Early China (2016) vol 39 pp 53–109
doi:10.1017/eac.2016.2 First published online 27 May 2016

THE *XINIAN*: AN ANCIENT HISTORICAL TEXT FROM THE QINGHUA UNIVERSITY COLLECTION OF BAMBOO BOOKS

Olivia Milburn*

Abstract

The *Xinian* or *Annalistic History* is one of an important collection of ancient bamboo texts donated anonymously to Qinghua University in 2008. The *Xinian* covers events from the history of the Western Zhou dynasty (1045–771 B.C.E.), through the Spring and Autumn Period (771–475 B.C.E.) and into the Warring States era (475–221 B.C.E.). Since the first publication of this manuscript in 2011, it has been the subject of much research, though this has usually been focused on the sections which have important parallels within the transmitted tradition. This article proposes a new way of understanding the *Xinian*, as a compilation produced from at least five source texts, and provides a complete translation of the entire text. Furthermore, although the contents of the *Xinian* are frequently at variance with the transmitted tradition, in particular the account of events given in the *Zuozhuan*, in some instances it may prove the more reliable source. The *Xinian* also provides some information concerning the history of the early Warring States era that helps to explain events in this generally badly documented era.

Introduction

In 2006, in the final chapter of his study of the *Zhushu jinian* 竹書紀年 (Bamboo Annals) and other ancient Chinese historical writings, Edward Shaughnessy suggested that it was only a matter of time before some new textual discovery transformed our understanding of ancient Chinese history: "We may see the day when the *Bamboo Annals* or a text something like it, is rediscovered, not in a tomb, but in the libraries of hardworking editors."[1] As it has transpired, he was quite correct, though this rediscovery has not come from reconstructing the *Zhushu jinian* text (work which is still ongoing), but from the donation

* Olivia Milburn, 米歐敏, Seoul National University, milburn@snu.ac.kr.

1. Edward Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006), 256.

by an anonymous alumnus of a major collection of bamboo texts to Qinghua University 清華大學 in 2008. The provenance of the Qinghua group of texts (comprising more than 2,300 individual bamboo strips) is not known, but they are thought to derive from a tomb robbery in either Hubei or Hunan Province. One of these texts is the *Xinian* 繫年, or *Annalistic History*.[2] The *Xinian* covers events from the history of the Western Zhou dynasty (1045–771 B.C.E.), through the Spring and Autumn Period (771–475 B.C.E.) and into the Warring States era (475–221 B.C.E.); the most recent events recorded in this text concern the reign of King Dao 楚悼王 (r. 400–378 B.C.E.).[3] This is compatible with the date obtained by C^{14} analysis of one of the bamboo strips: 305 B.C.E. +/− 30 years.[4] Although much of the material found in the *Xinian* records the history of the Zhou confederacy, there is a significant focus on the kingdom of Chu. This agrees with the supposed location of the tomb from which this text was derived, within the borders of this ancient southern kingdom.

The *Xinian* consists of twenty-three individual pericopes written on 138 bamboo strips, each ranging from 44.6–45 cm in length. For the convenience of readers of the original manuscript, the number of each strip was written on the back. However, there are two mistakes in the count: number fifty-two is duplicated but number eighty-eight is missing; furthermore the final strip of the text, number 138, is not numbered. Most scholars have simply followed the ordering of the text indicated by the Warring States era numbering; however, Wang Liancheng 王連成 has suggested that this represents a post facto addition to the text and is not necessarily correct.[5] In particular, he notes that pericopes one, three and four begin with accounts of the events at the time of the founding of the Zhou

2. The original manuscript of the *Xinian* is untitled. The title was chosen specifically by modern scholars working on the text to make a connection with the *Zhushu jinian*; see Li Xueqin 李學勤, ed., *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* 清華大學戰國竹簡 (Vol. 2; Shanghai: Zhongxi, 2011), 135.

3. It has long been understood that there are problems with the chronology given in the *Shiji* 史記 (Records of the Grand Historian) for the early Warring States era kings of Chu. This study will follow the corrected chronology given in Bai Guangqi 白光琦, "You Qinghua jian *Xinian* dingzheng Zhanguo Chu nian" 由清華簡繫年訂正戰國楚年 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article .php?id=1659 [accessed on September 30, 2014]). An identical revised chronology is also given in Tao Jin 陶金, "You Qinghua jian *Xinian* tan Huanzi Meng Jiang hu xiangguan wenti" 由清華簡繫年談洹子孟姜壺相關問題 (http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/ScrShow.asp?Src_ID=1785 [accessed on September 30, 2014]).

4. See Li Xueqin, "*Xinian* chuban de zhongyao yiyi" 繫年出版的重要意義, *Handan xueyuan xuebao* 邯鄲學院學報 23 (2013), 15–16.

5. See Wang Liancheng 王連成, "Jianyi Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhi bianlian yu 'Zhou wang wang jiuninan' de lijie wenti" 淺議清華簡繫年之編聯與周亡王九年的理解問題 (http://www.jianbo.org/uploadfile/20120708.doc [accessed on September 30, 2014]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dynasty, while pericope two describes the collapse of the Western Zhou dynasty in 771 B.C.E. Therefore, he suggests that the original order was disturbed, and the mistake has been preserved in the modern transcription thanks to the ancient numbering imposed on the text.

Classifying the *Xinian*

Unlike the *Chunqiu* 春秋 (Spring and Autumn Annals) and its commentaries, or indeed the *Zhushu jinian*, the *Xinian* is not an annalistic history in the strict sense of the words. As has been pointed out by a number of scholars, the name chosen for this text is a misnomer: each entry does not start with a date, and the present ordering of the text is not completely chronological.[6] Although some scholars have persisted in attempting to classify the *Xinian* as an annalistic history, this is rendered extremely difficult by the range of dates covered by the text.[7] Within each individual pericope, events that took place over the course of many decades—or even centuries—are discussed together, with considerable chronological overlap (see Table 1):

Although it has frequently been stated that the *Xinian* is a Chu historical text, much of the focus of the narrative is upon the changing and developing relationship between Chu and Jin.[8] The internal evidence of origin seems to be extremely problematic, given that some events are dated according to the Jin calendar, and some according to the Chu calendar. This dual focus has resulted in scholars suggesting that the *Xinian* may be related to the *Guoyu* 國語 (Discourses of the States) discovered with the *Zhushu jinian*—a text which has now been lost.[9] This text is described in the *Jinshu* 晉書 (History of the Jin dynasty): "A *Guoyu* in three chapters, describing the history of Chu and Jin" (國語三篇, 言楚晉事).[10] It is certainly true that the second half of the text

6. See Chen Minzhen 陳民鎮, "*Xinian* guzhi shuo: Qinghua jian *Xinian* xingzhi ji xuanzuo beijing chuyi" 繫年故志說清華簡繫年性質及撰作背景芻議, *Handan xueyuan xuebao* 22.2 (2012), 49–50.

