

UDC 811.581.11

**CODIFICATION OF STYLISTIC FORMS
OF THE TRADITIONAL TEXT (BASED ON THE TREATISE
“DIAN LUN. LUN WEN” (“典论. 论文”) BY CAO PI (曹丕))**

I. Kostanda

PhD (Philology), Associate Professor
Kyiv National Linguistic University
73, Velyka Vasylkivska Str., Kyiv, 03680, Ukraine
kostanda.iryana@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0002-5144-0941

The article is devoted to the analysis of the processes of stylistic codification and formation of stylistic norms on the example of one of the key works in this field of philology “Dian Lun. Lun Wen” (“典论. 论文”, literally “A Treatise on the Classics. A Discourse on Literature”) under Cao Pi (曹丕). Methodologically important for the study are the principles that the stylistic codification of the ancient Chinese language formed its original system of traditional stylistic means and functional styles, but the text forms became the foundation for the development of stylistics as a separate philological branch. The forms of the text and the functions assigned to them appeared under the influence of cultural and social factors. The article provides evidence of the traditions of heredity in the processes of stylistic codification, examines in detail the relationship between the works that formed the traditions of the style of the ancient Chinese language and introduced the processes of stylistic codification. In the essay “Dian Lun. Lun wen”, the basic concepts are analyzed and the dynamics of the development of the processes of the ancient Chinese language stylistic codification are studied. The historical and comparative research format used in the article allows one to argue the fact that the choice of carriers of stylistic codification, on the one hand, depended on the influence of already established ideas about stylistics,

© 2023 I. Kostanda; Published by the A. Yu. Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS of Ukraine on behalf of *The Oriental Studies*. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

which were reflected in previous philological works, and on the other hand, the change in stylistic concepts occurred under influence of extralinguistic factors. Essay “Dian Lun. Lun wen” was the impetus for the further development of stylistic phenomena, the formation of traditional forms of the text, influenced the introduction of the stylistic norm of both ancient and modern Chinese, and introduced the tradition of fixing and assigning their main emotional characteristics to text forms, that is, the pathos of the story for the formation of not only stylistic, but also literary research traditions.

Keywords: text forms, classification, style, codification, language standardization

1. Introduction

Emergence and development of text forms of the ancient Chinese language were regulated by the processes of codification of stylistic norms. Scientists such as Einar Haugen and Heinz Kloss have defined linguistic codification and studied this phenomenon. Codification is the selection and consolidation of certain linguistic phenomena aimed at establishing a linguistic norm. Codification can cover different language levels, so the developed system of codification of stylistic norms in ancient China led to the appearance of traditional forms of texts and traditional stylistic means (sometimes assigned to certain forms of texts). Wenyan Chinese had its own system of traditional stylistic devices, functional styles, traditional texts, but the key to the formation of all the above mentioned phenomena was a special original view of literature as such and text style in particular shaped by the cultural tradition, social factors of society and local mentality. Therefore, to study the phenomenon of stylistic codification properly, it is important not only to analyze the diversity of stylistic means and forms, but also to get and analyze the basic concepts of stylistic codification, chiseled by the traditional world outlook of the Chinese people. Therefore, to understand the dynamics of the development of stylistic codification and stylistic concepts, it is important to analyze in detail the first work that simultaneously initiated the use of certain forms of traditional text, and identified criteria for selecting linguistic phenomena; the text in question is the essay by Cao Pi (曹丕, 187–226) “Dian Lun. Lun Wen” (“论文”). This work did both: codified stylistic phenomena setting the vector for the development of codification in the field of stylistics, and influenced further attitude of researchers to literary works in general and to stylistics in particular. To

understand the processes of formation of modern Chinese stylistic phenomena, one should thoroughly analyze the processes of language codification on all language levels, including the stylistic level; this eventually will result in a proper explanation of the origin of linguistic phenomena in modern Chinese. A comprehensive analysis of “Lun Wen” (“论文”) is required to clearly depict the authenticity and originality of philological traditions of China in the field of stylistics as well as to demonstrate the idea of continuity in the fixation and codification of language norms.

The hypothesis put forward in this article is that the choice of language means (including text forms) for stylistic codification used to depend on extralinguistic factors, including the dominant ideology; and that the processes of stylistic codification were a reflection of values and ideology of China of the time.

In the process of studying the concepts and main principles of stylistic codification in “Lun Wen” (“论文”) work the origin and thematic features of the treatise are viewed; stylistic concepts that became a methodological basis for further scientific investigations and prompted the direction of codification processes are identified; text forms and stylistic means found in the treatise are described.

