

European Association for the Study of Chinese Manuscripts

Contents

- **Research Essay:** What is a *shu* 書? by Sarah Allan (p. 1)
- **Conference Announcements:** Workshop on Qinghua Manuscripts at Dartmouth (March 26, 2011) (p. 6) // Society for the Study of Early China at AAS/ICAS, Honolulu (April 2, 2011) (p. 7) // EASCM workshop 4 in Paris (July 6-8, 2012) (p. 7)
- **Conference Reports:** “Manuscript Culture ...,” Harvard, May 14-15, 2010 (p. 8) // “A Bamboo Event ...,” Penn State, May 17-18, 2010 (p. 9) // Li Xueqin presents Creel Lecture on Qinghua manuscripts (p. 11)
- **New Publications:** *China’s Early Empire // Yang Xiong and the Pleasures of Reading ... // Studia Orientalia Slovaca* (p. 12)
- **Self-Introductions** of EASCM members: M. Khayutina (p. 13) // E. Shaughnessy (p. 14).

• **Research Essay**

What is a *shu* 書?

by Sarah Allan (17/01/2011)*

The recent discoveries of bamboo slip manuscripts from Warring States period tombs are among the most important discoveries since that of oracle bone inscriptions in 1898 because they include philosophical and historical material that is closely related to some of the most important transmitted texts and they are revolutionizing our understanding of the history of Chinese thought. The *Shang shu* is one of the five classics and closely associated with Confucius, so the manuscripts now in the collection of Tsinghua University are of particular importance because many of them are apparently *shu* or “similar to *shu*.”¹ But what were *shu*? How do we know a *shu* when we see (read) it? What distinguishes a *shu* from other ancient texts?

* A Chinese version of this article was published as Ai Lan 艾蘭, “He wei ‘shu’ 何為《書》?” in *Guangming ribao* 光明日報 2010/12/10, 12.

¹ Li Xueqin 李學勤, ed., *Qinghua Daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* 清華大學藏戰國竹簡 (Shanghai: Zhong Xi Shuju), vol. 1 (2010); Qinghua Daxue Chutu Wenxian Yanjiu yu Baohu Zhongxin 清華大學出土文獻研究與保護中心, “Qinghua Daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian *Bao xun shiwen* 清華大學藏戰

The simple answer to these questions would be that *shu* are what is in the transmitted *Shang shu* and its lost chapters. Straightforward though this answer appears to be, it has two problems. One problem is that because *shu* were destroyed in the Qin, we have very little evidence of concerning its original form or early history. The transmitted *Shang shu* has both a modern text (*jinwen* 今文) version with 28 (or 29) chapters and old text (*guwen* 古文) one with 58 chapters. Most modern scholars take the *guwen* version as a forgery, but it may have used some early materials. Even the *jinwen* version is a multi-layered work, with different chapters written at different periods. It includes four sections: the “Yu shu 虞書,” the “Xia shu 夏書,” the “Shang shu 商書,” and the “Zhou shu 周書.” Few scholars doubt that some of the Zhou *shu* are genuinely contemporaneous works, written in the early Western Zhou Dynasty, but most scholars agree that most or all of the *shu* attributed to earlier periods were written later and some of them probably date to the Warring States period.² This suggests that people continued to compose texts in the style of ancient *shu*, attributing them to ancient kings, in the Warring States.

We might also add the *Yi Zhou shu* 逸周書, since its chapters were apparently also regarded as *shu*, even though they are not in the *Shang shu*. As Li Xueqin has pointed out, however, the *Yi Zhou shu* appears to have more than one source and to have been written at different times.³

The other problem is that there were clearly many more *shu* in pre-Han times than were ever included in the *Shang shu*, or the *Yi Zhou shu*. This is well recognized in the tradition that Confucius selected one hundred *shu* from some three thousand and in that the *Yi Zhou shu* represented left over documents. Even if these stories are apocryphal, the *Shang shu* clearly consists of a collection of documents of different periods that have been arranged in chronological order. It is unlikely that they were the only such documents. The Western Zhou rulers surely made more speeches and later people surely have composed more texts in the style of ancient *shu* than collected in these anthologies. For example, there is no reason to think that *Bao xun* 保訓 was

國竹簡〈保訓〉釋文,” *Wenwu* 文物 2009.6, 73-75; Li Xueqin 李學勤. “Qinghua jian jiu pian zongshu 清華簡九篇綜述,” *Wenwu* 2010.5, 51-57.