7. This point is made in Hou Wenxue 侯文學, Li Mingli 李明麗, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* de xushi lili, hexin yu linian" 清華簡繫年的叙事體例核心與理念, *Huaxia wenhua luntan* 華夏文化論壇 8 (2012), 286–87.

8. This is extensively discussed in Hu Kai 胡凱, Chen Minzhen 陳民鎮, "Cong Qinghua jian *Xinian* kan Jinguo de bangjiao: Yi Jin–Chu, Jin–Qin guanxi wei zhongxin" 從清華簡繫年看晉國的邦交以晉楚晉秦關系為中心, *Handan xueyuan xuebao* 22.2 (2012), 58–66.

9. See for example Liu Quanzhi 劉全志, "Lun Qinghua jian *Xinian* de xingzhi" 論清華簡繫年的性質, *Zhongyuan wenwu* 中原文物 2013.6, 43–50.

10. See Fang Xuanling 房玄齡, *Jinshu* 晉書 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1974), 51:1433. As noted by Chen Mengjia 陳夢家, *Xi-Zhou niandai kao: Liuguo jinian* 西周年代考: 六國紀年 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2005), 185, this text was probably different from the transmitted *Guoyu*, since otherwise the nature of the contents would not need to be mentioned.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. Dates of events recorded in the *Xinian**

	Date of First Event	Date of Last Event
1.*	Before 1045 B.C.E.	39th year of King Xuan of Zhou (789 B.C.E.)
2.*	c. 1st year of King You of Zhou (781 B.C.E.)	Reign of King Wen of Chu (689–675 B.C.E.)
3.*	Conquest of Shang (1045 B.C.E.)	King Ping moves capital (c. 770 B.C.E.)
4.*	King Cheng of Zhou (r. 1042/35–1006 B.C.E.)	State of Wei moves to Diqiu (653 B.C.E.)
5.*	Marriage of Lord Ai of Cai (pre-684 B.C.E.)	King Wen of Chu attacks Chen (637 B.C.E.)
6.*	Marriage of Lord Xian of Jin (pre-684 B.C.E.)	Qin and Jin attack Ruo (635 B.C.E.)
7.	4th year of Lord Wen of Jin (633 B.C.E.)	Covenant at Jiantu (632 B.C.E.)
8.	7th year of Lord Wen of Jin (630 B.C.E.)	Before Lord Mu of Qin's death (pre-621 B.C.E.)
9.*	Death of Lord Xiang of Jin (621 B.C.E.)	Establishment of Lord Ling of Jin (620 B.C.E.)
10.*	Battle of Jinyin (620 B.C.E.)	Battle of Hequ (614 B.C.E.)
11.	8th year of King Mu of Chu (617 B.C.E.)	Peace treaty between Chu and Song (594 B.C.E.)
12.	14th year of King Zhuang of Chu (600 B.C.E.)	Death of Lord Cheng of Jin (600 B.C.E.)
13. ?	17th year of King Zhuang of Chu? (597 B.C.E.)	?
14.	8th year of Lord Jing of Jin (592 B.C.E.)	Lord Qing of Qi pays court to Jin (588 B.C.E.)
15.*	King Zhuang of Chu established (613 B.C.E.)	King Zhao of Chu returns (505 B.C.E.)
16.	7th year of King Gong of Chu (584 B.C.E.)	Death of Lord Li of Jin (573 B.C.E.)
17.	1st year of Lord Ping of Jin (547 B.C.E.)	Murder of Lord Zhuang of Qi (549 B.C.E.)
18.	12th year of Lord Ping of Jin (534 B.C.E.)	Covenant at Xianquan (503 B.C.E.)
19.	Occupation of Chen and Cai (534 B.C.E.)	Moving Cai to Zhoulai (493 B.C.E.)
20.	15th year of Lord Jing of Jin (585 B.C.E.)	4th year of Lord You of Jin (430 B.C.E.)
21.	7th year of King Jian of Chu (422 B.C.E.)	8th year of King Jian of Chu (421 B.C.E.)

Continued

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. Continued

	Date of First Event	Date of Last Event
22.	1st year of King Sheng of Chu (404 B.C.E.)	Prisoners presented to king (401 B.C.E.)
23.	4th year of King Sheng of Chu (401 B.C.E.)	5th year of King Dao of Chu (386 B.C.E.)

Note: * The pericope numbers marked with an asterisk are those which begin without an explicit indication of dating; in these instances a date has been assessed from internal evidence.

concentrates on the history of these two states, but it is premature to associate the *Xinian* with an earlier textual discovery about which so very little is known. Alternatively, a number of scholars researching the *Xinian* have been drawn to the idea that this text represents a précis produced within the Chu court, and just such a text is described in the *Shiji*: "Duo Jiao was the tutor to King Wei of Chu, and since the king was not able to comprehend the entire *Chunqiu* [*Zuozhuan*], he selected the most important events, forty pericopes in all, thus forming the *Duoshi wei* (Highlights of Master Duo)" (鐸椒為楚威王傅, 為王不能盡觀春秋, 采取成敗, 卒四十章, 為鐸氏微).[11] For some scholars, in spite of the different lengths recorded for this text, the *Xinian* is—if not identical to the *Duoshi wei*—then at the very least closely related to it.[12] The wish to identify recently discovered bamboo texts with previously recorded but lost ancient writings is extremely strong, and the *Xinian* is not the only historical text to have been linked with the *Duoshi wei*. The *Zhengzi jia sang* 鄭子家喪 (The Funeral of Zijia of Zheng), a text recounting a single historical story concerning conflict between Jin and Chu, has also been identified as deriving from the *Duoshi wei*.[13] Likewise, it has been suggested that the badly damaged historical text excavated from the late Warring States era tomb at Cili 慈利 in Hunan Province in

11. Sima Qian 司馬遷, *Shiji* 史記 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1959), 14.510. The existence of this text is further documented in the "Yiwen zhi 藝文志" (Treatise on Arts and Literature), which mentions a *Duoshi wei* in three fascicles; see Ban Gu 班固, *Hanshu* 漢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1962), 30:1713.