Review of the written sources on the topic is made in Section 2 of the article. In Section 3, the key concepts of the methodology and research methods used to address this issue are discussed. The analysis of the essay is presented in Section 4. Dependence of forms of stylistic codification on the influence of extralinguistic factors in this article is discussed in Section 5. Section 6 sums up and summarizes the research data.

2. Literature review

In ancient China, stylistics was closely associated with literary studies and Confucian ideology. The first mention of the expressive means of language – tropes, is found in the philosophical work of “Zhuangzi” (“莊子”, 4th century BC), where the importance of allegory for literary texts is pointed out. Treatise “Dian Lun. Lun Wen” (“典论. 论文”), was written by Cao Pi (曹丕) during the disintegration of the Han dynasty (漢朝, 221 BC – 220 AD) and the formation of the Wei dynasty (魏, 220–266); it is a collection of essays on political, social, culturological, etc. topics; the book consists of twenty special articles. “Lun Wen” “论文”, one of these articles, is the first theoretical work on the history of Chinese stylistics and literary criticism. The term

“stylistics” in the Chinese philological tradition is primarily defined as “forms of text”, namely “文体”. This term is theoretically substantiated by scientists and it gives rise to the development of a new branch of traditional Chinese philology “the doctrine of style” that was described for the first time in the philological work of Liu Xie (劉勰, 465–522) “The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons” (“文心雕龙”).

Most of “Lun Wen’s” (“论文”) researches made by Cao Pi (曹丕) focused not on the analysis of the criteria for selecting the form and concept of codification, but on the impact of the ideas proposed in the essay and the further development of Chinese philological tradition. Thus, in the reign of the Tang dynasty (唐朝, 618–907), Lu Xiang (吕向) in his “Selected Works” (“文选”) noted, “This essay is the basis of the whole collection” (“此篇，论文章之体也”).

Lu Xun (鲁迅) in his work “Wei Jin’s style and the relationship between wine and medicine” (“魏晋风度及文章与药及酒之关系”) pointed out the following: “Gradual flourishing of the Chinese language is dictated by time, not only by the merits of Cao’s father and son, nevertheless the colorfulness and the beauty of the language is the merit of Cao Pi (曹丕)” (“汉文慢慢壮大是时代使然但华丽好看却是曹丕提倡的功劳”) [Lu 1981, 92]. Li Zehou (李泽厚) also pondered on the same topic: “The fact that Cao Pi (曹丕) emphasizes and advocates for the beauty of articles is due to his unique desire for ‘immortality’. As the immortality of the articles, by all means, makes the man immortal as well” (“曹丕所以讲求和提倡文章华美,是与他这种对人生不朽与他这种相人生不朽不朽的追求相联系的。文章不朽当然也就是人的不朽”) [Liu 2014, 245–246].

Among contemporary foreign scholars of Cao Pi’s (曹丕) essay “Lun Wen”, works of Xiao Li “The double meanings of ‘literature’ – a discussion about transference of literary criticism angle in Cao Pi’s (曹丕) ‘Dian Lun·Lun Wen’” [Xiao 2002], should be pointed out; this paper considers the value of the author’s personality and the author’s influence on the emergence of two meanings of the term “literature”. Another work (“Researching on the comparison between Cao Pi and Cao Zhi”) written by Guo Yanru compares creative achievements of Cao Pi (曹丕) and Cao Zhi (曹植) [Guo 2013]; nevertheless, the research does not consider the essay from the point of view of stylistic codification.

Tian Xiaofei’s “Cao Pi, ‘A Discourse on Literature’” was devoted to political and creative activities of Cao Cao (曹操), Cao Pi (曹丕)

and Cao Zhi (曹植); the chapter also viewed creative achievements of father and sons of Cao in the context of Confucian doctrine [Tian 2013]. This research work raises the question of connection between the philological tradition of China and the Confucian ideology.

It should be noted that not so many modern works are dedicated to the study of Cao Pi's (曹丕) essay "Lun Wen" ("论文"); and we have not discovered any works researching the connection between the mechanisms of stylistic codification in the abovementioned essay. Therefore, this particular study aims to fill this gap and offer answers to questions about the processes of stylistic codification and their dependence on extralinguistic factors.

3. Methods

This research work will attempt to study interaction between the processes of stylistic codification and extralinguistic factors (including state ideology). An important aspect in the study of material selection criteria for stylistic codification is the choice of methods of analysis.

An essay by Cao Pi (曹丕) entitled "Lun Wen" ("论文") was chosen to consider the mechanisms and concepts of codification, as well as to study extralinguistic factors in codification processes.

