In spite of the shortcomings of Meyer's proposed methodology for engaging with ancient Chinese texts, his proposals are important initiatives providing a different angle from which to view inquiry into early Chinese writings. Meyer's book is therefore a welcome and much needed contribution to the field of early Chinese textuality and intellectual history; it is as insightful as it is inspiring, and it may motivate the committed reader to look for deeper strata of meaning-creation in ancient Chinese texts.

No doubt, the recovered ancient bamboo texts, just like the received texts, will remain a subject of study for many years to come, given the multiplicity of texts, the scope of discussion in which the texts engage, and the difficulty of the early language in its many manifestations. All these will remain a great challenge to modern readers, separated by more than 2,000 years from the original users of these texts, whether oral or written.

Shirley Chan
Macquarie University

The Bamboo Texts of Guodian: A Study & Complete Translation. By Scott Cook. Cornell East Asia Series 164–165. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University East Asia Program, 2012. Two volumes. Pp. xviii + 1200. $178.00 hardcover, $138.00 paperback.[*]

In 1993, in the village of Guodian 郭店, Hubei province, a set of bamboo texts was excavated from a Warring States period (403–221 B.C.) tomb. For scholars of ancient China, these texts are easily the single most significant manuscript find since the year A.D. 279, the last time a textual cache of similar import was unearthed. Sixteen years have passed since their first publication in 1998. Over most of that time, Scott Cook has been preparing this comprehensive study and English translation, producing a massive two-volume work that is likely to serve as the definitive Western translation and key reference for the Guodian texts for decades to come.

Cook wrote his Master's thesis in 1990 on the "Yue ji" 樂記 (Record of music), the earliest fully-developed extant treatise on music, which was written no later

---

than the middle of the Western Han (second and first centuries B.C.) and is thought to contain a large amount of Warring States period material dealing with music. The Guodian manuscripts also deal extensively with musical harmony. Cook later compared the "Record of music" with the third century B.C. "Essay on music" ("Yue lun" 樂論) by Xunzi 荀子, contextualizing the works in the diverse intellectual landscape of the late Warring States period and a broader comparative philosophical framework. Cook began his studies of the Guodian manuscripts shortly after their 1998 publication with a text called the "Wu Xing" 五行 (Five conducts), connecting the musical metaphors pervading the text with their intellectual antecedents in the *Analects* and their descendants from Mencius 孟子 and Xunzi to post-Han intellectual history. Since then, Cook has published both in English and Chinese on a wide variety of topics connected with Warring States intellectual and political history: about the editorial aims and strategies of the *Guanzi* 管子 and the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋, and several more technical studies of the Guodian manuscripts, ranging from palaeography to phonology to the internal reordering of the bamboo strips within textual units. The latter is where his most original contributions lie.[1]

In the past ten to fifteen years, the field of palaeography has seen a complete technical revolution, moving from difficult-to-obtain editions with black and white photographic reproductions and sometimes mechanically reproduced hand-written palaeographic commentaries, to an almost completely web-based community of scholars who use palaeographic blogs to exchange opinions on editions with excellent colour reproductions, which are nevertheless mostly consulted in PDF format and often made obsolete within weeks of their publication.[2] Even with these changes, in this field a handful of masters who are able to command sources and have built expertise over decades are the first to produce and share information. Cook, who has earned his way into this select group, is now giving us an edition of the Guodian texts which is, at the time of writing, the most complete in any language, and will serve as the point of entrance into these manuscripts for a whole generation of scholars. Cook's scholarly milestone lays the foundation for future scholarly work on these texts, including studies that will take different perspectives.

---

[1] See a full list of his publications in the file provided on his website: https://www.grinnell.edu/sites/default/files/Scott%20Cook%202013%20CV.pdf.

[2] See Lee-moi Pham 范麗梅 and Kuan-yun Huang 黃冠雲, "Newly Excavated Texts in the Digital Age: Reflections on New Resources," *Early China* (forthcoming). The following three online tools transform the way to quote manuscript passages and to cut and paste Chu 楚 graphs, and have been used extensively in writing this review: (1) http://bamboo.lib.cuhk.edu.hk/searchcard.jsp; (2) http://xiaoxue.iis.sinica.edu.tw/chuwenzi; and specifically (3) http://www.bsm-whu.org/zxcl/.

In this review I will provide a brief outline of the contents of the volume, describing and assessing its contributions based on the arguments Cook lays out in the introduction. I will focus especially on my area of interest, palaeography and its relationship with historical phonology, demonstrating its importance in understanding the Guodian manuscripts.

Of the 1,200 pages that constitute the volume, the first 200 provide a general introduction, while the bulk of the volume, pages 200–950, is dedicated to an abundantly annotated transcription and translation of the text. Of these 750 pages, about 250 are dedicated to detailed introductions to each manuscript. A series of appendixes follow: Appendix A, around 50 pages in length, facilitates the comparison of the *Laozi* 老子 manuscripts with the Mawangdui 馬王堆 *Laozi* manuscripts and their received counterparts, and consists of collation tables juxtaposing each line of the three Guodian *Laozi* manuscripts to the six or seven other major editions of the *Daodejing* 道德經. Appendix B recapitulates in two pages the changes in strip order for all manuscripts, a major feature of this edition. Appendix C is a running translation of the texts (basically the same text as given on pages 200–950 without any critical apparatus), for the convenience of readers not interested in the Chinese text and for undergraduates. It is about 100 pages. Finally, Cook's work has 80 pages of bibliography and a 20-page index. As duly noted at the head of the index, the translation footnotes and the transcription have not been indexed (a loss which is only partly mitigated by the existence of concordances to the 1998 transcription, both in volume form and online).

Cook begins his introduction with a succinct account of the discovery and archaeological setting of the Guodian tomb where the cache of bamboo texts was found, followed by a clear and thorough discussion of the principles adopted in sorting and arranging the strips into textual units.[3] He dedicates a few pages to the Shanghai Museum manuscripts (the author has made significant contributions to the study of the rhymed texts in this collection) and the recently published Qinghua 清華 manuscripts.[4] Since Cook's book was published less than two years ago, a new

---

[3] Unlike some of the Shanghai Museum texts, no titles or any ordering devices were present.

[4] The Qinghua University manuscripts were purchased and donated to Qinghua by an alumnus in July 2008, after which they were evaluated for authenticity and carbon-dated. The results showed an approximate origin of roughly 305 B.C. ± thirty years. They amount to at least 1,700 full strips, of various dimensions and consist mostly of "classical and historical" works, including a large number of "document" (*shu* 書) texts that in some cases roughly correspond to chapters of the received *Shang shu* 尚書 and *Yi Zhou shu* 逸周書, as well as a number of ritual texts, divination texts, and a major set of annals bearing some resemblance to the *Zhushu*

bamboo manuscript of the *Laozi* has been published,[5] as well as three more volumes of the Qinghua collection, which has emerged as a dynamic focus of recent scholarly work. Cook's notes make use of data coming from both Shanghai and Qinghua; in the case of the Qinghua manuscripts, this is often thanks to materials shared by scholars before their actual publication.