12. See for example Chen Wei 陳偉, "Qinghua daxue cang zhushu *Xinian* de wenxianxue kaocha" 清華大學藏竹書繫年的文獻學考察, *Shilin* 史林 2013.1, 48.

13. See Feng Shi 馮時, "*Zhengzi jia sang* yu *Duoshi wei*" 鄭子家喪與鐸氏微, *Kaogu* 考古 2012.2, 76–83. For the original publication of the *Zhengzi jia sang*, which is held in the collection of the Shanghai Museum; see Chen Peifen 陳佩芬, "Zhengzi jia sang" 鄭子家喪, in Ma Chengyuan 馬承源, ed., *Shanghai bowuguan zang Zhanguo Chu zhushu* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書 (Vol. 7; Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2008), 169–88.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1987 is related to the *Duoshi wei*.[14] The difficulties of reconciling these attributions rests in the very brief description given of this book in Han dynasty texts, coupled with the fact that number of fascicles and other such bibliographical structuring remained fluid well into the imperial era. In the case of the *Xinian*, a close connection with the *Duoshi wei* is very unlikely, since it is not a précis of any known text. However, this suggested classification does point to one of the major features of the text. The *Xinian* is a very condensed source of information about the history of the Zhou dynasty, focusing on events that led to significant changes in the balance of power.

Rather than attempt a classification, some scholars have tried to group the contents by theme. So far, all of these studies have agreed to divide the contents of the *Xinian* into three main groups of material. Li Xueqin 李學勤 has proposed a chronological classification: pericopes one to four concern the Western Zhou dynasty, recording events up until the capital moved to the east in the time of King Ping (r. 770–720 B.C.E.); pericopes five to nineteen describe events during the Spring and Autumn period; pericopes twenty to twenty-three record Warring States era history.[15] Alternatively, Xu Zhaochang 許兆昌 and Qi Dandan 齊丹丹 have suggested that pericope one represents an overview of the entire history of the Western Zhou dynasty; pericopes two to five give a simple account of the history of some of the more important states of the Zhou confederacy; and pericopes six to twenty-three describe important events in the history of the Eastern Zhou dynasty, with particular reference to the interaction between Chu and Jin.[16] Meanwhile Yuri Pines has suggested a tripartite division, based upon the presumed origin of the textual material, with pericopes one to four forming a "Zhou" section; pericopes six to ten, fourteen, seventeen, and twenty forming a "Jin" section; and periscopes five, eleven to thirteen, fifteen to sixteen, nineteen, and twenty to twenty-three forming a "Chu" section. In addition, pericope eighteen is described as a "Jin-Chu" section.[17]

The form of the characters found in the *Xinian* is consistent with a provenance from the kingdom of Chu; however, the same certainty

14. For the original proposition of this theory; see Zhang Zheng 張錚, "Hunan Cili chutu Chujian neirong bianxi" 湖南慈利出土楚簡內容辨析, *Qiusuo* 求索 2007.6, 212–13, 188). It is also discussed in some detail in Xia Dekao 夏德靠, "Lun Cili Chujian de xingzhi" 論慈利楚簡的性質, *Kaili xueyuan xuebao* 凱里學院學報 29.2 (2011), 43–45.

15. See Li Xueqin, "*Xinian* chuban de zhongyao yiyi."

16. See Xu Zhaochang 許兆昌, Qi Dandan 齊丹丹, "Shilun Qinghua jian *Xinian* de bianzuan tedian" 試論清華簡繫年的編纂特點, *Gudai wenming* 古代文明 6.2 (2012), 60–66.

17. Yuri Pines, "Zhou History and Historiography: Introducing the Bamboo Manuscript *Xinian*," *T'oung Pao* 100.4–5 (2014), 294.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

does not pertain for the contents. Indeed, the vocabulary in use in the *Xinian* (in particular some of the grammatical particles found in this text) are not common in Warring States era writings from Chu. This has led to Chen Minzhen 陳民鎮 raising the possibility that the text originally derived—either in whole or in part—from elsewhere and the Qinghua manuscript was simply a copy produced in Chu.[18] I would like to suggest that the *Zhushu jinian* here forms an instructive parallel. Scholars working on this text have accepted that the *Zhushu jinian* is derived from two source texts: one an annalistic history of the early dynasties of Chinese history and the second an annalistic history of the state of Jin, and subsequently the state of Wei.[19] In spite of the manifest problems with attempting to classify the *Xinian*, and the difficulties caused by the fact that this text uses two different calendars, there seems to have been considerable reluctance to accept that it could be a compilation.[20] Here, I suggest that the *Xinian* manuscript should be considered as the uniform product of a single hand, but where the contents derive from five different source texts. One is a collection of accounts concerning the late Western Zhou dynasty and the circumstances surrounding the founding of the Eastern Zhou dynasty (A: pericopes 1–4). The second source text is a selection of scandalous stories which have a particular importance for the history of the kingdom of Chu (B: pericopes 5 and 15). This text can be distinguished from Source Text D, which also focuses on the history of Chu, by its lack of explicit dates. There is also some overlap in material—the beginning of pericope twenty repeats information from the end of pericope fifteen, suggesting again that the *Xinian* was compiled from a variety of sources. Then there is a group of closely-related stories concerning the history of the state of Jin during the time of Lord Wen of Jin 晉文公 (r. 636–628 B.C.E.) and his successors (C: pericopes 6–10). This focuses on a very narrow time-period of just over twenty years (636–614 B.C.E.), though the text

18. Chen Minzhen, "*Xinian* guzhi shuo," 52–55. A related theory is proposed in Zhu Xiaohai 朱曉海, "Lun Qinghua jian suowei *Xinian* de shuji xingzhi" 論清華簡所謂繫年的書籍性質, *Zhongzheng hanxue yanjiu* 中正漢學研究 2012.2, 40, who regards this text as notes on events in the history of the Zhou dynasty, produced within the kingdom of Chu, as recorded by a non-professional historian.

19. The distinction between these two source texts was recorded from the very earliest accounts of the *Zhushu jinian*; see for example *Jinshu*, 51:1432. See also David Nivison, *The Riddle of the Bamboo Annals* (Taipei: Airiti Press, 2009).