The choice of the abovementioned essay is not accidental, but due to the following facts:

- this essay was the first to establish the codifying tradition of stylistic phenomena of the ancient Chinese language;
- this essay was of great importance and great influence for the Chinese philological tradition: it introduced criteria and forms of stylistic codification, which gave the vector of development of the Chinese philological tradition and were in use for centuries.

The following methods were involved/used for each stage of this research work: variants of content analysis were used both for the study of individual elements, and creating a general picture of the stylistic codification development. For explaining the hypothesis descriptive method and method of conceptual analysis were used (for classification and interpretation of the studied linguistic phenomena); inductive analysis, as well as historical and comparative-historical methods were used for considering the phenomena in the diachronic aspect.

At the first stage, the text of the essay was analyzed to identify concepts and nominations that have become carriers of codification,

which allowed us to record and describe the identified features of the mechanisms and concepts of the above essay.

At the second stage the study of concepts and forms of codification was made and the definition of extralinguistic factors influencing codification was conducted in the following steps:

1. Consideration of historical, cultural, ideological background of the period when the essay was written. When considering the very first theoretical work on the stylistics of the Chinese language one should consider such aspects of its origin as historical background, cultural aspects, political ideology of the time, as well as the personality of the author.

2. Identification of extralinguistic factors that influenced the emergence of the essay, through the study of the concept and mechanisms of codification and the general historical background.

3. Analysis of the obtained results in diachronic terms.

4. At the third stage of the study, inductive analysis was used to identify patterns and discrepancies in the variability in stylistic codification systems of the key works of future generations made in the same field; to understand the relationship between extralinguistic influences and codification concepts. A holistic perspective of the development of stylistic codification processes in synchronic and diachronic aspects was created in this research work.

4. Results

Treatise “Dian Lun. Lun Wen” (“典论. 论文”) is a collection of essays on political, social, culturological, etc. subjects; the book consisted of twenty special articles. “Lun Wen”, one of these articles, is the first theoretical work on the history of Chinese stylistics and literary criticism. Unfortunately, most of these twenty articles have not come down to us; we can see only a few fragments from the treatise as of today. Nevertheless, “Lun Wen” was preserved in its entirety, largely due to the fact that Xiao Tong (萧统), during the Southern Dynasties (南朝, 420–589), included this essay in a work on stylistics and literary criticism entitled “Selected works of Zhaoming” (“昭明文选”).

“Lun Wen” treatise was written when the Han dynasty had virtually ceased to exist, although formally the emperor’s rule lasted another thirty years. Almost all this time the emperor was, de facto, a hostage under General Cao Cao; Cao Cao used the authority of the emperor to strengthen his position in the central regions of the former empire. The author of the above treatise is one of Cao Cao’s sons,

Cao Pi (曹丕), who, after his father's death in 220, forced the emperor to abdicate and subsequently he proclaims himself emperor of the new Wei dynasty. The treatise was written at a time when Cao Pi (曹丕) received the throne, and this fact left its mark on the ideas introduced in the work: literature, that was always given a very important place in Chinese culture, was now raised to an unprecedented level. Lu Xun (鲁迅) explained this fact in his article "Wei Jin's style and the relationship between wine and medicine" ("魏晋风度及酒与药的关系"): "Cao Pi (曹丕), fearing that his position as the heir to the throne will be shaken by competition between brothers; so he made literature so important to divert his younger brother Cao Zhi (曹植) by literary work, and distract him from political achievements" [Lu 1981, 95]. There is an evidence that before the creation of the treatise "Dian Lun. Lun Wen" Cao Zhi (曹植) read a letter entitled ("于杨德祖书") from his younger brother, which he addressed to his friend Yang Xiu (杨修). In this letter, this younger brother calls literary activity, namely poetry, "the small way" (小道). This letter alarmed Cao Pi (曹丕), and he, in order to strengthen his position as a prince, began to defend and glorify literature in his treatise.

However, whether bringing literature to the new high level was objective (inherent in Chinese culture) or subjective (authorial decision dictated by special circumstances), Cao Pi's (曹丕) thoughts and views led to literature flourishing and laid the cornerstone for further development of literary and stylistic criticism and played a major role in the introduction of stylistic codification of Wenyan language.

Before considering the essay itself, we have to point out another important extralinguistic aspect that influenced Cao Pi's (曹丕) thoughts and views, and that is political ideology. General ideology of the Han dynasty, and later the Wei dynasty, was Confucianism; its influence on all spheres of life in ancient China cannot be underestimated. Manifestations of Confucian ethics and ideology in the essay and the influence of Confucianism on the codification of stylistics (through the prism of the above work), as well as possible consequences of this influence on the further process of stylistic codification are identified and investigated in this research work.