² For summaries of the scholarship on dating, see Jiang Shanguo 蔣善國, *Shang shu zongshu* 尚書綜述 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1988), 135-40. Kai Vogelsang, “Inscriptions and Proclamations: On the Authenticity of the “gao” Chapters in the *Book of Documents*,” *BMFEA* 74 (2002), 138-209 (140-148). Vogelsang attempts to disprove the prevailing view concerning the early Western Zhou dating of some of the chapters. See also Michael Nylan, *The Five “Confucian” Classics* (New Haven & London: Yale UP, 2001), 133-4 for a concise list of dates for the chapters of the *jinwen* text.

³ Preface to Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, Zhang Maorong 章懋鎔, Tian Xudong 天旭東, ed., *Yi Zhou shu huijiao jizhu* 逸周書彙校集注, (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1995), 2.

ever included in the *Shang shu* or the *Yi Zhou shu* though it takes a similar form. It seems likely that this will prove true of some of other manuscripts in the Tsinghua collection that appear to be *shu*.

In my opinion, a more productive approach to understanding these manuscripts would be to define *shu* as a form of literary composition rather than as chapters of known historical compilations. So defined, we can discuss *shu* without entering into the complex history of the *Shang shu* or *Yi Zhou shu*. We can also begin to understand the origin and history of *shu* as opposed to that of the transmitted text and have a means to evaluate whether unearthed manuscripts should be regarded as *shu*, even if we have no evidence that they were ever included in the transmitted *Shang shu*.

The most significant features of *shu* are: (1) *Shu* were – or pretended to be – contemporaneous accounts. (2) *Shu* include formal speeches by model kings and ministers from ancient times (Western Zhou or earlier). There are a few chapters in the transmitted *Shang shu* which do not include speeches, but they are both exceptional and relatively late. (3) Many *shu* include the expression, *wang ruo yue* 王若曰, “the king seemingly said.” Not all *shu* do include this expression, but, to my knowledge, in transmitted literature, it is only found in *shu*. Thus it provides a key to understanding how *shu* are different from other texts.

Besides appearing in *shu*, the expression, *wang ruo yue*, is found in Western Zhou bronze inscriptions. In these inscriptions, the context is similar to that of the *Shang shu*; that is, the expression introduces a formal speech given by the king. The bronze inscriptions in which the term occurs are ceremonial appointments (*ce ming* 冊命) in which the king gives a speech charging someone with the duties of office and presenting him with various gifts. As Chen Mengjia 陳夢家 observed in his *Wang ruo yue kao* 王若曰考, these inscriptions often describe the ceremony preceding the royal speech in some detail.⁴ From these we know that the king did not deliver the speech himself, but an official, usually a type of scribe (*shi* 史), read it out. Thus, *wang ruo yue* means that the speech that follows was that of the king, but delivered by someone else.

Since the context in the *Shang shu* is also one of formal speech attributed to a king, the expression presumably had the same meaning that it did in the bronze inscriptions; that is, it denoted that the speeches attributed to the ruler were delivered orally by an official. The use of this term is not a good indicator of date, because later imitations written in the style of early *shu* may have used it to signify that they are writing in the *shu* form. It is also possible that it dropped out in the later transmission of some Zhou dynasty documents. In any case, the reason that the expression is found

⁴ Reprinted in *Shang shu tonglun* 尚書通論 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985), 146-70 (originally published in 1939).

in *Shang shu* but not in other forms of early literature is that only *shu* were – or pretended to be – contemporaneous records of formal speeches.

