175. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.

———. 'Zenyang zuo baihua wen 怎樣做白話文 (How to Write *baihua* Texts)'. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 44:1119–135. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.

———. 'Zhongguo lishi fenqi zhi yanjiu 中國歷史分期之研究 (Research on the Periodization of Chinese History)'. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 4:1224–233. Taibei, 1980.

———. 'Zhongguo xueshu sixiang jie zhi jiben wumiu 中國學術思想界之基本誤謬 (The Fundamental Faults of Chinese Scholarship and Thought)'. In *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集 (*Collected Works of Fu Sinian*), 1213–223. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.

Furth, Charlotte and Alitto, Guy, eds. *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Gao Pingshu, 高平叔. *Cai Yuanpei nianpu changbian* 蔡元培年譜長編 (*A Comprehensive Chronology of the Life of Cai Yuanpei*). Vol. 2 (1917–1926). Beijing: Renmin jiaoyu chuban she, 1996.

Gao yu xin wonder, 高宇昕 wonder. 'Xin wenhua yundong shide Zhongguo wenxue gu jin fenlie … 新文化運動使得中國文學古今分裂 …… (The New Culture Movement Led to a Rupture between Old and New in Chinese Literature …)'. *Xinlang weibo* 新浪微博 (*Sina Weibo*) (microblog), 12 October 2012. Accessed 26 February 2014. http://www.weibo.com.

Gao Yun, 高雲. s.v. 'Zhou Zuoren 周作人 (Zhou Zuoren)'. Edited by Xu Naixiang, 徐迺翔, Lu Rongchun, 陸榮椿, and Lan Dizhi, 藍棣之. *Zhongguo xiandai zuojia pingzhuan* 中國現代作家評傳 (*A Critical Biography of Contemporary Chinese Authors*). Jinan: Shandong jiaoyu chuban she, 1986.

Ge Wujue, 戈悟覺. *Shiguang you sheng* 時光有聲 (*Time Has a Voice*). Beijing: Zhongguo qingnian chuban she, 2011.

Geng Yunzhi, 耿雲志. *Hu Shi nianpu* 胡適年譜 (*A Chronology of Hu Shi's Life*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 1989.

Gernand, Bradley E. 'Biographical and Organizational Note: John W. Colbert'. *A Finding Aid to the Collection in the Library of Congress*, 2008. Accessed 25 July 2014. http://findingaids.loc.gov.

Goette, J.A. 'Letter to Lewis Chase', 1923. Container 187. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Beijing xuejie da fengchao xu zhi 北京學界大風潮續誌 (Continuing Record of the Great Student Protests in Beijing)'. 6 May 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Cai Yuanpei han ci hui Jing 蔡元培函辭回京 (Letter from Cai Yuanpei Saying He Will Return to Beijing)'. 31 May 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Cai Yuanpei zhi lai dian yu xuejie fengchao 蔡元培之來電與學界風潮 (Telegram from Cai Yuanpei and the Student Protests)'. 21 May 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Cai Yuanpei zhi xingxing zhizhi 蔡元培之行行止止 (The Whereabouts of Cai Yuanpei)'. 28 May 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Cai Zimin dumen yangke 蔡子民杜門養疴 (Cai Yuanpei Stays at Home to Cure His Illness)'. 20 June 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Cai Zimin zai Hang zhi tanhua 蔡子民在杭之譚話 (Talks with Cai Zimin in Hangzhou)'. 17 June 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Cai Zimin zhen huan shenjingbing ye 蔡子民真患神經病耶 (Does Cai Zimin Really Suffer from Neurosis?)'. 26 June 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Guanyu Beijing daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi suo wen 關於北京大學校長問題之所聞 ([The Things One] Hears about the Question of Beijing University's Chancellor)'. 21 June 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang 請看北京學界思想潮變迁之近状 (Let's Have a Look at the Recent Changes in Intellectual Trends in Beijing's Academia)'. 18 March 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Xuejie fengchao you qi 學生界風潮又起 (The Student Protests Flare Up Again)'. 10 May 1919.

Gongyanbao 公言報 (*The Public Voice*). 'Xuejie fengchao zhi yubo 學界風潮之餘波 (Repercussions of the Student Protests)'. 9 May 1919.

Goodman, Bryna. *Native Place, City, and Nation: Regional Networks and Identities in Shanghai, 1853-1937*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Graham, A.C., trans. 'Jing shang 經上 (Canon I)'. Database. *Chinese Text Project*, 2006. Accessed 5 June 2012. http://ctext.org.

Graham, A.C. *Later Mohist Logic, Ethics, and Science*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1978.

Grieder, Jerome B. *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance: Liberalism in the Chinese Revolution, 1917-1937*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Gu Xiuqing, 谷秀青. *Qing mo Min chu Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yanjiu* 清末民初江蘇省教育會研究 (*A Study of the Jiangsu Education Association in the Late Qing and Early Republic*). Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chuban she, 2009.

'Gudai hanyu cidian' bianxie zu, 《古代漢語詞典》編寫組. s.v. 'Hui 會 (Can, Meeting, Etc.)'. *Gudai hanyu cidian: suoyin ben* 古代漢語詞典：縮印本 (*A Dictionary of Classical Chinese: Short Version*). Beijing: Shangwu yinshu guan, 2007.

Gunn, Edward M. *Rewriting Chinese: Style and Innovation in Twentieth-Century Chinese Prose*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Guo Fengqi, 郭鳳歧 and He Huanzhen, 何煥臻, eds. s.v. 'Fu Zengxiang 傅增湘 (Fu Zengxiang)'. *Zhiming renwu 100 wei* 知名人物 100 位 (*100 Famous People*). Tianjin: Tianjin guji chuban she, 2009.

Guogu yuekan she, 國故月刊社. ‘Guogu yuekan she zhi Gongyanbao han 國故月刊社致公言報函 (A Letter from the National Heritage Society to the *Public Voice*)’. *Beijing daxue rikan* 北京大學日刊 (*The Beijing University Daily*). 24 March 1919.

Guogu 國故 (*National Heritage*). ‘Advertisement for *Citizen*’ no. 1 (20 March 1919).

Guogu 國故 (*National Heritage*). ‘Advertisement for the *Mathematical Journal*’ no. 1 (20 March 1919).

Guogu 國故 (*National Heritage*). ‘Ben she jishi lu 本社記事錄 (Records of This Society)’ no. 1 (1919).

Guogu 國故 (*National Heritage*). ‘Copyright Page’ no. 1 (20 March 1919).

Guogu 國故 (*National Heritage*). ‘Guanggao jiamu 廣告價目 (Price List for Advertisements)’ no. 1 (20 March 1919).

Guogu 國故 (*National Heritage*). ‘Guogu yuekan sheyuan lu 國故月刊社員錄 (Members of the National Heritage Society)’ no. 1 (20 March 1919).

Guoli Taiwan daxue jinian Fu gu xiaozhang choubei weiyuanhui aiwan lu bianyin xiaozu, 國立臺灣大學紀念傅故校長籌備委員會哀輓錄編印小組. *Fu gu xiaozhang aiwan lu* 傅故校長哀輓錄 (*Obituaries of the Late Principal Fu*). Taibei: Guoli Taiwan daxue, 1951.

Hamilton, Clarence H. ‘Religion and the New Culture Movement in China’. *The Journal of Religion* 1, no. 3 (May 1921): 225–232.

Hammerstrom, Erik J. ‘Buddhists Discuss Science in Modern China (1895-1949)’. PhD, Indiana University, 2010.

Hanyu da cidian bianji weiyuan hui, 漢語大詞典編輯委員會 and Luo Zhufeng, 羅竹風, eds. s.v. ‘Gu 古 (Old)’. *Hanyu da cidian* 漢語大詞典 (*Great Chinese Dictionary*). Shanghai: Hanyu da cidian chuban she, 2001.

———. , eds. s.v. ‘Jiu 舊 (Old)’. *Hanyu da cidian* 漢語大詞典 (*Great Chinese Dictionary*). Shanghai: Hanyu da cidian chuban she, 2001.

———. , eds. s.v. ‘Wenhua 文化 (Culture)’. *Hanyu da cidian* 漢語大詞典 (*Great Chinese Dictionary*). Shanghai: Hanyu da cidian chuban she, 2001.

Harrison, Henrietta. ‘Newspapers and Nationalism in Rural China 1890-1929’. *Past & Present* no. 166 (February 2000): 181–204.

———. *The Making of the Republican Citizen: Political Ceremonies and Symbols in China 1911-1929*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Hawks Pott, F.L. ‘The Intellectual and Social Crisis in China’. *The Journal of Religion* 2, no. 3 (May 1922): 291–302.

Hill, Michael Gibbs. *Lin Shu, Inc.: Translation and the Making of Modern Chinese Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Holmes, Ros. ‘Pillars of Fat: The Corporeal Aesthetics of Civilization (Wenming) in Contemporary Art’. *The China Journal* no. 72 (July 2014): 121–138.

———. ‘Pillars of Fat: The Corporeal Aesthetics of Wenming in Contemporary Art’. Lecture presented at the Chinese Studies Seminar Series, University of Oxford, 21 November 2013.

Hsi, Chen. ‘Is a Knowledge of Ancient Greek and Roman Literature such as Indicated by Dr Zucker’s Book of Interest to You Either Personally or as Chinese?’ Student essay. Beijing, n.d. Container 220. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Hu, Shi. ‘Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature’. In *Modern Chinese Literary Thought: Writings on Literature, 1893-1945*, edited and translated by Denton, Kirk A., 123–139. Stanford, 1996.

———. ‘The Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China’. PhD, Columbia University, 1922.

Hu Shi, 胡適. *Hu Shi de riji* 胡適的日記 (*The Diary of Hu Shi*). Edited by Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindai shi yanjiu suo Zhonghua minguo shi yanjiu shi, 中國社會科學院近代史研究所中華民國史研究室. Vol. 1. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985.

———. *Hu Shi riji quanbian* 胡適日記全編 (*Complete Edition of Hu Shi’s Diaries*). Edited by Cao Boyan, 曹伯言. Vol. 8. Hefei: Anhui jiaoyu chuban she, 2001.

———. *Hu Shi riji quanji* 胡適日記全集 (*Hu Shi’s Collected Diaries*). Edited by Cao Boyan, 曹伯言. Vol. 2. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 2004.

———. ‘Introduction to “Western Literature, Volume 1: Greece and Rome, by A. E. Zucker”’. In *Hu Shi quanji* 胡適全集 (*Hu Shi’s Collected Works*), 35:287–297. Hefei: Anhui jiaoyu chuban she, 2003.

———. ‘Jianshe de wenxue geming lun 建設的文學革命論 (Discussion of a Constructive Literary Revolution)’. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*) 4, no. 4 (1918): 289–306.

———. ‘Jieshao wo ziji de sixiang 介紹我自己的思想 (Introducing My Own Thought)’. In *Hu Shi wen xuan* 胡適文選 (*Selected Works of Hu Shi*), 1–25. Shanghai: Yadong tushuguan, 1930.

———. ‘Lun guogu xue – da Mao Zishui 論國故學——答毛子水 (A Discussion of the Study of the National Heritage – A Reply to Mao Zishui)’. In *Hu Shi wencun* 胡適文存 (*Selected Works of Hu Shi*), 1.II:285–288. Shanghai: Yadong tushuguan, 1922.

———. ‘Wenxue gailiang chuyi 文學改良芻議 (Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature)’. Edited by Chen Duxiu, 陳獨秀. *Liu mei xuesheng jibao* 留美學生季報 (*The Chinese Students’ Quarterly*) 2, no. 5 (spring 1917): 1–14.

———. ‘Wenxue gailiang chuyi 文學改良芻議 (Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature)’. Edited by Chen Duxiu, 陳獨秀. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*) 2, no. 5 (January 1917): 1–11.

———. ‘Women duiyu Xiyang jindai wenming de taidu 我們對於西洋近代文明的態度 (Our Attitude towards Modern Western Culture)’. *Xinghua* 興華 (*The Chinese Christian Advocate*) 23, no. 30 (1926): 8–19.

———. ‘Wu si yundong shi qingnian aiguo de yundong 五四運動是青年愛國的運動 (The May Fourth Movement is the Young People’s Patriotic Movement)’. In *Hu Shi xueshu wenji: xin wenxue yundong* 胡適學術文集：新文學運動 (*Collection of Hu Shi’s Scholarship: The New-Literature Movement*), edited by Jiang Yihua, 姜義華, 297–308. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1993.

———. ‘Xin sichao de yiyi 新思潮的意義 (The Meaning of the New Intellectual Tide)’. In *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*), edited by Chen Duxiu, 陳獨秀, 7A:9–16. Tokyo: Taian, 1963.

Hu Shi, 胡適 and Jiang Menglin, 蔣夢麟. ‘Women duiyu xuesheng de xiwang 我們對於學生的希望 (Our Hopes for the Students)’. In *Minguo shiqi mingren tan wu si: lishi jiyi yu lishi jieshi* 民國時期名人談五四：歷史記憶與歷史解釋

（1919-1949） (*Famous People of the Republican Period Talk about May Fourth: Historical Reminiscences and Historical Explanations*), edited by Yang Hu, 楊琥, 93–97. Fuzhou: Women duiyu xuesheng de xiwang, 2011.