Treatise "Dian Lun. Lun Wen" ("典论. 论文") begins with a critical observation that "literary men despised each other from the times immemorable", and this statement is confirmed by written proofs of the past showing this relationship of writers to each other. However,

Cao Pi (曹丕) writes that in fact there are very few writers who have created equally talented works in different genres, and most writers, as a rule, are only talented in one genre. At the end of this part of the essay the author comes to important conclusions:

– “...everyone, if something goes well for him, despises those who do succeed as he does”

– “...people do not see clearly, and do not understand their weaknesses”.

In the second part, Cao Pi (曹丕) called outstanding writers: “Seven Sages”. He praised their literary abilities. However, Cao Pi (曹丕) returns to the statement from the first part that, even being so gifted, writers do not get along well with each other: “but you will have a hard time if you try and put such perfect steeds into one cart, it will be difficult to get mutual respect and support from them”. As a result, and good advice to the next generation of writers is given, and we can see it in the concluding phrase of this part: “I evaluated my abilities by comparing and measuring my talents against talents of other people, that is the only reason why while writing this piece I avoided the heavy burden called “literary men despising each other””.

In the third part, Cao Pi (曹丕) noted some works of the “Seven scholars of Jian’an”, as well as analyzed the general shortcomings found in the essays of the writers he noted. The author also mentioned the names of such literary forms as: “章表书记”, but he did not cover this topic. An important point of his critique was that Cao Pi (曹丕) noted the following features that codified stylistic characteristics of a literary work for future generations:

- 和 – harmony;
- 壮 – forces;
- 密 – sophistication;
- 理 – meaning;
- 辞 – lyricism.

In the fourth part of Cao Pi (曹丕), a very important opinion is expressed: “the general essence of most articles is the same, but the available end result (i.e. the chosen style and form) are different”. Further on, the author lists four forms of literary text:

- 1) 奏议 “memorandum”;
- 2) 书论 “discussion of literature”;
- 3) 铭诔 “honoring the memory of the deceased”;
- 4) 诗赋 “simple poems and odes”.

For each of the above forms the main characteristics are pointed out:

- 1) 雅 “sophistication” for 奏议 “memorandum”;
- 2) 理 “reasonableness” for 书论 “discussion of literature”;
- 3) 实 “truthfulness” for 铭 诔 “honoring the memory of the deceased”;
- 4) 丽 “beauty” for 诗赋 “simple poems and odes”.

The result of this part is the author’s statement that “only true literary talent succeeds”, meaning this person can write in all literary forms in equally talented manner.

The fifth part begins with the statement that “energy” (“气”) is the main thing for article, and Cao Pi (曹丕) divides “energy” into “pure” (清) and “turbid” (浊). By “energy” the creative temperament, talent, and individuality of the writer are meant. Therefore, the author claims that:

- “it is impossible to get (energy) by just making an effort”;
- “it is impossible to reproduce everything and master everything to the fullest”, because everyone, even when trying to repeat after someone else, still brings something of their own to the process, and this significantly affects the result.

In the last sixth part Cao Pi (曹丕) raises literature to an unprecedented level with the following statements:

- “The essay is close to governing the country and is a great thing that can be passed on to future generations”;
- “Human age and longevity..., fame and happiness... come to an end after a certain period of time, but an essay is so unlike it – it can exist and circulate forever, there are no time limits for it”.

The author cites historical examples from the past, mentions people who have devoted themselves to literary work and gained immortal fame: “Jou Wenwan during his imprisonment created “The Book of Changes”; Jou Gundan who reached the top wrote “The book of rituals”.

Cao Pi (曹丕) assures that for the sake of literary fame, one should endure poverty and hunger; a person who has high ideals and wants to pass his thoughts to future generations should value time (as ancient sages did in the past), not to worry about urgent matters, and only then, it will be possible to leave behind “unsurpassed outstanding thoughts”.

5. Discussion

Treatise “Dian Lun. Lun Wen” (“典 论. 论文”) made a significant contribution to the history of stylistics and standardization of stylistic norms, codifying the following phenomena:

1. Cao Pi (曹丕) noted that the individual qualities, the unique personality of the writer are the key to creating a literary work. In the phrase “the main thing for an artist” is “energy” (“气”) – one can clearly see the theoretical concept in which a creative personality and individuality of a writer become the main conditions for studying the style and characteristics of literary works. The writer’s innate talent is his personal quality, that is why the talent and individuality (energy) “cannot be obtained simply by making an effort”.