20. Li Xuying 李旭穎, "*Xinian* yu *Zuozhuan* suozai shishi bijiao yanjiu" 繫年與左傳所載史事比較研究 (Unpublished MA dissertation, Hebei shifan daxue, 2012), 45–48 considers the possibility that the *Xinian* is a compilation, but does not suggest attributions for the different sections of the manuscript. This study is also unusual in proposing that the compiler might have been a travelling scholar from Jin, temporarily visiting the kingdom of Chu.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

does not always make explicit reference to dating. In this section, although the narrative is divided into different pericopes, the account flows smoothly from one to the next. There is a source text focusing on the history of the kingdom of Chu (D: pericopes 11–13, 16, 19, 21–23); and a source text focusing on the history of the state of Jin (E: pericopes 14, 17–18, 20). Both D and E are characterized by careful attention to dating, furthermore E can be distinguished from C by the unconnected narrative and the much longer time-span under consideration: nearly two hundred years. This internal arrangement is significant not only for understanding how the text was composed, but also for demonstrating its authenticity. It is extremely unlikely that a forger would produce so complex an arrangement of material.

The transcription of the text given below follows that published in 2011 in the *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* 清華大學藏戰國竹簡 (Warring States era Bamboo Books in the Collection of Qinghua University), with loan characters indicated by [graph] and additions indicated by 【graph】. Duplicate characters and contractions will be indicated as they are in the original manuscript, with the mark = followed by the relevant additional character in parentheses. In the case of amendments made by other scholars, the attribution will be given in a footnote. In each case the number on the back of the strip will be indicated first in subscript, followed by the actual number of the strip determined by the scholars arranging the text for publication (1/1 and so on). Most pericopes have the punctuation mark ㄴ at the end. The exceptions are the damaged strip at the end of story thirteen, and stories fifteen and twenty-two, which simply lack this conventional mark. For the purposes of this discussion, the text has been regrouped according to the source text that it is derived from, rather than preserving the original order.

Annotated Translation

Source Text A

PERICOPE ONE

$_{1/1}$ 昔周武王監觀商王之不龔[恭]帝=[上帝], 禋祀不寠[寅]. 乃乍[作]帝伎[籍]以鬃[登]祀帝=[上帝]天神: 名之曰 $_{2/2}$ 千嗇[畝]. 以克反商邑, 尃[敷]政天下. 孝=[至于]東=王=[厲王, 厲王]大癆[虐]于周卿孳[士]者[諸]正萬民, 弗刃[忍]于乎[厥]心, $_{3/3}$ 乃歸東[厲]王于敔[彘]. 龍[共]白[伯]和立十又四年, 東[厲]王生洹=王=(宣王. 宣王)即立[位], 龔[共]白[伯]和歸于宋[宗]. 洹[宣] $_{4/4}$ 王乃訊[始]弃[棄]帝伎[籍]弗畋[田]. 立 卋[三十]又九年, 戎乃大敗周自[師]于千嗇[畝].ㄴ

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1/1 In the past, King Wu of Zhou observed that the Shang king did not respect God on High,[21] and that sacrifices were not performed reverently.[22] Therefore, he created divine revenue [fields] in order to present sacrifice to God on High and the Spirit of Heaven: the name of this place was 2/2 Qianmu.[23] Thus he conquered the Shang, spreading good government across the entire world. In the time of King Li (r. 878–841 B.C.E.), King Li behaved with great cruelty to the ministers, elders, and the common people of Zhou, so that they could no longer bear it in their hearts, 3/3 therefore they exiled King Li to Che (Zhi).[24] In the fourteenth year of the reign of He, the earl of Gong [865 B.C.E.], King Li had a son named King Xuan (r. 827–782 B.C.E.). When King Xuan came to the throne, He, earl of Gong, went home to live in Song (Zong).[25] King 4/4

21. As noted by Yoshimoto Michimasa 吉本道雅, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō" 清華簡繫年考, *Kyōtō daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiyō* 京都大學文學部研究紀要 52 (2013), 1–94), 6, in using terms like *jianguan* 監觀 (to observe), the section of the *Xinian* that deals with Western Zhou dynasty history draws on the same vocabulary as the *Shijing* 詩經 (Book of Songs); this term is also found in Zheng Xuan 鄭玄, Kong Yingda 孔穎達, *Mao Shi zhengyi* 毛詩正義 (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 1999), 1018 ("Huangyi" 皇矣). Such usage confirms the observation made by Yuri Pines, "Zhou History and Historiography," 295, that the wording of the opening parts of this text is more formal and archaic than later sections.

22. This translation follows the original transcription of the text, which gives the character 帝 as a contraction of the two characters *Shangdi* 上帝 (God on High). Chen Qinxiang 陳勤香, "Du Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhaji" 讀清華簡繫年札記, *Yuwen xuekan* 語文學刊 2014.7, 24, suggests instead that 帝 is simply a variant form for the character *di* 帝, with = indication duplication rather than contraction.

23. For a study of the revenue fields (*jitian* 籍田) of the Zhou dynasty; see Li Bai 李白, "Zhoudai jitian li kaolun" 周代籍田禮考論, *Nongye kaogu* 農業考古 2012.3, 24–29; and Yang Yanmin 楊燕民, "Zhongguo gudai jitian liyi zhongzhong" 中國古代籍田禮儀種種, *Neimenggu shehui kexue (Wenshizhe ban)* 內蒙古社會科學 (文史哲版) 1990.6, 89–95.

24. The translation here follows the annotations in Su Jianzhou 蘇建洲, Wu Wenwen 吳雯雯, Lai Yixuan 賴怡璇, *Qinghua er Xinian jijie* 清華二繫年集解 (Taipei: Wanjuanlou, 2013), 18, that three groups of people were oppressed by King Li of Zhou.