In a small number of bronze inscriptions, a speech delivered by a minister rather than the king is preceded by the expression, *ruo yue*, so the expression marks it as a performance in which a speech of a king or an official was delivered by someone else. It does not mean that the speech is that of a king. Thus, in the *Duo shi* 多士 chapter of the *Shang shu*, the Duke of Zhou is the protagonist, but the speech that follows is preceded by *wang ruo yue*. Some scholars have taken this to imply attempted usurpation by the Duke of Zhou, but as Chen Mengjia has pointed out, a more apt interpretation is that the Duke of Zhou delivered the speech, but it was still that of the ruler. So, in the *Duo fang* 多方, we also have, *Zhou Gong yue wang ruo yue* 周公曰王若曰 (*Duo fang*), “the Duke of Zhou said: the king seemingly said.” In the *Li zheng* 立正 and *Jun shi* 君奭 chapters, on the other hand, we have *Zhou Gong ruo yue*. In those cases, Zhou Gong would have been speaking on his own behalf, with someone else reading the speech, but the term would not imply that he was claiming kingship.

The term *shu* 書 also occurs in some of these ceremonial appointment bronze inscriptions. These inscriptions also refer to *ce* 冊, texts written on bamboo slips, and the terms are sometimes used together. Here, Li Feng 李峰 has had an important insight into the relationship between these two terms that I believe provides the key to understanding the meaning of *shu*. Observing the pattern of distinction in the usage of these two expressions, he suggests that the *ming shu* is a document in the more abstract sense of the literary composition, i.e. the words that were read out.⁵ *Ming ce* refers to the physical document on which the appointment was written, i.e. the bamboo slips, from which the scribe read out. Thus it was the *ming ce* which was physically transferred to the official at the end of the ceremony.

We may hypothesize, then, that *shu* were originally the scripts of speeches composed for the purpose of delivery by officials on behalf of the ruler or high minister in a formal ceremony. The expression *ruo yue*, “seemingly said,” marked the fact of their performance. These speeches were literary compositions delivered in the king’s name by someone else – the king “seemed” to say them, but did not actually voice them. Since they were the scripts of speeches delivered on behalf of the king, they were necessarily written down in advance of the performance. They would not only have been written down in advance, but a copy would also have been archived afterwards with a record as to the date, place, and circumstances of delivery.

⁵ Li Feng, *Bureaucracy and the State in Early China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 112; See also Li Feng, “‘Offices’ in Bronze Inscriptions and Western Zhou Government Administration,” *Early China* 26-27 (2001/2), 50.

Western Zhou bronzes were commonly cast for the particular purpose of recording official appointments or other benefices. However, the kings would also have made other formal speeches that were not cast on bronzes. Presumably, these were also pre-recorded on bamboo slips, read out by an official in a formal ceremony, and archived with a record of the date, place, and circumstances of delivery. Significantly, the Zhou *shu* tend to provide only sparse information concerning the date, place and circumstances of delivery, whereas *shu* attributed to earlier periods, but presumably written later, tend to have more elaborate narrative information in addition to the speeches.

The *Songs* (*shi* 詩) originated with oral performance and were written down later. Conversely, *shu* were originally literary compositions that were later performed orally. In this sense, they can be regarded as the first Chinese literary compositions. Because the *shu* originated as scripts of speeches and with a few exceptions include direct quotation of the words of the kings and ministers, they have an authenticity as contemporaneous documents that is absent from narrative history. This point is essential because it meant that by studying them, one could commune directly with the kings of ancient times without the intervention of interpretation. It is why only the speeches of greatest kings and ministers were included and why the *shu* were so important to Confucius, who claimed that he transmitted, but did not create (述而不作, *Lun yu* 7.1). This emphasis on speech is also very different from the ancient Greek historical tradition, which stressed action and deeds.

How these scripts of speeches came to be circulated is not clear, although it is possible that their texts were presented in the form of bamboo slips after the speeches were delivered, like the appointment speeches recorded in bronze inscriptions, and that they gained circulation in this manner. The traditional supposition that Confucius had access to the archives of the state of Lu is also worth noting, especially since the core of the *Shang shu* are documents associated with the founder of that state, the Duke of Zhou. We may suppose that once such documents began to be circulated they inspired imitations. Thus, while the original *shu* were actually scripts of speeches, other works were written in the style of such scripts. While these might be considered forgeries, it is possible that at least some of them were written in the spirit of fictional reconstructions.