2. Cao Pi (曹丕) said that literary works are “close to governing the country”, and called them “a great thing that can be passed on to future generations”, he praised literary works above “glory and happiness”, “high speeches of historians” and the power of high officials. This statement codified the high value of literature and was a great breakthrough for the development of literature and the manifestation of literary consciousness, as well as had a great impact on the development of literary creativity and literary theory and criticism of future generations. Cao Pi (曹丕) urged writers to follow the example of the sages of antiquity, who were afraid of wasting time on everyday needs, but spent time to gain immortality in literary work.

Cao Pi (曹丕) theorized that “content” can have different forms of embodiment and thus confirmed the view that different literary forms of text have different styles, and different styles, in their turn, must have different stylistic characteristics. “The text is the same, but the outcome is different” is the earliest detailed stylistic theory, as well as the earliest stylistic theory with different styles.

As it can be seen from all of the above said, the ideas and thoughts noted by Cao Pi indeed had an impact on the literary ideas and literary criticism of future generations, but what Cao Pi touched upon in his work raises questions; and answers to those questions can provide new information to the history of stylistic codification of the ancient Chinese languages Wenyan and Baihua. Let’s attempt to view those issues in detail.

“A Treatise on the Classics. A Discourse on Literature” was the first monograph in the history of Chinese literary criticism that analyzed

theoretical and literary issues: Cao Pi (曹丕) was the first to officially put forward the idea of classifying styles and their corresponding characteristics. The classification of literary forms of works proposed by Cao Pi (曹丕) is of epochal significance – it is the very first stylistic codification as such:

- 1) 奏议 “memorandum”;
- 2) 书论 “discussion of literature”;
- 3) 铭诔 “honoring the memory of the deceased”;
- 4) 诗赋 “simple poems and odes”.

However, it should be noted that this classification had a major drawback: not all literature known at that time was subject to such a classification; a significant number of works remained unattended. So, the question arises as to whether these four forms of text were the only ones known at the time, and if not, then why did the author not include other literary works in this classification?

To answer the first part of the question, one should turn to the history of the Chinese philological tradition. Chinese written language before the appearance of Cao Pi's (曹丕) critical work, had existed for several decades, and the result of its full functioning was appearance of various types of literature, which found their realization in the appropriate forms of the text. Since Cao Pi's (曹丕) work is considered to be the first step in creating literary criticism and initiating stylistic codification, we will turn to library classifications of texts to gain a broader knowledge of what forms of texts existed at the time. Since text forms and their transformation require classification and fixation, as with the historical development of language the division of literature into four categories has been known since the Warring States period (475–221 BC). “Jing Shi Zi Ji” (“经史子集”) are four main categories of literature, each of which is represented by specific forms of texts [Zhou 1955, 159–160]. Such a system of literature classification is traditional for ancient China [Li 2016, 106], so these categories of literature are one of the manifestations of traditional Chinese culture, and these categories of literature can provide valuable information on understanding the main cultural foundations of Chinese civilization. All the names of the above literary forms are found in the form of classification in the first in the history of China work on the systematization of literature “Seven Strategies” (“七略”) [Zhou 1955, 161], which was created during the Western Han period

(西汉, 206 BC – 8 AD) around 26 BC, the authors of this large-scale work were Liu Xiang (刘向) and Liu Xin (刘歆) [Zhou 1955, 161]. Let us view the definitions for each category of literature:

1) “canons” 书 (full name 经书) – this category of literature is represented by texts of Confucian doctrine, which were considered canonical [Zhou 1955, 164];

2) “official history” (full name 史书, sometimes another name is used 正史) – this category of literature is represented by texts of chronicles, historical registers, etc. [Li 2016, 110];

3) “philosophical theory” 子 (full name 诸子) is a philosophical literature written before the Qin dynasty (秦, 221–206 BC) during the flourish of Chinese philosophical thought, so this period is often called the “Period of Hundred schools” [of philosophy] (百家代) [Zhou 1955, 165];

4) “ontology” 集 (full name 文集) – this category is represented by literature, texts of poems, songs, poetic criticism, fiction [Zhou 1955, 165].

As a separate point, it should be noted that the order of presentation of the four categories of literature was not accidental: the categories are presented in order of importance for the socio-cultural and political life of traditional Chinese society.

The literary forms singled out by Cao Pi (曹丕) took the following place in this classification:

1) 奏议 “memorandum” belonged to the section of “official history” but in addition to these forms of texts the following literary pieces were presented in this section: “alternative history” 史史, “memoirs” 传记, “historical criticism” 史评, “orders” (subgroup “orders” is implemented in such forms of text as 册文, 制, 敕, 诏, 诰, 策令, 玺书, 教, 谕), subgroup “reports” (implemented in such forms of text as 册文, 制, 敕, 诏, 诰, 策令, 玺书, 教, 谕), a subgroup “lecture” (realized in such forms of text as 表, 奏, 疏, 议, 上书, 封事), “biography” 传记, “historical abstract” 史钞 etc.

