R EVIEW A RTICLES

Reading Early Chinese Manuscripts*

William G. Boltz
University of Washington, Seattle

Rewriting Early Chinese Texts. By Edward L. Shaughnessy. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006. Pp. 287. $85.00 cloth, $29.95 paper.

Professor Shaughnessy confesses early on in his "Introduction" that two decades ago he failed to heed Qiu Xigui's advice to become familiar with Warring States period palæography, and as a consequence he now modestly claims that he is not in a position either to rewrite any early texts himself or "to adjudicate the different rewritings" of texts that have been variously proposed by other scholars (p. 4).[1] He presents us instead with a study designed to illustrate the nature and import of the discovery and subsequent transmission of early manuscripts, focusing especially on how such manuscripts have been edited over time and what the impact of that editing has been. It is this editing, both its motivation and its consequences, that Shaughnessy means by the term "rewriting." While we naturally think of discovered manuscripts as pristine in that they are largely, if not entirely, untouched by the vicissitudes of transmission, Shaughnessy's approach reminds us that once a manuscript becomes known and is studied, edited and published, it has begun its life as a transmitted text.[2] We over-simplify the picture if we think only of a two-way contrast between transmitted texts and discovered texts as mutually exclusive categories, the former "contaminated" by alterations over the course of transmission, the latter "immaculate" through having been protected by long seclusion and inaccessibility.[3] Transmission itself,

---

[1]   Shaughnessy's modesty in this regard is somewhat belied by the fact that in his appendix to chapter two (pp. 94–130) he does "rewrite" the "Zi yi" text.

[2]   This is the case even if "published" means no more than being copied in an official form for inclusion in an imperial archive or being carved into stone and placed on public view.

[3]   Western textual criticism has tended to see the effect of changes that a text may have suffered over time in strikingly negative terms, typically as "contamination" or "corruption" of the original work. See, for example, Susan Cherniack, "[t]exts are always changed in the course of transmission, by accident or design. . . . Western textual criticism has come to regard

William G. Boltz

apart from the effects on a text that it allows, involves nothing more than the passage of time. The effects are the important consideration; they are the consequences of changes, either inadvertent or deliberate, that a text suffers in the course of its transmission, and they will thus vary according to the nature and extent of the changes that engender them. All other things being equal, the older a text is and the longer it has been transmitted, the greater the extent of changes it will have been subject to. Even a discovered manuscript may have undergone some period of transmission and textual alteration before it was buried, entombed, or otherwise lost. And, at least theoretically, even a transmitted text could be entirely free of contamination or corruption, and identical to its original form. All of this suggests that we might look upon the effect of textual transmission as a relative thing; discovered manuscripts falling on the low end of the scale, but not necessarily at the zero point, and texts extant and transmitted over long periods of time tending to fall near the high end.

Shaughnessy's work can be seen as divided into two parts of roughly equal length, corresponding to his discussions of modern manuscript discoveries (chapters one and two) and of the third-century A.D. Ji *zhong* (*sic*) 汲冢 manuscript discovery (chapters three and four). In chapter one (pp. 9–61) Shaughnessy illustrates in a narrative, somewhat discursive way how Chinese scholars themselves analyze and interpret recently discovered manuscripts and in that light are able to discern how early transmitted texts have been rewritten in the course of their transmission. He draws examples chiefly from the Guodian 郭店 and Shanghai Museum 上博 corpuses of bamboo strip manuscripts to exemplify the sort of textual problems that arise in studying these texts and how modern Chinese palæographers have dealt with them. In some cases when different scholars have offered different explanations to the same question, or where the same scholar has given different answers to the same textual question at different times, Shaughnessy has surveyed the competing suggestions and indicated where the preferred conclusion seems to lie. Chapter two (pp. 63–130) consists in an extended discussion of the "Zi yi" 緇衣 text, well-known in its transmitted form as a section of the *Li ji* 禮記 and a text for which there are now two discovered manuscript versions, a Guodian manuscript, in forty-seven bamboo strips, where the "title" phrase is written 茲衣 and a twenty-four strip Shanghai Museum manuscript where the same phrase is written 紂衣. Shaughnessy appends to this chapter his own annotated rewriting and translation of this text.

In chapter three (pp. 131–84) Shaughnessy outlines the circumstances and content of the late third- and early fourth-century A.D. rewriting of the late fourth- or early third-century B.C. Ji *zhong* texts, i.e., the manuscripts reported in *Jin shu* 晉書 3 (Wu di ji 武帝紀) and enumerated in *Jin shu* 51 (the Shu Xi 束皙 "biography") as having been discovered in 279 or 280 in the tomb of Wei Xiang wang 魏襄王 (*sic,* Shaughnessy [pp. 133–36] shows that

---

(Note 3 — *Continued*)

transmission as a wholly degenerative process through which texts become 'corrupted' and 'contaminated'" ("Book Culture and Textual Transmission in Sung China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54.1 [1994], pp. 5–125, citation from pp. 5–6). Nothing in the Chinese tradition, as far as I know, takes such a negative view of the process of textual transmission.

the intended name is in fact likely to have been Wei Xiang'ai wang 魏襄哀王). He gives a general descriptive introduction to the tomb find overall and an itemized and annotated list of the sixteen discovered manuscripts following the order given in *Jin shu* 51.[4] In chapter four (pp. 185–256) he analyzes the historical "editing and editions" of the so-called *Bamboo Annals* (*Zhushu jinian* 竹書紀年) in relation to its Ji *zhong* manuscript sources, a subject on which he has already published two major studies.[5] He centres his scrutiny here squarely on the editorial efforts undertaken at the Jin court in the decades following the discovery of the manuscripts and discusses at length the consequences of those efforts for the subsequent history of the text.

Shaughnessy's underlying thesis, to which he returns repeatedly, is that "texts are written and rewritten over time" (p. 254). And, one might add, "all the time." Textual rewritings have, Shaughnessy is intent to show, historical implications; his contention is that the rewriting of texts is often the result of deliberate editorial manipulation designed to make a text say what it "ought" to say from a given editor's perspective. This means no more than that some of the "contamination" that a Chinese text has suffered in the course of its transmission may arise from a process of motivated editorial revision, a fact about the history of texts in general, and especially texts that constitute parts of revered or sacred canons, that has long been recognized in Western classical and Biblical textual studies.[6] The

---

[4] The sixteenth (and last-listed) item is described simply as "nineteen *pian* of miscellaneous documents" (雜書十九篇) followed by what appear to be four or five distinct text names (see Shaughnessy, pp. 177–83), so the Ji *zhong* corpus of discovered manuscripts would actually seem to consist *in toto* of nineteen or twenty individual texts. Shaughnessy's treatment of this corpus is generally very carefully presented and thoroughly documented. His discussion of the *Yi yao yin yang gua* 易繇陰陽卦 (number three in the list of sixteen, written as 易爻陰陽卦 in Shaughnessy's Index [p. 285, twice], but with 繇 in the *Jin shu jiaozhu* 斠注 51), is especially interesting because Shaughnessy would like to equate it with the "lost" *Gui cang* 歸藏, which in turn is now believed to be attested in manuscript form from Wangjiatai 王家台. (See Shaughnessy, "The Wangjiatai *Gui Cang*: An Alternative to *Yi Jing* Divination," in *Facets of Tibetan Religious Tradition and Contacts with Neighbouring Cultural Areas,* ed. Alfredo Cadonna and Esther Bianchi [Florence, Italy: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2002], pp. 95–126.) His discussion here is unfortunately marred by a bit of carelessness in how the text is named. We find it given as *Yi yao yin yang gua* in the enumeration, as *Yi gua yin yang yao* three lines later (p. 156), and as *Yi gua yin yang shuo* (presumably 説) twice on p. 161. Tracing the references given in the index for this and for the *Yin yang shuo* 陰陽説 (which Du Yu 杜預 mentions in his *Chunqiu Zuozhuan jijie* 春秋左傳集解 "Hou xu" 後序; see Shaughnessy, pp. 143–45) leads to still more confusion of names, but suffice it here to say that this kind of carelessness seems to be the exception rather than the rule in Shaughnessy's book.