In sum, if we define *shu* as a literary form, a *shu* is any text which claims to be a contemporaneous record of a speech of an ancient king. Some *shu* will be authentic scripts of speeches prepared for royal delivery, some will be based upon such speeches, and others will be fictional reconstructions of what an ancient ruler or minister might have said.

● **Conference Announcements** (chronological)

Workshop on Qinghua Manuscripts at Dartmouth (March 26, 2011)

Reading Workshop on the Tsinghua Bamboo-slip Manuscripts at Dartmouth (Yin Gao and Yin Zhi), March 26, 2011 at Dartmouth College

The second one-day Reading Workshop on the Tsinghua Bamboo-slip Manuscripts at Dartmouth will be held on March 26 (Saturday), 2011 at Dartmouth College. We will read the manuscripts, Yin Gao 尹誥 and Yin Zhi 尹至, recently published in *Qinghua Daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* 清華大學藏戰國竹簡, Li Xueqin 李學勤, ed. (Shanghai: Zhong Xi Shuju, 2010). Li Xueqin's article. "Qinghua jian jiupian zongshu 清華簡九篇綜述" in *Wenwu* 2010.5, 51-57, provides a convenient summary of the content.

We will spend the day reading and discussing Yin Gao and Yin Zhi with Prof. Zhao Ping'an 趙平安—a member of the Tsinghua "zhengli" team, graph by graph and line by line. There will not be any formal papers, but participants are expected to have prepared by reading the text before the workshop. (We will provide pdfs to the participants for this purpose). In reading the text, we will discuss palaeographic issues, textual problems, and, of course, the broader implications of the content. Prof. Zhao will also update us on recent progress in preparing the Tsinghua slips for publication.

The workshop is open to anyone who wishes to attend, including graduate students. We have reserved a limited number of rooms for March 25 and 26. Travel information is as below. We have very minimal funding, so we will need to charge a "registration fee" to cover the rooms and some of our expenses. If you are willing to share a room and wish to stay both nights, it will be \$150. If you want a single room, it will be twice that. If you do not need a room, there will be no fee, but please let us know that you are coming.

With regard to transportation to Hanover, NH, Dartmouth Coach (www.dartmouthcoach.com) provides excellent, comfortable, reliable bus service to and from New York and Boston (Logan or South Station). Manchester, NH Airport is a little more than an hour away; it now has a shuttle service (<http://uvshuttle.com/>), as well as rental cars.

If you would like to come, please email: Sarah.allan@dartmouth.edu, Allison.C.Parsley@dartmouth.edu, specifying the number of nights (25th or 26th) and single or shared room.

(Sarah Allan, Wen Xing, Foong Janice Kam

Department of Asian and Middle Eastern Languages, Dartmouth College)

Society for the Study of Early China (at AAS/ICAS Honolulu) (April 2, 2011)

The Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Early China 2011 will be held as a “Meeting in Conjunction” with the AAS/ICAS convention, Honolulu, Hawaii, on Saturday, April 2, 12-1:30, at the Convention Center, Room 302B. Prof. Zhao Ping’an 趙平安 (Qinghua Daxue Chutu Wenxian Yanjiu yu Baohu Zhongxin 清華大學出土文獻研究與保護中心) will deliver a talk on “The Warring States period bamboo slip manuscripts in the Tsinghua University collection.” The Business Meeting will follow. Please note that the time of this meeting is Saturday at noon. (Bring your lunch).

(Sarah Allan, Chair, Society for the Study of Early China)

European Association for the Study of Chinese Manuscripts (July 6-8, 2012)

Title: Chinese Manuscripts Workshop 4 (successor of Tomb Text Workshops 1-3)

Date: July 6-8, 2012

Location: Paris

Topic: Excavated and Purchased Chinese Manuscripts

One issue often encountered in the study of Chinese manuscripts, from whatever area or period, is how their integrity is preserved once they leave scientific or otherwise institutionalized control, even if it were just for a period of time. This issue is pertinent to many Dunhuang manuscripts, but also to more recent manuscripts, such as those written by Lin Zhao before her execution in 1968. And it is especially pertinent in the case of manuscripts purchased on antique markets, which had surfaced as the result of tomb looting.