2) 书论 “discussions of literature” belongs to the division “canons” 经, but apart from these forms of texts the following forms were also presented in this division: “comment” 注, “description” 传, “note” 笺, “explanation” 解, “detailed explanation” (疏), “detailed explanation of right meaning” (义疏), “detailed explanation of right original meaning” (正义) etc.

3) 铭诔 “celebrations to commemorate a deceased man” belonged to the division “official history” 史;

4) 诗赋 “simple verses and odes” were placed in “Ontology” division and apart from these literary forms of texts the following forms were also presented: “alternative ontology” (别集); “generalized ontology” (总集); “critical review of verses and prose” (诗文评); “songs and arias” (词曲); “novels” (小说). As one can see from the above-said, other forms of literary text with different stylistics existed in China back then, too. Why did Cao Pi (曹丕) underline these forms of literary text in his work? The answer to this question, in the opinion of the author of this research work, can be found in the last part of Cao Pi’s (曹丕) work: “Essay is close to governing a country”. In other words, from the author’s point of view the main function of literature is to be of use in governing the country, and the forms of texts he notifies correspond the realization of this aim: “memorandums”, except for the artistic value are documentation that is used in office businesses serving interests of the state; 书论 “the discussion of literature” carries out the important role of publicism that supports reinforcing and establishing state ideology (Confucianism) through criticism and explanation; 铭诔 “celebration in honour of memory of the deceased” literary form relates to the cult of ancestors and honouring the olden days; it is a quintessence of the tradition of inheriting cultural values; 诗赋 “simple verses and odes” supports the tradition of Confucianism to maintain respectful attitude to poetic work of a person.

As one can clearly see, Confucian ideology had a great impact on Cao Pi (曹丕) when he selected literary forms of texts for this research work. It is equally important to point out the following lines: “...essay ... is a big thing that can be passed to future generations”, “...essay can exist and circulate forever, time frames are non-existent for it”; all those lines carry in them obvious imprints of Confucianism with its traditional respect to the olden days and its cult of ancestors; but at the same time those lines also proclaim the following idea: the essay that serves the interests of the state must be passed “from generation to generation”. However, if literature “is not related to the matter of governing a country”, it is not worth of being preserved. For this particular reason Cao Pi (曹丕) chose only those literary forms of texts that service state matters and state ideology; all other types of literature, especially those dealing with personal experiences and

intimate feelings of a person, do not deserve to be codified and preserved. After Cao Pi's (曹丕) investigation other research works on stylistic codification appeared with the most prominent being the following:

1) "Wen Fu" ("文赋", literary "Prose and verses") – a philological work of Lu Ji (陆机) made in the days of the Western Qin Dynasty (西晋, 265–420) [Liu 2002]. In this research work ten types of texts were differentiated and stylistic means of each of them were described.

2) "Wen Xuan" ("文选", literary "Selected Works") – this philological work remained in history of Chinese philology under the name "Selected works of Zhaoming" ("昭明文选") was written by the heir of throne Zhaoming (昭明太子) in the reign of the Southern Liang dynasty (南朝梁, 502–557) [Zhao 2000, 251]. Zhaoming pointed out 38 types of literary forms of texts in his research.

3) "Wen Xin Diao Long" ("文心雕龙", namely "Literary spirit of the carved dragon") – a prominent work of the theorist of Chinese philology Liu Xie (刘勰) appeared in the days of the rule of Southern Qi dynasty (南朝齐, 479–502) [Zhou 2020]. This work views forms and stylistic means of Confucian canons, philosophical works, chronicles, verses etc.

4) "Critical analysis of the forms of articles" ("文章辨体") written by Wu Ne (吴讷), points out 59 forms of texts; this research work appeared in the reign of Min dynasty (明朝, 1368–1644) [Zhou 1955, 174].

5) "Clear analysis of the forms of articles" ("文体明辨") created by Xu Shizeng (徐师曾), names 127 forms of texts; the work appeared in the reign of Min dynasty [Zhou 1955, 176].

6) "Gu Wen Ci Lei Zuan" ("古文辞类纂") – a philological work by Yao Nai (姚鼐) where 13 forms of texts are considered; the work appeared in the reign of Qing dynasty (清朝, 1636–1912).