[5] "The 'Current' *Bamboo Annals* and the Date of the Zhou Conquest of Shang," *Early China* 11–12 (1985–87), pp. 33–60; and "On the Authenticity of the *Bamboo Annals,*" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 46.1 (1986), pp. 149–80.

[6] For a recent introductory-level discussion of New Testament textual criticism, especially as it pertains to this kind of "editorial rewriting," see Bart D. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 2005).

nature of texts and the circumstances of their transmission everywhere will always allow for the emergence of textual variants,[7] and these variants will sometimes be the result of inadvertent error and other times the product of deliberate editorial alteration.

Shaughnessy recognizes, of course, that textual variation is not always the result of deliberate rewriting, but often comes naturally as a consequence of simple errors and misunderstandings of a multitude of kinds on the part of scribes, scholars, commentators and editors or as a result of physical damage to the manuscript itself. Traditionally, eliminating such errors and restoring the text to a form that comes as close to the original as possible has been considered the chief task of the textual critic, and it is often the case that in trying to do this different critics, reflecting honest differences of opinions, come to different conclusions about what is an error and what is to be restored in a given instance.[8] Shaughnessy's descriptive discussions in chapter one exemplify mainly this "honest differences of opinion" aspect of the work of textual criticism. His examination of the "Zi yi" text in chapter two and his analysis of the *Zhushu jinian* in chapter four, by contrast, illustrate the phenomenon of "deliberate editorial manipulation," albeit in different ways and to different ends. No North American scholar of early Chinese history is likely to be in a better position to survey modern Chinese studies of early texts and their potential for having been rewritten than is Professor Shaughnessy. Not only does he show himself to be thoroughly familiar with the voluminous secondary literature that has mushroomed in China in the past couple of decades (notwithstanding his modest hints to the contrary [p. 13]), but he is also on close personal terms with most, if not all, of the major scholarly figures involved in the study, editing and publishing of these excavated texts of the past three decades.[9]

---

[7] Not *variora,* as Shaughnessy is wont to call textual variants, as if this were a nominal plural form of singular *variorum.* The word *variorum* itself is already a plural, viz., the genitive plural (masc.) of *varius;* thus *editio variorum* "edition of variants," and by extension "variorum edition," leading to the accepted use of "variorum" as a(n ungrammatical) singular referring to a "variant."

[8] Recent work analyzing the structure of early Chinese texts suggests that the notion of a single "original" as it has traditionally been used in Western classical textual criticism may not always be the most apt way to characterize the putative source of what we have as the received versions of many Chinese texts. Every text, obviously, must have originated somewhere in some form at some time, but it is now becoming apparent that many of what we think of as single, pre-imperial Chinese texts seem to have originated as composite works assembled from any number of disparate source materials. To speak of an "original" in such circumstances is useful only if the word "original" is understood relative to the particular state of a text analyzed and to its possible composite origin.

[9] Shaughnessy's discussions throughout are invariably richly documented by his extensive citations of recent Chinese scholarship. His citation of pertinent Western scholarship seems to be slightly less thorough. In discussing the textual variants of *zhang* 章 57 of the *Laozi,* for example, his presentation is markedly reminiscent of the discussion given by Rudolf Wagner on the same passage ("The Wang Bi Recension of the *Laozi,*" *Early China* 14 [1989], pp. 27–54, esp. p. 47) and might have benefited from further attention to Wagner's remarks, but he fails to mention this article. On the other hand, he is to be complimented on including the important, but not well-known, work of the late Ulrich Unger (see pp. 167, 180 *et passim*).

Shaughnessy titles his first chapter "The Editing of Archaeologically Recovered Manuscripts and Its Implications for the Study of Received Texts." He seems to intend that this chapter should serve as a kind of introduction to the philological and text critical aspects of what editing a manuscript entails. To this end he surveys the main steps in the editing process, beginning with sections on (i) the initial cleaning and preservation of the bamboo strips (which he calls "organization," based on the Chinese term *zhengli* 整理, which usually includes this stage within its referential scope), (ii) transcribing the manuscript, and (iii) establishing the order of the strips (which he calls "textual sequence"). His next three sections all involve variation between manuscript and transmitted text: (iv) variation between manuscripts and matching or counterpart received texts, (v) variation between manuscript citations of other transmitted texts and the same passages in the received versions of those texts proper (Shaughnessy calls this "variations in transcription"), and (vi) variation in textual sequence, i.e., in the order of passages or of self-contained "units" of the text, to which Shaughnessy has given the name "pericope," rather than in actual wording (p. 50). His final two sections in this chapter deal with the organization of textual units into larger assemblages, to wit, (vii) the nature of the book in early China and (viii) the composition of the Confucian canon.

Shaughnessy gives many illustrative examples of these various parts of the manuscript-editing process, some extensive and inherently important, some more anecdotal. He shows a number of good examples of the *postfactum* consequences of mis-reading a word or line or of mis-interpreting a graph. But he does not show how we decide that something is a mis-reading or a mis-interpretation in the first place or how a modern scholar faced with a newly discovered manuscript should proceed analytically or exegetically in order not to make these kinds of mistakes and not to fall into the kinds of textual traps that he has illustrated. Apart from giving examples, he does not identify any criteria or other procedural bases for deciding how to understand ambiguous manuscript passages or for such basic things as determining in non-obvious cases when a variant is lexical and when it is merely graphic. The chapter is descriptively rich, but stops short of providing any general methodological principles or guidelines that might help someone trying to examine a manuscript in this critical way, and it does not rise to the level of presenting a general introduction to the methodology of text-critical analysis.

Shaughnessy ends chapter one with a one-paragraph "Conclusions" section (pp. 60–61) in which he says that the Han-dynasty manuscripts discovered in the 1970s tend to "authenticate China's traditional literary heritage," while the Warring States period Guodian and Shanghai Museum manuscripts "tend to destabilize those texts." Although he does not say as much here, the Han manuscripts to which he refers must be primarily the Mawangdui silk manuscripts discovered in 1973, dating from around 200 B.C. The most important of those manuscripts in connection with "China's traditional literary heritage" are without doubt the two separate manuscript copies of the *Laozi* included in the Mawangdui corpus. In spite of numerous textual variants in these manuscripts relative to the transmitted text, including the inverse order of the "Dao jing" 道經 and the "De jing" 德經 halves, these two early Han-period manuscripts conform surprisingly closely to the received text of the *Laozi*. It is entirely reasonable, therefore, as well as technically correct from a text-critical perspective to call the Mawangdui silk manuscripts of the *Laozi* "the *Laozi*." The *Laozi*

William G. Boltz

parallels found in the late fourth-century B.C. Guodian manuscripts, by contrast, differ substantially enough from the received text that there is no objectively sound textual basis for calling these passages "the *Laozi.*" They appear instead to constitute a part of the kind of "source materials" or textual "building blocks" out of which the *Laozi* was compiled sometime in the third century B.C. To this extent, then, the *Laozi* is an example of how the Han manuscripts, in this case very early Han manuscripts, "authenticate" the received texts that we know, while the pre-Han manuscripts "destabilize" (in Shaughnessy's term) those same received texts. In the case of the *Laozi,* the difference between the authenticating Han manuscripts and the destabilizing pre-Han is a consequence of the rewriting impulses and propensities of those unknown third-century compilers. We might ask for how many other Warring States period texts does the same contrast obtain.