In section C of the Introduction, Cook discusses the Chu 楚 script, a regional variant of the Chinese Script that remained un-unified prior to the advent of imperial China in 221 B.C., and is a distinctive feature of the Guodian texts. This script was almost unknown before the archaeological finds in Hubei in the 1980s and 1990s. Previously, for this stage of the Chinese writing system scholars relied on bronze inscriptions, on Xu Shen's 許慎 (58?–147?) *Shuowen jiezi* 説文解字, on fragments of old stelae, and on compilations of "ancient script" forms from the Song dynasty. Now, we have a huge amount of varied textual material. At the same time, our understanding of the script is still imperfect: its unusual appearance and strong reliance on loangraphs[6] make the direct reading of the strips very challenging even for scholars who are used to reading other kinds of pre-imperial epigraphical material.

Most of Cook's extensive annotation is dedicated to problems related to features of the Chu script, which I will here summarize briefly and discuss in some detail later. The Chu script has some distinctive allographs (graphs which have the same pronunciation and meaning but different shapes[7]), for instance, those for *ren* 仁 (humanity), *dao* 道 (the way), and *shen* 慎 (be careful about):

(Note 4—*Continued*)

    jinian 竹書紀年, covering a period from the beginning of the Zhou to the early years of the Warring States (see Cook, pp. 25–26).

[5] The so-called Beijing University manuscript, dated to the Western Han: Beijing daxue Chutu wenxian yanjiusuo 北京大學出土文獻研究所, ed., *Beijing daxue cang Xi Han zhushu* 北京大學藏西漢竹書 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2012).

[6] "A loangraph is a homophonous or nearly homophonous graph borrowed to write another word" (Qiu Xigui 裴錫圭, *Chinese Writing*, trans. Gilbert L. Mattos and Jerry Norman [Berkeley, CA: Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 2000], p. 261). The Chinese term is *jiajie* 假借 or *jiajiezi* 假借字. This applies best to the post-Qin writing system, where at the end of a standardizing process one graph was fairly unambiguously associated with a given word and therefore with the pronunciation of this word as well. Cook uses the term "loan word," apparently with the same meaning as loangraph, but as this phrase normally refers to words from one language borrowed into another, I will not follow him here.

[7] See Qiu Xigui, *Chinese Writing*, p. 297.

Table 1

Standard characters[8]	仁 [9]	道 [10]	慎 [11]
Chu allographs	㤅志	𧗟	誓𣂏䛞䛞

Some of these forms can be partially explained phonologically. I will use Axel Schuessler's Old Chinese reconstructions throughout this review.[12] *Ren* 仁 is reconstructed as *nin, and *qian* 千 is reconstructed as *snhin, therefore 志 can be considered a loangraph (a graph used to write an unrelated homophonous or semi-homophonous graph). *Shen* 身 (body, self) is reconstructed as *lhin. While 㤅 cannot be considered a standard loangraph (the initial is too different), its choice might be motivated not only by its semantics but also by its matching vowel and final. As for 𧗟, while we are unable to identify its phonetic element, we have no reason to doubt that it stands not only for a word of similar meaning, but specifically for the word *luʔ (way), usually even in the Chu script[13] written with the graph *dao* 道 (belonging to a set of semi-homophone items sharing the phonetic element *shou* 首 *lhuʔ[14]). Thus we may

---

8   By standard character I refer here and throughout this review to the graphic shape used after the Qin imperial unification (221 B.C.).

9   仁 (http://xiaoxue.iis.sinica.edu.tw/chuwenzi?kaiOrder=2211). I am following Chen Sipeng 陳斯鵬 in analysing the graph in "Zhongxin zhi dao" 忠信之道 strip 8 as 志 , even though in the Guodian corpus 㤅 and 志 are almost undistinguishable. See Chen Sipeng, *Chuxi jianbo zhong zixing yu yinyi guanxi yanjiu* 楚系簡帛中字形與音義關係研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2011), p. 162.

10 道 (http://xiaoxue.iis.sinica.edu.tw/chuwenzi?kaiOrder=2211).

11 慎 (Cook, p. 29). http://bamboo.lib.cuhk.edu.hk/servlet/list?action=listcard&id=&t=&con=%E6%85%8E&tno=&startPos=1&pageSize=20

12 Axel Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to* Grammata Serica Recensa (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009). I am here simplifying Schuessler's transcription by omitting the diacritics showing vowel quality, a feature which is essential to connecting Old Chinese to Middle Chinese form but does not seem to play a role in the borrowing relationships discussed in this review.

13 The allograph 𧗟 appears only in the Guodian manuscripts, about one third of the times the word word *luʔ (way) is written. Other Chu manuscripts simply use the graph *dao* 道 (with the exception of the Shanghai Museum manuscript "Ziyi" 緇衣 where 𧗟 occurs once, in strip 17). See Teng Rensheng 滕壬生, *Chuxi jianbo wenzi bian* 楚系簡帛文字編, rev. ed. (Wuhan: Hubei jiaoyu chubanshe, 2008), pp. 166–69, for a comprehensive list of the occurrences.

14 This is what is referred to as a phonetic series. According to William Boltz's definition in his authoritative book on the early phase of the Chinese writing system, the elements of this set must adhere to three conditions: "(i) all the characters share a common graphic component that

call it an allograph. The same applies to *shen* 慎.[15]

The opposite of allography is homography, whereby unrelated words are written with graphs that, due to their similarity in shape, systematically create cases of graphic confusion,[16] as, for example, with *heng* 亙 and *ji* 亟, *tian* 天 and *er* 而, *wang* 亡 and *zuo* 乍 (作), *tian* 天 and *fu* 夫, and *jian* 柬 and *dong* 東.[17] Allography and homography both work against the standardized bi-univocal association between one graph and one morpheme that would become prevalent in the post-Qin writing system, and might cause uncertainty in the transcription of the text, but they affect a limited number of graphs and in most cases context is sufficient to eliminate any ambiguity.

Next Cook discusses calligraphic divisions and textual markers for punctuation and other purposes, before moving to a distinctive feature of this edition: its numerous instances of internal reordering. Cook significantly reorders the texts from Liu Zhao's 劉釗 earlier and widely used edition,[18] to a certain extent for "Qiongda yi shi" 窮達 以時, "Tang Yu zhi dao" 唐虞之道, "Cheng zhi" 成之, and "Liu de" 六德; and to a much larger extent for "Zun deyi" 尊德義 and the four "Yucong" 語叢 texts.[19] Both "Zun deyi" and "Yucong 4" are (irregularly) rhymed texts (see Cook, pp. 92–96). Recognition of this textual device, together with the discovery that three of the "Zun deyi" bamboo strips had been pieced together in the wrong way, is the rationale for Cook's reshuffling. Cook's text, like that of Chen Wei 陳偉,[20] also has one additional

––––––––––––––––––––

(Note 14—*Continued*)

    stands in each case for the pronunciation of the word that the given character represents, (ii) all of the pronunciations of the words of a given set are homophonous or nearly homophonous with one another, and (iii) all save for the primary graph itself have become graphically differentiated through the acquisition of a semantic determinative." William G Boltz, *The Origin and Early Development of the Chinese Writing System* (New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1994), p. 90.