Hu, Shih. 'My Student Days in America'. *Chinese Christian Student* 25, no. 7 (1934): 10–12.

Huang Banghe, 黃邦和 and Pi Mingxiu, 皮明庶, eds. s.v. 'Cao Rulin 曹汝霖 (Cao Rulin)'. *Zhong wai lishi renwu cidian* 中外歷史人物詞典 (*Dictionary of Historical Figures in China and Abroad*). Changsha: Hunan renmin chuban she, 1987.

———. , eds. s.v. 'Zhang Zongxiang 章宗祥 (Zhang Zongxiang)'. *Zhong wai lishi renwu cidian* 中外歷史人物詞典 (*Dictionary of Historical Figures in China and Abroad*). Changsha: Hunan renmin chuban she, 1987.

Huang Dexin, 黃德馨. s.v. 'Jiao'ao zujie tiaoyue 膠澳租界條約 (Jiao'ao Concession Treaty)'. Edited by Zhu Jieqin, 朱傑勤 and Huang Banghe, 黃邦和. *Zhong wai guanxi shi cidian* 中外關係史辭典 (*A Historical Dictionary of Sino-Foreign Relations*). Wuhan: Hubei renmin chuban she, 1992.

———. s.v. 'Zhong Ri junshi xieding 中日軍事協定 (Sino-Japanese Military Conventions)'. Edited by Zhu Jieqin, 朱傑勤 and Huang Banghe, 黃邦和. *Zhong wai guanxi shi cidian* 中外關係史辭典 (*A Historical Dictionary of Sino-Foreign Relations*). Wuhan: Hubei renmin chuban she, 1992.

Huang Guangyu, 黃光域. s.v. 'Beijing daobao 北京導報 (Peking Leader)'. *Jindai Zhongguo zhuanmen fanyi cidian* 近代中國專名翻譯詞典 (*Dictionary of the Translation of Modern Chinese Proper Names*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 2001.

Huang Yanpei, 黃炎培. 'Huang Yanpei riji zhengli fanli 黃炎培日記整理凡例 (Guide to the Structure of Huang Yanpei's Diary)'. In *Huang Yanpei riji* 黃炎培日記 (*Huang Yanpei's Diary*), edited by Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindai shi yanjiu suo, 中國社會科學院近代史研究所, 2:1–2. Beijing: Huawen chuban she, 2008.

———. *Huang Yanpei riji* 黃炎培日記 (*Huang Yanpei's Diary*). Edited by Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindai shi yanjiu suo, 中國社會科學院近代史研究所. Vol. 2. Beijing: Huawen chuban she, 2008.

———. 'Nanyang huaqiao jiaoyu shangque shu 南洋華僑教育商榷書 (A Discussion of the Education of Chinese Nationals in Malaysia)'. *Zhongguo yu Nanyang* 中國與南洋 (*China and Malaysia*) 1, no. 1 (1918).

———. 'Zhiye jiaoyu shishi zhi xiwang 職業教育實施之希望 (Hopes for Implementing Vocational Education)'. *Jiaoyu zazhi* 教育雜誌 (*Education Magazine*) 9, no. 1 (1917): 1–9.

Hunan sheng jiaoyu hui, 湖南省教育會. 'Hunan sheng jiaoyu hui, qing zhaoji quanguo jiaoyu hui lianhe hui kai linshi hui daidian 湖南省教育會請召集全國教育會聯合會開臨時會代電 (Telegram-Style Document from the Hunan Educational Association, Asking to Convene a Provisional Meeting of the National Union of the Educational Associations)'. Edited by Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 江蘇省教育會. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (June 1919): 5–6.

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

Ip, Hung-Yok, Hon, Tze-Ki and Lee, Chiu-Chun. 'The Plurality of Chinese Modernity: A Review of Recent Scholarship on the May Fourth Movement'. *Modern China* 29, no. 4 (October 2003): 490–509.

Jenco, Leigh. 'Culture as History: Envisioning Change across and beyond "Eastern" and "Western" Civilizations in the May Fourth Era'. *Twentieth-Century China* 38, no. 1 (January 2013): 34–51.

———. 'The Problem of the Culturally Unprecedented: Cultural Difference as Historical Discontinuity after May Fourth', n.d.

Jian Xianqi, 蹇先騏. 'Meiguo huobi shi tanlüe 美國貨幣史譚略 (A Sketch of America's History of Currency)'. *Shangye xuesheng* 商業學生 (*Commercial Student*) no. 2 (December 1919): 50–55.

Jiang Qi, 姜琦. 'Xin wenhua yundong he jiaoyu 新文化運動和教育 (The New Culture Movement and Education)'. *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放與改造 (*Emancipation and Reconstruction*) 5, no. 2 (1 March 1920): 88– 95.

Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 江蘇省教育會. 'Cheng jiaoyu zongzhang zuzhi Zhonghua xin jiaoyu she wen 呈教育總長組織中華新教育社文 (Petition to the Minister of Education Regarding the Foundation of the Chinese New-Education Society)'. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (January 1919): 2.

———. 'Cheng Qi shengzhang chenshu taolun xuechao hou jiuji fangfa wen 呈齊省長陳述討論學潮後救濟方法文 (Petition to Provincial Governor Qi, Reporting about the Discussions on Rescue Methods after the Student Protests)'. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (September 1919): 6–7.

———. 'Fu yanshuo jingjin hui jianze 附演説競進會簡則 (Attachment: Regulations for the Speech Competition)'. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (March 1918): 7–8.

———. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*), 1919.

———. 'Kaihui jilu 開會紀錄 (Meeting Minutes)'. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (May 1919): 20–25.

———. 'Kaihui jilu 開會紀錄 (Meeting Minutes)'. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (June 1919): 15–18.

———. 'Kaihui jilu 開會紀錄 (Meeting Minutes)'. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (October 1919): 41–47.

———. 'Lu hujunshi qing zhuangao ge xuesheng rexin aiguo wu wei hefa zhi yundong shu 盧護軍使請轉告各學生熱心愛國務為合法之運動書 (Letter to Military Envoy Lu, Asking to Pass On That Every Student's Enthusiastic and Patriotic Actions Are Legal Movements)'. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (June 1919): 2.

———. ‘Yanshuo jingjin hui bisai jishi 演説競進會比賽紀事 (Record of the Contest of the Speech Competition)’. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (December 1918): 10–12.

———. ‘Zhi da zongtong, guowuyuan qing duiyu Qingdao jiaoshe reng dian zhuanshi kangyi dian 致大總統、國務院請對於青島交涉仍電專使抗議電 (Telegram to the President and the Cabinet, Asking to Intervene in the Qingdao [Question], and Still Send a Telegram to the Special Envoy [in Paris] Letting Him Resist)’. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (June 1919): 10–11.

———. ‘Zhi da zongtong, guowuyuan, jiaoyubu chenming Shanghai ge xiao xuesheng yin jiaoyu zongzhang yiren deng wenti qun yi bake, qing fuxun yuqing dian 致大總統、國務院、教育部陳明上海各校學生因教育總長易人等問題群議罷課，請俯順輿情電 (Telegram to the President, the Cabinet and the Ministry of Education, Explaining That the Students of All Schools in Shanghai Have Gone on Strike, Due to Questions Such as the Replacement of the Minister of Education, etc., and Asking to Succumb to Public Sentiment)’. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (May 1919): 10.

———. ‘Zhi ge zhongdeng xuexiao qing tongzhi xuesheng yu shujia qi nei zuzhi jiangyan tuan shu 致各中等學校請通知學生於暑假期內組織講演團書 (Letter to All Middle Schools, Asking to Inform the Students to Form Lecture Corps During the Summer Holidays)’. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (May 1919): 13–14.

———. ‘Zhi Mei zongtong, Mei guohui, Ying, Fa shouxiang, ji Ying, Fa guohui qing zhuchi gongdao dian 致美總統、美國會、英、法首相、及英、法國會請主持公道電 (Telegram to the US President, the US Congress, the Prime Ministers of Britain and France, the Parliaments of Britain and France, Asking to Uphold Justice)’. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (June 1919): 1.

———. ‘Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu 致中等以上各學校通知定期舉行演説競進會書 (Letter to All [Educational Institutions] from Middle-School Level and above, Informing Them That a Date Has Been Chosen to Conduct the Lecture Competition)’. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (October 1919): 18–21.

———. ‘Zhi zhongdeng yishang xuexiao paiyuan dao hui shu 致中等以上學校派員到會書 (Letter to Schools of a Higher Level than Middle [Schools, Instructing Them] to Send Personnel to the Conference)’. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (June 1919): 7–8.

Jiangsu shengli di er nüzi shifan xuexiao xiaoyou hui huikan 江蘇省立第二女子師範學校校友會彙刊 (*Alumnae of the Second Women’s Normal School of Jiangsu Province*), 1919.

Jiao Zhongping, 焦仲平. s.v. ‘Dong Qiusi 董秋斯 (Dong Qiusi)’. Edited by Ma Liangchun, 馬良春 and Li Futian, 李福田. *Zhongguo wenxue da cidian* 中國文學大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Chinese Literature*). Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chuban she, 1991.

Jiaoyubu, 教育部. ‘Jiaoyubu shu quandao shang xue liang jie dian 教育部屬勸導商學兩界電 (Telegram by the Members of the Ministry of Education Advising the Merchants and Students)’. Edited by Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 江蘇省教育會. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (June 1919): 5.

———. ‘Tongsu jiaoyu jiangyan guize 通俗教育講演規則 (Regulations on Lectures for Popular Education)’. In *Zhonghua minguo jiaoyu fagui xuanbian* 中華民國教育法規選編 (*Anthology of Education Laws and Regulations of the Republic of China*), edited by Song Enrong, 宋恩榮 and Zhang Xian, 章咸, 533. Nanjing: Jiangsu jiaoyu chuban she, 2005.

———. ‘Tongsu jiaoyu yanjiu hui zhangcheng 通俗教育研究會章程 (Regulations for the Popular Education Research Society)’. In *Zhonghua minguo jiaoyu fagui xuanbian* 中華民國教育法規選編 (*Anthology of Education Laws and Regulations of the Republic of China*), edited by Song Enrong, 宋恩榮 and Zhang Xian, 章咸, 531–33. Nanjing: Jiangsu jiaoyu chuban she, 2005.

Jiefang yu gaizao 解放與改造 (*Emancipation and Reconstruction*). ‘Ben kan qishi er 本刊啓事二 (Announcements of this Publication, Two)’ 1, no. 1 (15 October 1919).

Jiefang yu gaizao 解放與改造 (*Emancipation and Reconstruction*). ‘Copyright Page’ 1, no. 1&2 (15 October 1919).

Jiefang yu gaizao 解放與改造 (*Emancipation and Reconstruction,*). ‘Guanggao jia mubiao 廣告價目表 (Price List for Advertisements)’ 1, no. 1+2 (15 October 1919).

Jin Chongji, 金衝及. ‘Wu si yundong: weida de lishi zhuanzhe dian 五四運動：偉大的歷史轉折點 (The May Fourth Movement: A Great Historical Turning Point)’. *Renmin ribao* 人民日報 (*The People’s Daily*). 4 May 2009.

Jing Guan, 靜觀. ‘Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao 北京大學新舊之暗潮 (The Latent Trends of Old and New at Beijing University)’. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 6 March 1919.

———. ‘Dumen xuejie xiaoxi 都門學界消息 (News from Academia in the Capital)’. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 5 November 1919.

———. ‘Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi 告新文化運動的同志 (To the Comrades of the New Culture Movement)’. *Xin funü* 新婦女 (*New Woman*) 1, no. 2 (1920): 31–33.

Johnston, Reginald F. *Twilight in the Forbidden City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Jones, Andrew F. *Developmental Fairy Tales: Evolutionary Thinking and Modern Chinese Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Judge, Joan. ‘Public Opinion and the New Politics of Contestation in the Late Qing, 1904-1911’. *Modern China* 20, no. 1 (January 1994): 64–91.

Kaske, Elisabeth. *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education, 1895-1919*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Keller, Raffael. s.v. ‘Philippe de Vargas’. *Historisches Lexikon der Schweiz (Historical Encyclopaedia of Switzerland)*. Bern, 2 May 2011. http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch.

Kissinger, Henry. ‘Transcript of Remarks at the 14th Annual John M. Ashbrook Memorial Dinner’. *Ashbrook Center*, 11 September 1997. Accessed 9 June 2014. http://ashbrook.org/events/kissinger-transcript/.

Ko, Dorothy. *Teachers of the Inner Chambers: Women and Culture in Seventeenth-Century China*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Koselleck, Reinhart. 'Representation, Event, and Structure'. In *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, translated by Tribe, Keith, 105–115. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985.

Lanza, Fabio. *Behind the Gate: Inventing Students in Beijing*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

———. 'Of Chronology, Failure, and Fidelity: When Did the May Fourth Movement End?' *Twentieth-Century China* 38, no. 1 (January 2013): 53–70.

Laohu bu chi fanfan, 老虎不吃飯飯. 'Wu si yundong yihou … 五四運動以後…… (After the May Fourth Movement …)'. *Xinlang weibo* 新浪微博 (*Sina Weibo*) (microblog), 28 December 2012. Accessed 31 December 2012. http://s.weibo.com.

Larson, Wendy. *Literary Authority and the Modern Chinese Writer: Ambivalence and Autobiography*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991.