Recognizing the tendency to be rewritten over time as a feature of the history of many, if not most, of the transmitted pre-Han texts that we read, Shaughnessy says that "we cannot be certain that any particular reading does not owe as much, if not more, to the Han editor of the text as it does to its original author" (p. 60). In particular, until pre-Han manuscripts are discovered and compared with the transmitted versions of the same texts, we cannot know fully what were the effects of such important Han scholars even as Liu Xiang and Liu Xin, the fact of whose editing of the pre-Han corpus is well known from preserved records of their bibliographical writings, but the substance of whose editing is largely invisible to us without independent sources for comparison. Shaughnessy points out within the first three pages of his book that traditionally "the editions of Liu Xiang and Liu Xin *were* the ancient texts" (p. 3, emphasis original). If the editions of the classics that we have from the received tradition are those reflecting the editorial hands of Liu Xiang and Liu Xin, it is not surprising that most Han manuscripts will authenticate that version of the text. By the same token, most pre-Han manuscripts will "destabilize" those versions and will open for us instead a window into what the text looked like before the editorial exercises of the Lius or of any other of the many Han scholars who took part in the mass editing of pre-Han works. Curiously, Shaughnessy does not elaborate in his short "Conclusions" section of chapter one on any individual text, but it seems likely that he has in mind the way in which the Ji *zhong* manuscripts "destabilize" the transmitted *Zhushu jinian,* as he shows in chapter four of the present book. Nor does he mention the *Laozi* as reflecting this general feature of transmitted texts. In spite of the fact that the evidence of the manuscripts seems to exemplify just what Shaughnessy claims in this "Conclusions" section, he appears unwilling to see this pattern as applicable to the *Laozi* text itself, probably because the Mawangdui *Laozi* manuscripts, even though they come from a Han tomb and authenticate the received *Laozi* to a remarkable degree, are too early to be the products of Han editors and therefore are not examples of the central point that he wants to make. In fact, the Mawangdui manuscripts show that at least for the *Laozi* the liberties taken by Han editors were minimal.

Shaughnessy makes one the further point in this conclusion. He says that given what we now can see about the composite structure of early Chinese texts, it is no longer meaningful to accept a whole text simply as "genuine" or to dismiss it as a "forgery." Such blanket assessments reflect an inaccurate and over-simplified understanding of how texts were composed, written, edited and transmitted, even the so-called discovered texts. We must recognize, in Shaughnessy's words, "a more subtle instability at all levels of the text: the

word, the pericope, and perhaps even the whole text" (p. 60). This is, Shaughnessy says, "nothing new in Chinese studies" (ibid.). It is also, I think, a part of the reason why in the Chinese philological tradition the idea that textual variation over time was not seen in the same negative way as a degenerative process that it was in the West.

In his enthusiasm to illustrate the extent to which texts are rewritten over time Shaughnessy allows himself to claim on rather flimsy grounds that editors not only changed texts according to their historical biases or their ethical or aesthetic predispositions, but also imposed "grammatical inventions" on the written language. In particular he claims that the use of the various negatives in Classical Chinese was indiscriminate and interchangeable, and he implies that the rules that we generally recognize as governing their use are the artificial impositions of some unnamed "grammarians" seemingly bent on correcting texts to fit their own perceptions of grammatical standards or stylistic felicity. Shaughnessy launches his attack on the accepted conventions of Classical Chinese negation by observing how a likely graphic confusion of *wu* 毋, the prohibitive negative, with *nü* 女 (in this case for 汝 *ru* "you") in the Guodian manuscript *Cheng zhi wen zhi* 成之聞之 led to the misreading of a passage in the "Jun shi" section of the *Shu jing* (pp. 37–39). The transmitted passage with 汝 *ru* "you" is not difficult to understand. But the meaning of the manuscript version with what appears to be the prohibitive negative *wu* 毋 is less clear and, taken together with its other variants, seems to have a meaning nearly opposite that of the received text. Shaughnessy himself had long ago noted that the traditional understanding of the received text was suspect, given the historical picture that could be drawn.[10] Now, he finds that the sense of the manuscript passage, when the *wu* < *məʔ 毋 is read as if it were the existential negative *wu* < *ma 無, fits well with his earlier speculations.[11] Because this interpretation, equating 毋 with 無, seems to provide him with a welcome meaning for the line, he jumps to the conclusion that in manuscripts of both the Warring States period and the Western Han "negatives seem to have been used quite indiscriminately" (p. 40).

To be sure, the Chu manuscript forms of 毋 and 女 are similar, though not "essentially identical" as Shaughnessy claims (p. 39). Typically 女 was written as and 毋 was the same graph with two additional strokes or "dots" thus .[12] Shaughnessy has sensed that the

---

[10] Edward L. Shaughnessy, "The Duke of Zhou's Retirement in the East and the Beginnings of the Ministerial-Monarch Debate in Chinese Political Philosophy," *Early China* 18 (1993), pp. 41–72.

[11] Asterisked forms are proposed Old Chinese reconstructions, following generally, but not always precisely, the scheme presented in Robert H. Gassmann and Wolfgang Behr, *Antikchinesisch — Ein Lehrbuch in drei Teilen,* Teil 1 (Bern [etc.]: Peter Lang, 2005).

[12] It is a graphic distinction between the negative *wu* 毋 / and *mu* 母 / "mother" that is often difficult to discern; less frequently that between 毋 and 女. This follows from the fact that the pronunciations of 毋 and 女 are very dissimilar, *məʔ and *gnaʔ respectively, which means that they would normally be written with different characters, whereas *mu* "mother" was *mməʔ, close enough to the negative 毋 *məʔ to allow naturally for the possibility of using the same character to write both words, especially since the two words are sufficiently different in meaning that context would normally preclude any real uncertainty as to what word was being written.

William G. Boltz

prohibitive negative 毋 appearing in the manuscript seems in this case to stand for the existential negative 無, and he may well be right. He is also right to look for an explanation for this unexpected use of the 毋 negative here. But instead of looking into the textual or linguistic details of this particular passage for his explanation, or of reconsidering whether it can be understood with the *wu* 毋 negative taken in its conventional prohibitive sense after all, he decides that this one instance of a seeming mix-up of the two *wu* negatives, 毋 and 無, justifies his sweeping *ex cathedra* claim that negatives can be used indiscriminately and interchangeably.

Apparently recognizing that one swallow does not make a spring, Shaughnessy goes on to say that there is "manifold evidence that other negatives could also be used inter-changeably" (p. 40). As a sample of this "manifold evidence" he gives one more example of what he suggests is the indiscriminate use of negatives. His example this time comes from a line in the "Lü xing" section of the *Shu jing* that is cited in the "Zi yi" text, and so we find it in both the Guodian and Shanghai manuscripts of that work and in the transmitted *Li ji* version. It also occurs in the "Shang tong (zhong)" section of the *Mozi.* We thus can adduce five distinct versions of the line in question. The full line as it appears in the transmitted text of the *Shu jing* is 苗民弗用靈制以型惟作五瘧之型曰法.[13] The negative, which we see in the first clause, varies thus: (i) the Guodian manuscript and (ii) the Shanghai manuscript both have *fei* 非, (iii) the transmitted *Li ji* "Zi yi" text has *fei* 匪, (iv) the *Shu jing* line itself has *fu* 弗, and (v) the *Mozi* line has *fou* 否. Shaughnessy claims that in spite of the four different written negatives found in these five versions of the same line, there is no "real difference" in meaning among them and that this is further evidence that negatives are used indiscriminately and interchangeably.

Neither of these two examples lends the slightest credibility to Shaughnessy's general claim that negatives could be used indiscriminately and interchangeably. In the first instance, it is generally recognized that the two negatives *wu* < *məʔ 毋 and *wu* < *ma 無, originally distinct in both meaning and pronunciation, became homophonous through the regular sound changes that characterized the late Zhou language, and this quite naturally led to confusion in their usage.[14] What Shaughnessy has noticed in the *Cheng zhi wen zhi* manuscript is no more than an example of this well-known phenomenon. In the second example, contrary to first appearances and to the impression that Shaughnessy wants to convey, there is really only one grammatically and lexically significant variation among the four different characters used for the negatives in this line, viz., the variation between the negative words *fei* (非) and *bu* (written normally as 不, which character, by curious happenstance, does not appear in any of the cited lines at all). The difference between the scriptions 非 and 匪, except when the latter writes the word *fei* "bamboo basket" (now

---

13   This line is translated by James Legge as "Among the people of Meaou, they did not use the power of good, but the restraint of punishments. They made the five punishments engines of oppression, calling them the laws." *The Chinese Classics, III, the Shoo king* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, n.d. [rpt. Taipei: Wen shi zhe, 1972]), p. 591.

