

This is a new paperback edition, with changes may be possible with another new edition, it is most appropriate to address a major theoretical issue concerning in this study.

Some reviewers of this book are concerned with Eurocentric approaches to Chinese history. The use in the book are formulated by Eurocentric perceived “contradiction” warrants a careful differentiation of “Eurocentric” from “Eurocentric” representing and explaining social formations in European, or more precisely Western, perspective to objects—both symbolic and material. Eurocentric concepts and theories such as “modernity,” “individualism,” and “modernity” “paratext,” for example, are not components of the unique development of institutions that propelled Europe into the course of ultra-modern the modern period.

Unlike the sociological theories of Max Weber or Jürgen Habermas’ theory of the “public sphere,” major concepts such as “field,” “habitus,” and “capital” postulate any necessary connection—historical theories of capitalism or modern nation-states—to explain and justify the presumably superior development of modern Europe. In fact, his theory offers a “critical perspective” in Craig Calhoun, “Habitus, Field, and Capital: A Critical Perspective,” in Craig Calhoun, Edward L. Shils, *Bourdieu: A Critical Perspective*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 1-10.

without postulating any universal course of development. He is concerned with the various differentiations in mental and social structures that reproduce modes of domination. Like the other theories focus on the analysis of the structural relations of domination in its multiple forms.

Despite his commitment to the study of habitus (science), his concepts of “habitus,” are developed to transcend the “knowledge” of a specific society. He believes “that there are no relations between fields [emphasis in original] to investigate each historical case separately” (Pieper and Quant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Chicago Press, 1992, p. 109). By avoiding the methods employed in Eurocentric theories, Bourdieu’s theories provide alternatives for application in the study of non-Western societies. They have provided me with alternative tools for the study of the production of culture and power in the nineteenth centuries.

The same can be said of Gerard Genette’s theories. There are indeed some paratexts in the European tradition—parts in the Chinese book—the watermark, the capital letters, and fantastic picture-in-letter. There are certainly numerous elements in the tradition that can be called paratexts—prefaces, postscripts, dedications, method of packaging, paper, book design, illustrations, title, name of author, editor, etc. As demonstrated in this book, “paratext” can have a profound impact of publishing on literary production in early modern China. The concept of “paratext” challenges Eurocentric grand theories of historical development and ideological configurations.

Michele Foucault and Michele de Certeau

constraining apparatus and procedure that infuse Foucault's works. The postmodernist perspective does not warrant some words of explanation. Like the postmodernist, the author of the development of modern culture is the nation-state, capitalism, and their law, factory, city and discourses/knowledges, suppressing heterogeneous voices. Like Foucault and Bourdieu, however, the author is not a postmodernist. The dominated people's "tactics" of resistance are reading, walking, and speaking.

In their analysis and criticism of their symbolic regimes in modern capitalism, these European scholars have fashioned a critical discourse to compute and undermine the assumptions and the social analysis produced to explain the "Ying-yang" or "genetic" theories challenging Eurocentric theories. Their application in this study is meant to challenge the study of practices in early modern China through a social and historical analysis, which highlights the social and historical processes of China.

For this edition, I would like to thank my students for their help in correcting mistakes. I would like to thank Kwang-ching Liu, Tze-ki Hon, and Liang-ching Ho, Lane Harris, Jing Jing Chang, Tongluo Wang, and Jing and Lane are especially meticulous in their corrections and errors.

Finally I would like to dedicate this book to Professor Kwang-ching Liu, who, as he kindly read the book and corrected some