Lary, Diana. 'Warlord Studies'. *Modern China* 6, no. 4 (October 1980): 439–470.

Lean, Eugenia. *Public Passions : The Trial of Shi Jianqiao and the Rise of Popular Sympathy in Republican China*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2007.

Lee, Leo Ou-fan. 'Incomplete Modernity: Rethinking the May Fourth Intellectual Project'. In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, edited by Doleželová-Velingerová, Milena and Král, Oldřich, 31–65. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

Lee, Leo Ou-fan and Goldmann, Merle. *An Intellectual History of Modern China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Lee, Nelson K. 'How Is a Political Public Space Made? – The Birth of Tiananmen Square and the May Fourth Movement'. *Political Geography* 28, no. 1 (January 2009): 32–43.

Legge, James. *The Chinese Classics*. Vol. 4: The She King. 2nd ed. Taibei: SMC Publishing Inc, 1991.

Leung, Pak-Wah. s.v. 'Song Meiling'. *Political Leaders of Modern China: A Biographical Dictionary*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2002.

Lew, Christopher R. and Leung, Edwin Pak-Wah. s.v. 'Beiyang Army'. *Historical Dictionary of the Chinese Civil War*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2013.

'Lewis Chase's Schedule at Beijing Normal University'. Beijing, 2 November 1923. Container 187. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Li Bingzhong, 李秉忠, Wei Canjin, 衛燦金 and Lin Conglong, 林從龍. s.v. 'Xin wenhua yundong 新文化運動 (The New Culture Movement)'. Edited by Qu Lindong, 瞿林東. *Jianming wenshi zhishi cidian* 簡明文史知識詞典 (*Concise Dictionary of Knowledge about Literary History*). Xian: Shaanxi renmin chuban she, 1990.

Li, Cheng. 'My Reflections and Querries [sic] on the Question of the Creation of the Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non Chinese.' Examination paper, 22 January 1924. Container 221. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Li Dazhao, 李大釗. 'Xin jiu sichao zhi jizhan 新旧思潮之激战 (The Fierce Battle between New and Old Intellectual Tides)'. In *Qingchun* 青春 (*Youth*), edited by Zhang Yuexuan, 張越選, 141–44. Beijing: Gaodeng jiaoyu chuban she, 2010.

Li Fan, 李帆. ‘Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue 劉師培與北京大學 (Liu Shipei and Beijing University)’. *Beijing daxue xuebao* (*Zhexue shehui kexue ban*) 北京大學學報（哲學社會科學版） (*Journal of Peking University* [*Humanities and Social Sciences*]) 38, no. 6 (2001): 108–118.

Li Jinxi, 黎錦熙, ed. ‘Duyin tongyi hui Zhili daibiao Wang Pu deng cheng jiaoyu bu qing banxing zhuyin zimu wen 讀音統一會直隸代表王璞等呈教育部請頒行注音字母文 (Petition to the Ministry of Education from Wang Pu, etc., Representative of the Commission for the Unification of Pronunciation, Requesting the Promotion of Bopomofo)’. In *Guoyu xue jiangyi* 國語學講義 (*Lecture Notes on the Study of the National Language*). Shanghai: Shangwu yinshu guan, 1919.

———. , ed. *Guoyu xue jiangyi* 國語學講義 (*Lecture Notes on the Study of the National Language*). Shanghai: Shangwu yinshu guan, 1919.

———. *Guoyu yundong shigang* 國語運動史綱 (*A Survey of the National-Language Movement*). Beijing: Shangwu yinshu guan, 2011.

Li Quan, 李泉. *Fu Sinian xueshu sixiang pingzhuan* 傅斯年學術思想評傳 (*A Critical Biography of the Scholarship and Thought of Fu Sinian*). Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chuban she, 1999.

Li Shenzhao, 李慎兆. s.v. ‘Xin wenhua yundong 新文化運動 (The New Culture Movement)’. Edited by Qu Lindong, 瞿林東. *Zhongguo zhongxue jiaoxue baike quanshu* 中國中學教學百科全書 (*Chinese Middle-School Teaching Encyclopaedia*). Shenyang: Shenyang chuban she, 1991.

Li Songlin, 李松林, ed. s.v. ‘Xin jiaotong xi 新交通系 (The New Communications Clique)’. *Zhongguo guomindang shi da cidian* 中國國民黨史大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of China’s Nationalist Party*). Hefei: Anhui renmin chuban she, 1993.

———. , ed. s.v. ‘Xiyuan jiekuan 西原借款 (The Nishihara Loans)’. *Zhongguo guomindang shi da cidian* 中國國民黨史大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of China’s Nationalist Party*). Hefei: Anhui renmin chuban she, 1993.

Li, Tien Yueh. ‘Letter to Lewis Chase’, 2 September 1924. Container 216. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Li Xiaofeng, 李小峰. ‘Xinchao she de shimo 新潮社的始末 (Beginning and End of the New Tide Society)’. In *Wu si yundong huiyi lu xu* 五四運動回憶錄續 (*Records of Memories of the May Fourth Movement. Sequel*), edited by Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindai shi yanjiu suo, 中國社會科學院近代史研究所, 200–242. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chuban she, 1979.

Li Yuanxiu, 李元秀 and Wu Di, 武迪, eds. *Shijie quanshi* 世界全史 (*World History*). Vol. 41. Beijing: Junshi yiwen chuban she, 2006.

Liang Shu’an, 梁淑安. s.v. ‘Zhang Yuanji 張元濟 (Zhang Yuanji)’. *Zhongguo wenxue jia da cidian* 中國文學家大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Chinese Writers*). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997.

Liang Yiqun, 梁義群. s.v. ‘Duan Qirui 段祺瑞 (Duan Qirui)’. Edited by Qu Lindong, 瞿林東. *Zhongguo zhongxue jiaoxue baike quanshu* 中國中學教學百科全書 (*Chinese Middle-School Teaching Encyclopaedia*). Shenyang: Shenyang chuban she, 1991.

———. s.v. ‘Ershiyi tiao 二十一條 (The Twenty-One Demands)’. Edited by Qu Lindong, 瞿林東. *Zhongguo zhongxue jiaoxue baike quanshu* 中國中學教學百

科全書 (*Chinese Middle-School Teaching Encyclopaedia*). Shenyang: Shenyang chuban she, 1991.

Liao Gailong, 廖蓋隆, Sun Liancheng, 孫連成 and Chen Youjin, 陳有進, eds. s.v. 'Kang Xinfu 康心孚 (Kang Xinfu)'. *Makesi zhuyi baike yaolan* 馬克思主義百科要覽 (*Compiled Encyclopaedia of Marxism*). Beijing: Renmin ribao chuban she, 1993.

Lien, Chan. s.v. 'Hu Shih'. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc, 2014. Accessed 5 June 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/274124/Hu-Shih.

Lin, Diana. *Peking University: Chinese Scholarship and Intellectuals, 1898-1937*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, 2005.

Lin Lüjian, 林呂建. s.v. 'Tang Erhe 湯爾和 (Tang Erhe)'. *Minguo renwu da cidian* 民國人物大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Republican Figures*). Hangzhou: Zhejiang daxue chuban she, 2013.

Lin, Shu. 'Nightmare'. In *Modern Chinese Literary Thought: Writings on Literature, 1893-1945*, edited by Denton, Kirk A., translated by Wong, Timothy, 146–150. Stanford, 1996.

Lin Shu, 林紓. 'Da daxuetang xiaozhang Cai Heqing taishi shu 答大學堂校長蔡鶴卿太史書 (Reply to the Chancellor of the University, Hanlin Scholar Cai Heqing)'. In *Lin Shu wenxuan* 林紓文選 (*Selected Works of Lin Shu*), edited by Xu Guiting, 許桂亭, 106–112. Tianjin: Baihua wenyi chuban she, 2006.

———. 'Jing Sheng 荊生 (Scholar Jing)'. In *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang shi ziliao jianbian* 中國現代思想史資料簡編 (*Concise Edition of Historical Material on Chinese Contemporary Thought*), edited by Cai Shangsi, 蔡尚思, 1:488–490. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chuban she, 1982.

———. 'Jing sheng 荊生 (Scholar Jing)'. In *Canchun* 殘春 (*Last Days of Spring*), edited by Zhang Ren, 張靭, 212–13. Bainian baibu zhengyi xiaoshuo 百年百部爭議小說 (100 Dispute Novels of 100 Years). Changchun: Jilin shying chuban she, 1996.

———. 'Yaomeng 妖夢 (Nightmare)'. In *Canchun* 殘春 (*Last Days of Spring*), edited by Zhang Ren, 張靭, 214–216. Bainian baibu zhengyi xiaoshuo 百年百部爭議小說 (100 Dispute Novels of 100 Years). Changchun: Jilin shying chuban she, 1996.

Lin, Xiaoqing Diana. *Peking University: Chinese Scholarship and Intellectuals, 1898-1937*. Albany, N.Y., 2005.

Lin, Yü-sheng. *The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness: Radical Antitraditionalism in the May Fourth Era*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979.

Lin, Yutang. *A History of the Press and Public Opinion in China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Liu Bannong, 劉半農. '"Chuqi baihua shi gao" xu mu 《初期白話詩稿》序目 (Preface to, and Contents of, *Manuscripts for Poems in Baihua in the Early Phase*)'. In *Liu Bannong yanjiu ziliao* 劉半農研究資料 (*Research Materials on Liu Bannong*), edited by Bao Jing, 鮑晶. Beijing: Zhishi chanquan chuban she, 2011.

———. 'Fu Wang Jingxuan shu 復王敬軒書 (A Reply to Wang Jingxuan)'. In *Qian Xuantong, Liu Bannong* 錢玄同、劉半農 (*Qian Xuantong, Liu Bannong*), edited by Zhao Lidong, 趙利棟, 114–132. Wu si fengyun renwu wencui 五四風

雲人物文萃 (Collections of Famous May Fourth Figures). Beijing: Renmin ribao chuban she, 1999.

Liu Guisheng, 劉桂生 and Zhang Buzhou, 張步洲, eds. *Taiwan ji hai wai wu si yanjiu lunzhu xieyao* 臺灣及海外五四研究論著擷要 (*Excerpt of Academic Books on May Fourth in Taiwan and Overseas*). Beijing: Jiaoyu kexue chuban she, 1989.

Liu Jianming, 劉建明, ed. s.v. '*Impartial* 大公報 (Dagong bao)'. *Xuanchuan yulun xue da cidian* 宣傳輿論學大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of the Study of Propaganda and Public Opinion*). Beijing: Jingji ribao chuban she, 1993.

Liu Jianye, 劉建業. s.v. 'Guoshi guan 國史館 (The National Historiography Institute)'. *Zhongguo kangri zhanzheng da cidian* 中國抗日戰爭大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of China's War of Resistance against Japan*). Beijing: Beijing yanshan chuban she, 1997.

Liu Jingquan, 劉景泉. *Beijing minguo zhengfu, yihui, zhengzhi yanjiu* 北京民國政府、議會、政治研究 (*Research on Government, Parliament and Politics of the Beijing Republic*). Tianjin: Tianjin jiaoyu chuban she, 2006.

Liu Kedi, 劉克敵. *Hua luo chun reng zai: Wu Mi yu 'Xueheng'* 花落春仍在：吳宓與《學衡》 (*The Flowers Have Wilted but Spring Is Still There: Wu Mi and the 'Critical Review'*). Beijing: Zhongguo wenlian chuban she, 2001.

Liu, Lydia. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity - China, 1900-1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Liu, Lydia He, Ko, Dorothy and Karl, Rebecca E., eds. *The Birth of Chinese Feminism: Essential Texts in Transnational Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.

Liu, Qian. 'Creative Translation and Creativity via Translation: The Transformation of Emotional Expression in Early Modern Chinese Fiction (1900-1925)'. PhD, University of Oxford, 2013.

Liu Shipei, 劉師培. 'Liu Shipei zhi Gongyanbao han 劉師培致公言報函 (Letter by Liu Shipei to the *Public Voice*)'. *Beijing daxue rikan* 北京大學日刊 (*The Beijing University Daily*). 24 March 1919.

———. 'Lunwen zaji (qian qi nian) 論文雜記 （前七年） (Jottings of Comments on Texts [The First Seven Years])'. In *Liu Shenshu xiansheng yishu* 劉申叔先生遺書 (*Posthumous Papers by Mr Liu Shenshu*), 710–723. Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chuban she, 1997.

Liu, Taotao. 'Conversation with the author', 25 June 2014.

———. 'E-mail message to the author', 22 June 2014.

Liu, Te Yuan. 'The Educational Value of Chinese Character Writing'. Student essay, n.d. Container 219. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Liu Xiaobo, 劉曉波 and others. 'Ba lin xianzhang 零八憲章 (Charta 08)'. Translated by Rudolph, Jörg M. *Ostasieninstitut, Hochschule Ludwigshafen am Rhein* (*Institute for East Asian Studies, Ludwigshafen am Rhein University*), 8 October 2010. Accessed 22 April 2013. http://www.oai.de.

Liu Xuelin, 劉學林 and Chi Duo, 遲鐸, eds. s.v. 'Ba dai 八代 (Eight Dynasties)'. *Guwen guanzhi cidian* 古文觀止詞典 (*Dictionary of the Best of Old Literature*). Xi'an: Shanxi renmin chuban she, 1994.