14   See E. G. Pulleyblank, *Outline of Classical Chinese Grammar* (Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press, 1995), p. 107.

written 筐 in the standard orthography), is functionally no more than graphic.[15] The confusion between the negatives 弗 (*pət) and 不 (*pə) in transmitted texts is widely recognized as a consequence of the fact that the former was a part of the personal name Fu-ling 弗陵 of Emperor Zhao of the Western Han (r. 86–74 B.C.) and was therefore avoided out of respect in texts written after his death. The customary practice was to replace the character 弗 with 不, a substitution that presented no interpretive problem at all.[16] As is also well known, 弗 *fu* < *pət is a fusion of the simple negative *bu* < *pə (usually written 不) plus the third person pronoun *zhi* < *tə 之, which shows up only vestigially as the final -t of *pət. This fused form arose as a consequence of the grammatical rule that required direct object pronouns of negated verbs to come between the negative and the verb. Hence, the two so-called "particles" 不 and 之 occurred juxtaposed, and became fused, probably because they were both unstressed syllables, into a single syllable much like English "do not" becomes fused into "don't."[17] Later, when scholars and editors no longer felt any need to observe the "taboo" on Emperor Zhao's name and wanted to restore the original 弗 characters to their "rightful" places in the texts, the earlier grammatical rule about the position of direct object pronouns had become obsolete and the proper explanation of 弗 as a fusion of *bu* < *pə 不 plus *zhi* < *tə 之 was no longer clearly understood. As a consequence 弗 was "restored" in places where it never existed in the first place and was not restored in places where it should have been, leaving 不 instead. The outcome is that in transmitted pre-Han and early Han texts the distribution of 弗 and 不 relative to each other is unsystematic and inexplicable from a grammatical perspective. Ironically, it was the discovery of the Mawangdui manuscripts and recognition of the fact that the distribution of 弗 and 不 relative to each other there conformed exactly to cases where one would expect a direct object pronoun and, respectively, where one would not, showing conclusively that the fusion hypothesis for 弗 was correct.

The appearance of 否 *fou* in the *Mozi* line probably is to be accounted for by the fact that originally the two negatives *bu* 不 and *fou* 否 were both written with the character 不 and were phonetically very close to each other, suggesting in fact a cognate, perhaps derivational, relation.[18] The received *Mozi* text is known generally to have suffered

---

[15] The mediaeval Chinese rhyming dictionaries register 匪 as *fei* in the rising tone (上聲), whereas the everyday negative *fei* 非 is read in the level tone (平聲). This tonal anomaly remains to be explained.

[16] See Guan Xihua 管錫華, *Hanyu guji jiaokan xue* 漢語古籍校勘學 (Chengdu: Ba-Shu shushe, 2003), p. 611.

[17] See Ding Shengshu 丁聲樹, "Shi fouding ci 'fu', 'bu'" 釋否定詞弗不, *Qingzhu Cai Yuanpei Xiansheng liushiwu sui lunwenji* 慶祝蔡元培先生六十五歲論文集 2 (Beiping: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, 1935), pp. 967–96 and P. A. Boodberg, "Some Proleptical Remarks on the Evolution of Archaic Chinese," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 2.3/4 (1937), pp. 329–72, esp. p. 337.

[18] See Pulleyblank, op. cit., p. 103. Phonetically, from the perspective of Middle Chinese, the difference between *bu* 不 and *fou* 否 is the difference between level tone and rising tone, just as it was in the case of *fei* 非 and *fei* 匪. (Modern Chinese *bu* is not the regular development from the Old Chinese pronunciation.) Whether the Middle Chinese alternation between a level

considerable corruption in the course of its transmission and to be as a result highly irregular in its orthography. The occurrence of the character 否 to write the everyday negative *bu* would not be particularly surprising. Nevertheless, such a graphic variant can legitimately be considered a kind of mix-up of two negatives, but it is a mix-up of the *wu* 毋 / *wu* 無 kind, where a reasonable explanation can be proposed on the basis of similar Old Chinese pronunciations and known historical developments in the language.

What is a genuine distinction and cannot be explained away as easily as we have suggested for *wu* 毋 and *wu* 無 or for *bu* 不, *fu* 弗 and *fou* 否 is the variation between the witnesses with *fei* 非 and those reducible to *bu* 不. This is a fundamental difference in the wording, and in the meaning, between the manuscript and *Li ji* version of the line on the one hand and the transmitted *Shu jing* and *Mozi* version on the other. In its principal uses *fei* 非 either negates a noun phrase or marks a negative exclusionary clause, including hypothetical clauses that are often called "subjunctive" (of the "were it not for . . ." or "except for . . ." kind), and *bu* 不 by contrast negates verb phrases.[19] This basic grammatical and structural feature of Classical Chinese was not eroded or erased by any kind of indiscriminate or interchangeable use of negatives. At the very least, I would suggest that, following Harbsmeier, the version of the line in question with *fei* seems to say "it was not as if the Miao people made good use of the 'ideals'; they were (by contrast) regulated by punishments . . ." whereas the version with *bu* says more straightforwardly "the Miao people did not make good use of . . . etc."[20] The former implies an observation or judgement on someone's part; the latter simply sets out an objective fact.[21] It is also possible that the use of *fei* in the first part of the line is stylistically related to the occurrence of *wei* 惟 in the second. In general *wei* marks an affirmative exclusionary clause ("only . . .") and is thus complementary to *fei* as the marker of a negative exclusionary clause ("except . . ."). It is very likely that these two words are derivationally related.[22] What impact these different nuances might have on the meaning of the larger passage, and on the historical picture that the texts

---

(Note 18 — *Continued*)

    tone reading and a rising tone reading, or between the Old Chinese segmental features corresponding to these tones, has the same significance for both the 不 / 否 pair and the 非 / 匪 is not clear.

[19] The character 非 is also used to write the cognate verb *fei* "to be wrong," often used transitively "to regard [something] as wrong." For further discussion of these negatives see my "Logic, Language, and Grammar in Early China," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 120.2 (2000), pp. 220–21.

[20] Christoph Harbsmeier, *Aspects of Classical Chinese Syntax* (London and Malmö: Curzon Press, 1981), pp. 19–22. See also Derek Herforth, "Philological Marginalia on a Grammatical Study of Old Chinese," *Early China* 11–12 (1985–87), pp. 210–11. My translations here are intended only to illustrate the grammatical point, not necessarily to give the best English words for the Chinese terms.

[21] In the version of the *Mozi* line that Shaughnessy gives in his discussion (p. 41) he has inadvertently left out the word *yong* 用 "to make good use of."

[22] See Guillaume Jacques, "The character 維 · 惟 · 唯 ywij and the reconstruction of the 脂 *Zhi* and 微 *Wei* rhymes," *Cahiers de Linguistique — Asie Orientale* 29.2 (2000), pp. 205–22.

draw remains still somewhat unclear. Rather than pursuing this, Shaughnessy claims that "it would be difficult to see any real difference in meaning" (p. 41).

Shaughnessy cites a passage from Anthony Grafton's recent book on the history of the footnote to suggest that it is not only in the transmission and editing of Classical Chinese texts that we encounter artificial "grammatical inventions," but that the same thing happened to the Western classics (p. 42).[23] In discussing the nineteenth-century German intellectual historian Leopold von Ranke, Grafton mentions that Ranke had attended Gottfried Hermann's lectures at the University of Leipzig on the classical Greek poet Pindar and had written in his notebooks that Hermann had described the texts of Pindar's odes as having suffered in the hands of the Alexandrian philologists who, in Grafton's words, "had done their worst by way of deliberate editorial revision, making Pindar meet their own standards of taste and elegance. Only scholarship could scour away the false patina and reveal the real texts underneath" (Grafton, op. cit., p. 89). Grafton goes on to quote Ranke (translating Ranke's Latin into English at the same time), and Shaughnessy quotes Grafton, ending with "we must not think that the text of these poems that we now have before us is what Pindar produced, but rather one into which the grammarians' corrections have been interpolated. We must, therefore, . . . remove these inventions of the grammarians" (Shaughnessy, ibid.; Grafton, op. cit., p. 90).