The issues brought along by purchased manuscripts will be one of the main topics of our upcoming meeting. Manuscripts purchased on antique markets pose fundamental problems, such as whether or not to include them in our research. Scholars currently balance between publishing about collections obtained through illegal activities or ignoring these manuscripts (and documents) altogether, thus potentially missing out on important historical, philological or philosophical contents. During our last workshop in Zürich, discussion focused on manuscripts bought by the Shanghai Museum. At the present moment, at least three other institutions obtained new manuscripts from antique markets (Beijing University, Qinghua University, Yuelu Academy). From preliminary publications, we know that each of the three collections contain important texts, such as *Laozi* (Beijing MSS), some *Shangshu* chapters (Qinghua MSS) and more than a thousand slips concerning Qin’s legislation (Yuelu MSS). Enough to keep Chinese manuscriptologists occupied for years. Yet, in addition to the ethical issue, these manuscripts are marked by many other problems. For example: (1) the difficulty of considering the manuscripts in a regional context, (2) the impossibility of relying on the archaeological context to understand the social

context of the production and the use of those texts, (3) the complexity of reconstituting individual texts from collections of (fragmented) slips, and last but not least, (4) the problem of possible forgeries.

We therefore invite scholars to propose papers on any kind of Chinese manuscript(s) that deal with the differences between archaeologically retrieved manuscripts and those obtained otherwise. As we think EASCM can take a part in the diffusion of knowledge about Chinese manuscripts to people less familiar with this field, we hope that this kind of meeting and the publication that follows from the meeting, will help people interested in Chinese manuscripts to be aware of those problems related to the use of such sources.

(The EASCM Board)

● Conference reports

“Manuscript Culture in the Chinese Tradition,” Harvard Univ., May 14-15, 2010

By Matthias L. Richter (University of Colorado at Boulder)

A conference titled “Manuscript Culture in the Chinese Tradition” (中國手抄本文化國際學術討論會), was held on the 14th and 15th of May, 2010, at Harvard and was organised and hosted by Tian Xiaofei of the Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations. The programme embraced a wide historical scope, reaching from pre-imperial China to the late twentieth century. The diversity of thematic and methodological approaches was no less stimulating and productive than the wide variety of subject matter. Questions of authorship in early China as well as in the mediaeval and late imperial periods were discussed in the first of a succession of six thematic panels, the last of which focused on the impact that print culture and resulting modes of textual reception can have on manuscript production and transmission. The four panels within this bracket comprised questions of physical properties of manuscripts, circumstances of their production and preservation as well as textual criticism, *critique génétique* and traces of manuscript culture in printed literature.

Panel 1, “Authors”: Martin Kern (Princeton) “Texts and Their Absent Authors in Early Chinese Manuscripts”, Sarah Allen (Wellesley College) “Writing Authorship: Stabilization and Change in Ninth-Century Chinese Stories”, Wilt Idema (Harvard) “Now Let Us All Praise Professional Scribes: Some Comments on the Eighteenth-century Manuscripts of Pu Songling’s *Liaozhai zhiyi*”, Discussant: Michael Puett (Harvard);

Panel 2, “Textual Sites: Physical, Transcendental, and Virtual”: James Robson

(Harvard) “An Alternative Archive: Manuscripts and Printed Texts Found Inside of Chinese Statues”, Jie Li (Harvard) “Prison Writings in Blood: The Transmission of Lin Zhao’s Manuscripts”, Michel Hockx (SOAS, London) “The Making of Modern Poets”, Discussant: Judith Zeitlin (University of Chicago);

Panel 3, “Reading Back from the Traces”: Stephen Owen (Harvard) “The Poet in the Scroll: Du Fu’s Collected Poems in Manuscript”, Ding Xiang Warner (Cornell) “The Paperless Trail: Interpreting Manuscript Culture without Manuscripts”, Kai Vogelsang (University of Hamburg) “Editing Late Imperial Chinese Texts: The Case of the *Jiao Bin lu kangyi*”, Discussant: Peter Bol (Harvard);