Lu Yi, 卢毅. '"Guogu" yu "Xinchao" zhi zheng shuping – jian lun wu si shiqi "zhengli guogu yundong" de xingqi 《国故》与《新潮》之争述评——兼论五四时期

"整理国故运动"的兴起 (The Quarrels between *National Heritage* and *New Tide* - And the Emergence of the "Movement to Tidy Up the National Heritage" in the May Fourth Period)'. *Renwen zazhi* 人文雜誌 (*Journal of Humanities*) no. 1 (2004): 39–44.

Luo Jialun, 羅家倫. 'Jinri Zhongguo de zazhi jie 今日中國的雜誌界 (The Chinese World of Magazines Today)'. In *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*), 2:73–82. Minguo zhenxi qikan 民國珍稀期刊 (Valuable Republican Journals). Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 2006.

———. '"Wu si yundong" de jingshen 五四運動的精神 (The Spirit of the May Fourth Movement)'. *Meizhou pinglun* 每週評論 (*The Weekly Review*). 26 May 1919.

———. '"Wu si yundong" de jingshen "五四運動"的精神 (The Spirit of the "May Fourth Movement")'. In *Minguo shiqi mingren tan wu si: lishi jiyi yu lishi jieshi* 民國時期名人談五四：歷史記憶與歷史解釋（1919-1949） (*Famous People of the Republican Period Talk about May Fourth: Historical Reminiscences and Historical Explanations*), edited by Yang Hu, 楊琥, 78–79. Fuzhou: Fujian jiaoyu chuban she, 2011.

Luo Zhitian, 羅志田. 'Xin wenhua yundong shiqi guanyu zhengli guogu de sixiang lunzheng 新文化運動時期關於整理國故的思想論爭 (Intellectual Debates about "Tidying Up China´s National Heritage" in the Period of the New Culture Movement)'. In *Qingji minchu guanyu 'guoxue' de sixiang lunzheng* 清季民初關於'國學'的思想論爭 (*Intellectual Debates on 'National Learning' at the End of the Qing and in the Early Republic*). Beijing: Shenghui dushu xinzhi sanlian shudian, 2003.

Ma, Yuxin. *Women Journalists and Feminism in China, 1898-1937*. New York: Cambria Press, 2010.

MacKinnon, Stephen R. 'Toward a History of the Chinese Press in the Republican Period'. *Modern China* 23, no. 1 (January 1997): 3–32.

Manuscript Division. 'Biographical and Organizational Note: Lewis Nathaniel Chase'. *A Finding Aid to the Collection in the Library of Congress*, 2012. Accessed 5 July 2013. http://findingaids.loc.gov.

Mao Zishui, 毛子水. '"Bo Xinchao 'Guogu he kexue de jingshen' pian" dingwu 《駁新潮〈國故和科學的精神〉篇》訂誤 (Corrections to "Against the Article 'The National Heritage and the Scientific Spirit' in *New Tide*")'. *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*) 2, no. 1 (30 October 1919): 37–57.

———. '"Bo Xinchao 'Guogu he kexue de jingshen' pian" dingwu 《駁新潮〈國故和科學的精神〉篇》訂誤 (Corrections to "Against the Article 'The National Heritage and the Scientific Spirit' in *New Tide*")'. In *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*), 2:461–481. Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 2006.

———. 'Guogu he kexue de jingshen 國故和科學的精神 (The National Heritage and the Scientific Spirit)'. *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*) 5, no. 1 (1 May 1919).

———. 'Guogu he kexue de jingshen 國故和科學的精神 (The National Heritage and the Scientific Spirit)'. In *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*), 2:191–204. Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 2006.

Marchand, Leslie A. s.v. 'George Gordon Byron, 6th Baron Byron'. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Accessed 26 March 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/87071/George-Gordon-Byron-6th-Baron-Byron.

Mei Feuerwerker, Yi-tsi. ‘Reconsidering Xueheng: Neo-Conservatism in Republican China’. In *Literary Societies Of Republican China*, edited by Hockx, Michel and Denton, Kirk A., 137–170. Plymoth: Lexington Books, 2008.

Meisner, Maurice J. *Li Ta-Chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Meizhou pinglun 每週評論 (*The Weekly Review*). ‘Advertisement for *New Tide*’. 5 January 1919.

Meizhou pinglun 每週評論 (*The Weekly Review*). ‘Chajin “fanghai zhi”an’ de jihui, chuban zhi jingguo 查禁《妨害治安》的集會、出版之經過 (The Process of Prohibiting Meetings and Publications That “Harm the Public Order”)’. 27 July 1919.

Meizhou pinglun 每週評論 (*The Weekly Review*). ‘Header’. 4 May 1919.

Meizhou pinglun 每週評論 (*The Weekly Review*). ‘Jing sheng 荊生 (Scholar Jing)’. 9 March 1919.

Meizhou pinglun 每週評論 (*The Weekly Review*). ‘Ping Lin Weilu zuijin suo zhuan “Jing sheng” duanpian xiaoshuo 評林蝟廬最近所撰“荊生”短篇小說 (A Comment on the Short Story “Scholar Jing,” Recently Written by Lin Weilu)’. 16 March 1919.

Meizhou pinglun 每週評論 (*The Weekly Review*). ‘Xiang jiang pinglun ... 湘江評論…… (Xiang River Review)’. 24 August 1919.

Meizhou pinglun 每週評論 (*The Weekly Review*). Beijing, 1919.

Meng Zhen, 孟真. ‘Qing Liang Yusheng zhi shiji zhi yi san shi liu juan 清梁玉繩之史記志疑三十六卷 (The Doubtful Points in the *Shiji* by the Qing Historian Liang Yusheng, Vol 36)’. In *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*), 1:145–147. Beijing, 2006.

Miao Jinyuan, 繆金源. ‘Miao Jinyuan zhi Hu Shi 繆金源致胡適 (Miao Jinyuan to Hu Shi)’. In *Hu Shi laiwang shuxin xuan* 胡適來往書信選 (*A Selection of Hu Shi’s Correspondence*), 117–19. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1979.

———. ‘Suowei “xin wenhua yundong” de chachao yu pochan 所謂“新文化運動”的查抄與破產 (Confiscation and Bankruptcy of the So-called “New Culture Movement”)’. *Piping* 批評 (*Criticism*). 20 October 1920.

Mitter, Rana. *A Bitter Revolution: China’s Struggle with the Modern World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Mittler, Barbara. *A Newspaper for China?: Power, Identity, and Change in Shanghai’s News Media, 1872-1912*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2004.

Moller, Alan Gordon. ‘Bellicose Nationalist of Republican China: An Intellectual Biography of Fu Ssu-Nien’. PhD, University of Melbourne, 1979.

Moti 墨梯 (*The McTyeirean*). ‘Advertisement for Mingming Glasses’ no. 2 (June 1918).

Moti 墨梯 (*The McTyeirean*). ‘Advertisement for Mingming Glasses’ no. 3 (June 1919).

Moti 墨梯 (*The McTyeirean*). ‘Advertisement for the Methodist Publishing House’ no. 4 (June 1921).

Moti 墨梯 (*The McTyeirean*). ‘Pictures of Staff’ no. 3 (June 1919).

Moti 墨梯 (*The McTyeirean*). ‘Read the *Shanghai Gazette*’ no. 3 (June 1919).

Moti 墨梯 (*The McTyeirean*). ‘The *Shanghai Gazette*’ no. 2 (June 1918).

Mukerji, Chandra and Schudson, Michael. *Rethinking Popular Culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

‘My Reflections and Queries on the Subject of Revealing or Interpreting China and the Chinese to Non-China, by Means of Imaginative Literature’. Examination paper, 22 January 1924. Container 221. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Nathan, Andrew J. ‘A Constitutional Republic: The Peking Government, 1916–28’. In *The Cambridge History of China*, 12:256–283. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Histories Online, 1983. Accessed 13 November 2013. http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/histories/.

———. *Peking Politics, 1918-1923: Factionalism and the Failure of Constitutionalism*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1976.

Niu, Minghua. ‘Letter to Emma Lester’, 5 September 1933. Container 209. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. ‘Letter to Emma Lester’, 12 October 1933. Container 209. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. ‘Letter to Emma Lester’, 6 February 1934. Container 209. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. ‘Letter to Emma Lester’, 28 February 1934. Container 209. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. ‘Letter to Emma Lester’, 18 May 1936. Container 209. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. ‘Letter to Emma Lester’, 23 July 1937. Container 209. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

O.C. Wang, 王文祺. ‘My Reflections and Queries on the Question of the Creation of the Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non Chinese’. Examination paper, 22 January 1924. Container 221. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Ouyang Junxi, 歐陽軍喜. ‘Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong – yi “Xingqi pinglun,” “Jianshe” wei zhongxin 國民黨與新文化運動——以《星期評論》、《建設》為中心 (The Nationalist Party and the New Culture Movement – with a Focus on *Weekly Review* and *Construction*)’. *Nanjing daxue xuebao* 南京大學學報 (*Journal of Nanjing University*) no. 1 (2009): 72–84.

Pang Ju’ai, 龐菊愛. *Kua wenhua guanggao yu shimin wenhua de bianqian: 1910-1930 nian Shenbao kua wenhua guanggao yanjiu* 跨文化廣告與市民文化的變遷：1910-1930 年《申報》跨文化廣告研究 (*Developments in Cross-cultural Advertisement and Urbanites’ Culture: Research on Cross-cultural Advertisement in* Shenbao, *1910-1930*). Shanghai: Shanghai jiaotong daxue chuban she, 2010.

‘Passport of Emma Service Lester’, 1927. Container 215. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Pei Xiaowei, 裴效維. s.v. ‘Huang Kan 黃侃 (Huang Kan)’. Edited by Ma Liangchun, 馬良春 and Li Futian, 李福田. *Zhongguo wenxue da cidian* 中國文學大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Chinese Literature*). Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chuban she, 1991.

Peng Peng, 彭鵬. ‘Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong: yi 1920 nian qianhou wei zhongxin 研究系與五四時期新文化運動：以 1920 年前後為中心 (The Research Clique and the New Culture Movement in the May Fourth Period:

With a Focus on the Time around the Year 1920)'. PhD, Zhongshan daxue 中山大學 (Sun Yat-sen University), 1994.

———. *Yanjiu xi yu wu si shiqi xin wenhua yundong: yi 1920 nian qianhou wei zhongxin* 研究系與五四時期新文化運動：以 1920 年前後為中心 (*The Research Clique and the New Culture Movement in the May Fourth Period: With a Focus on the Time around the Year 1920*). Guangzhou: Zhongshan daxue chuban she, 2003.

Piping 批評 (*Criticism*). 'Advertisement for *New Woman*'. 20 October 1920.

Piping 批評 (*Criticism*). 'Banner'. 20 October 1920.

Piping 批評 (*Criticism*). 'Ben she qishi san 本社啟事三 (Announcements of this Society Three)'. 20 October 1920.

Piping 批評 (*Criticism*). 'Ben she tongxin chu … 本社通信處 …… (Our Contact Details …)'. 20 October 1920.

Piping 批評 (*Criticism*). 'Fakan ci 發刊詞 (Manifesto)'. 20 October 1920.

Piping 批評 (*Criticism*). 'Xin qingnian she chuban … 新青年社出版…… (Published by the New Youth Society …)'. 20 October 1920.

Pusey, James Reeve. *Lu Xun and Evolution*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Qi Yaolin. 'Qi shengzhang pi 齊省長批 (Approval by Provincial Governor Qi)'. Edited by Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 江蘇省教育會. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (September 1919): 9.

Qi Yaolin, 齊耀琳 and Li Chun, 李純. 'Li dujun Qi shengzhang fudian 李督軍齊省長復電 (Reply Telegram from Military Governor Li and Provincial Governor Qi'. Edited by Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, 江蘇省教育會. *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* 江蘇省教育會月報 (*Jiangsu Educational Association Monthly Report*) (June 1919): 8.

Qian Jian, 淺見. 'Jiake Gegen zhuyan xinming jiang kaiyan 賈克哥根主演新明將開演 (Lead Actor Jackie CooganWill Newly Star in a Movie)'. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 5 September 1924.

Qian Xuantong, 錢玄同. 'Chen Duxiu xiansheng jian … 獨秀先生鑒 ……（To the Notice of Mr Chen Duxiu …）'. Edited by Chen Duxiu, 陳獨秀. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (*New Youth*) 3, no. 1 (March 1917): 1–7 (tongxin 通信 [letters]).

Qiu Changwei, 邱昌渭. 'Lun xin wenhua yundong (da Wu Mi jun) 論新文化運動(答吳宓君] (A Discussion of the New Culture Movement [A Reply to Mr Wu Mi)'. *Liu mei xuesheng jibao* 留美學生季報 (*The Chinese Students' Quarterly*) 8, no. 4 (1921): 1–13.

Qiu Shihuang, 邱沛篁, Wu Xinxun, 吳信訓 and Xiang Chunwu, 向純武, eds. s.v. 'Jiefang yu gaizao 解放與改造 (Emancipation and Reconstruction)'. *Xinwen chuanbo baike quanshu* 新聞傳播百科全書 (*Encyclopaedia of News and Broadcasting*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 1998.

———. , eds. s.v. 'Pan Zhenwen 潘慎文'. *Xinwen chuanbo baike quanshu* 新聞傳播百科全書 (*Encyclopaedia of News and Broadcasting*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 1998.