It would seem that Grafton's "inventions of the grammarians" (Ranke's Grammaticorum figmenta) is the motive source behind Shaughnessy's use of the same term to describe this alleged phenomenon ostensibly plaguing Chinese classical texts. But the "inventions of the grammarians" to which Hermann, Ranke, and Grafton refer do not constitute a pretext to disregard grammar altogether, lumping varying grammatical constructions and distinctions together and claiming that there was no difference between them. In the abstract the Alexandrian philologists had little awareness of the nature of language change over time or of dialectal differences as they pertained to the texts of antiquity. But they were nothing if not aware of and attentive to paradigmatic regularity and anomaly in the grammatical constructions of the language of the texts, especially in comparison with current spoken Greek. And these they took as the starting point for their editorial remaking of the texts. They may have been misguided in their revisionist efforts and sometimes wrong in their results, but capricious or arbitrary in the grammatical purport of their scholia they were not.[24] If there is a parallel in the Chinese world, it would likely best be found in the editorial work of the Han scholars.[25] Shaughnessy's example of the

---

[23]   Anthony Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997).

[24]   For a lucid and linguistically well-informed, if brief, account of the grammatical dimension of the Alexandrians see R. H. Robins, *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1951), pp. 36–43 in particular.

[25]   Any Han parallel that we might try to identify with the kind of textual scholarship that is associated with the Library at Alexandria will inevitably be very approximate. We know far less about the textual endeavours of the Han philologists and their motivations, especially their linguistic motivations, than is known about the Alexandrians and their successors. The classic English language histories of Alexandrian scholarship are John Edwin Sandys, *A History of*

William G. Boltz

difference between the pre-Han manuscript form of the line from the "Lü xing" with *fei* 非 and the transmitted line with a form of *bu* 不 is precisely the kind of grammatical difference that might have arisen in a such a scholarly context and that deserves to be explained in that light, not dismissed *a priori* out of hand as having no significance for the meaning of the text. Elsewhere in his book, as we have mentioned already, Shaughnessy emphasizes the importance of recognizing that what we have as the received corpus of classical texts may reflect the work of Han editors as much as of their pre-Han compilers. And he has implied, if not stated explicitly, that it is necessary to sort out just these kinds of differences in order to appreciate how the texts have been rewritten over time. To dismiss the grammatical difference between the two negatives here is not just ill-advised with regard to the meaning of the passage itself, but also seems to be inconsistent with his overall thesis.

In chapter two and its appendix, in what he presents as a text-critical study, Shaughnessy compares the two manuscript versions of the "Zi yi" text with each other and with the received text (called R) found in the *Li ji*. His chief method is to conflate (his term) the two discovered manuscripts into his own "recension based on the readings of those two manuscripts," which he calls M, and which he then translates and compares with the received version (p. 94).[26] Strictly speaking, such a "conflation" as Shaughnessy makes for the two "Zi yi" manuscripts, if it is to represent anything meaningful, ought to represent the best approximation possible to a source text (which may or may not be what we would call "an original text," depending on what we can determine about the textual history of the "Zi yi" overall) from which the two extant manuscript witnesses have devolved. And to represent that, the conflation must have been established according to explicit text-critical premises and rigorous methods and procedures, with attention to the details of every variant among the available witnesses in order to determine whether the variant is lexical or graphic. When a variant is deemed lexical, the next step is to try identify some relation between (or among) the different words in question, and then to determine which of the lexical possibilities is likelier (or likeliest) to have been original. There is an increasingly well-developed text-critical methodology for dealing with textual variation, for choosing among divergent proposals responding to the same textual question, particularly with regard to identifying when a variant is lexical and when it is merely graphic, and ultimately for establishing the best approximation to the original source text that we can. To be sure, Shaughnessy approaches many of the instances of textual variation that he encounters in establishing his M text in a seemingly text-critical way, usually by citing the opinions and

---

(Note 25 — *Continued*)

> *Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903–1908, 3d ed., 1920), book two, pp. 103–66 (now somewhat dated) and Rudolf Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), part two, pp. 87–233. For the successors to the Alexandrians in the first centuries of the Christian era see Robert A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988).

[26] On p. 65 he uses the term "composite M text" for this conflation and on p. 71 he uses the verb "consolidate" for this procedure.

judgements that have been registered in contemporary Chinese scholarship and then choosing among these possibilities, sometimes by adducing further graphic and lexical data himself and defending a reading on that basis. And he makes passing reference to such details for many more instances. But this kind of textual criticism is not his primary concern, much less his forte, and such methodological questions receive comparatively little direct attention or comment.

He does not, for example, even mention the different ways that the name of the "Zi yi" text is written in the three different versions that he has before him, though he gives the variant characters in his transcriptions. And he seems not to recognize the possibility that graphic variation *per se* might sometimes be important. In regard to the *guwen* 古文 and other non-standard forms of characters that often appear in these manuscripts he says that he will transcribe them with conventional characters (by which he means standard *kai shu* 楷書 characters of the transmitted orthography) because they are "trivial differences, simply representing the idiosyncratic 'spelling' tendencies of the . . . scribes" (p. 65). To this he adds a footnote in which he avers that he is "aware of the arguments for a stricter . . . transcription," but that in this case he thinks it is superfluous, and to defend his decision he cites the late Paul Thompson: "Where such variants are strictly orthographic . . . and nothing else, then their inclusion in the collation in opposition to the standard form will present false variations."[27] Thompson has a point; Shaughnessy does not. Thompson is referring to instances where the textual critic has determined, after having collated the witnesses and made the necessary critical study, that a variant is indeed merely graphic "and nothing else," and his point is in some respects (but not all) valid. Once the possibility of lexical variation has been ruled out and a variant has been judged to be graphic only, with no further implications for the *genius loci* of the witness, then Thompson's observation may apply and the transcription may no longer need to be direct, but may reflect the result of an editorial decision, which will be indicated in the accompanying apparatus. Shaughnessy, by contrast, often invokes this editorial dispensation prematurely, without evidence of having first considered the question of whether a variant is merely graphic or might be lexical. It is, moreover, possible to disagree even with Thompson, since his claim that mere graphic variation is of no real consequence to the meaning of the text does not take into account what might turn out to be significant temporal or areal variation in the writing system, things that for their part might bear on the dating or provenance, and in turn the interpretation, of the manuscript in question.[28] Far too little study has been done yet to claim, as Shaughnessy does, that these graphic variants are no more than trivial "spelling" idiosyncrasies.

---

[27] "On the Formal Treatment of Textual Testimony," in *The Guodian* Laozi: *Proceedings of the International Conference, Dartmouth College, May, 1998,* ed. Sarah Allan and Crispin Williams (Berkeley, CA: Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, 2000), p. 95.

[28] If, for example, I see a sign in the Pacific Northwest that says "Worldwide Financial Centre — Investments with Honour" I can be pretty sure that it is a Canadian or British firm, not an American one. To that extent, at least, the "trivial" graphic variation between *centre* and *center, honour* and *honor,* conveys some information and is thus not entirely trivial. The same kind of thing might apply *mutatis mutandis* to the Chu script; it remains yet to be studied.

William G. Boltz

Shaughnessy does in fact make an effort to transcribe the two manuscripts as they are written, largely by relying on the work of the Chinese editors of the respective texts, but in his M conflation he entirely disregards non-standard graphs in favour of a modern orthography based solely on the standard, received writing system. This procedure would not be objectionable if behind each instance of using a standard character he had given a reasoned argument explaining why the manuscript variants could justifiably be considered merely graphic. But Shaughnessy generally does not give such an argument and often seems instead to jump to the conclusion that such variants can only be graphic, rarely considering that they might be lexical. To give some idea of Shaughnessy's approach to the manuscripts and what kinds of questions remain unanswered, we shall look at the opening line of the "Zi yi" text as he has presented it in his appendix to chapter two (pp. 94–95). He transcribes the two manuscript lines, labelled G (Guodian) and S (Shanghai), as given here:[29]

> G:　夫子曰：好媺女好茲衣，亞 ⹀女亞逃白，則民臧匜而型不屯。

> S:　・子曰：𡥈頪女𡥈紌衣，亞 ⹀女亞徛白，則民咸𡟎而型不刬。

And he then gives his conflated version, labelled M, as:

> M:　夫子曰：好美如好緇衣，惡惡如惡巷伯，則民咸服而型不頓。

Strictly speaking, Shaughnessy's transcriptions are not quite accurate. A narrow transcription, by which I mean a transcription that reproduces the structure of the characters just as they are written, but in *kai shu*-style characters, without incorporating any decisions or judgements on the part of the editor as to what words the characters stand for, would look like this (G_R and S_R for "G Revised" and "S Revised"):