As becomes understandable from the above-mentioned proofs, philologists of following generations did not limit themselves by the four forms of literary text named by Cao Pi (曹丕), on the contrary they expanded the list considerably. However, the main idea established by Cao Pi (曹丕) and preserved by following generations of researchers was as follows: only those literary forms of texts that corresponded with the high aims of servicing the state were investigated,

codified and preserved. So, in the prominent works on the topic “Gu Wen Ci Lei Zuan” (“古文辞类纂”), that summed up codification processes of stylistics, one can find 13 forms of texts: “theory and criticism” (论辨), “preface and afterword” (序跋), “memorandum” (奏议), “discussion of literature” (书说), “introductory word to the gift” (赠序), “edict” (诏令), “biography” (传状), “inscriptions on stone stelae” (碑志), “notes about miscellaneous things” (杂记), “rhymed inscriptions and instructive inscriptions” (箴铭), “laudations” (颂赞), “songs and odes” (辞赋), “panegyric” (哀祭) [Yao 1998, 138].

It is obvious that the 13 forms of literary texts are united by one circle of interests: state affairs, feelings of being in debt for the state, introductions and strengthening the Confucian ideology values. It is very important to point out at this point that although this work was written in reign of Qing dynasty, the following crucial literary forms of texts (although they existed back then and some of them were very advanced) were not mentioned in the research work, including such forms as “novel” (小说), “drama” (杂剧), “short story” that already existed as a well-shaped form of literary text (“notes of the wonderful” (志怪), “descriptions of extraordinary” (传奇), “story travelling by word of mouth” (话本), drama of dynasty Yuan (“元曲”). The forms of literary text mentioned above bore the name of “low literature” in ancient China solely because they told stories of personal, intimate events; this type of literature did not serve the interests of the state, and some descriptions could even undermine Confucian moral and ideology.

Subsequently, it is possible to assert that treatise of Cao Pi (曹丕) not only defined the stylistic forms of literary texts, most importantly it also laid the foundation for dividing literature into high and low based on the criterion of “serving the matter of governing a country”; and thus the author pointed the vector of development for stylistic codification for centuries to come. Almost complete absence of official sources of codification of Baihua language was the result of this division of literature into high and low types.

6. Conclusions

Review of the essay of Cao Pi (曹丕), comparative analysis of literary forms of texts of different time periods and research of influence

of codification on the principles marked above, allow us to come to the following conclusions:

1. Appearance of the essay indicated that Chinese philological theory entered the period of self-analysis.

2. The four forms of literary texts (奏议 “memorandum”; 书论 “discussion of literature”; 铭诔 “honoring the memory of the deceased”; 诗赋 “simple poems and odes”) were selected and codified by Cao Pi (曹丕) because of their aiming at servicing the interests of the state.

3. All the four forms of the literary texts from the essay of Cao Pi (曹丕) existed in their authentic form for centuries. So, for instance, the form of the text 奏议 a “memorandum” was mentioned for the first time in philological work of Cao Pi (曹丕) “论文” and from that time we can trace the description of this type of the text in all weighty works on stylistics, including the philological research conducted in the reign of Qing dynasty “Gu Wen Ci Lei Zuan” author Yao Nai (姚鼐).

4. In the history of Chinese philological tradition there were only those stylistic forms and types of texts of Wenyan language; forms of texts in Baihua language were neither codified nor systematized, their ethic and social backgrounds were not analyzed. The conception of codifying exceptionally the forms of texts belonging to “high” literature did not change till the end of the 19th century. This philological phenomenon is explained by the fact that Cao Pi’s (曹丕) essay codified and started differentiating between “high” and “low” literature by defining the main criterion of this division: serving the interests of the state.

The history of stylistic codification, analyzing its sources and the value of the first works in stylistic codification gives modern researchers important material for understanding many linguistic phenomena of Chinese language. Detailed consideration of methods and concepts of stylistic codification is represented in the very first research work in this plain, and it gives a spark for further investigations of the phenomena of Chinese stylistic codification; its impact on the language norm and language culture of both ancient and modern Chinese languages is of great importance for further scientific research works in lexicology and lexicography, phonology and theory of translation.

REFERENCES

Guo Yanru (2013), *Pi zhi you lie lun yanjiu* [Researching on the comparison between Cao Pi (曹丕) and Cao Zhi], Lanzhou University, Lanzhou. (In Chinese).

Guo Yingde (1995), *Zhongguo gudai wenti xue lun gao* [Chinese Ancient Stylistics], Beijing daxue chuban she, Beijing. (In Chinese).

Li Nanhui (2016), *Zhongguo gudai wenti xue lunzhu ji mu (1900–2014)* [Collection of Works on Ancient Chinese Stylistics (1900–2014)], Peking University Press, Beijing. (In Chinese).