25. Song is here amended to Zong on the basis of the commentary by Sima Biao 司馬彪 (243–306) on the "Rangwang" 讓王 (Yielding Kingship) chapter of the *Zhuangzi* 莊子; see Guo Qingfan 郭慶藩, *Zhuangzi jishi* 莊子集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2008), 983–84: "In the troubles of King Li of Zhou, the Son of Heaven vacated [the throne] and all the lords requested that he become the Son of Heaven, but the earl of Gong refused. However, he did act as king. In the fourteenth year there was a great drought and the palace caught fire. A divination was performed with respect to the sun and the interpretation said: 'King Li is causing this evil.' The duke of Shao then established King Xuan. The earl of Gong went back to Zong, enjoying himself happily on top of Mt. Gong." (周厲王之難, 天子曠絕, 諸侯皆請以為天子, 共伯不聽. 即干王位. 十四年大旱室焚, 卜於太陽, 兆曰: "厲王為祟." 召公乃立宣王. 共伯復歸於宗, 逍遥得意共山之首). These events are also mentioned in the *Zhushu jinian*; see Hong Yixuan 洪頤煊,

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Xuan was the first to abandon the divine revenue fields and not to cultivate them.[26] He was on the throne for thirty-nine years and then the Rong nomadic people inflicted a serious defeat on the Zhou army at Qianmu.[27]

PERICOPE TWO

5/5 周幽王取妻于西繒[申], 生坪[平]王=[王. 王] 或[又]叡[取]孚[褒]人之女, 是孚[褒]忩[姒], 生白[伯]盤. 孚[褒]忩[姒]辟[嬖]于王=[王, 王] 6/6 與白[伯]盤, 达[逐]坪[平]=王=[平王, 平王] 走西繒[申]. 幽王起自[師]回[圍]坪[平]王于西繒[申]=[申, 申]人弗敗[畀]. 曾[繒]人乃降西戎以 7/7 攻幽=王=[幽王. 幽王]及白[伯]盤乃滅, 周乃亡. 邦君者[諸]正乃立幽王之弟會[余]臣于虩[虢], 是噣[攜]惠王. 8/8 立廿=[二十]又一年, 晉文侯穀[仇]乃殺惠王于虩[虢]. 周亡王九年, 邦君者[諸]侯亥[焉]冟[始]不朝于周. 9/9 晉文侯乃逆坪[平]王于少鄂, 立之于京自[師]. 三年乃東遷[徙], 止于成周. 晉人亥[焉]冟[始]啟 10/10 于京自[師]. 奠[鄭]武公亦政[正]東方之者[諸]侯. 武 公即殜[世], 臧[莊]公即立[位]; 臧[莊]公即殜[世], 邵[昭]公即立 [位]. 11/11 其夫=[大夫]高之巨[渠]爾[彌]殺邵[昭]公而立其弟子釁[眉]壽. 齊襄公會者[諸] 侯于首沚[止], 殺子 12/12 釁[眉]壽, 車豎[轘]高之巨[渠]爾[彌], 改立東[厲]公. 奠[鄭]以冟[始]政[正]. 楚文王以啟于灘[漢]湯[陽].ㄴ

5/5 King You of Zhou (r. 781–771 B.C.E.) took a wife from Western Shen, and she gave birth to King Ping.[28] The king also took a woman from the people of Fu (Bao),[29] this was Lady Fu Si (Bao Si), and she

Zhushu jinian 竹書紀年 (Sibu beiyao edn.), B:8a–b. On the basis of the similarity between the two accounts, Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 8, considers that the *Xinian* and *Zhushu jinian* were here derived from a single source.

26. Lei Xiaopeng 雷曉鵬, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* yu Zhou Xuanwang 'bu ji Qianmu' xin yan" 清華簡繫年與周宣王 '不籍千畝' 新研, *Zhongguo nongye* 中國農業 2014.4, 56–63, argues that the failure in ritual here ascribed to King Xuan of Zhou should be understood as a comprehensive failure in government as well: the abandonment of the revenue fields indicating serious disruption in agriculture in general.

27. These events are also mentioned in the *Guoyu*; see Shanghai shifan daxue guji zhenglizu 上海師範大學古籍整理組, *Guoyu* 國語 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1978), 22 ("Zhouyu shang" 周語上), which again states specifically that the battle of Qianmu was lost by the forces of King Xuan in the thirty-ninth year of his reign (789 B.C.E.).

28. As noted by Li Xueqin, "You Qinghua jian *Xinian* lun 'Wenhou zhi ming'" 由清華簡繫年論 '文侯之命', *Yangzhou daxue xuebao (Renwen shehui kexue ban)* 揚州大學學報 (人文社會科學版) 2013.3, 50, the *Xinian* follows Zhou dynasty usage in clarifying that this is Western Shen as opposed to Southern Shen, a state recorded in a number of bronze inscriptions. This issue was also discussed in an earlier publication by the same author; see Li Xueqin, "Lun Zhongchengfu gui yu Shenguo" 論仲稱父簋與申國, *Zhongyuan wenwu* 中原文物 1984.4, 31–32, 39.

29. The two characters Fu 孚 (pû) and Bao 褒 (phu R!) were phonetically similar in ancient Chinese pronunciation; see Axel Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), 182–83.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gave birth to Bopan.[30] Lady Fu Si was favoured by the king. His Majesty $_{6/6}$ loved Bopan, and thus forced King Ping into exile: King Ping fled to Western Shen.[31] King You raised an army and laid siege to King Ping at Western Shen, but the people of Shen were not afraid. The people of Zeng then joined with the Western Rong in order $_{7/7}$ to attack King You; King You and Bopan were killed and the Zhou dynasty was destroyed. The lords of the various states and the elders then established King You's younger brother, Yuchen, in Guo, and he became King Hui of Xie (r. 770–750 B.C.E.). $_{8/8}$ He was established for twenty-one years, after which Chou, Marquis Wen of Jin (r. 780–746 B.C.E.), killed King Hui in Guo. Zhou was without a king for nine years (749–741 B.C.E.), so the lords of the various states began not to pay court to Zhou. $_{9/9}$ Marquis Wen of Jin met King Ping at Shao'e and had him take the throne in the capital.[32] In the third year (738 B.C.E.), he moved the capital east, taking up residence in Chengzhou. The people of Jin then began to open up land $_{10/10}$ around the capital. Lord Wu of Zheng (r. 771–744 B.C.E.) was the leader of the lords in the eastern regions. When Lord Wu passed away, Lord Zhuang (r. 743–701 B.C.E.) was established; when Lord Zhuang passed away, Lord Zhao (r. 700–695 B.C.E.) was established.[33] $_{11/11}$ His Grandee Gao Zhi Juer (Gao Qumi) killed Lord

30. In the transmitted tradition, the son of King You and Lady Bao Si is named Bofu. Many commentators cite a quotation from the *Zhushu jinian* (not found in the transmitted text) using the name Bopan; see for example Kong Yingda 孔穎達, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushu* 春秋左傳注疏 (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 2000), 1698 (Zhao 26).