> G_R:　夫子曰：好媺女好茲衣，壺 ⹀女壺逃白，則民臧放而茊不屯。

> S_R:　・子曰：𡥈頪女𡥈紌衣，亞 ⹀女亞衛白，則民咸𡟎而型不肺。

There are several places where we might agree that the difference between Shaughnessy's transcription and the more accurate narrow transcription is, in his word, "trivial," e.g., 亞 in Shaughnessy's G and S both for G_R 壺 and S_R 亞, Shaughnessy's 刬 in S for S_R 肺. By the same token we might agree further that the difference between the manuscript forms 壺 and 亞, and his M version with the standard 惡 is also "trivial." But note next the correspondences G 好 :: S 𡥈 (S_R 𡥈) :: M (and R) 好 for *hao* "be fond of, regard as good" (Shaughnessy: "love") and G 媺 :: S 頪 :: M (and R) 美 for *mei* "fine, attractive, appealing" (Shaughnessy: "beauty"), both cases where the intended word is not in doubt, but where, except for G 好, the characters used in the manuscripts are likely to be unfamiliar to most of us and have not become a part of the received writing system. Apart from a minor correction in the spatial arrangement of the components of Shaughnessy's 𡥈, which in S

---

[29]　The proposed M conflation for line one that Shaughnessy gives in his initial discussion of this passage (pp. 70–77) differs slightly from the M conflation that he gives for the same line in the appendix.

actually occurs written as 㝥, both the transcriptions and the understandings that Shaughnessy gives are correct and unambiguous. All the same, we might like to know how he, or other textual critics, came to these conclusions. If we had been provided with an argument to explain that G 媺 and S 顡 were graphic variants of standard 美 for *mei* "fine, attractive, appealing," it would likely have included a note to the effect that within the transmitted, received writing system we find the character 媺 used often in the *Zhou li* to write the word *mei* "fine, etc.," not merely glossed, but in fact identified, by Jia Gongyan 賈公彥 (fl. *c.* 650) as 美也. Clearly 媺 *mei* < *məjʔ is an allograph of the everyday character 美 within the transmitted writing system. Just as clearly, the two different graphs that we find in the two "Zi yi" manuscripts corresponding to R 美 both have the same phonophoric component as seen in 媺, viz., 𡬈 / 𡬀, a component that is known primarily from its occurrence as the phonophoric in the character 微 *wei* "minuscule" < *mʷəj. Similarly, we might expect some comment on the fact that the graphic structure of the unusual character in S for *hao* < *hhuwʔ "good, fond of," S 𡥀 (S_R 㝥), would seem to have 丑 *chou* < *hnruwʔ as the phonophoric component.[30] These two examples are particularly curious because each of the non-standard, non-transmitted characters has a clearly identifiable phonophoric component, something we generally recognize as a fundamental feature of character structures that contributes to the overall functional efficacy of the writing system, while neither of the common, standard characters in the received writing system for the same two words has an obvious phonophoric, making them apparently idiosyncratic and from a systemic perspective, structurally less regular. In fact, based on the corpus of Warring States period Chu bamboo strip manuscripts now available, it would seem that the everyday character 美 does not occur at all in these texts, which means that Shaughnessy's M text with 美 is anachronistic and does not really reflect anything that we can confirm to have been a possibility in the writing system of these manuscripts.[31] Such observations as these about the nature of the pre-Han writing system are lost to us when we transcribe the manuscripts exclusively with characters of the received writing system.

When we look at Shaughnessy's G 㲋 :: S 麥 :: M (and R) 服 correspondence we find that deciding how to establish and write the M conflation becomes a more complicated matter than simply choosing to use a standard or a non-standard character to write the word(s) in question. While the graph in G has often been transcribed as 㲋, it is now widely recognized that the correct transcription is 攸. The corresponding S graph is somewhat more

---

[30]　If in fact 丑 chou < *hnruwʔ is the phonophoric component in the character 𡥀 / 㝥 standing for the word hao < *hhuwʔ "good, fond of," then there is some feature of the initials of one or both of these words that eludes our present understanding. The conventional requirement is that the initials of the phonophoric component and the character in question should be homorganic, but as given here they are not. The Old Chinese initial hh- of *hao* is a velar, and the hn- of *chou* is a dental.

[31]　For a very interesting, if somewhat speculative, study of the Guodian manuscript graphs for the word *mei* "attractive," see Robert H. Gassmann, "Preliminary thoughts on the relationship between lexicon and writing in the Guodian texts," *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 59.1 (2005), pp. 242–52.

puzzling, but it is all the same graphically 猋, not 猋 as Shaughnessy has given it. More importantly, in both cases we must ask whether the graphs stand for different words from that of the received text, or are merely graphic variants for the same word. By giving 服, the character of the received text, in his M conflation, Shaughnessy automatically implies that the two graphs seen in the two manuscripts are both no more than variant ways of writing the word *fu* "submit." He does comment briefly in his footnote to this line that Qiu Xigui has transcribed the Guodian character as 放 and that Li Ling has suggested the Shanghai manuscript character ought to be transcribed 扐 and understood as writing the word *li* "strength." But beyond this he never considers the possibility that the manuscripts show any difference in wording one from the other, or either from the received version, and in the end we are left to conclude that his silence on any other possibility means that he takes them all as writing the word *fu* "submit." His argument is limited to this footnote statement:

> For the final word of the *Shi* quotation [i.e., the line citing the *Shi jing* that follows the one under consideration here — WGB], read *fu* 孚 "sincere" in both G and R, S reads 反, the ancient form of 服; the archaic forms and senses of 孚 and 服 are very similar, and the words are surely cognate. It seems possible that a text with a reading such as this here influenced the reading of R in the previous sentence [i.e., the sentence with the G 伿力 :: S 猋 :: M 服 correspondence — WGB].

Nothing in this statement addresses the question, much less answers it, of whether or not the G 伿力 (G$_R$ 放) :: S 猋 (S$_R$ 猋) :: M (and R) 服 correspondence reflects two (or even three) different words or just three different ways of writing the same word.[32] If Shaughnessy means that the two manuscripts both write *fu* "submit" in the first place, even if each does so with a character different from the other, which is what his conflation implies, then his comment about the possible influence of the word *fu* 孚 "sincere" (*sic*) at the end of the *Shi jing* citation is irrelevant, since there is no lexical variation that needs to be explained. If he really means that the 孚 at the end of the *Shi jing* citation was responsible for the 服 *fu*

---

[32] Much of his comment in the note about the words 孚 and 服 remains dubious. I think the understanding of 孚 *fu* as "sincere" is based on a misunderstanding of Du Yu's gloss to the passage in the *Zuo zhuan* (Zhuang 10) that says 小信未孚, in regard to which Du Yu said 孚 大信也. In neither the *Zuo zhuan* nor in Du Yu's gloss does the word *xin* 信 mean "sincere," and by extension neither does 孚 *fu*. The correct understanding for *xin* 信 is "reliable, dependable, trustworthy" (hence > "honest"), and this is the quality that is crucial to the successful nurturing of the young, whether human or avian, hence the association with the basic meaning of 孚 *fu* "brood, incubate, hatch, care for fledglings." And this sense of "nurturing or supportive dependability," I would argue, is how the word should be understood in the *Shi jing* line that appears in this "Zi yi" passage, "the myriad states behaved with a **supportive reliability**" as well as in the original *Shi* "Da ya" ode "Xia wu" 下武 (Mao 243) line 永言配命，成王之孚 "ever striving to match the Mandate, achieving the **nurturing dependability** of a king." By the same token, I doubt that 孚 and 服 are cognate. They are not in the same *Shi jing* rhyme group; 孚 is 幽部 and 服 is 職部 and their respective basic meanings "brood" vs. "submit" do not seem to me to match very well.