Panel 4, “Variation”: Matthias L. Richter (University of Colorado at Boulder) “Physical Properties of Manuscripts as Indicators of their Social Function: The Case of *Fan wu liu xing* 凡物流形”, Christopher Nugent (Williams College) “The Moon is Missing: A Li Bai *Yuefu* and Its Material Contexts”, Wang Yao (Suzhou University) “A Comparative Study of the Draft, Definite Version, and Rewritten Version of ‘The Second Handshake’ 〈第二次握手〉抄本、定稿本与重写本之比较”, Discussant: Catherine Yeh (Boston University);

Panel 5, “Discoveries”: Paul W. Kroll (University of Colorado at Boulder) “Problems and Pleasures of Reading *fu* from Dunhuang”, David Wang (Harvard) “Madam White, *The Book of Change*, and Eileen Chang: On A Poetics of Involution”, Discussant: Eileen Chow (Harvard);

Panel 6, “The Pressures of Print: Publicity and Performance”: Hilde De Weerd (Oxford) “Manuscript Transmission during the First Age of Print”, Ellen Widmer (Wellesley College) “Women and Textual Production in Late Imperial China”, Suyoung Son (University of Chicago) “Writing, Reading, and Printing in Zhang Chao’s *Youmengying*”, Xiaofei Tian (Harvard) “Corporal and Textual Mutilation in the World of a Tiny Insect”.

“A Bamboo Event: Re-evaluating Early Chinese Culture Through Excavated Texts,” Pennsylvania State University, May 17-18, 2010

(& Follow-up workshop on *Heng xian* in autumn)

By Matthias L. Richter (University of Colorado at Boulder)

A two day workshop “A Bamboo Event: Re-evaluating Early Chinese Culture Through Excavated Texts” was held at Pennsylvania State University on the 17th and 18th of May, 2010. This CCKF funded workshop was jointly organised by Erica Brindley (Penn State) and Constance A. Cook (Lehigh University). While this workshop narrowly focused on four texts of the Shanghai Museum collection of Warring States Chu manuscripts, the presentations and discussions approached the texts from vastly different angles, ranging from codicological and palaeographic

details, historical phonology and textual criticism to the placement of the texts in their contemporary context or more broadly in the history of philosophy and literature.

Erica Brindley interpreted the text *Heng xian* 恆先 as a cosmogony with naturalistic and spiritualistic elements, emphasising in particular the role of *qi* in the process of cosmogony. Matthias Richter (University of Colorado at Boulder) read the same text as primarily concerned with language and nomenclature, interpreting the cosmogonic first part of the text as primarily serving to legitimise the ruler's prerogative to control naming practices. Xing Wen (Dartmouth College) focused on the rhetorical qualities of the text. He observed parallel phrases and generally regular structures in it to an extent that suggested to him that *Heng xian* could be seen as an early predecessor of the *baguwen* 八股文 genre.

The second topic of discussion was that of the two manuscripts bearing the text *Fan wu liu xing* 凡物流形. Scott Cook (Grinnell College) and Lai Guolong (University of Florida) subsequently presented their often significantly variant readings of these yet little studied and particularly difficult to decipher manuscripts. Aside from the many intricate palaeographic and orthographic issues, they both also discussed how this text, which largely consists of unanswered questions, relates to transmitted literature, in particular the "Heavenly Questions" (*Tian wen* 天問) of the *Chu ci* 楚辭.

The second day of the workshop was devoted to the manuscripts *Kongzi shi lun* 孔子詩論 and *Zhonggong* 仲弓, respectively. Constance Cook discussed notions of ritual and music in *Kongzi shi lun*, placing the manuscript text in the broader ritualistic discourse in early China. Lin Suqing 林素清 (Academia Sinica) discussed the issue of slips with and without margins in the same manuscript, and William H. Baxter (University of Michigan) explored cases in which variant forms of characters for certain words may reflect morphological features relating to different word classes. Anne Kinney (University of Virginia) focused on the place of the text in the history of early Chinese poetics, paying particular attention to the concept of *zhi* 志 as expressed in *Kongzi shi lun*.