31. If the chronology given by other ancient texts is correct, Lady Bao Si arrived in the palace in the 3rd year of King You's reign, and Prince Bopan was established as the Crown Prince in the 8th year, as a small child. See *Shiji*, 4.147; and *Zhushu jinian*, B:11a respectively. Therefore, Chen Wei 陳偉, "Du Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhaji san" 讀清華簡繫年札記三, *Jianghan kaogu* 江漢考古 2012.3, 118, suggests that it is unlikely that *Wang yu Bopan zhu Pingwang* 王與伯盤逐平王 means: "His Majesty and Bopan forced King Ping into exile." Instead, *yu* 與 is a verb: "to love."

32. For *jingshi* 京師 as a term meaning the place of residence of the Son of Heaven; see He Xiu 何休, Xu Yan 徐彥, *Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan zhushu* 春秋公羊傳注疏 (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 1999), 94 (Huan 9). Dong Shan 董珊, "Du Qinghua jian *Xinian*" 讀清華繫年 (http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/SrcShow.asp?Src_ID=1752 [accessed on September 30, 2014]), suggests that this refers to the capital city of Jin, and not (as the annotators of the 2011 publication suggest) the Zhou capital Zongzhou 宗周. This usage is testified to in a number of Jin bronzes such as the Jin Jiang *ding* 晉姜鼎.

33. In the transmitted tradition, the expression *jishi* 即世 (to pass away) is particularly associated with its many appearances in the *Zuozhuan*; see Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 18, being used but rarely in other historical texts. This confirms the impression that the *Xinian* and the *Zuozhuan* are closely related. As noted by Yuri Pines, "Zhou History and Historiography," 298, when the deaths of monarchs—particularly the kings of Chu—are mentioned in the *Xinian*, this formal term is used. It appears only sporadically when the deaths of lords are recorded.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zhao and established his younger brother Xinshou (Meishou).[34] Lord Xiang of Qi (r. 698–686 B.C.E.) met the other lords at Shouzhi, killing the unratified lord, $_{12/12}$ Xinshou, and rending Gao Zhi Juer apart with chariots. He established Lord Li instead (r. 700–673 B.C.E.) and the state of Zheng began from this point on to be well-governed.[35] King Wen of Chu then opened up land at Tanyang (Hanyang).[36]

PERICOPE THREE

$_{13/13}$ 周武王既克嚚[殷], 乃執[設]三監于殷. 武王陟, 商邑興反, 殺三監而立窠子耿. 成 $_{14/14}$ 王屎[纘]伐商邑, 殺窠子耿.[37] 飛曆[廉]東逃于商盍[蓋]氏, 成王 伐商盍[蓋], 殺飛曆[廉], 西覃[遷]商 $_{15/15}$ 盍[蓋]之民于邾虗[吾], 以御奴虞之戎: 是秦先=[先人], 殜[世]乍[作]周屈[扞]. 周室即[既]窜[卑]坪[平]王東遷, 止于成 $_{16/16}$ 周. 秦中[仲]玄[焉] 東居周地以戰[守] 周之壅[墳]墓[墓]. 秦以𠂤[始]大.ㄴ

$_{13/13}$ When King Wu of Zhou defeated the Yin, he established the Three Guardians in Yin. When King Wu died, the Shang city rose in rebellion, killing the Three Guardians and establishing Geng, Viscount of Lu.[38]

---

34. The *Xinian* is notable for preserving the vocative forms of many personal names. For an analysis of Zhi 之 as a vocative; see Yang Shuda 楊樹達, *Gushu yiyi juli dubu* 古書疑義舉例讀補 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1991), 4. The *Zuozhuan*, 150 (Huan 17), which also mentions these events, does not make the relationship between Lord Zhao and the new ruler installed by Gao Qumi clear; the *Xinian* provides the information that they are brothers.

35. According to the *Zuozhuan*, 132 (Huan 11), the two half-brothers Lord Zhao and Lord Li were originally established simultaneously as the ruler of Zheng by different factions within the court. In the circumstances it was impossible for either to fully establish their authority. It was not until 694 B.C.E. when Lord Zhao was dead and Lord Xiang of Qi had purged the court that the situation was resolved.

36. In the *Zuozhuan*, 459 (Xi 28), it states that by 632 B.C.E., all the Ji states in the Hanyang region had been conquered by Chu. Here, the *Xinian* places this conquest as early as the reign of King Wen of Chu.

37. The reading of the character *shi* 屎 as *zuan* 纘 follows Huang Tiantian 黃甜甜, "*Xinian* disanzhang Chengwang shi fa Shangyi zhi shizi bulun" 繫年第三章成王屎伐商邑之屎字補論, *Shenzhen daxue xuebao (Renwen shehui kexue ban)* 深圳大學學報(人文社會科學報) 29.2 (2012), 53–56.

38. The character Lu is being read by analogy to the text of the Taibao *gui* 太保簋, which records the same individual: Geng, Viscount of Lu 录子耿 or Sheng, Viscount of Lu 录子聖. See Shirakawa Shizuka 白川靜, *Kinbun tsūshaku* 金文通釋 (Vol. 1A; Kobe: Hakutsuru bijutsukan, 1964), 59–60; and Yin Weizhang 殷瑋璋, Cao Shuqin 曹淑琴, "Zhouchu Taibaoqi zonghe yanjiu" 周初太保器綜合研究, *Kaogu xuebao* 考古學報 1991.1, 5–6. The text of the Taibao *gui* specifically mentions the rebellion of Shang loyalists; for a translation of the inscription, see Edward Shaughnessy, *Before Confucius: Studies in the Creation of the Chinese Classics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 138.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

King 14/14 Cheng repeatedly attacked the Shang city, killing Geng, Viscount of Lu.[39] Feilian fled east to the Shanggai clan, whereupon King Cheng attacked Shanggai and killed Feilian.[40] He moved the people of Shang 15/15 gai west to Zhuwu, in order that they might control the Nuzha Rong.[41] These were the ancestors of the Qin.[42] From one generation to the next they were the protectors of Zhou.[43] When the Zhou royal house declined, King Ping moved east and took up residence in Cheng 16/16 zhou. At this point Qin Zhong moved east into the lands of Zhou, in order to guard the tombs of the Zhou [ruling house].[44] Qin then began to become an important [state].

---

39. The attack by King Cheng's forces on the Shang city is also mentioned in the text of the Kanghou *gui* 康侯簋. Tang Lan 唐蘭, *Xi-Zhou qingtongqi mingwen fendai shizheng* 西周青銅器銘文分代史徵 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), 12, suggests that the term Shangyi 商邑 (Shang city) in this inscription should be understood as a reference to the former Shang dynasty capital.