———. , eds. s.v. ‘Piping 批評 (Criticism)’. *Xinwen chuanbo baike quanshu* 新聞傳播百科全書 (*Encyclopaedia of News and Broadcasting*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 1998.

———. , eds. s.v. ‘Shenbao 申報 (The Shanghai News)’. *Xinwen chuanbo baike quanshu* 新聞傳播百科全書 (*Encyclopaedia of News and Broadcasting*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 1998.

———. , eds. s.v. ‘Shishi xinbao 時事新報 (Current Affairs)’. *Xinwen chuanbo baike quanshu* 新聞傳播百科全書 (*Encyclopaedia of News and Broadcasting*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 1998.

———. , eds. s.v. ‘Xin qingnian 新青年 (New Youth)’. *Xinwen chuanbo baike quanshu* 新聞傳播百科全書 (*Encyclopaedia of News and Broadcasting*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 1998.

———. , eds. s.v. ‘Xin Shen bao 新申報 (The New Shanghai News)’. *Xinwen chuanbo baike quanshu* 新聞傳播百科全書 (*Encyclopaedia of News and Broadcasting*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 1998.

———. , eds. s.v. ‘Xueheng 學衡 (The Critical Review)’. *Xinwen chuanbo baike quanshu* 新聞傳播百科全書 (*Encyclopaedia of News and Broadcasting*). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chuban she, 1998.

Quanguo baokan suoyin 全國報刊索引 (*National Index of Chinese Newspapers and Periodicals*) (database). Accessed 1 August 2013. http://www.cnbksy.com.

Quanguo baokan suoyin, qikan daohang 全國報刊索引，期刊導航 (*National Index of Chinese Newspapers and Periodicals, Guided Navigation*) (database). Accessed 1 August 2013. http://www.cnbksy.com/shlib_tsdc/originNavSearch.do.

Quanguo jiaoyu hui lianhe hui, 全國教育會聯合會. ‘Qing ding guoyu biaozhun bing tuixing zhuyin zimu yiqi yuyan tongyi 請定國語標準並 推行注音字母以期語言統一 (Please Determine a Standard for the National Language and Promote Bopomofo, So As to Unify the Language)’. In *Lijie jiaoyu huiyi yijue an huibian* 歷屆教育會議議決案彙編 (*Collection of the Resolutions of All Historical Meetings of the Education Associations*), edited by Tai Shuangqiu, 邰爽秋, 12–13. Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei zhongxin, 2010.

———. ‘Tongyi guoyu fangfa’an 統一國語方法案 (Scheme to Unify the National Language)’. In *Lijie jiaoyu huiyi yijue an huibian* 歷屆教育會議議決案彙編 (*Collection of the Resolutions of All Historical Meetings of the Education Associations*), edited by Tai Shuangqiu, 邰爽秋, 2–3. Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei zhongxin, 2010.

Reddy, William M. ‘Anthropology and the History of Culture’. In *A Companion to Western Historical Thought*, edited by Kramer, Lloyd and Maza, Sarah. Blackwell Reference Online. Oxford: lackwell Publishing, 2006. Accessed 25 February 2014. www.blackwellreference.com.

Rendao, 人道. ‘Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme 新文化運動是什麼 (What is the New Culture Movement)’. *Xinghua* 興華 (*The Chinese Christian Advocate*) 17, no. 34 (8 September 1920): 26–27.

Renmin ribao 人民日報 (*The People’s Daily*) (database). Zhonghua shuzi shuyuan 中華數字書苑 (China Digital Library). Accessed 4 March 2014. http://www.apabi.com.

Renmin ribao 人民日報 (*The People's Daily*). 'Wei minzu fuxing zouxiang qingchun yuezhang – jinian wu si yundong 90 zhounian 為民族復興奏響青春樂章——紀念五四運動 90 周年 (Playing the Music of Youth for the Rejuvenation of the Nation – Commemorating the Ninetieth Anniversary of the May Fourth Movement)'. 4 May 2009.

'Resou bang 熱搜榜 (Top Searches)'. *Xinlang weibo* 新浪微博 (*Sina Weibo*) (microblog), 12 October 2012. Accessed 26 February 2014. http://s.weibo.com/top/summary.

Rhode, Deborah L. *In Pursuit of Knowledge: Scholars, Status, And Academic Culture*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2006.

Rong Yuming, 戎毓明, ed. s.v. 'Liu Xiping 劉希平 (Liu Xiping)'. *Anhui renwu da cidian* 安徽人物大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Figures from Anhui*). Beijing: Tuanjie chuban she, 1992.

Sang, Bing. 'The Divergence and Convergence of China's Written and Spoken Languages: Reassessing the Vernacular Language during the May Fourth Period'. *Twentieth-Century China* 28, no. 1 (January 2013): 71–93.

Sayer, Derek. *Capitalism and Modernity: An Excursus on Marx and Weber*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Schneider, Axel. *Wahrheit und Geschichte: zwei chinesische Historiker auf der Suche nach einer modernen Identität für China (Truth and History: Two Chinese Historians in Search of a Modern Identity for China)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997.

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

Schwarcz, Vera. 'A Curse on the Great Wall: The Problem of Enlightenment in Modern China'. *Theory and Society* 13, no. 3 (May 1984): 455–470.

———. *The Chinese Enlightenment: Intellectuals and the Legacy of the May Fourth Movement of 1919*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

———. *Time for Telling the Truth Is Running Out: Conversations with Zhang Shenfu*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Semanov, Vladimir Ivanovich and Alber, Charles J. *Lu Hsün and His Predecessors*. White Plains, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1980.

Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiu suo, 上海社會學院歷史研究所, ed. *Wu si yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji* 五四運動在上海史料選輯 (*The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: A Selection of Historical Materials*). Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chuban she, 1980.

Shapin, Steven. 'The Ivory Tower: The History of a Figure of Speech and Its Cultural Uses'. *The British Journal for the History of Science* 45, no. 1 (March 2012): 1–27.

Shen Xuanwu, 申鉉武. *Zhongguo zhengdang, zhengtuan daguan* 中國政黨、政團大觀 (*Overview over China's Political Parties and Political Groupings*). Yanji: Yanbian daxue chuban she, 1988.

Shen Yinmo, 沈尹默. 'Wo he Chen Duxiu 我和陳獨秀 (I and Chen Duxiu)'. In *Chen Duxiu yanjiu cankao ziliao* 陳獨秀研究參考資料 (*Study and Reference Material on Chen Duxiu*), edited by Anqing shi lishi xuehui, 安慶市歷史學會, 1:89–91. Anyang: Anyang shi chuban she, 1981.

Shenbao 1872-1949 申報 1872-1949 (*The Shanghai News 1872-1949*) (database). Accessed 19 October 2012. http://shunpao.egreenapple.com.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). '"Cha hua nü" xiaoshuo zhi xin dianying "茶花女" 小說之新電影 (The New Film about the Novel "The Lady of the Camellias")'. 26 October 1923.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Advertisement for *New Tide*'. 3 November 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Bake zhong zhi Jing xuejie xiaoxi 罷課中之京學界消息 (News of the Striking Students in Beijing)'. 23 May 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Beijing daxue you qi jueda bolan: Cai xiaozhang cizhi chu Jing 北京大學又起絕大波瀾：蔡校長辭職出京 (Another Big Wave Rises at Beijing University: President Cai Quits and Leaves Beijing)'. 12 May 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Ben bao de guanggao, faxing ji qita 本報的廣告、發行及其他 (This Newspaper's Advertisement, Distribution and so on)'. 20 September 1947.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Chen Duxiu bei bu 陳獨秀被捕 (Chen Duxiu Arrested)'. 15 June 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Chengzhong xiao zhi xin xun: xianzai xiaoyou Hu Shi zhi tongnian keyi 澄衷校之新訊: 檢載校友胡適之董年課藝 (News from Chengzhong School: Discovery and Publication of Childhood Essays by Alumnus Hu Shi)'. 22 December 1922.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Chuban jie xiaoxi 出版界消息 (News from the Publishing World)'. 31 March 1925.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Fu jiaoyu tanhe shuo zhi youlai 傅教育彈劾說之由來 (Origins of the Story about the Impeachment of [Minister of] Education Fu)'. 1 April 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Guonei zhuandian 國內專電 (National Special Telegrams)'. 10 October 1924.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Haishang xiaoshuo jia manping (yi) 海上小說家漫評（一） (Commentary of Foreign Novelists [1])'. 16 January 1921.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Hu Renyuan zhang daxue wenti: jiaoyuan xuesheng yizhi fandui 胡仁源長大學問題：教員、學生一致反對 (Chancellor Hu Renyuan's Problem with the University: Professors and Students Unanimously Oppose Him)'. 10 June 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Hu Shi zuori di Hu 胡適昨日抵滬 (Hu Shi Arrived in Shanghai Yesterday)'. 21 May 1927.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Jiang Zhe zhi jinian guochi yu zheng Qingdao 江浙之紀念國恥與爭青島 (Jiangsu's and Zhejiang's Commemoration of the National Disgrace and Fight for Qingdao)'. 11 May 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Jimo Xu sheng 寂寞徐生 (Lonely Scholar Xu)'. 20 February 1921.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Jing xuejie jin xun 京學界近訊 (Recent News from Academia in Beijing)'. 11 August 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Jing xuejie zhi zuijin xingdong 京學界之最近行動 (Latest Events in Beijing's Academia)'. 27 May 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 'Jinghua duanjian 京華短簡 (Short Letters from the Capital)'. 5 April 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Kuiyi zhengwu chu yifu biantong Hanlin yuan guanzhi 會議政務處議覆變通翰林院官制 (The Institution for Political Affairs of the Court Conference Discusses and Replies regarding the Adaptation of the Hanlin Academy Bureaucracy)’. 15 November 1909.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Meiguo nü xiaoshuo jia Shituhuo furen xiaoying 美國女小說家施土活夫人小影 (A Photo of the Female American Writer Mrs. Stowe)’. 10 April 1921.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Shandong wenti Zhong Ri huanwen zhi pilu 山東問題中日換文之披露 (Disclosure of Sino-Japanese Diplomatic Correspondence on the Shandong Question)’. 22 February 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Waibao lun Nan Bei jianghe yaodian 外報論南北講和要點 (Foreign Newspapers Discuss Crucial Points about the Peace Talks between South and North)’. 17 December 1918.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Weiwei gongsi xin dao da pi xiaoshuo 微微公司新到大批小說 (A Great Amount of Novels Newly Arrives at Weiwei Company)’. 3 February 1923.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Wu yue qi ri zhi guomin dahui 五月七日之國民大會 (The National Assembly of 7 May)’. 8 May 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Xiaoshuo xianping 小說閒評 (Casual Evaluation of Novels)’. 20 February 1921.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Xiju jia huanyan Hu Shizhi: Hu yun hui Jing hou zuo changshi juben 戲劇家歡宴胡適之: 胡允回京後作嘗試劇本 (Actors Give a Banquet in Hu Shizhi’s Honour: Hu Consents to Write a Trial Script after His Return to Beijing)’. 20 November 1923.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Xuejie fengchao zhong ge fangmian zhi taidu 學界風潮中各方面之態度 (The Attitude of All Parties in the Student Protests)’. 8 May 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Yanshuo jingjin hui di er ci kaihui ji 演說競進會第二次開會紀 (Record of the Second Lecture Competition)’. 25 December 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Yanshuo jingjin hui dingqi zai Ning kahui 演說競進會定期在寧開會 (The Lecture Competition Is Scheduled to Be Held in Nanjing)’, 31 October 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Yanshuo jingjin hui yanti zhi jieshi 演說競進會演題之解釋 (Explanation of the Topic of the Lecture Competition)’, 2 November 1919.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Yi xiaoshuo yi xi tan 譯小說一席談 (A Talk about the Translation of Novels)’. 3 April 1921.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Yi xiaoshuo yi xi tan 譯小說一席談 (A Talk about the Translation of Novels)’. 3 April 1921.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Yingguo zhuming xiaoshuo shecheng yingju 英國著名小說攝成影戲 (A Famous English Novel Is Adapted for the Screen)’. 16 December 1922.