The workshop was concluded by a session devoted to the manuscript *Zhonggong*. Andrew Mayer (Brooklyn College) and Yan Shixuan 顏世鉉 (Academia Sinica) presented their respective readings of this less controversial text. Both scholars focused on the ideological import of the text and its placement in the history of early Chinese philosophy.

A follow-up workshop, devoted entirely to reading and translating the text *Heng xian* was held in autumn 2010 at Penn State. A publication of articles on *Heng xian* and possibly other texts in the journal *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, with Erica Brindley and Paul Goldin as guest editors, is expected to appear in 2011.

Li Xueqin presents Creel Lecture on the Qinghua bamboo manuscripts in Beijing, December 10, 2010

By Edward L. Shaughnessy (University of Chicago)

Professor Li Xueqin 李学勤, Director of the Center for the Study and Preservation of Unearthed Texts (出土文献研究与保护中心) of Qinghua University (清华大学), Beijing, presented the 15th Annual Herrlee G. Creel Memorial Lecture at the University of Chicago Center in Beijing on 10 December 2010; his topic was “The Qinghua Strips and the *Shang Shu* and *Yi Zhou Shu*” (清华简与《尚书》和《逸周书》). The lecture was attended by students and faculty of the University of Chicago and of Qinghua University, as well as by other guests from throughout Beijing.

After presenting a general overview of Qinghua University’s acquisition and preservation of its corpus of bamboo-strip manuscripts from the Warring States period, and then providing an introduction to the editorial work done on the manuscripts to date, Professor Li proceeded to discuss five discrete topics concerning these manuscripts:

- Whether there was a “*Shang shu*” in antiquity?
- Whether the “archaic text” (古文) *Shang shu* is authentic or not?
- Whether there was a distinction between the *Shang shu* and the *Yi Zhou shu*?
- Whether there was only a single version of the *Shang shu*?
- And whether the *Yi Zhou shu* derived from Han-dynasty editors?

Based on the evidence in the Qinghua bamboo-strip manuscripts, Professor Li answered the first of these questions in a qualified affirmative; it is clear that there were documents referred to as *shu* 書 and that at least some of these were bundled together and referred to as a “*Shang shu*.” With respect to the second topic, the Qinghua manuscripts reveal clear evidence that the “archaic text” *Shang shu* is in fact not authentic; manuscripts of texts the titles of which correspond to texts in the received text of the “archaic text” *Shang shu* reveal no correspondence in contents. Again based on the evidence in the Qinghua bamboo-strip manuscripts, Professor Li then went on to suggest, somewhat more tentatively, that as late as the Warring States period there was no distinction between the *Shang shu* and the *Yi Zhou shu*, that there were multiple versions of the *Shang shu* in circulation, and that therefore the *Yi Zhou shu* did not come to be regarded as an independent text until the Han period. Professor Li’s lecture was both detailed in its specific points of evidence and broad in its implications for the creation and communication of knowledge in early China, a truly stimulating occasion for all who attended.



Li Xueqin 李学勤 presenting 2010 Creel Lecture
“The Qinghua Strips and the *Shang Shu* and *Yi Zhou Shu*”
(清华简与《尚书》和《逸周书》)

● **New Publications**

Relying on voluntary reports by members, the following new publications by or related to EASCM members have been brought to our attention. There are without doubt many more. It is hoped that calls to report these will meet with more enthusiasm in the future.

Nylan, Michael & Michael Loewe, ed., *China's Early Empires. A Re-appraisal*, Cambridge UP, 2010, 624 pp.

Including:

“Excavated manuscripts: context and methodology” by Enno Giele, pp. 114-34

“The laws of 186 BCE. Appendix: Legal documents” by Michael Loewe, pp. 253-65

“Administration of the family (*Qihuai bisi*). Appendix: On the sources” by Michael Nylan, pp. 266-95

“Numbers, numeracy and the cosmos. Appendix: *Nine Chapters*” by Christopher Cullen, pp. 323-38

“Divination and astrology: received texts and excavated manuscripts. Appendix: (1) Writings relating to divination ...” by Marc Kalinowski, pp. 339-66

“Manuscripts, received texts and the healing arts. Appendix: Early evidence of the healing arts” by Vivienne Lo, pp. 367-97

Nylan, Michael, *Yang Xiong and the Pleasures of Reading and Classical Learning in Han China*, American Oriental Society monograph series, forthcoming in early 2011. Description by the author: “It is all about manuscript culture and reading practices in late Western Han, when the library was being reorganized under the direction of Liu Xiang (26-6 BC). It talks a lot about lexicons of the time as well.”