40. Feilian is also described as as the founding father of the state of Qin in *Shiji*, 5.174–75. Here, however, his name is given as Feilian 蜚廉.

41. For the identification of Zhuwu as the Maojiaping 毛家坪 site in Gangu County 甘谷縣, Gansu Province; see Li Xueqin, "Tan Qinren chu ju 'Zhuwu' de dili weizhi" 談秦人初居邾吾的地理位置, *Chutu wenxian* 出土文獻 2 (2011), 1–5. There are many different branches of the Rong nomadic people recorded in the transmitted tradition and in inscriptions on excavated bronzes; for a study of what is known of these particular people see Li Xueqin, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* Nuzha zhi Rong shikao" 清華簡繫年奴虘之戎試考, *Shehui kexue zhanxian* 社會科學戰綫 2011.2, 27–28.

42. The origin of the state of Qin has long been a matter of debate with various scholars suggesting either that this state was founded by a branch of a Western nomadic people, or by remnants of the Shang polity. For an overview of these theories; see Tian Xudong 田旭東, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* yu Qinren xiqian xintan" 清華簡繫年與秦人西遷新探, *Qin-Han yanjiu* 秦漢研究 6 (2012), 36–41. The *Xinian* does not solve this problem; it merely provides one more account suggesting a relationship with the Shang.

43. This translation follows the annotations of the original publication in reading 屈 as *han* 扞 (to protect); this reading is also favoured by Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 23. Various other alternatives have been offered; Xiaohu 小狐, "Du *Xinian* yizha" 讀繫年臆札 (http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/SrcShow.asp?Src_ID=1766 [accessed on 20 July, 2015]), suggests *han* 翰 (under the auspices of); Huadong shifan daxue zhongwenxi Zhanguo jian dushu xiaozu 華東師範大學中文系戰國簡讀書小組, "Du *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian er. Xinian* shu hou (yi)" 讀清華大學藏戰國竹簡二.繫年書後(一) (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=1609 [accessed on 20 July, 2015]), suggests fu 服 (to submit to); Dong Shan, "Du Qinghua jian *Xinian*," suggests *pei* 陪 (to accompany).

44. Niu Pengtao 牛鵬濤, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* yu tongqi mingwen huzheng erze" 清華簡繫年與銅器銘文互證二則, *Shenzhen daxue xuebao (Renwen shehui kexue bao)* 29.2 (2012), 49 argues that Qin Zhong should be understood specifically as Lord Xiang of Qin 秦襄公 (r. 777–766 B.C.E.).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PERICOPE FOUR

$_{17/17}$ 周成王, 周公既䜌[遷]殷民于洛邑, 乃岂[追]念蹟[夏]商之亡由, 方[旁]執[設]出宗子, 以乍[作]周厚 $_{18/18}$ 鳴[屏], 乃先建衛[衛]弔[叔]垏[封]于庚[康]丘以侯殷之夆[餘]民. 衛[衛]人自庚[康]丘䜌[遷]于沂[淇]衛[衛]. 周惠王立十 $_{19/19}$ 又七年赤鄗[翟]王逋虘迟[起] 岂[師]伐衛[衛], 大敗衛[衛]岂[師]於景. 幽侯滅玄[焉], 翟述[遂]居衛=[衛. 衛]人乃東 $_{20/20}$ 涉河䜌[遷]于曹玄[焉]立悳[戴]公申. 公子啟方奔齊. 訾[戴]公巒[卒], 齊趄[桓]公會 者[諸]侯以成[城]楚丘, □ $_{21/21}$ 公子啟方玄[焉]是文=公=[文公. 文公]即殜[世], 成公即立[位]. 翟人或[又]涉河伐衛于楚丘, 衛人自楚丘 $_{22/22}$ 䜌[遷]于帝丘.ㄴ

$_{17/17}$ When King Cheng of Zhou and the Duke of Zhou moved the Yin people to Luoyi, they remembered the reasons why the Xia and the Shang dynasties had collapsed.[45] Thus they established junior members of the ruling house [in fiefs] far and wide in order that they might act as a protective $_{18/18}$ screen for Zhou.[46] Thus they initially established Wei Diao Feng (Wei Shu Feng) at Gengqiu (Kangqiu), in order that he might rule over the remaining Yin people.[47] The men of Wei from Gengqiu moved to Qiwei. In the seventeenth $_{19/19}$ year [660 B.C.E.] of the reign of King Hui of Zhou (r. 676–652 B.C.E.), King Liuhu of the Red Di raised an army and attacked Wei.[48] He inflicted a terrible defeat on the Wei army at Qiong, and Marquis You (r. 668–660 B.C.E.)

45. The translation here follows the annotations provided by the original publication. However, Chen Wei, "Du Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhaji," 118, suggests that this sentence should be read as: "they remembered that the Xia and Shang dynasties had no descendants [maintaining ancestral sacrifices]" (乃追念夏商之亡胄).

46. The concept of regional lords forming a protective screen is also found in the transmitted tradition; see for example Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, Zhang Maorong 張懋鎔, Tian Xudong 田旭東, *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu* 逸周書彙校集注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1995), 997 ("Jigong" 祭公).

47. As noted by Li Xueqin, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* jieda feng Wei yimi" 清華簡繫年解答封衛疑謎, *Wenshi zhishi* 文史知識 2012.3, 13–15, there has been much speculation over the terms of the "Kanggao" 康誥 (Announcement to Kang) text in the *Shangshu* 尚書 (Book of Documents), which some imperial era scholars read as meaning that the state of Wei was first founded by Kang Shu in the reign of King Wu of Zhou. The *Xinian* makes it clear that this enfeoffment occurred in the reign of King Cheng.

48. The *Zhushu jinian*, B:15b is the only other ancient text to specify that it was the Red Di that invaded Wei in this year. The *Xinian* is unique in naming the ruler concerned. Huadong shifan daxue zhongwenxi Zhanguo jian dushu xiaozu 華東師範大學中文系戰國簡讀書小組, "Du *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian er. Xinian* shu hou (er)" 讀清華大學藏戰國竹簡二.繫年書後(二) (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=1611 [accessed on 20 July, 2015]), suggest that Liuhu of the Red Di should be understood as the same person as Liuxu 留吁, whose death at the hands of the Jin army is mentioned in the *Chunqiu*, 766 (Xuan 16).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was killed by him.[49] The Di thereupon occupied Wei, and the people of Wei moved east and crossed $_{20/20}$ the Yellow River, travelling towards Cao. They established Shen, Lord Dai [of Wei] (r. 660–659 B.C.E.) as their new ruler, and the Honourable Qifang fled to Qi.[50] When Lord Dai passed away, Lord Huan of Qi (r. 685–643 B.C.E.) summoned all the regional lords with a view to fortifying Chuqiu, [one character illegible in the original text; from context this should be "establishing"] $_{21/21}$ the Honourable Qifang there: he became Lord Wen (r. 659–641 B.C.E.).[51] When Lord Wen passed away, Lord Cheng (r. 640–606 B.C.E.) was established. The Di people again crossed the Yellow River and attacked Wei at Chuqiu, so the Wei people had to $_{22/22}$ move from Chuqiu to Diqiu.