Liu Xin (2014), *Qi lue* [Seven strategies], Beijing yinshua xueyuan, Beijing. (In Chinese).

Liu Zongmin (2002), Shi lun lu ji de “Wen Fu” [On Lu Ji’s “Wen Fu”], *Nanjing shifan daxue wen xueyuan xuebao*, No. 2, pp. 22–6. (In Chinese).

Lu Xun (1981), *Eryi ji* [Just set], Renmin wenxue chuban she, Beijing. (In Chinese).

Tian Xiaofei (2005), Cao Pi, “A Discourse on Literature”, in Mair V., Steinhart N. and Goldin P. (eds), *Hawai’i Reader in Traditional Chinese Culture*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, pp. 231–3, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824852351-041> (accessed 10 September 2022).

Xiao Li (2002), “The double meanings of ‘literature’ – A discussion about transference of literary criticism angle in Cao Pi’s ‘Dian Lun·Lun Wen’”, *Journal of Yunmeng*, No. 3, pp. 43–5.

Yao Nai (1998), *Guwen ci lei zuan* [Lexicographical compilation of ancient Chinese], Shanghai Ancient Books Publishing House, Shanghai. (In Chinese).

Zhao Ming (2000), *Zhao Ming wenxuan (quan wu ce)* [Selected works of Zhaoming (5 volumes)], Huaxia Publishing House, Beijing. (In Chinese).

Zhou Bingdiao (1955), *Gu hanyu zixue shouce* [Ancient Chinese Self-study], Hunan renming chubenshe (In Chinese).

Zhou Zhenhua (2020), “Wen xin diao long” yu “Zhaoming wenxuan”: zhong li wen de xuan wen bijiao [Comparison of the selected essays in “Wenxindiaolong” and “Selected Works of Zhaoming”], available at: <https://wenku.baidu.com/view/7e1be4c674c66137ee06eff9aef8941ea66e4be0.html?fixfr=2kGJsPJZNTltLUQbritiRw%253D>

%253D&fr=incomel-wk_app_search_ctr-search (accessed 15 January 2022). (In Chinese).

I. Kostanda

**КОДИФІКАЦІЯ СТИЛІСТИЧНИХ ФОРМ
ТРАДИЦІЙНОГО ТЕКСТУ
(НА МАТЕРІАЛІ ТРАКТАТУ “ДЯНЬ ЛУНЬ.**

ЛУНЬ ВЕНЬ” (“典论. 论文”) АВТОРСТВА ЦАО ПІ (曹丕))

Статтю присвячено аналізу процесів стилістичної кодифікації та становлення стилістичних норм на прикладі одного з ключових творів із цієї галузі філології “Дянь Лунь. Лунь вень” (“典论.论文”, досл. “Обговорення класики. Критичні статті”) авторства Цао Пі (曹丕). Методологічно важливими для дослідження є принципи, згідно з якими стилістична кодифікація давньокитайської мови сформувала свою оригінальну систему традиційних стилістичних засобів та функціональних стилів, але фундаментом для розвитку стилістики як окремої філологічної галузі стали форми тексту. Форми тексту та закріплені за ними функції з’явилися під впливом культурологічних та соціальних факторів. У статті наведено докази традицій спадкоємності у процесах стилістичної кодифікації, детально розглянуто взаємозв’язок між творами, які формували традиції стилістики давньокитайської мови та запроваджували процеси стилістичної кодифікації. У есе “Дянь Лунь. Лунь вень” проведено аналіз опорних концепцій та досліджено динаміку розвитку процесів стилістичної кодифікації давньокитайської мови. Використаний у статті історично-порівняльний формат дослідження дозволяє аргументувати той факт, що вибір носіїв стилістичної кодифікації, з одного боку, залежав від впливу вже сформованих уявлень про стилістику, які було відображено у попередніх філологічних працях, а з іншого боку, зміна стилістичних концепцій відбувалася під впливом екстралінгвістичних факторів. Есе “Дянь Лунь. Лунь вень” стало поштовхом для подальшого розвитку стилістичних феноменів, формування традиційних форм тексту, вплинуло на запровадження стилістичної норми і стародавньої, і сучасної китайської мови та запровадило традицію фіксувати та закріплювати за формами тексту їхні основні емоційні характеристики, тобто пафос оповідання, що є важливим надбанням для формування не лише стилістичних, але й літературознавчих дослідницьких традицій.

Ключові слова: форми тексту, класифікація, стилістика, кодифікація, стандартизація мови

Стаття надійшла до редакції 22.09.2022