[15]   The standard graphs 道 and 慎 often occur in the same manuscripts that contain their non-standard allographs, so that it is not easy to correlate the non-standard graphs with a specific semantic or textual function.

[16]   See Qiu Xigui, *Chinese Writing*, p. 301.

[17]   The forms of 與, 畧, and 興 are also easily mixed up in the Chu script (Cook, p. 643, n. 24); another case is that of the character 叟 which can stand for both the set of homophones *shi* 史 *srəʔ*/ *shi* 事 *s-rəʔ*/ *li* 吏 *rəh*/ and for the set of homophones *bian* 變 *prons*/ *bian* 辯 *bens*/; see Chen Sipeng, *Chuxi jianbo zhong zixing yu yinyi guanxi yanjiu*, p. 111–15.

[18]   Liu Zhao, *Guodian Chujian jiaoshi* 郭店楚簡校釋 (Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 2003).

[19]   The first three, being miscellanies of short statements, are likely to be more or less subjectively ordered by any editor.

[20]   Chen Wei, *Xinchu Chujian yandu* 新出楚簡研讀 (Wuhan: Wuhan daxue chubanshe, 2010).

strip that had somehow been omitted altogether from the initial publication of the Guodian materials, belonging to "Yucong 3" and given number 73 by Cook (p. 873). Finally, Cook concludes this section by establishing the criteria for his transcription and his monumental annotations. In the following I focus on these criteria and their implementation in a few selected cases.

The first step to understanding the texts (to which Cook's section D is dedicated) is the transcription of Chu graphs into their standard equivalents (*liding* 隸定), either by rendering each of their component elements into individual equivalents and then assembling them back together, or by equating them directly with standard characters where that equivalency is well understood (see table 1 here). As the equivalence between *ren* 仁, *dao* 道, *shen* 慎 and their allographs is not in dispute, they are not in themselves a hindrance to the transcription of the text.

Other frequently used forms, such as *hun* 昏 *hmən for *wen* 問 *məns and *wei* 微/ 媺 *məiʔ for *mei* 美 *muiʔ, are not a critical issue for the transcriber interested in finding the equivalent standard characters, but they are very interesting for phonologists, who want to know whether their frequent usage reflects differences in pronunciation between Chu speech (or more generally the speech of that time) and the speech that our reconstructions, based on different sources, reflect.[21] But there is an important difference between the two kinds of forms, as *wei* 媺, an allograph with a phonetic component close in pronunciation to *mei* 美, is always used to represent the meaning "beautiful" in the manuscripts,[22] while a loangraph like *hun* 昏, also close in pronunciation to *wen* 問, stands in many other contexts for a completely unrelated word meaning "dark," and could create ambiguity in certain contexts.

More problematic, and very intriguing for phonologists, are the graphs 戩, 譏, 羑, 僕, 斅, 𦔻, which Cook asserts include an unidentified phonetic element such as 羋 or 美 and correspond (in different contexts) to a wide variety of standard characters: *qian* 淺 *tshen (shallow), *cha* 察 *tshret (investigate), *qie* 竊 *tset (steal, stealthily), *bian* 辯 *brenʔ (determine, discern), and *qi* 戚 *tshiuk (grief),[23] most of which cannot be considered as possible loangraphs for each other according to our current understanding of Old Chinese phonology (see table in Cook, p. 33). The semantic

---

[21]　See Cook, p. 86, n. 197 and the study by Baxter cited in that note: "Old Chinese Reconstruction and Recently Excavated Texts," an unpublished draft presented at the workshop on "Chinese Paleography: Theory and Practice," University of Chicago, 28–30 May 2005.

[22]　See William G. Boltz, "Reading Early Chinese Manuscripts [Review article of *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* by Edward L. Shaughnessy]," *Journal of Chinese Studies* 47 (2007), p. 473.

[23]　The list is sometimes extended to the characters *dai* 帶 *tas and *dui* 對 *tuts; see more details at p. 517, n. 208; p. 607, n. 60; p. 655, n. 92; p. 715, n. 149; p. 857, n. 64; as well as in Bai Yulan 白於藍, *Jiandu boshu tongjiazi zidian* 簡牘帛書通假字字典 (Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 2008), pp. 206, 366–67.

overlap between some of them, such as *cha* 察 (investigate) and *bian* 辯 (determine, discern), raises the possibility that in such cases we are dealing with synonyms and not loangraphs.[24]

When there is no semantic overlap, if one accepts recent phonetic reconstructions like Schuessler's,[25] one is bound to hypothesize that we must here be facing a situation of graphs whose forms are accidentally the same but that actually stand for different words (homography), just as in the case of the character 叓 standing both for *shi* 史 *srəʔ/ *shi* 事 *s-rəʔ/ *li* 吏 *rəh/ and for *bian* 變 *prons/ *bian* 辡 *bens.[26]

The yearly publication of new manuscripts allows us to test this hypothesis against new data. Recently Li Ling 李零, discussing two passages from bamboo collections other than Guodian, one from the Qinghua manuscript "Chu ju" 楚居 (where *qie* 竊 is written as 㯱), the other from the Shanghai Museum manuscript "Zi gao" 子羔 (where Qie 契 is written as 㓞), has argued that the 卂 component should be identified with the phonetic 禼 *set; that this component is present in both *cha* 察 *tshret and *qie* 竊 *tset; and that they should be kept apart from *qian* 淺 *tshen and the other characters.[27]

---

[24] As argued by Liu Zhao, *Guodian Chujian jiaoshi*, p. 84 (see also Cook, p. 511, n. 172). Only in two of its six occurrences in the Guodian manuscripts is *bian* 辯 written with this graph (in the other cases the graphs used are 叓 and 攴). In both occurrences where 叓 is transcribed as 辯 the matching Mawangdui manuscript has *bian* 辯. While other shapes of *bian* 辯 have elements of similarity with this graph, they are by no means identical.

郭. 五. 37(楚)	説文	睡. 為15(秦)

[25] Or if one simply adheres to any alphabetic rendering of Old Chinese, including the one developed by the linguist Wang Li 王力 and still used by many scholars in mainland China. Non-alphabetic transcriptions, while in principle equivalent to alphabetic ones, often allow for more flexibility in judging sound similarity among words (see below pp. 13–14).

[26] See note 17 above.