Raoul D. Findeisen reports that he has taken over editorship of the academic journal *Studia Orientalia Slovaca (SOS)*, which is published semiannually by the Department of East Asian Studies, Faculty of Philosophy, Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia (Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, Katedra východoázijských štúdií). This is interesting with respect to manuscript studies in two ways: 1) the journal strives to introduce through English reviews many of the works of Eastern European colleagues, that can be expected to also contain research on the wealth of manuscripts that are housed in St. Petersburg and elsewhere in Eastern Europe; 2) the editor explicitly invites contributions of articles based on manuscript studies. For more information, write to sos@fphil.uniba.sk.

● **Self-introductions of EASCM members** (in alphabetic order)



Dr. **Maria Khayutina** 夏玉婷. I studied history with the focus on Ancient China at the Moscow State University and made my PhD at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1999. Since 2001, I conducted several projects in Bochum and Munich, where I am currently working on my habilitation thesis and teaching courses on various aspects of the pre-modern Chinese history and culture. My main research interests are the history of the pre-imperial period and inscriptions on bronze ritual vessels and bells. Although bronze inscriptions are not just *manuscripts*, but more complex products of writing and *manufacture*, working with both these categories of written materials is often related to similar methodological problems, including the issues of authenticity, readability, interpretation and connections to received texts. Hence, I am very glad to have a chance to discuss them with my colleagues who deal with bamboo, silk or paper. Looking at the language of the inscriptions, art-historical features of their material carriers, or the archaeological context of their discovery, I finally aim at using inscribed bronzes as sources for reconstructing social and political processes in early China. Based on the analysis of bronze inscriptions, I discussed in a number of papers

early Chinese geopolitical organization, time-reckoning, representations about sacred space and privacy, as well as some particular inscriptions or inscriptions' groups. My most recent publications include:

- "Royal Hospitality and Geopolitical Constitution of the Western Zhou Polity (1046/5-771 BC)," *T'oung Pao* 96.1-3 (2010), 1-77.
- "The Royal Year-Count of the Western Zhou Dynasty (1045-771 BC) and its Use(r)s: a Sociological Perspective," in *Time and Ritual in Early China*, eds. Xiaobing Wang-Riese und Thomas O. Höllmann, *Asiatische Forschungen Monographienreihe* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), pp. 125-151.

Forthcoming are papers on "Marital Alliances and Affinal Relatives (*sheng* 甥 and *hungou* 婚購) in the Society and Politics of Zhou China in the Light of Bronze Inscriptions" and "The Tombs of Peng 棚 State and Related Questions."

The full list of my publications and downloads of papers are available at www.sinits.com.



Edward L. Shaughnessy. I am interested generally in the cultural and literary history of the Zhou period, and am committed especially to the study of its archaeologically recovered textual materials, from oracle-bone and bronze inscriptions through the bamboo-strip manuscripts that have been unearthed in such breathtaking profusion in the last two decades. At the same time, I remain fascinated with the received literary tradition of the period, especially the three

classics: *Zhou Yi*, *Shang shu* and *Shi jing*. Indeed, I find it most rewarding when it proves possible to use these two types of texts to explicate each other. Within this general scholarly agenda, I have resolutely maintained two focal points: bronze inscriptions and the *Zhou Yi*, both of which reached their full maturity toward the end of the Western Zhou period (1045-771 B.C.). I am presently completing a monographic study to be entitled "*The Changes Unearthed*," a survey of recently excavated manuscripts of or relating to the *Yi jing*. I hope in the near future to turn my attention to an analytic dictionary of the language of Western Zhou bronze inscriptions, and in the long term to prepare a comprehensive history of the Western Zhou period.

Enno Giele (editor)
Tucson, March 17, 2011