"submit" of the received text, then we would expect him to tell us what was the word in those manuscripts before the change to 服 *fu* "submit." This would be genuine lexical variation, but Shaughnessy is silent on what the word of the manuscripts, one or both, might have been if it was not *fu* "submit." If his study purports to be an analysis and translation of the manuscripts, not merely of the received text, then we would expect that the words of the manuscripts would be identified when they differ from the received version, and the bases for the identifications would be laid out.[33] We might also expect some discussion of the methodology or of the text-critical principles involved in establishing M, which Shaughnessy introduced as "based on the readings of those two manuscripts" (p. 94). We find neither of these. The problem arises, I think, from the fact that by conflating the two manuscripts impressionistically into one as he has done, Shaughnessy unwittingly effaces any potential lexical differences that might have been discernible between the two manuscripts. When he then proceeds to centre his discussion on a comparison of his M conflation with the received text, the possibilities of lexical variation overall, including those between the manuscripts proper and the received text, except in transparent and obvious cases, recede into the background before they have properly been considered. With his M conflation, as he has constructed it, Shaughnessy has in effect created a new version of the text, which exists in his book and nowhere else, a version that he then proceeds to study and translate. This is not the usual approach to the textual criticism of early manuscripts, and it leads to no very useful conclusions about the history of the real text itself.

What Shaughnessy gives us instead of a rigorous text-critical study of individual lines and words is a compelling argument to explain how the R and M versions of the "Zi yi" have come to have their respective individual sections, what he calls their pericopes, ordered as they are, each in a sequence very different from the other, and what these differing sequences suggest about the editorial intent underlying the different versions of the work. As it happens, the Guodian and Shanghai manuscripts of the "Zi yi" text are so similar to each other that Shaughnessy can disregard methodological rigour in his text-critical approach and still, based on his somewhat impressionistically conflated M version, reach a convincing conclusion about how the strips of the original text must have been manipulated to account for the different sequences of the sections that we find in these two versions of the text. In a nutshell Shaughnessy's conclusion is that the sequence of sections in M differs from R as we find it in the *Li ji* because the editors of each version had differing aims in what they wished to convey or promote through their use of this text. He concludes his comparative

---

[33]   As it turns out, it is likely that the three graphs G 㐰 (G_R 放) :: S 㝊 (S_R 㝊) :: R 服 do in fact all write the same word, *fu* "submit," and so Shaughnessy's conclusion is after all defensible. See Huang Xiquan 黃錫全, "Du Shangbo Chujian zhaji" 讀上博楚簡札記 (http://www.jianbo.org/Wssf/2002/huangxiquan01.htm) for an excellent, succinct analysis of the graphs of the two manuscripts and their relation to the received text. I am grateful to Ms. Yang Li of the University of Washington for bringing this article to my attention. See also my own "*Lii jih* 'Tzy i' and the Guodiann Manuscript Matches" in *Und folge nun dem, was mein Herz begehrt: Festschrift für Ulrich Unger zum 70. Geburtstag,* ed. Reinhard Emmerich and Hans Stumpfeldt (Hamburg, Germany: Hamburger Sinologische Schriften 8 [2002]), pp. 209–21.

analysis of the opening "two or three" sections of M and R by saying that "both represent reasonable and consistent editorial perspectives, the sequence of M emphasizing the superior's role as a model for the people below him, while that of R asserts instead the disadvantages of ruling through the use of punishments" (p. 76). In anticipating his appended M recension of the whole "Zi yi" and its comparison with R, he says "[i]t would be difficult based on just these [opening, WGB] pericopes to decide which of the two sequences is preferable, *if such a decision is even appropriate*" (ibid., italicized emphasis added). When we have looked at the whole text, he suggests, we will conclude with him "that only the sequence of M maintains a reasonable and consistent editorial perspective . . . while that of R suddenly veers off into concerns unrelated with those of the opening pericopes" (p. 77). The M version, in other words, he thinks is preferable, and this he tells us is the "consensus view" (ibid.).

Shaughnessy seems to recognize that the question of "preferability" may not be appropriate (see the preceding citation), but by the end of the same paragraph he is nevertheless prepared to pass a "preferability" judgement in favour of M. Before deciding such a question, we might expect that he would tell us according to what criteria he thinks the decision is to be made. In a way Shaughnessy defeats his own purpose by seeming to presume that "preferability" can somehow be judged independently of the intent of the text, and, by implication, of its editor. Shaughnessy may see the M sequence as preferable, but if you are the editor and promoter of the "disadvantages of ruling through the use of punishments" message embodied in the R version, then for you R is going to be preferable. The point is, and it is Shaughnessy himself who has brought it to the fore, that each of the differing section sequences in the two versions of the text is *motivated,* not accidental to its structure. And, in view of that, the more clearly we can identify the doctrinal, philosophical, political, ethical, social, or ideological motivation, the better we understand both the text itself and the intellectual and historical context in which it was produced and used. Preferability in the abstract does not enter the picture. This leads to a related question. If the structure of the M and R versions differ as greatly as they do, and if we can identify a conscious editorial basis, whether in doctrine, philosophy, or any of the other possibilities listed above, for the different structures, as Shaughnessy has apparently been able to do, is it in fact correct or meaningful to call M and R two versions of *the same text?* Or, does it make more sense to see them as two different texts that have arisen from a common stock of textual "raw material"? For the "Zi yi" Shaughnessy does not hesitate to say that these versions are all "the same text" (p. 64). By this he would seem to allow that the "same text" may be significantly rewritten to promote different editorial perspectives and still remain the same text.

Given the high degree of similarity of the two discovered manuscripts of the "Zi yi" to each other and the fact that apart from the differing sequence of sections they are also exceedingly close to the text of R, Shaugnhessy's answer that M and R are indeed two versions of the "same text" is neither unreasonable nor indefensible. But, all the same, the opposite answer would also be worth considering, simply because it is not at all obvious how different two texts can be and still be the *same text.* That this is not a trivial question or a mere terminological quibble becomes clear when we ask the same thing about the received *Laozi* text *vis-à-vis* the three Guodian manuscripts that have frequently, but misleadingly,

been identified as the *Laozi* text. The Guodian corpus in its entirety dates from about 300 B.C. and includes three physically distinct groups of strips that in the aggregate bear texts corresponding to thirty-two of the total eighty-one sections of the received *Laozi,* equivalent to about forty per cent. The other sixty per cent of the received *Laozi* is not found anywhere in the Guodian corpus, or in any other Warring States period manuscript corpus yet unearthed. Unlike the Mawangdui versions, which have only one or two sequential disparities relative to the received text, the thirty-two Guodian *Laozi* parallels have only one or two sequential matches and generally are in an order completely different from the order of their matching sections in the received text.

The differences among the various versions of the "Laozi" material are much more substantial than was the case for the "Zi yi" text. How to answer the question of whether the *Laozi* parallels in the Guodian manuscripts are or are not "the *Laozi*" seems a considerably less straightforward matter than does the comparable question for the "Zi yi." From a text-critical perspective the extensive textual differences between the Guodian manuscript parallels and the received text of the *Laozi* preclude recognizing the Guodian parallels as "the *Laozi*." The Guodian bamboo strips do not testify to the existence of the *Laozi* as early as 300 B.C. in any meaningful way, if we intend the name *Laozi* to mean the received text that has been called by that name for two millennia. We could, of course, simply define the name *Laozi* to include materials such as are found in the Guodian bamboo strips, but to do so is to confuse content, generic identity and "message" with actual text. No one would deny that the sense or content of these Guodian *Laozi* parallels closely conform to the sense and content of the received *Laozi;* they do after all match (often in variant forms) thirty-two of the eighty-one sections of the received *Laozi.* On the level of the individual section, one by one, each of the thirty-two sections of the received text with a matching passage among the Guodian parallels is clearly the same text as its Guodian counterpart. But this does not add up to saying that in the aggregate the Guodian counterparts are the *same text* as the received *Laozi.*

In chapter one Shaughnessy says that "opinion has been divided" on the question of whether or not one should see the Guodian *Laozi* parallels as an early version of the *Laozi* text and he seems to leave the matter open and undecided (p. 64). But in his "Conclusion" to the whole book he says "there now seems to be a consensus in China that the three Guodian 郭店 manuscripts composed exclusively of material found also in the received text of the *Laozi* confirm traditions that ascribe that text, in the entirety of its eighty-one chapters, to an elder contemporary of . . . Confucius" (pp. 257–58).[34] To insist that the Guodian "Laozi" manuscripts prove the existence of the *Laozi* text as early as 300 B.C., if not still earlier, is to succumb to an uncritical eagerness to date this particular philosophical work to its traditional place alongside the *Analects* of Confucius and to ignore the objective textual evidence for its history. Calling the Guodian *Laozi* parallels the *Laozi* obscures the real, and

---

[34]   For a slightly earlier discussion of the same question, where Shaughnessy takes the same position, see his "The Guodian Manuscripts and Their Place in Twentieth-Century Historiography on the *Laozi,*" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 65.2 (2005), pp. 417–57, esp. pp. 444–52.

presumably the more interesting, relation between manuscript and received text in favour of an enthusiasm for the antiquity of the *Laozi* text itself that the evidence fails to support.