[27] See Li Ling, "Du Qinghua jian biji: *xie* yu *qie*" 讀清華簡筆記：禼與竊, *Qinghua jian yanjiu* 清華簡研究 1 (2012), pp. 330–34, as well as the following studies: Liu Zhao, "Liyong Guodian Chujian zixing kaoshi jinwen yi li" 利用郭店楚簡字形考釋金文一例, *Guwenzi yanjiu* 古文字研究 24 (2002), pp. 277–81; Qiu Xigui, "Shi 'Zigao' pian 'jin' zi bing lun Shang de jin de zhi shuo" 釋〈子羔〉篇「鉊」字並論商得金德之説, *Jianbo* 簡帛 2 (2007), pp. 63–70; He Jingcheng 何景成, "Chu wenzi 'qi' de wenzixue jieshi" 楚文字" 契" 的文字學解釋, *Jianbo yuyan wenzi yanjiu* 簡帛語言文字研究 5 (2010), pp. 63–67. *Qie* 竊 *tset and *qian* 淺 *tshen share the same initial and main vowel and their respective finals are not too distant, so they could be in a loanword relationship, which has furthermore some ground in traditional glosses (William Baxter, personal communication).

Table 2

	离 *set	契 *set/khets< *s-kets	竊 *tshet<k-set	察 *tshret	淺 *tshen
Baoshan					
Guodian			 	 	
	  說文古文	 上博(2). 子羔.10			
Qinghua[28]			 		

I mention this recent article to show how a palaeographer like Li Ling, who is not relying on alphabetic transcriptions as a way to judge phonetic compatibility, has reached a conclusion that phonologically-inclined readers of the manuscripts were led to postulate on the basis of phonological compatibility alone. These palaeographic and phonological data, which I summarize in table 2 here (compare with Cook, p. 33), show that frequently the solution to problems within the Guodian corpus comes from new sources, especially from the Shanghai Museum and Qinghua collections; thus, our understanding of the Guodian corpus is provisional and likely to remain so for a very long time.

How extensive is the issue of non-standard characters in the Guodian texts, besides the few examples discussed above, and how far should we be guided by phonetic similarity judged according to contemporary reconstructions? Both issues require a more systematic approach than is prevalent among palaeographers, who are the only group qualified to give us the transcriptions but who are also often

---

[28] Drawing from Ji Xusheng 季旭昇, ed., *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian (yi) duben* 清華大學藏戰國竹簡（壹）讀本 (Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 2013), p. 371.

unconcerned with the phonological details captured by recent reconstructions. Let me analyse a couple of passages:

(1) 凡人青（情）為可兌（悅）也。句（苟）以其青（情），唯（雖）怘（過）不亞（惡）；不以其青（情），唯（雖）難不貴。句（苟）又（有）其青（情），唯（雖）未之為，斯人信之壴（矣）。

In general, true affections in a person are something to delight in. If one does something with true affections, though he may transgress, this is not to be deplored. If one does something not with true affections, though he may [accomplish] difficult [tasks], these are not to be valued. If one has true affections, though he has not yet done something, people will have trust in him [to do so]. ("Xing zi ming chu" 性自命出, 50–51; Cook, pp. 736–37)

(2) 門內之絧（治）紉（恩）穿（弇）宜（義），門外之絧（治）宜（義）斬紉（恩）。悬（仁）頪（類）蒻（柔）而速（束），宜（義）頪（類）弅（持）而丝（絕）；悬（仁）蒻（柔）而酓（納〔匿〕），宜（義）強（剛）而柬（簡）。

In the order within the [family] gates, goodwill holds check over propriety; in the order beyond the [family] gates, propriety cuts short goodwill. The manner of humanity is flexible and cohesive; the manner of propriety is steadfast and uncompromising. ("Liu de," 30–31; Cook, pp. 791–92)

The first passage is fairly unproblematic, while the second contains many characters that require extensive annotation. For practical purposes, I will divide them into three groups: (a) loangraphs that contain a common phonetic element (that belong to the same phonetic series); (b) loangraphs that, even though they do not belong to the same series, are fairly unproblematic as their phonological relationship with the standard character they stand for is fairly transparent; and (c) allographs or otherwise problematic characters, whose transcription is subject to debate or whose phonological relationship with the standard character they stand for is loose (differing in the main vowel and/or initial or final consonant[29]). It is to group (c) that Cook's notes dedicate the most attention.[30]

---

[29] The difference in initial consonants is relevant only when it involves non-homorganic consonants, namely consonants with different places of articulation (e.g. 青 *tseŋ and 情 *dzeŋ have homorganic initials, while 紉 *nən and 恩 *ʔən do not).

[30] The only problematic loangraph in column (b) is 紉 *nən = 恩 *ʔən. At page 75 Cook states that: "wherein Qiu Xigui suggests that 紉 (*nən-s) be read 仁 (*nin), 'humanity,' which shares

Table 3[31]

(a) Guodian graph	Standard equivalent graph	(b) Guodian graph	Standard equivalent graph	(c) Guodian graph	Standard equivalent graph
青 *tseŋ	情 *dzeŋ	㤧 [=化] *hŋroih	過 *koi	算	弇 *ʔamʔ
兌 *lots	悦 *lot	壴 [=喜] *həʔ	矣 *ləʔ	類	類 *rus
句 *ko	苟 *koʔ	絧 [=司] *sə	治 *drə	幽 · 88) 88) 88) 説文古文	絕 *dzot
唯 *wi	雖 *swi	紉 *nən	恩 *ʔən	䖇	柔 *nu
亞 *ʔrakh	惡 *ʔak	宜 *ŋai	義 *ŋaih	酓	納 *nəp [loan for 匿 *nrək]
又 *wəh	有 *wəʔ	強 *gaŋ	剛 *kaŋ	悬	仁 *nin
芇 [=止] *təʔ	持 *drə	柬 *krenʔ	簡 *krenʔ		

It is quite clear that the script used in these manuscripts has a very high number of graphs that, from the point of view of the standardized Qin script we are acquainted with, would be described as loangraphs.[32] How high in comparison to other sources

_____

(Note 30—*Continued*)

with it the same initial and forms a natural parallel to 義, 'propriety.' Other scholars, however, would read 恩 (*ʔən/*ʔin), 'kindness,' 'goodwill,' instead—a slightly more distant but still highly plausible phonetic loan." (I have changed the reconstructions in Cook's quotation from Wang Li's to Schuessler's—the argument is not affected.) It is true that the vowel of 恩 is actually a better match for 紉 than the *-i- of 仁 *nin, but we know that *-ən and *-in are often interchangeable (and they alternate in the phonetic series including 恩 itself). On one hand, 恩 is favoured by a matching passage from a received text; on the other 仁 seems to be favoured by contextual factors (such as the above mentioned parallelism between 仁 and 義). An additional argument for 恩, as Cook remarks, is that 仁 is always written as 悬 in the Guodian texts. In the end, the arguments tend here to weigh almost equally, even though phonologically 仁 *nin remains a better match.