Shenbao 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). ‘Yingguo zhuming xiaoshuo shecheng yingju 英國著名小說攝成影戲 (A Famous English Novel Is Adapted for the Screen)’. 16 December 1922. ‘Yingyin Shuoming 影印說明 (Explanations to the Photo-

Offset)'. In *Yishibao* 益世報 (*Social Welfare Tiensin*), 20:i. Tianjin: Nankai daxue chuban she, 2004.
Sheridan, James E. 'The Warlord Era: Politics and Militarism under the Peking Government, 1916–28'. In *The Cambridge History of China*, 12:284–321. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Histories Online, 1983. Accessed 13 November 2013. http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/histories/.
Shexie xiaolang, 蛇蠍小狼. 'Fuxi zhengzhi … 復習政治 …… (When Revising Politics …)'. *Xinlang weibo* 新浪微博 (*Sina Weibo*) (microblog), 12 October 2012. Accessed 31 December 2012. http://s.weibo.com.
'Sheyuan 社員 (Members of the Society)'. In *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*), 1:150. Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 1966.
Shi, Shumei. *The Lure of the Modern: Writing Modernism in Semicolonial China, 1917-1937*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
Shuang Yu, 霜羽. 'Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai 大學校長問題之過去現在未來 (Past, Present and Future of the Problems with the University's Chancellor)'. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 13 May 1919.
Spence, Jonathan. *The Search for Modern China*. New York: Norton, 1999.
Strand, David. *Rickshaw Beijing: City People and Politics in the 1920s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
Su, K'e Ju. 'The Educational Value of Chinese Character Writing'. Student essay, n.d. Container 219. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Sun Changwei, 孫常煒, ed. *Cai Yuanpei xiansheng quanji* 蔡元培先生全集 (*Collected Works of Mr Cai Yuanpei*). Taibei: Taiwan shangwu yinshu guan, 1968.
Sun Youkui, 孫友葵. s.v. 'Wu Zhihui 吳稚暉 (Wu Zhihui)'. Edited by Zhu Jianhua, 朱建華, Liang De, 梁德, and Sung Chun, 宋春. *Zhongguo zhengdang yaoren chuan* 中國政黨要人傳 (*Biographies of Important Members of Political Parties*). Changchun: Jilin wenshi chuban she, 1990.
Sze Be Tsung. 'Letter to Emma Lester', 18 September 1929. Container 218. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
———. 'Letter to Emma Lester', 17 October 1929. Container 218. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Sze, We Tsung. 'Letter to Emma Lester', 18 October 1932. Container 213. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Sze, Wu Tsung. 'Letter to Emma Lester', 3 June 1925. Container 214. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
———. 'Letter to Emma Lester', 5 July 1926. Container 208. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
———. 'Letter to Emma Lester', 8 February 1934. Container 207. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Tan Mingqian, 譚鳴謙. 'Laodong wenti zhi jiejue 勞動問題之解決 (The Solution of the Workers' Question)'. *Xinchao* 新潮 (*New Tide*) 1, no. 4 (1 April 1919): 603–610.
Tang Xiaobing, 唐小兵. *Xiandai Zhongguo de gongong yulun: yi 'Dagong bao' 'Xingqi lunwen' he 'Shen bao' 'Ziyou tan' wei li* 現代中國的公共輿論：以《大公報》「星期論文」和《申報》「自由談」為例 (*Modern Chinese*

Public Opinion: The Examples of 'Weekly Review' of Impartial and 'Free Talks' of the Shanghai News). Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chuban she, 2012.

Tang Xiu, 唐隽. 'Du Chen Duxiu de "Xin wenhua yundong shi shenme" 讀陳獨秀的"新文化運動是什麼？" (Reading Chen Duxiu's "What is the New Culture Movement?")'. *Meishu* 美術 (*Art*) (Shanghai) 2, no. 2 (1920): 105–108.

Taylor, Jenny Bourne. s.v. 'New Historicism'. Edited by Payne, Michael. *Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1997. Accessed 25 February 2014. http://www.blackwellreference.com.

Tiang Hao, 天豪. 'Beijing zhi daxue xiaoxi 北京之大學消息 (News from Beijing's Universities)'. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 3 July 1924.

Tianjin lishi bowu guan, 天津歷史博物館 and Nankai daxue lishi xi 'Wu si yundong zai Tianjin' bianxie zu, 南開大學歷史系《五四運動在天津》編寫組, eds. *Wu si yundong zai Tianjin: lishi ziliao xuanji* 五四運動在天津: 歷史資料選輯 (*The May Fourth Movement in Tianjin: Selection of Historical Materials*). Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chuban she, 1979.

Ting Hao, 廷浩. '"Gu er ku yu" zhi pinglun "孤兒苦遇"之評論 (Evaluation of *Oliver Twist*)'. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*). 10 September 1924.

Ting, Vung Yuin. 'Letter to Emma Lester', 11 January 1937. Container 209. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Tsou, Szu-Ju. 'The Marriage Customs in My Own Community, Soochow'. Student essay. Beijing, n.d. Container 221. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Wagner, Rudolf. 'The Role of the Foreign Community in the Chinese Public Sphere'. *The China Quarterly* no. 142 (June 1995): 424–443.

Wagner, Rudolf G. 'The Canonization of May Fourth'. In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, edited by Doleželová-Velingerová, Milena and Král, Oldřich, 66–120. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

Wakeman, Jr., Frederic. 'The Civil Society and Public Sphere Debate: Western Reflections on Chinese Political Culture'. *Modern China* 19, no. 2 (1993): 108–138.

Waldron, Arthur. *From War to Nationalism: China's Turning Point, 1924-1925*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Wang Dapeng, 王大鵬, ed. s.v. 'Hu Shi 胡適 (Hu Shi)'. *Bainian guoshi* 百年國士 (*Our Country's Scholars of a Hundred Years*). Beijing: Zhongguo wenlian chuban she, 1999.

Wang, David Der-wei. 'Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937'. In *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature*, edited by Chang, Kang-i Sun, 2:413–564. Cambridge Histories Online. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Accessed 12 September 2013. http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/histories/.

———. *Fin-de-Siècle Splendor: Repressed Modernities of Late Qing Fiction, 1849-1911*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Wang, Fan-sen. *Fu Ssu-Nien: A Life in Chinese History and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Wang Feng, 王風. 'Wu si qianhou de Lin Shu 五四前後的林紓 (Lin Shu around May Fourth)'. In *Honglou zhongshen ji qi huixiang: chongxin shendu 'wu si' xin*

wenhua 紅樓鐘聲及其回響：重新審讀'五四'新文化 (*The Tolling of the Red Mansion and Its Echo: A New Reading of the 'May Fourth' New Culture*), edited by Chen Pingyuan, 陳平原, 22–33. Beijing: Beijing daxue chuban she, 2009.

Wang Guanghe, 王光和. 'Xifang yingxiang yu Hu Shi lun wenyan zhi "si" yu baihua zhi "huo" 西方影響與胡適論文言之「死」與白話之「活」 (Western Influence and Hu Shi's Argument That *wenyan* Is "Dead" and *baihua* Is "Alive")'. *Shijie wenxue pinglun* 世界文學評論 (*World Literature Criticism*) no. 1 (2010): 263–267.

Wang Guangyuan, 王光遠. *Chen Duxiu Nianpu 1879-1942* 陳獨秀年譜 1879-1942 (*A Chronology of the Life of Chen Duxiu, 1879-1942*). Chongqing: Chongqing chuban she, 1987.

Wang Guohua, 王國華. *Xuelin sui hua: 1919 nian – 2009 nian de Zhongguo wenren jianying* 學林碎話：1919 年-2009 年的中國文人剪影 (*Anecdotes from Academia: Sketches of Chinese Literary People from 1919 to 2009*). Showwe Information Co., Ltd., 2010.

Wang Jingfang, 王敬芳. 'Fakan ci 發刊辭 (Manifesto)'. *Xin qun* 新群 (*Social Reconstruction*) no. 1 (November 1919): 1–7.

Wang Jingxuan, 王敬軒. 'Wang Jingxuan jun lai xin 王敬軒君來信 (A Letter from Mr Wang Jingxuan)'. In *Qian Xuantong, Liu Bannong* 錢玄同、劉半農 (*Qian Xuantong, Liu Bannong*), edited by Zhao Lidong, 趙利棟, 107–113. Wu si fengyun renwu wencui 五四風雲人物文萃 (Collections of Famous May Fourth Figures). Beijing: Renmin ribao chuban she, 1999.

Wang Runian, 王儒年. *Yuwang de xiangxiang: 1920-1930 niandai Shenbao guanggao de wenhua shi yanjiu* 欲望的想像：1920-1930 年代《申報》廣告的文化史研究 (*The Imagination of Desire : A Cultural History of Advertisement in Shenbao in the 1920s and 1930s*). Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chuban she, 2007.

Wang Shiqing, 王世清. 'Shenbao "jinzhi youdi" shijian 《申報》"禁止郵遞"事件 (The Affair of the *Shanghai News'* "Postal Ban")'. In *Shi Liangcai yu 'Shenbao' de fazhan* 史量才與《申報》的發展 (*Shi Liangcai and the Development of Shanghai News*), edited by Fu Dehua, 傅德華, Pang Rongdi, 龐榮棣 and Yang Jiguang, 楊繼光, 95–100. Shanghai: Fudan daxue chuban she, 2013.

Wang, Tzu Li. 'The Education Value of Chinese Character Writing'. Student essay, n.d. Container 219. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Wang Yinxue, 王吟雪. 'Shishi xinbao: cong wu si yundong yilai Shanghai gua xin wenhua yundong zhaopai de baozhi … 時事新報：從五四運動以來上海掛新文化運動招牌的報紙…… (*Current Affairs*: Newspapers that Hang Up the Signboard New Culture Movement in Shanghai since the May Fourth Movement)...' *Xin fojiao* 新佛教 (*New Buddhism*) 1, no. 6 (1920): 9–10.

Wang Yuanfang, 汪原放. *Huiyi Yadong tushuguan* 回憶亞東圖書館 (*Remembering East Asia Library*). Shanghai: Xuelin chuban she, 1983.

———. *Yadong tushuguan yu Chen Duxiu* 亞東圖書館與陳獨秀 (*East Asia Library and Chen Duxiu*). Shanghai: Xuelin chuban she, 2006.

Wang, 往. 'Xin jiu sichao pingyi 新舊思潮評議 (A Fair Discussion of New and Old Intellectual Tides)'. In *Wu si yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji* 五四運動在

上海史料選輯 (*The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: A Selection of Historical Materials*), edited by Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiu suo, 上海社會學院歷史研究所, 107–108. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chuban she, 1980.

Wasserstrom, Jeffrey N. *Student Protests in Twentieth-Century China: The View from Shanghai*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Wei Qiao, 魏橋, ed. s.v. 'Jiang Menglin 蔣夢麟 (Jiang Menglin)'. *Zhejiang sheng renwu zhi* 浙江省人物志 (*Records of Personages in Zhejiang*). Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chuban she, 2005.

———. , ed. s.v. 'Qian Nengxun 錢能訓 (Qian Nengxun)'. *Zhejiang sheng renwu zhi* 浙江省人物志 (*Records of Personages in Zhejiang*). Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chuban she, 2005.

———. , ed. s.v. 'Qian Xuantong 錢玄同 (Qian Xuantong)'. *Zhejiang sheng renwu zhi* 浙江省人物志 (*Records of Personages in Zhejiang*). Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chuban she, 2005.

———. , ed. s.v. 'Shen Yinmo 沈尹默 (Shen Yinmo)'. *Zhejiang sheng renwu zhi* 浙江省人物志 (*Records of Personages in Zhejiang*). Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chuban she, 2005.

Wen, Shih Ch'ang. 'My Reflections and Queries on the Question of Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non-Chinese'. Examination paper, 22 January 1924. Container 221. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Wen yu hui. 'Invitation to Hu Shi's Lecture', 17 November 1922. Container 220. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

———. 'Invitation to Hu Shi's Lecture', 20 February 1924. Container 187. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Wen yu hui and Zucker, A.E. 'Invitation to Lewis Chase's Lecture', 5 June 1922. Container 222. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

West, Philip. *Yenching University and Sino-Western Relations, 1916-1952*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.

'Western Literature'. Library catalogue. *World Cat*, 1925. Accessed 10 January 2014. http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/488594713.

Weston, Timothy B. 'The Formation and Positioning of the New Culture Community, 1913-1917'. *Modern China* 24, no. 3 (July 1998): 255–284.

Weston, Timothy B. *The Power of Position: Beijing University, Intellectuals, and Chinese Political Culture, 1898-1929*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2004.

Wikipedia. s.v. 'New Culture Movement'. Accessed 26 February 2014. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Culture_Movement.

Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Revised edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Wu Jing, 吳靜. *'Xuedeng' yu wu si xin wenhua yundong* 《學燈》與五四新文化運動 (*The 'Scholar's Lantern' and the May Fourth New Culture Movement*). Beijing: Zhongguo shuju chuban she, 2013.

Wu Lichang, 吳立昌, ed. *Wenxue de xiaojie yu fan xiaojie: Zhongguo xiandai wenxue paibie lunzheng shilun* 文學的消解與反消解：中國現代文學派別論爭史論

(*Dispelling Literature and the Opposition to Dispelling It: A History of the Factions and Debates in Modern Chinese Literature*). Shanghai: Fudan daxue chuban she, 2004.

Wu Mi, 吳宓. 'Lun xin wenhua yundong (jielu *Liu mei xuesheng jibao*) 論新文化運動（節錄留美學生季報） (A Discussion of the New Culture Movement [An Excerpt from the *Chinese Students' Quarterly*])'. *Xueheng* 學衡 (*The Critical Review*) no. 4 (1922): 36–58.

———. 'Zai lun xin wenhua yundong (da Qiu Changwei jun) 再論新文化運動(答邱昌渭君) (Another Discussion of the New Culture Movement [A Reply to Mr Qiu Changwei])'. *Liu mei xuesheng jibao* 留美學生季報 (*The Chinese Students' Quarterly*) 8, no. 4 (1921): 13–38.

Wu Ti, 伍俶. 'Yi Mengzhen 憶孟真 (Remembering Mengzhen)'. In *E'e zhi shi: Mingren bixia de Fu Sinian, Fu Sinian bixia de mingren* 諤諤之士：命人筆下的傅斯年傅斯年筆下的名人 (*Outspoken Gentlemen: Fu Sinian in the Words of Famous People, Famous People in the Words of Fu Sinian*), edited by Wang Furen, 王富仁 and Shi Xingze, 石興澤, 82–86. Shanghai: Dongfang chuban zhongxin, 1999.