Beyond the significant differences between the Guodian *Laozi* parallels and the received text itself, we should also notice that the third of the so-called Guodian "Laozi" manuscripts in fact includes substantial textual material, viz., the "Tai yi sheng shui" 大一生水 and "Tian dao" 天道 passages (eight and six bamboo strips in length respectively), that is not found in the received *Laozi,* yet is physically an integral part of this manuscript. There is no objective reason not to consider these parts intrinsic to this Guodian manuscript as a whole, and therefore it is not the case that these manuscripts are "composed exclusively of material found in the received text of the *Laozi*" as Shaughnessy claims.[35] To think that they are exclusively "Laozi" is simply a misconception that arises from how the modern editors have laid them out in their 1998 publication, based presumably on an a priori presumption that they had "Laozi" manuscripts to hand.[36] What we have, I think, in the Guodian strips is likely a reflection of a part of the textual source materials out of which the text we know as the *Laozi* emerged. How that "emergence" took place, i.e., how the received *Laozi* was compiled as it was, why, and by whom, we do not know. But the evidence of the manuscripts suggests that it occurred sometime between the time of the Guodian materials around 300 B.C. on the one hand and the Mawangdui around 200 B.C. on the other, i.e., sometime in the third century B.C.

In any event when we ask whether the manuscript version and the received text of the "Zi yi" are or are not the same text, and when we ask the same question about the received *Laozi* text in regard to its manuscript versions, the answers may be sharply different. But the implication of the questions is the same, viz., that the difference in textual circumstances is a matter of degree, not of kind. Fundamentally what is at issue in both cases is the question of what constitutes a distinct text in early China, where authorial attribution is often no more

---

[35]   The three Guodian "Laozi" manuscripts are called simply *jia* 甲, *yi* 乙, and *bing* 丙 by the editors and generally in subsequent studies. It is the *bing* manuscript, consisting in a total of twenty-eight bamboo strips, that includes the non-*Laozi* material. Its contents are as follows: strips 01–03 with text matching sections (*zhang* 章) seventeen and eighteen of the received *Laozi* as a single passage, i.e., not marked in any way that would separate seventeen from eighteen, strips 04–05 with text matching section thirty-five of the received *Laozi,* strips 06–10 with text matching section thirty-one of the received *Laozi,* strips 11–14 with text matching section sixty-four of the received *Laozi,* strips 15–22 with the "Tai yi sheng shui" passage, and strips 23–28 with the "Tian dao" passage. There is nothing in this manuscript itself that would suggest the parts with *Laozi* matches are in any way to be distinguished from the last two passages, which of course are not found in the *Laozi.* It is simply a single manuscript some parts of which happen to have ended up as parts of the received *Laozi* and some parts of which did not. For a further analysis and study of these Guodian "Laozi" manuscripts and a discussion of their relation to the received *Laozi* see William G. Boltz, "The Fourth-century B.C. Guodiann Manuscripts from Chuu and the Composition of the *Laotzyy,*" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119.4 (1999), pp. 590–608.

[36]   Jingmen shi Bowuguan 荊門市博物管, *Guodian Chumu zhujian* 郭店楚墓竹簡 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1998), pp. 3–10, 111–22.

than after-the-fact tradition. How fixed do we demand or how plastic do we allow the same text to be? *Ex cathedra* answers will not solve the problem; the question needs to be decided on the basis of a body of explicit text-critical criteria that has yet to be completely established. To the extent that the differences among versions of a text reflect the kind of differing editorial perspectives that Shaughnessy has identified for the "Zi yi," and that such differences likely have to do with how a text was used, usage itself might be an essential consideration in determining whether two texts are the same or not.

Chapter four is a text-critical *tour de force.* Here Shaughnessy examines the *Zhushu jinian,* arguably the most important item of the Ji *zhong* manuscript discovery, in much the same way he did the "Zi yi," except that here we do not, of course, have any actual manuscript in front of us, but only a transmitted Ji *zhong* text, the earliest extant editions dating from the late Ming, accompanied by a rich historical record of how the manuscript was found, edited and received, and a Qing period "reconstruction" of the text based on citations culled from other transmitted texts. These are what have come to be known, respectively, as the *Jinben* 今本 ("Current") *Zhushu jinian* and the *Guben* 古本 *Zhushu jinian.*[37] Shaughnessy showed in chapter three that there seem to have been two separate editions of the Ji *zhong* texts prepared, "the first by the team initially charged by Jin Wu di . . . with editing the manuscript, led by Xun Xu 荀勖 (d. 289) and He Qiao 和嶠 (d. 292), and then, about a decade later, a second incorporating corrections made by Wei Heng 衛恆 (d. 291) and Shu Xi 束皙 (c. 261–300), court librarians during the following reign of Jin Hui di 晉惠帝 . . ." (p. 187). He suggests that the difference between the so-called *Jinben Zhushu jinian* and the *Guben* version, while not corresponding directly to these two editions prepared at the Jin court, still is likely a consequence of the editorial rewritings and the textual variations that they engendered, and that this does not have to mean that the former is a forgery, as has often been claimed (p. 254).

Shaughnessy's study of the *Zhushu jinian* is an exacting analysis of the received text in the light of all of the ancillary textual evidence that he can assemble, including of course the fragments that have come collectively to be known as the *Guben* text, and as such it is an example of the kind of textual study that he does best. In his 1986 study (see note 5 *infra*) he examined in detail one specific passage in the *Jinben* text, viz., the account of Wu wang's 武王 death. There he showed that the discrepancy between the date that the received text of the *Jinben Zhushu jinian* gives, which matches the tradition known from the Eastern Han, and what is given in the pre-Han and Western Han sources, could be explained by "undoing" the editorial manipulations that were imposed on the *Jinben* text after it was found in 280. By discerning both why and how the text had been altered at the Jin court, he was in a position to explain this "undoing" and to restore the original reading. He concluded that since it is possible to restore this one passage to a form that was "exactly as it came out of

[37]   For a summary of both traditional and current understanding of the textual nature and history of this text see the *Chu shu chi nien* entry by David S. Nivison, in *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide,* ed. Michael Loewe (Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies and The Society for the Study of Early China, 1993), pp. 39–47.

the ground in 280 A.D., indeed, exactly as it went into the ground in 296 B.C." and thus to show that it was surely not a "post-Song fabrication," then "we must be open to the possibility that the entirety of the 'Current' *Bamboo Annals* has been transmitted with similar fidelity" (Shaughnessy 1986, p. 180).

In chapter four of the present book Shaughnessy confirms through a meticulous textual analysis of many passages of the *Zhushu jinian* his 1986 suspicions and shows the we are justified in having confidence in the authenticity of the "Current" *Bamboo Annals* as a genuine pre-Han text, as long as we are willing to make the requisite philological analysis of the text to determine what its original form was. Changes to the text were "sometimes inadvertent," the result of the sort of confusion that editors of discovered manuscripts often encounter, and at other times they were "deliberate fabrications" designed to make the text "consistent with the orthodox historical opinion of the time" (p. 204). These are, as Shaughnessy clearly shows, just the sort of textual irregularities and problems that modern palæographers confront in working with recently excavated manuscripts *vis-à-vis* their transmitted counterparts. And this in turn is why Shaughnessy has devoted half of his book to the Ji *zhong* manuscript discovery and in particular to an analysis of the *Zhushu jinian.* Given the potential importance of an authentic *Zhushu jinian* for establishing a precise chronology of early Chinese history, it is not surprising that Shaughnessy argues that the Ji *zhong Zhushu jinian* was probably the most important manuscript discovery ever, even though that discovery was more than seventeen hundred years ago (p. 255).