31 Both Chu graphs and equivalent standard graphs here reproduce Cook's choices.

32 Treating Chu graphs and their sound values as if they were following the same rules of the standardized Qin 秦 script and had standard Old Chinese pronunciation is certainly a very rough simplification. But at the moment this assumption of uniformity is the working hypothesis

(*Continued on next page*)

is difficult to say, as there is no agreement on which categories should be considered. There is, in fact, to my knowledge, no systematic count of this sort for any excavated text; the three I sketched above are ad hoc categories, and my category (c) is a mixed bag of residual elements, so it should be refined or redefined in further studies. I plan to count and analyse all the characters in Cook's book, but for the purpose of this review I have limited myself to the loangraphs in the longest piece in the Guodian collection, the "Xing zi ming chu," where out of 1,551 characters more than one third (547) stand for loangraphs. Of these 547, 371 stand for words in the same phonetic series (a), 114 for quasi-homophones in other phonetic series (b), and 62 for words whose relationship with the graphs is more problematic (c). If this proportion is more or less constant throughout the Guodian materials, we should have around 500 examples of these problematic characters, with perhaps around 100 tokens, which would produce a great deal of uncertainty in transcription.[33] And while these forms are all reproduced in many recent compilations of Chu and Warring State graphs, there is still no authoritative dictionary to match the reference work for the study of the script of the Warring States era, He Linyi's 何琳儀 palaeographical dictionary,[34] which unfortunately is based entirely on scholarship and sources predating the Guodian discovery.

Which tools should we then use to decide how to transcribe these characters? First and foremost, for texts without matching counterparts, context, meaning, what makes sense in the passage at hand, the grammar of the language, and matching passages in the received literature. Cook cites approvingly a passage of Chen Wei's that advocates a relatively conservative approach: "Generally speaking, the basic trend in the circulation of ancient texts should be one of continuity, so that disparities between different excavated texts or between excavated and received texts should mostly be the result of their having employed variants that are the same or similar in meaning," and "only when it . . . becomes difficult or impossible to establish such connections" should we then "consider alienation or opposition in textual meaning."[35]

(Note 32—*Continued*)

    adopted by all the practitioners in the field, for lack of viable alternatives. With this caveat, throughout this paper I am using the term "loangraph," instead of attempting to use more precise designations such as "loangraphs from the point of view of the Qin script" (see also note 6 above and page 19 below).

[33] Chen Wei's edition leaves most problematic graphs untranscribed, providing instead a photographic reproduction of the graph. This method clarifies the extent of the issue to readers.

[34] He Linyi, *Zhanguo guwen zidian* 戰國古文字典 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998).

[35] For a carefully articulated opposite view on the treatment of variants between excavated and received texts, see Matthias L. Richter, *The Embodied Text: Establishing Textual Identity in Early Chinese Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), especially Chapter 6.

But context only points to a preferred hypothesis; to prove the validity of that hypothesis, one must show that either the problematic character and its proposed standard equivalent are allographs (as for example 悤 and *ren* 仁), or that the problematic character contains a phonetic element allowing it to serve as a loangraph for the proposed standard equivalent. Cook's notes, which reflect the general practice in the field, show that in most cases he takes the second approach. Therefore, the way one establishes criteria for phonological similarity is essential to the way one proves the hypothesized relationships between problematic characters and their standard counterparts, with stricter rules offering a more limited number of standard candidates than looser ones.

The strictest rules are based on the recent six-vowel system for Old Chinese associated with William Baxter and Laurent Sagart in the West, Sergei Starostin in Russia, and Zheng Zhang Shangfang 鄭張尚芳 in China.[36] They require identity of main vowels and finals, and similarity in the initial consonants. The reconstruction by Wang Li 王力, still very popular in mainland China, though somewhat outdated and with fewer vowels and therefore allowing more cases of homophony than the six-vowel systems, is not fundamentally different. A more traditional approach is to rely on traditional phonological categories (rhymes and a system of initials connected with Middle Chinese values) that are not based on alphabetic transcriptions, and that therefore do not translate into precise phonetic values.[37] As this point is very significant for my argument, I here cite Cook extensively:

---

[36] See William H. Baxter, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992); Laurent Sagart, *The Roots of Old Chinese* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999); William H. Baxter and Laurent Sagart, *Old Chinese: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford University Press, forthcoming); Sergej A. Starostin, *Rekonstrukcija drevnekitajskoj fonologičeskoj sistemy* [The reconstruction of the Old Chinese phonological system] (Moskva: Nauka, 1989); Zheng Zhang Shangfang, *Shanggu yinxi* 上古音系 (Shanghai: Shanghai jiaoyu chubanshe, 2003).

[37] While for Middle Chinese as recorded in the *Qieyun* rime dictionary (A.D. 601) traditional phonological categories and modern alphabetic transcriptions express in different ways what are basically the same sound values, for Old Chinese this is not the case. According to the six-vowel system certain rhymes are split into up to three distinguished sets, as for example the *yuan* 元 rhyme into the *-en, *-an, *-on/*-wan sets, which do not interrhyme (see Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese*, p vi). Furthermore, within the same phonetic series different graphs might be reconstructed with different vowels, reflecting rhyming patterns in the *Book of Odes* and information from ancient loan glosses, so for example the *yuan* 元 rhyme graph *qian* 淺 (shallow) is reconstructed as *tshen while the graph *jian* 踐 (trample) is reconstructed as *dzanʔ. These more detailed reconstructions make certain loangraph relationship much less likely than others, imposing constraints that cannot be captured by the traditional phonological categories.

The reconstruction of precise phonetic values for old Chinese characters is certainly invaluable for the comparative linguist, for developing phonological hypotheses that account for sound changes over time, and for noting some of the more subtle phonetic distinctions between otherwise identically sounding words that traditional categories of initials and finals might otherwise tend to obscure. However, for our purpose here of determining in each instance what may constitute a plausible loan, the assignment to phonological categories is generally (if not always) sufficient, and any additional information that might be provided by such reconstructions is not necessarily essential to the task, . . . Where I may have occasion to discuss phonological arguments in this work, I will often make reference to the system of Wang Li 王力 (with certain modifications by his followers), whose relatively clear set of guidelines for discussing types of phonological relationships and determining what may make for a plausible loan (or at least for "common-origin graphs"[38] [*tongyuanzi* 同源字]) has gained widespread currency among Chinese scholars. . . . More recently developed (/refined) systems such as Baxter's may well account better for all the evidence in many ways, but until a detailed etymological lexicon for Old Chinese based on one of these systems becomes available,[39] Wang Li's system will continue to have its usefulness. (pp. 86–87)

This attitude reflects the approach prevalent among Chinese palaeographers, who tend to be rather lukewarm towards contemporary historical phonology. Perhaps since transcribers are interested in finding solutions that enable them to make sense of obscure texts, they prefer to have more possibilities to choose from rather than fewer. Phonologists, on the other hand, are more interested in proving loanword relationships by quantifiable criteria, so they prefer stricter rules that reduce the arbitrariness in the choice of loangraphs. Even they would admit that in most cases we are not talking about certainty of proof, but about a continuum from higher to lower probabilities.