Wu Xiang, 吳翔. 'Lun Xu Shuzheng yu Wanxi junfa de xingshuai 論徐樹錚與皖系軍閥的興衰 (The Rise and Fall of Xu Shuzheng and the Anhui Warlord Clique)'. Master's, Huazhong shifan daxue 華中師範大學 (Huazhong Normal University), 2009.

Xi Ping, 希平. 'Duiyu "Liu Boming jun yanjiang xin wenhua yundong zhi yiyi ji biyao" de piping 對於"劉伯明君演講新文化運動之意義及必要"的批評 (A Criticism of "Liu Boming's Talk on the Meaning and Necessity of the New Culture Movement")'. *Juewu* 覺悟 (*Enlightenment*). 1 July 1920.

Xian Jin, 先进. 'Xin wenhua yundong de wuqi 新文化運動的武器 (The Weapons of the New Culture Movement)'. *Xingqi pinglun* 星期評論 (*The Weekly Review*). 31 August 1919.

Xie Yuanxue, 謝遠學. *Zhongguo gongchandang lishi jishi* 中國共產黨歷史紀實 (*Records of the History of the Chinese Communist Party*). Vol. 1A. Beijing: Renmin chuban she, 2003.

Xin fojiao 新佛教 (*New Buddhism*). 'She gao 社告 (Announcements of This Society)' 1, no. 1 (1920): 1–2.

Xin funü 新婦女 (*New Woman*), 1920.

Xin funü 新婦女 (*New Woman*). 'Copyright Page' 1, no. 2 (1920).

Xin funü 新婦女 (*New Woman*). 'Jingyi yanjing gongsi jin qi 精益眼鏡公司謹啓 (Careful Notice by *Jingyi* Glasses Company)' 1, no. 1 (reprint) (10 October 1920): 1.

Xin funü 新婦女 (*New Woman*). 'Xin Funü xuanyan 新婦女宣言 (Manifesto of "The New Woman")' 1, no. 1 (reprint) (10 October 1920): 1.

Xin Wei, 心危. 'Riben dui wo xin sixiang shishi zhi tongqing 日本對我新思想失勢之同情 (Japan's Sympathy for the Loss of Power of Our New Intellectual Tide)'. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*), 25 April 1919.

Xin xuesheng 新學生 (*New Student*). 'Ben she qishi yi 本社啓事一 (Announcements of this Society, One)' 1, no. 1 (December 1919).

Xin xuesheng 新學生 (*New Student*). 'Fakan ci 發刊詞 (Manifesto)' 1, no. 1 (December 1919): 1–3.

Xin xuesheng 新學生 (*New Student*). 'Xin xuesheng di yi juan di yi hao muci 新學生第一卷第一號目次 (*New Student*, Vol 1, No 1, Table of Contents)' 1, no. 1 (December 1919).

Xinchao 新潮 (*New Tide*). 'Advertisement for *New Youth*' 1, no. 1 (1 January 1919).

Xinchao 新潮 (*New Tide*). 'Advertisement for the *Morning Post*' 1, no. 1 (1 January 1919).

Xinchao 新潮 (*New Tide*). 'Copyright Page' 1, no. 1 (1 January 1919).

Xinchao 新潮 (*New Tide*). 'Copyright Page' 2, no. 1 (30 October 1919).

Xinchao 新潮 (*New Tide*). 'Guanggao jiamu 廣告價目 (Price List for Advertisements)' 1, no. 1 (1 January 1919).

Xinchao 新潮 (*New Tide*). Vol. 1. Minguo zhenxi qikan 民國珍稀期刊 (Valuable Republican Journals). Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 2006.

Xinchao 新潮 (*New Tide*). Vol. 2. Minguo zhenxi qikan 民國珍稀期刊 (Valuable Republican Journals). Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 2006.

Xinchao 新潮 (*New Tide*). Vol. 3. Minguo zhenxi qikan 民國珍稀期刊 (Valuable Republican Journals). Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 2006.

Xinghua 興華 (*The Chinese Christian Advocate*). 'Xin wenhua yundong zhi jieshi 新文化運動之解釋 (Explanation of the New Culture Movement')' 16, no. 44 (12 November 1919): 28–29.

Xinqun 新群 (*Social Reconstruction*). 'Advertisement for "Bali heyi hou zhi shijie yu Zhongguo 巴黎和議後之世界與中國 (The World after the Paris Peace Conference and China)"' no. 1 (November 1919).

Xinqun 新群 (*Social Reconstruction*). 'Advertisement for *New Tide*, Vol. 1, ed. 3' no. 1 (November 1919).

Xinqun 新群 (*Social Reconstruction*). 'Advertisement for *New Tide*' 1, no. 1 (November 1919).

Xinqun 新群 (*Social Reconstruction*). 'Ben zazhi bianji renyuan 本雜誌編輯人員 (Editors of This Magazine)' no. 1 (November 1919).

Xinqun 新群 (*Social Reconstruction*). 'Copyright Page' 1, no. 1 (November 1919).

Xiong Zhiyong, 熊志勇 and Su Hao, 蘇浩. *Zhongguo jin xiandai waijiao shi* 中國近現代外交史 (*A History of Modern and Contemporary Diplomacy in China*). Beijing: Shijie zhishi chuban she, 2005.

Xu Guoyu, 徐國俞. 'My Reflections and Queries on the Question of the Creation of the Chinese Imaginative Literature of Interest to Non Chinese'. Examination paper, 22 January 1924. Container 221. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Xu Hansan, 許漢三. *Huang Yanpei nianpu* 黃炎培年譜 (*A Chronology of Huang Yanpei's Life*). Beijing: Wenshi ziliao chuban she, 1985.

Xu Jilin, 許紀霖. *Jindai Zhongguo zhishi fenzi de gongong jiaowang* 近代中國知識分子的公共交往 (*Contacts between Modern Chinese Intellectuals*). Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chuban she, 2007.

Xu Jilin, 許紀霖 and Luo Gang, 羅崗. *Qimeng de ziwo wajie* 啓蒙的自我瓦解 (*Enlightenment Collapsing In on Itself*). Beijing: Guilin chuban jituan, 2007.

Xu Weiming, 徐為民, ed. s.v. 'Bao Yi 抱一 (Bao Yi)'. *Zhongguo jin xiandai renwu bieming cidian* 中國近現代人物別名詞典 (*Dictionary of the Pseudonyms of Chinese Figures in the Modern and Contemporary Period*). Shenyang: Shenyang chuban she, 1993.

———. , ed. s.v. 'Xi Ping 希平 (Xi Ping)'. *Zhongguo jin xiandai renwu bieming cidian* 中國近現代人物別名詞典 (*Dictionary of the Pseudonyms of Chinese Figures in the Modern and Contemporary Period*). Shenyang: Shenyang chuban she, 1993.

Xu Youchun, 徐友春, ed. s.v. 'Gao Yihan 高一涵 (Gao Yihan)'. *Minguo renwu da cidian* 民國人物大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Republican Figures*). Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chuban she, 1991.

———. , ed. s.v. 'Li Xiaofeng 李小峰 (Li Xiaofeng)'. *Minguo renwu da cidian* 民國人物大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Republican Figures*). Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chuban she, 1991.

———. , ed. s.v. 'Li Xinbai 李辛白 (Li Xinbai)'. *Minguo renwu da cidian* 民國人物大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Republican Figures*). Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chuban she, 1991.

———. , ed. s.v. 'Lu Zongyu 陸宗輿 (Lu Zongyu)'. *Minguo renwu da cidian* 民國人物大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Republican Figures*). Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chuban she, 1991.

———. s.v. 'Luo Yunyan 羅運炎'. *Minguo renwu da cidian* 民國人物大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Republican Figures*). Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chuban she, 1991.

———. s.v. 'Ting Weisheng 衛挺生 (Ting Weisheng)'. *Minguo renwu da cidian* 民國人物大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Republican Figures*). Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chuban she, 1991.

———. , ed. s.v. 'Zhang Yuanqi 張元奇 (Zhang Yuanqi)'. *Minguo renwu da cidian* 民國人物大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of Republican Figures*). Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chuban she, 1991.

Xu Zhongshu, 徐中舒, ed. s.v. 'Ci 祠 (Sacrifice, Etc.)'. *Hanyu da zidian* 漢語大字典 (*Great Chinese Dictionary*). Wuhan: Hubei cishu chuban she, 2008.

Xue Xiangsui, 薛祥綏. 'Du gushu fa ju yu 讀古書法舉隅 (How to Read Old Books)'. *Guogu* 國故 (*National Heritage*) no. 1 (1919): 1B–2B.

Yang Shousen, 楊守森. *Yishu jingjie lun* 藝術境界論 (*The Boundaries of Art*). Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chuban she, 2008.

Yang Zhensheng, 楊振聲. 'Huiyi wu si 回憶五四 (Remembering May Fourth)'. In *Wu si yundong huiyi lu xu* 五四運動回憶錄續 (*Records of Memories of the May Fourth Movement. Sequel*), edited by Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindai shi yanjiu suo, 中國社會科學院近代史研究所, 52–57. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chuban she, 1959.

Yang Zhijiu, 楊志玖, Wu Ze, 吳澤 and Zheng Tianting, 鄭天挺, eds. s.v. 'Feng Guozhang 馮國璋 (Feng Guozhang)'. *Zhongguo lishi da cidian* 中國歷史大辭典 (*Great Chinese Historical Dictionary*). Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chuban she, 2000.

Ye Juan, 葉雋. *Deyu wenxue yanjiu yu xiandai Zhongguo* 德語文學研究與現代中國 (*Research on German Literature and Contemporary China*). Beijing: Beijing daxue chuban she, 2008.

Ye Shixiang, 葉世祥 and Zhang Dongmei, 張東梅. 'Xiandaixing shiye zhong de "guocui pai" he "Xueheng pai" 現代性視野中的"國粹派"和"學衡派" (The "National Essence Group" and the "Critical Review Group" from a Modern Perspective)'. *Xiandaixing shiye zhong de 'guocui pai' he 'Xueheng pai'* 21, no. 4 (2008): 1–4.

Ye Yonglie, 葉永烈. *Chen Yun zhi lu* 陳雲之路 (*Chen Yun's Road*). Nanning: Guangxi renmin chuban she, 2005.

Ye Yun, 野雲. 'Ji Beijing daxue shiye shi (xu) 紀北京大學始業式 (續) (Remembering Beijing University's New Academic-Year Opening Ceremony, Part Two)'. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*), 15 September 1920.

———. 'Jing xuejie yaoren zhi diaoxie 京學界要人之凋謝 (The Passing-Away of Important Figures in Beijing Academiia)'. *Shenbao* 申報 (*The Shanghai News*), 27 November 1919.

Yeh, Wen-hsin. *Provincial Passages: Culture, Space, and the Origins of Chinese Communism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

———. *Shanghai Splendor: Economic Sentiments and the Making of Modern China, 1843-1949*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2007.

———. *The Alienated Academy: Culture and Politics in Republican China, 1919-1937*. Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1990.

Yi Wan, 億萬. 'Yi zhou Beijing de gongmin da huodong 一週北京的公民大活動 (One Week of Great Activities by the Citizens of Beijing)'. *Meizhou pinglun* 每週評論 (*The Weekly Review*). 11 May 1919.

Yisheng, 遺生. 'Zui jin zhi xueshu xinchao 最近之學術新潮 (Recent New Trends in Scholarship)'. In *Wu si yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji* 五四運動在上海史料選輯 (*The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: A Selection of Historical Materials*), edited by Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiu suo, 上海社會學院歷史研究所, 106–107. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chuban she, 1980.

Yishibao 益世報 (*Social Welfare Tiensin*). 'Beijing xuesheng fu Cai Zimin liang dian 北京學生覆蔡子民兩電 (Two Telegrams from the Students in Beijing in Reply to Cai Zimin)'. 12 July 1919.

Yishibao 益世報 (*Social Welfare Tiensin*). 'Daxue xiaozhang zhi cizhi 大學校長之辭職 (The Resignation of the Chancellor of the University)'. 10 May 1919.

Yishibao 益世報 (*Social Welfare Tiensin*). 'Daxuesheng lai Jin canguan zhiwen 大學生來津參觀誌聞 (University Student Comes on a Visit to Tianjin)'. 7 January 1919.

Yishibao 益世報 (*Social Welfare Tiensin*). 'Jiaoyu ting huiyi fangfan xuechao 教育廳會議防範學潮 (The Meeting of the Provincial Education Department Is on Guard against Student Protests)'. 2 December 1919.

Yishibao 益世報 (*Social Welfare Tiensin*). 'Shandong wenti yi jiejue 山東問題已解決 (The Shandong Question Has Already Been Solved)'. 10 May 1919.

Yishibao 益世報 (*Social Welfare Tiensin*). 'Waijiao jinji yu heju polie (liu) 外交緊急與和局破裂（六） (The Urgency of Diplomacy and the Destruction of Peace [Six])'. 21 May 1919.

Yishibao 益世報 (*Social Welfare Tiensin*). ‘Waijiao jinji yu heju polie (si) 外交緊急與和局破裂（四） (The Urgency of Diplomacy and the Destruction of Peace [Four])’. 19 May 1919.