I believe that the specific nature of the Chu script, with its very high number of loangraphs (around one third of the total graphs, if my count above is reliable) calls for a reassessment of the traditional palaeographers' stance. Recent developments in the tools available, now that we have an etymological dictionary and a handbook of reconstructions, both by Axel Schuessler,[40] make such reassessment possible. And even if

---

[38] The term "cognate words" is more commonly used in linguistic literature.

[39] Even though Cook refers in his bibliography to Schuessler's etymological dictionary (Axel Schuessler, *ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese* [Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007]), he cites it only once (at p. 779, n. 49).

[40] Schuessler recent handbook of reconstructions (see note 12 above) is not in Cook's bibliography.

Schuessler's etymological dictionary might just be a preliminary attempt,[41] there is no reason to wait for a more detailed one, as Cook advocates, before accepting modern reconstruction systems as the basis to determine what may make for a plausible loan, because there is no cogent reason to connect loangraphs and cognate words in general.[42]

Admittedly, the precision of an alphabetical reconstruction does not always equate with the certainty of our knowledge: to make this clear, Baxter and Sagart provide two versions of their reconstruction, one that is "user friendly" and one that includes brackets around all elements whose reconstruction is uncertain and admits of an alternative. Alphabetical reconstructions make explicit a set of hypotheses, in such a way that similarity can be assessed quantifiably, while Cook's notes often leave the issue implicit, and therefore very difficult to assess.[43] We are fast approaching for Old

---

[41] See George Starostin's review of Schuessler's ABC Dictionary in the *Journal of Language Relationship* 1 (2009), pp. 155–62 (also available at: http://starling.rinet.ru/Texts/schuessl. pdf), where the reviewer calls Schuessler's dictionary "arguably the biggest thing that has so far happened to Chinese historical linguistics studies in the 21st century" (p. 155), but warns against "the mistake of taking this dictionary for the *definitive* word on Chinese etymology" (p. 161).

[42] See Qiu Xigui, *Chinese Writing*, pp. 273–77, which warns against confusing the two issues; as examples of the few cases when etymologically related words serve as loangraphs, he cites the examples of the borrowing of *yuan* 原 *ŋwan (source) to write *yuan* 元 *ŋon (beginning) and of *pan* 畔 *bans (field boundary) to write *pan* 叛 *bans (divide into sections).

[43] Take the example of a rhyming binome like 由與 *ju-la, singled out by Cook at p. 90, from strip 28 of "Cheng zhi": 聖人不可由與墠之, which Cook reads as: 聖人不可須臾捨之 "The sage can never let it rest (/abandon it) for an instant." Cook refuses to follow Liu Zhao's reading of 由與 *ju-la as 猶豫 (hesitate) *ju-laʔ-s based on grammatical considerations (the absence of the particle 而 before the following verb); he thinks that the construction should be read adverbially, and thus proposes to read it as 須臾 *s-no-jo (for an instant). As he says: "While 猶豫 is surely the more proper reading from a phonological standpoint, I give the reading of 須臾 instead out of the force of conventional usage, though the two should be understood as on some level interchangeable." But in the end a choice needs to be made, and Cook makes it in favour of 須臾 *s-no-jo. Now, one must keep in mind that even the binome 須臾 *s-no-jo is chosen among other binomes because of its supposed phonetic similarity to *ju-la, and that 猶豫 *ju-laʔ-s is not only an almost perfect phonological match, but that it is recognized as an alternative graphic representation for 由與 even in basic introductions to Chinese palaeography such as Qiu Xigui, *Chinese Writing*, pp. 280–81. This is certainly known to Cook, and shows how far he is ranking a closer accord with the textual habits of Classical Chinese texts over phonology. What I want to emphasize is not that such a choice is wrong, but that its justification is misleading for the non-initiate, representing a phonetic choice of extremely low probability as simply slightly less likely than an almost perfect phonetic match.

Chinese the moment that came a century ago for Middle Chinese, when Karlgren's reconstruction, with all its imperfections, was accepted as "the first attempt at a detailed phonetic interpretation of the phonology, because most of the Chinese work on what we call 'rhyme books' (actually dictionaries), were more or less on the basis of abstract sort of algebra rather than arithmetic. Karlgren would actually give you the real numerical values of the various abstract terms," as recalled by Y. R. Chao.[44] Assuming quantifiable values instead of abstract terms is both possible and advisable to reduce arbitrariness in the establishment of loangraph equivalences in the Chu manuscripts.

    In the effort to reduce arbitrariness, Cook relies on a different corrective. He stresses the importance of loan dictionaries: "Ultimately, however, the argument for any loan that falls outside of a phonetic series is rarely convincing unless it is backed up by actual textual examples of such loans as evidenced in other works (especially when found in other contemporary excavated materials), either between the characters themselves or between other members of their respective phonetic series. . . . For excavated materials (most specifically Chu bamboo manuscripts), Bai Yulan's [白於藍] recently published *Jiandu boshu tongjiazi zidian* is especially valuable."[45]

    Since our understanding of the texts is still very much in flux, a work like that of Bai Yulan should be considered a collection of textual glosses, each of which needs to be tested for its soundness in its specific context, rather than a real dictionary that establishes general and uniform relationships between graphs.[46] Take the following example where Cook combines his criteria for phonological similarity with Bai Yulan's collection to prove his hypotheses:

(3) 因互（恆）則古（固），戠（就）汇（徯／匿）則亡。

    If [he] relies upon the constant, [the state] will be secure; if [he] heads down obscure paths, it will perish. ("Zun deyi," Cook, p. 655)

Cook provides notes (92 and 93 at page 655) to justify the 戠（就）and 汇（徯／匿）loangraph relationships. I quote them fully here, to illustrate both the complex nature

44   Y. R. Chao in conversation with Rosemary Levenson, 1974–77, in Yuen Ren Chao, *Chinese Linguist, Phonologist, Composer and Author: Oral History Transcript*, p. 138. Available online at the University of California website Calisphere: http://content.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb8779p27v&brand=calisphere&doc.view=entire_text.

45   See note 23 above.

46   It is therefore fitting that the 2012 enlarged edition of Bai Yulan's work (that I couldn't get hold of in time for this review) has changed title from *zidian* 字典 (dictionary) to *huizuan* 彙纂 (compilation): *Zhanguo Qin Han jianbo gushu tongjiazi huizuan* 戰國秦漢簡帛古書通假字彙纂 (Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 2012).

of the issues, the richness of the annotations, and at the same time some problems I perceive with his approach:

Note 92 [戠 = 就]: See the note on this graph in strip 8, where I have followed majority opinion and read 察. As CW 02.12 (pp. 138–39) points out, however, the graph 戠 is closely related in form to 戚 (as written in strip 7), which in turn represents a word bearing a close phonetic relation to 就 (cf. BYL 08.1, p. 175), as he reads it in both instances in this text. I tentatively follow this interpretation here, given especially that 就 in turn pairs well with both 因 above, and 避, its common antithetical verb, below (for more on the placement of 避 at the head of the phrase, see below). Cf. the equivalent graph in strip 19 of "Cheng zhi" and the closely related graph 戠 of "Xing zi ming chu" strip 38.

Note 93 [迡 = （徯/匿）]: 迡: YSX 99.3 and LZ 00.5 both interpret the inner element as 匚, YSX reading the graph as 徯, "small paths," and LZ as is, in the sense of the "hidden"; CJ 07.11 reads 昵, "[those] close," "intimates." We might alternately render this graph as 迡: the same graph appears in strip 8 of the Shanghai Museum (v. 2) text "Min zhi fumu" 民之父母, in which place the received text has 近, whereas the v. 3 "Zhou Yi" 周易 text has a graph with the same phonetic plus 土, which corresponds to 泥 in the received version. A closely related graph also appears in strip 14 of the Shanghai Museum v. 2 text "Cong zheng, jia" 從政甲, which ZGY suggests could be read either 昵 or 邇. For further examples of this interloaning with the 尼 phonetic, see BYL 08.1, pp. 140–1. HXQ (cited in CW et al. 09.9) and BYL 08.1 both read 匿, the "hidden"; CW et al. read 泥, in the sense of "inflexibility." LL 99.8 instead reads 曲; ZFW 99.10 (p. 49) reads 隱, without explanation.

Readers not familiar with the material should know that this range of complexity and uncertainty is not common. Such wide divergence of opinions and lack of consensus among scholars occur mostly in textual situations like the one discussed here, where not one, but two problematic Chu characters occur in a row, diminishing the contextual constraints that are the most important factors in generating our loangraph hypotheses when reading Chu manuscript texts without transmitted counterparts. BYL 08.1 stands for Bai Yulan's dictionary,[47] while the other abbreviations stand for

---

[47] While I made the point above that Bai Yulan's work should be treated as a collection of glosses rather than as a real dictionary, the 2008 edition I and Cook cite is still titled and commonly referred to as a dictionary.

different scholars, as explained below in this review at page 21 and in Cook at page 191. In note 92, we see , generally interpreted as a loangraph for *cha* 察, interpreted here as containing the element *qi* 戚 *tshiuk, which is close enough phonetically to *jiu* 就 *dzuh (to go, to proceed) to serve as a loangraph for it. This is partially based on Cook's above mentioned table at page 33, partly on Bai Yulan's dictionary, and presumably driven by the hypothesis that, given the meaning assigned to the following graph as "hidden (path)," a verb of motion would fit the context better than a verb like *cha* 察 (investigate). As I indicated above, there are reasons to be sceptical about the phonological soundness of the loangraph relationship between 欶 and *qi* 戚 *tshiuk. As for the graph 迀 in note 93, it is an unknown graph and different scholars have employed different strategies to explain it,[48] most of which revolve around words meaning "obscure, crooked, hidden," as required by the context. One strategy is to relate it to *xi* 匸 (to conceal), without analysing it as a loangraph; another is to find a way to transcribe it with a character that might serve as loangraph for a character with such a meaning. Cook proposes two complementary characters, with equivalent meaning, but represented by two unrelated words, the first being *xi* 徯 *ge (small path), proposed by Yan Shixuan 嚴世鉉 (abbreviated YSX); the second being *ni* 匿 *nrək (hidden), that Bai Yulan connects with *ni* 昵 *nrit ([those] close, intimates). I find two problems with this choice. First, the two characters are too distant phonetically (both the main vowel and the final are different). Second, while Bai Yulan does give that reading for the graph (specifically referring to this passage in our text),[49] in all other cases his readings (based among other sources on manuscripts with transmitted counterparts such as "Min zhi fumu" 民之父母 and the *Zhou yi* 周易) is *ni* 昵. As he does not give cogent phonological reasons for his reading of 迀, in the end his entry cannot serve as a proof in evaluating the probability of a loangraph relationship based on one among many semantic options and on the very doubtful case of phonetic similarity between *nrit and *nrək.[50]

---

[48] Chen Sipeng, *Chuxi jianbo zhong zixing yu yinyi guanxi yanjiu*, p. 217, n. 43 adds quite a few to the ones given here by Cook.

[49] Bai Yulan, *Jiandu boshu tongjiazi zidian*, p. 140.

[50] In some other cases, the lack of an explicit reconstruction is even more problematic, as in the following passage at p. 659 ("Zun deyi" strip 35): 勇不足以沬（潰）眾. "Courage is insufficient to break through the masses." Here Cook proposes to read *mo* 沬 *mat (come to an end) as *kui* 潰 *(g)wəs (wash away, break through), rejecting the possibility to read it as the phonologically closer *mie* 滅 *met/*mat (extinguish). This is based on Shen Pei's 沈培 proposal to transcribe the graph not as having the phonetic *mo* 末 *mat but the phonetic *wei* 未 *məs/*mət-s (not yet), which gives us the same main vowel of *kui* 潰 *(g)wəs, while at the same time leaving open the issue of how to bridge the distance between the initials. If we check what Bai Yulan's

Referring to all these sound values reconstructed (often as mere hypotheses) for Old Chinese as if they were real words in the language represented by the Chu script is admittedly an abstraction. How distant that language was from Old Chinese, and which kind of loangraph conventions were used by its scribes, is something that we simply cannot determine now.[51] Yet all practitioners work with the assumption (either explicit or, more often, implicit) that, in establishing loangraphs for the Chu script, Old Chinese values and loangraph conventions apply, whether we use traditional categories or more precise reconstructions. A radical denial of this practice would amount to abandoning the task of reading texts without transmitted counterparts.

By bringing these phonological issues to the fore, I intend to make them available for further scrutiny. Cook's extremely rich annotation would be strengthened by a heightened phonological awareness.

I now come to the area of intellectual history, covered in section E. I will offer a very brief overview of what many readers will find the most interesting aspect of the volume. Cook concentrates his attention on six long texts, referred to as "Confucian Texts" ("Ziyi" 緇衣, "Wu xing" 五行, "Cheng zhi," "Zun deyi," "Xing zi ming chu," "Liu de"), which share physical features (they constitute groups II and IV in Cook's table 1 at page 19) and striking similarities in wording and philosophical inclination.