Yu Chunmei, 喻春梅. *Dadao wei gong: Changsha ‘Dagong bao’ (1915-1927) yu Hunan shehui sichao* 大道為公：長沙《大公報》（1915-1927）與湖南社會思潮 (*The Grand Course Pursues a Public Spirit: Impartial in Changsha (1915-1927) and Intellectual Tides Hunanese Society*). Changsha: Hunan renmin chuban she, 2011.

Yu Lunian, 俞鹿年. s.v. ‘Suzheng ting 肅政廳 (Censorship Bureau)’. *Zhongguo guanzhi da cidian* 中國官制大辭典 (*Great Dictionary of the Chinese Bureaucratic System*). Harbin: Heilongjiang renmin chuban she, 1992.

Yu Shizhen, 俞士鎮. ‘Gu jin xueshu goutong siyi 古今學術鉤通私議 (Connecting Old and New Scholarship)’. *Guogu* 國故 (*National Heritage*) no. 1 (1919): 1B–3A.

Yu Tiandong, 余天棟. ‘Xin wenhua yundong zhi zhongzhong wenti ji tuixing fa 新文化運動之種種問題及推行法 (The Various Questions of the New Culture Movement and Ways to Promote It)’. *Xuesheng* 學生 (*The Students’ Magazine*) 7, no. 3 (1920): 1–5.

Yu Wenzao, 于文藻. s.v. ‘Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培 (Cai Yuanpei)’. Edited by Zhu Jianhua, 朱建華, Liang De, 梁德, and Song Chun, 宋春. *Zhongguo zhengdang yaoren chuan* 中國政黨要人傳 (*Biographies of Important Members of Political Parties*). Changchun: Jilin wenshi chuban she, 1990.

Yü, Ying-shih. ‘Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment: A Historian’s Reflection on the May Fourth Movement’. In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China’s May Fourth Project*, edited by Doleželová-Velingerová, Milena and Král, Oldřich, 299–326. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

Yuan Hui, 袁暉. *Hanyu biaodian fuhao liubian shi* 漢語標點符號流變史 (*A History of the Development of Chinese Punctuation Marks*). Wuhan: Hubei jiaoyu chuban she, 2002.

———. s.v. ‘Jiushi biaodian fuhao 舊式標點符號 (Old-Style Punctuation Marks)’. *Biaodian fuhao cidian* 標點符號詞典 (*A Dictionary of Punctuation Marks*). Shanghai: Shanghai chuban she, 2000.

Yuan Quan, 淵泉. ‘Jinggao shoujiu dang 警告守舊黨 (Warning the Conservative Faction)’. In *Wu si yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji* 五四運動在上海史料選輯 (*The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: A Selection of Historical Materials*), edited by Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiu suo, 上海社會學院歷史研究所, 104–105. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chuban she, 1980.

Yuan Shuyi, 苑書義, ed. s.v. ‘Yanjiu xi 研究系 (Research Clique)’. *Zhongguo lishi da shidian* 中國曆史大事典 (*Great Encyclopaedia of Chinese History*). Shijiazhuang: Hebei Jiaoyu chuban she, 1988.

Yun Chao, 蘊巢. ‘Lun Daxue xin jiu zhi zheng 論大學新舊之爭 (Discussing the Quarrel between New and Old at the University)’. *Yishi bao* 益世報 (*Social Welfare Tiensin*). 7 April 1919.

Zhang Hongru, 張宏儒. s.v. ‘Zhongguo gongxue zai Shanghai chuangban 中國公學在上海創辦 (The Chinese Public School Is Founded in Shanghai)’. *Ershi shiji Zhongguo dashi quanshu* 二十世紀中國大事全書 (*Comprehensive Volume on*

Great Events in Twenty-First-Century China). Beijing: Beijing chuban she, 1993.

Zhang Jianming, 張建明 and Qi Dazhi, 齊大之. *Hua shuo Jing shang* 話説京商 (*Talking about Business in Beijing*). Beijing: Zhonghua gongshang lianhe chuban she, 2006.

Zhang Jingru, 張靜如, Xiao Sheng, 肖甦 and Jiang Huayi, 姜華宜, eds. s.v. 'Shen Zhongjiu 沈仲九 (Shen Zhongjiu)'. *Wu si yilai lishi renwu biming, bieming lu* 五四以來歷史人物筆、名別名錄 (*Pen Names and Pseudonyms of Historical Figures since May Fourth*). Xi'an: Shanxi renmin chuban she, 1986.

———. , eds. s.v. 'Zi Jun 子俊 (Zi Jun)'. *Wu si yilai lishi renwu biming, bieming lu* 五四以來歷史人物筆、名別名錄 (*Pen Names and Pseudonyms of Historical Figures since May Fourth*). Xi'an: Shanxi renmin chuban she, 1986.

Zhang Juncai, 張俊才. *Lin Shu pingzhuan* 林紓評傳 (*A Critical Biography of Lin Shu*). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007.

Zhang Kaiyuan, 章開沅, ed. s.v. 'Jiaoyu hui zhangcheng 教育會章程 (Regulations for Educational Associations)'. *Xinhai geming cidian* 辛亥革命辭典 (*Dictionary of the Xinhai Revolution*). Wuhan: Wuhan chuban she, 1991.

———. , ed. s.v. 'Nanyang gongxue 南洋公學 (Nanyang Public School)'. *Xinhai geming cidian* 辛亥革命辭典 (*Dictionary of the Xinhai Revolution*). Wuhan: Wuhan chuban she, 1991.

Zhang Liaozi, 張繆子. 'Zhang Liaozi yuan han 張繆子原函 (Original letter from Zhang Liaozi)'. In *Cai Yuanpei xiansheng quanji* 蔡元培先生全集 (*Collected Works of Mr Cai Yuanpei*), edited by Sun Changwei, 孫常煒, 1093–94. Taibei: Taiwan shangwu yinshu guan, 1968.

Zhang Xuan, 張煊. 'Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian 駁新潮國故和科學的精神篇(Against the Article "The National Heritage and the Scientific Spirit" in *New Tide*)'. *Guogu* 國故 (*National Heritage*) no. 3 (20 May 1919): 1B–4A.

———. 'Mozi jing shuo xin jie: xu 墨子經說新解:續 (New Explanations of the *Mozi*, Part 2)'. *Guogu* 國故 (*National Heritage*) no. 3 (1919): 1B–3A.

———. 'Wen yan heyi pingyi 文言合一平議 (The Integration of Written and Spoken Language)'. *Guogu* 國故 (*National Heritage*) no. 1 (1919): 1–5.

———. 'Zhongguo wenxue gailiang lun 中國文學改良論 (The Reform of Chinese Literature)'. *Guogu* 國故 (*National Heritage*) no. 4 (1919): 1B–4A.

Zhang Zuoyao, 張作耀. s.v. 'Yunmu dai ri biao 韻目代日表 (Table of the "Replacing-Days-by-Rhyme-Groups" [System])'. *Zhongguo lishi bianlan* 中國歷史便覽 (*A Manual to Chinese History*). Beijing: Renmin chuban she, 1990.

Zhao Xiaolan, 趙曉蘭 and Wu Chao, 吳潮. *Chuanjiaoshi Zhongwen baokan shi* 傳教士中文報刊史 (*A History of Chinese-Language Missionary Newspapers*). Shanghai: Fudan daxue chuban she, 2011.

Zheng Shiqu, 鄭師渠. 'Wu si hou guanyu "xin wenhua yundong" de taolun 五四后關于"新文化運動"的討論 (Discussions about the "New Culture Movement" after May Fourth)'. Conference Paper presented at the 'Wu si de lishi yu lishi de wu si' xueshu taolun hui '五四的歷史與歷史中的五四'學術討論會 ('The History of May Fourth and the May Fourth of History.' An Academic Symposium), Beijing, 6 May 2009. Accessed 24 April 2013. http://www.wanfangdata.com.

Zheng Zhenduo, 鄭振鐸. ‘Xin wenhua yundong de jingshen yu taidu 新文化運動的精神與態度 (The Spirit and Attitude of the New Culture Movement)’. *Xinxue bao* 新學報 (*New Learning*) no. 2 (28 April 1920): 5–8.

Zhi Yan, 隻眼. ‘Guanyu Beijing daxue de yaoyan 關於北京大學的謠言 (The Rumours about Beijing University)’. In *Wu si yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji* 五四運動在上海史料選輯 (*The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: A Selection of Historical Materials*), edited by Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiu suo, 上海社會學院歷史研究所, 103–104. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chuban she, 1980.

Zhong Hengxu, 種恒續. ‘The Triumph of the Students’. *Shangye xuesheng* 商業學生 (*Commercial Student*) no. 2 (December 1919): 22–29.

Zhong Jiu, 仲九. ‘Wu si yundong de huigu 五四運動的回顧 (Looking Back on the May Fourth Movement)’. *Jianshe* 建設 (*Construction*) 1, no. 3 (1919): 599–612.

Zhonggong Jiangsu shengwei dangshi gongzuo weiyuan hui, 中共江蘇省委黨史工作委員會 and Zhongguo di er lishi dang’an guan, 中國第二歷史檔案館, eds. *Wu si yundong zai Jiangsu* 五四運動在江蘇 (*The May Fourth Movement in Jiangsu*). Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chuban she, 1992.

Zhonggong Zhejiang shengwei dangxiao dangshi jiaoyan shi, 中共浙江省委黨校黨史教研室, ed. *Wu si yundong zai Zhejiang* 五四運動在浙江 (*The May Fourth Movement in Zhejiang*). Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chuban she, 1979.

Zhongguo guojia shuzi tushu guan (Minguo zhuanlan) 中國國家數字圖書館（民国專欄） (*National Digital Library of China [Republican Section]*) (database). Accessed 19 October 2012. http://res4.nlc.gov.cn.

Zhongguo kexue yuan lishi yanjiu suo di san suo jindai shi ziliao bianji zu, 中國科學院歷史研究所第三所近代史資料編輯組, ed. *Wu si aiguo yundong ziliao* 五四愛國運動資料 (*Materials on the Patriotic Movement of May Fourth*). Beijing: Kexue chuban she, 1959.

Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindai shi yanjiu suo ‘jindai shi ziliao’ bianyi shi, 中國社會科學院近代史研究所《近代史資料》編譯室, ed. *Wu si aiguo yundong* 五四愛國運動 (*The Patriotic Movement of May Fourth*). Vol. 1. Beijing: Zhishi chanquan chuban she, 2013.

Zhonghua minguo jiaoyu bu, 中華民國教育部. s.v. ‘Bian 辨 (Distinguish, Etc.)’. *Chongbian guoyu cidian xiuding ben* 重編國語辭典修訂本 (*Revised Dictionary of the National Language, Revised Edition*), 1994. Accessed 20 August 2014. http://dict.revised.moe.edu.tw.

Zhou Changxian, 周長憲. ‘Fuyuan xuezhang dajian 伏園學長大鑒 (To Principal Fuyuan)’. In *Qingnian bi dushu* 青年必讀書 (*Young People Must Study*), edited by Wang Shijia, 王世家, 88–89. Kaifeng: Henan daxue chuban she, 2006.

———. ‘Piping de jingshen he xin wenhua yundong 批評的精神和新文化運動 (The Critical Spirit and the New Culture Movement)’. *Piping* 批評 (*Criticism*). 1920.

———. ‘Zhou Changxian qishi 週長憲啓事 (Announcement by Zhou Changxian)’. *Beijing daxue rikan* 北京大學日刊 (*The Beijing University Daily*). 1919.

Zhou, Gang. *Placing the Modern Chinese Vernacular in Transnational Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Zhou Zuoren, 周作人. ‘Christmas Card to Lewis Chase’, n.d. Container 220. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Zhu Daihen, 朱黛痕. ‘Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu 擬與同鄉某君討論新文化運動施行方法書 (Pretending to Discuss Ways to Implement the New Culture Movement with Someone from My Native Village)’. *Jiangsu shengli di er nüzi shifan xuexiao xiaoyou hui huikan* 江蘇省立第二女子師範學校校友會彙刊 (*Alumnae of the Second Women’s Normal School of Jiangsu Province*) no. 9 (November 1919): 36–38 (Section: Zazu 雜俎 [Miscellanea]).

Zhu Lin’gong, 朱麟公, ed. ‘Guoyu yanjiu hui jianzhang 國語研究會簡章 (General Regulations for the Committee for the Research of the National Language)’. In *Minguo congshu* 民國叢書 (*Collected Volume on the Republican Period*). Shanghai: Shanghai shudian chuban she, 1921.

Zhu Yu, 朱昱. *Shiren* 食人 (*Eating People*). Performance, 2000.

Zucker, A.E. and Hu, Shi. *Western Literature: Specimens of Literature with Introductions Embodying the Chief Traditions of Europeans and Americans*. Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1922.

Zung, Tsing Tuh. ‘Contemporary Drama of China’. Student essay, 29 July 1924. Container 220. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Zurndorfer, Harriet T. ‘How to Write a Woman’s Life into and out of History: Wang Zhaoyuan (1763-1851) and Biographical Study in Republican China’. In *Writing Lives in China, 1600-2010: Histories of the Elusive Self*, edited by Dryburgh, Marjorie and Dauncey, Sarah, 86–109. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.