(Note 50—*Continued*)

dictionary has to say about loans between *mo* 沬 and *kui* 潰, we see that it supports reading *mo* 沬 as *kui* 潰 in this specific passage (this is the only example for this loangraph relationship given) based on a passage in the received literature where the phrase *kui zhong* 潰眾 occurs (in the Warring States text *Wei Liao zi* 尉繚子, where we find 潰眾奪地 [breaking through the population and seizing the territory]). That means, once again, that the emphasis on context justifies accepting a doubtful phonological relationship on top of reading as 沬 what most palaeographers (including Bai Yulan) transcribe as 沬, which begins to seem like a leap of faith. A different transcription (or even a scribal mistake—it is often difficult to distinguish the two cases) is certainly not impossible, as the graphs are similar in shape and easily confused:

沬	沬	末	末	未	未
	說文	望 2.13(楚)	說文	包 2.181(楚)	說文

51 See the preliminary attempts by Zhao Tong 趙彤, *Zhanguo Chu fangyan yinxi* 戰國楚方言音系 (Beijing: Zhongguo xiju chubanshe, 2006); and Li Cunzhi 李存智, *Shangbo Chujian tongjiazi yinyun yanjiu* 上博楚簡通假字音韻研究 (Taipei: Wanjuanlou tushu gufen youxian gongsi, 2010).

Some sentences, like the following, from "Ziyi" strips 14–15, reappear with only minimal differences in other texts of the corpus, such as "Zun deyi" strips 36–37 and "Cheng zhi" strip 7 (Cook, pp. 98–99):

(4) 子曰：「下之事上也，不從其所以命，而從其所行。上好此物也，下必有甚焉者矣。」

The Master said, "In serving their superiors, subordinates do not follow that which they command, but rather follow the example of their conduct. If the superior is fond of something, then among the subordinates will invariably be those even more so."

Even more pervasive than literal repetition is the constant presence of the complementary pairing *ren* 仁 (humanity) and *yi* 義 (propriety), which is of course a feature of many early Chinese texts, but is most commonly associated with Confucius's grandson Zisi 子思, to whom these texts have been affiliated, and Mencius.

Such a pairing can be seen for example by comparing the following two sentences:

(5) 忠，仁之實也。信，義之期也。

Loyalty is the substance of humanity, and trustworthiness is the expectation of propriety. ("Zhongxin zhi dao," strip 8; Cook, p. 582)

(6) 孝，仁之冕也。禪，義之至也。

Filial piety is the acme of humanity, and abdication is the height of propriety. ("Tang Yu zhi dao," strips 7–8; Cook, p. 552)

Parallel to this pairing of "humanity"/"propriety" is the distinction between family and socio-political obligations, with some very stark, surprising statements for the priority of the family over socio-political obligations, as in the following passage:

(7) 為父絕君，不為君絕父。

The ruler may be forsaken for the sake of the father, but the father may not be forsaken for the sake of the ruler ("Liu de," strip 29; Cook, p. 791)

Cook reviews the vast literature trying to establish affiliations between these texts and Warring States intellectual lineages, and defends his argument that they predate not only Xunzi but Mencius (a topic that could be explored not only through intellectual history but through detailed linguistic investigations). He then reviews the textual relationships between these texts and the traditional "Six Classics," a topic that could

lead to a rewriting of Chinese History,[52] as it provides us, for the first time, with extensive sources from the pre-unification period. Most affected are the classics of Ritual, which were compiled, in the form we have them, during the Han, and have often been suspected of being outright Han forgeries. Texts from the Guodian corpus, such as the "Ziyi," and from the Shanghai Museum corpus, such as the "Min zhi fumu," which correspond to chapters of the Han compilations, show us that these parts date from no later than the fourth century B.C.

Cook identifies four main shared themes in the manuscripts:[53] (1) a concern for Heaven and its relationship with human fate and human nature; (2) a strong attention to various paths of self-cultivation, emphasizing sincerity (lack of artifice) and solitude; (3) an equally strong commitment to education and the channelling of emotions through ritual and tradition; (4) a recurrent appeal to music as the way to activate and mold emotions and virtues into harmony.

This general overview on the common elements of the texts provided in the introduction is useful, but the real intellectual substance comes with the individual introductions to the texts, where questions about the content of the individual man-uscripts, their relationships with transmitted counterparts (in the case of the *Laozi* and the "Ziyi"), their relationships with other manuscript versions (in the case of the "Wu xing" and the "Xing zi ming chu" and, once again, the "Ziyi") their affiliations and the whole breadth of their textual problems are treated with a sure knowledge of the already very extensive relevant literature and a masterful grasp of all the levels touched. Different readers might want to plunge directly into the analysis of the texts they find most fascinating. There is no need to proceed in a linear order, as the very extensive notes treat each problematic character almost every time it appears, and give cross-references to the note with the most extensive treatment. I would make one minor caveat about the system of abbreviations inside the notes. As explained at page 191, studies are referenced by the initials of the scholar(s) (surname first) who authored them, followed by the year and month of publication (or year and periodical issue number) as found in the bibliography: Chinese names of three syllables will have three letters (e.g., Li Xueqin is LXQ); Japanese and Western scholars will generally all have two (e.g., Ikeda Tomohisa is IT; Paul Goldin is GP). Some abbreviations, such as for example QXG, will be almost immediately recognizable as referring to Qiu Xigui by people who are familiar with the literature; but names that

---

[52] See Edward L. Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006).

[53] The following generalizations do not apply to the so-called "Daoist works," namely the three *Laozi* manuscripts and the "Taiyi sheng shui" 太一生水.

are not so familiar, such as for example Luo Chi 羅熾, will force the reader to flip through 15 pages, from page 1138 to 1153, before finding the intended reference. A table would have been preferable.

In this long and scrupulous work I did not see a single mistaken Chinese character, either in its standard or in its non-standard form, or any typos in the translation. The only minor breach in citation etiquette I saw was the usage of the Chinese rather than the English edition in citing Karlgren's work on loangraphs (at p. 84, n. 191).

Much could be said about the individual pieces; here I will simply recommend the casual reader to begin with the Laozi texts, which have already been authoritatively translated and annotated by Robert Henricks[54] but which have never been analysed in such detail; or with one of the shorter pieces, such as the "Taiyi sheng shui"; whose cosmology based on water leads us to reconsider our approach to creation myths in Chinese culture;[55] or the "Lu Mu Gong wen Zisi" 魯穆公問子思, the only dialogue in the collection, which argues for an extraordinarily frank relationship between ruler and minister; or the "Yucong 4," with its witty and cynical recipes for a successful career as a political advisor. Among the longer texts, the "Xing zi ming chu" and the "Wu xing" might be good places to start as they are complex while at the same time orderly, immediately appealing in their topics and fairly well understood.

In conclusion, this is a work of a depth and magnitude which are rare both in Western and Chinese scholarship on ancient China. No other contribution by a single author in this exponentially expanding and quickly changing field of bamboo manuscript studies can match it. Cook's work is so ingenious, and so meticulous, that I can predict with confidence that his book will endure as our standard reference for the Guodian texts for at least the next two generations.

MARCO CABOARA
Swedish Collegium for Advanced Studies

---

[54] Robert Henricks, *Lao Tzu's Tao Te Ching: A Translation of the Startling New Documents Found at Guodian* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

[55] See Paul R. Goldin, "The Myth That China Has No Creation Myth," *Monumenta Serica* 56 (2008), pp. 1–22.