* * *

This group of stories focuses primarily on the reigns of four Zhou dynasty monarchs: Kings Li, Xuan, You and Ping. The first story concerns the regency of the earl of Gong; the *Xinian* confirms the account of these events given in the *Zhushu jinian*, which was the first textual discovery to alert scholars to a mistake in the *Shiji*.[52] The *Shiji* states that after King Li abandoned the capital in the wake of serious political upheavals: "The two prime ministers, the duke of Shao and the duke of Zhou, were in charge of the government, and they took the

49. The posthumous title of this ruler is normally given as Lord Yi of Wei 衛懿公. The place of his defeat and death at the hands of the Di is recorded in the transmitted tradition as the Ying Marshes (Yingze 熒澤); see *Zuozhuan*, 265–66 (Wen 2). According to some accounts of these events, Lord Yi's body was eaten by the victors; see for example Xu Weiyu 許維遹, *Han Shi waizhuan jishi* 韓詩外傳集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2005), 252–53 (7.11).

50. The term *gongzi* 公子 is here translated as "Honourable" following British usage, as this is the system commonly used to translate other Zhou dynasty aristocratic titles. Honourable is the basic title of all children of aristocrats, though in practice they may be more commonly known by a courtesty title, for example when indicating the individual's status as heir.

51. According to the *Shiji*, 37.1594–1955, Lord Dai and Lord Wen of Wei were brothers. However, Lord Wen's personal name is usually given as Hui 燬. The Honourable Qifang of Wei is mentioned in Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi* 呂氏春秋新校釋 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2002), 979 ("Zhijie" 知接) as one of Lord Huan of Qi's ministers, and his name is given in other texts as the Honourable Kaifang 公子開方; see for example Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, *Han Feizi jishi* 韓非子集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1958), 194–95 ("Shiguo" 十過). The *Xinian* suggests that Qifang/Kaifang and Hui, Lord Wen of Wei, were one and the same person; in which case he can have played no role in the death of Lord Huan of Qi. This confirms the analysis of Noma Fumichika 野間文史, "Sei Kankō no saiki to *Saden* no seiritsu" 斉桓公の最期と左伝の成立, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 87 (1994), 28–41, that the stories concerning conflict at the time of Lord Huan of Qi's death were a late Warring States era invention.

52. *Zhushu jinian*, B:8a.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

title: 'United and Harmonious'" (*Shaogong, Zhougong erxiang xingzheng, hao yue Gonghe* 召公周公二相行政, 號曰共和): that is, Sima Qian had misunderstood the name "He of Gong" as an epithet.[53] The *Xinian* suggests that the eventual transfer of power from the earl of Gong to King Xuan was peaceful; this echoes the closely-related account given in the *Lu Lianzi* 魯連子, a text dated to the Warring States era which now survives only in a handful of quotations.[54]

In the second story, the *Xinian* provides important clarification concerning one of the major scandals of the Zhou dynasty; the civil war which broke out when King You attempted to dispossess his Crown Prince. According to the *Shiji*, King You was killed and Lady Bao Si taken prisoner; the fate of their son, Prince Bofu, is not mentioned.[55] This raised the possibility that he survived the sack of the Zhou capital, a theory which was thoroughly explored by imperial era commentators on historical texts. Of particular interest to those scholars who wanted to trace the fate of Prince Bofu was the cryptic reference to the king of Xie preserved in the *Zuozhuan*: "The king of Xie was in violation of the statutes so the lords dismissed him" (*Xiewang jian ming zhuhou ti zhi* 携王奸命諸侯替之).[56] In the commentary by Du Yu (222–85), this king of Xie is specifically identified as Prince Bofu, and his lead was followed by many later imperial era scholars.[57] However, the *Zhushu jinian* provides a different account, which is more closely related to that found in the *Xinian*:

> 犬戎殺王子伯服, 執褒姒以歸. 申侯, 魯侯, 許男, 鄭子立宜臼于申; 虢公翰立王子余臣于攜.
>
> The Quanrong killed Prince Bofu and captured Lady Bao Si, taking her away with them. The marquis of Shen, the marquis of Lu, the baron of Xu and the unratified lord of Zheng established Yijiu in Shen [as King Ping]. Lord Han of Guo established Prince Yuchen in Xie.[58]

---

53. *Shiji*, 4.144. For a study of the figure of He, earl of Gong, in the context of the *Xinian* text; see Tao Xinghua 陶興華, "Cong Qinghua jian *Xinian* kan 'Gonghe' yu 'Gonghe xingzheng'" 從清華簡繫年看共和與共和行政, *Gudai wenming* 7.2 (2013), 57–62.

54. This text is quoted in *Shiji*, 4.144n1, having been incorporated into the *Zhengyi* 正義 (Correct Meanings) commentary.

55. See *Shiji*, 4.149. Sima Qian's failure to even mention the existence of the king of Xie in the *Shiji* has been the subject of criticism since at least the Qing dynasty; see Liang Yusheng 梁玉繩, *Shiji zhiyi* 史記志疑 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2006), 103.

56. See *Zuozhuan*, 1476 (Zhao 26).

57. See Du Yu 杜預, *Chunqiu jingzhuan jijie* 春秋經傳集解 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2007), 1599n19 (Zhao 26). See also the *Suoyin* 索隱 (Seeking the Obscure) commentary on the *Shiji* by Sima Zhen 司馬貞 (679–732); *Shiji*, 4.148n16; and the commentary by Wei Zhao 韋昭 (204–73) on the *Guoyu*, 256n8 ("Jinyu" 晉語 1).

58. *Zhushu jinian*, B:11b. This account does not indicate how Prince Yuchen was related to the ruling house, but this omission is rectified by the *Xinian*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Again, the *Zhushu jinian* agrees with the *Xinian* that King Hui was killed by Lord Wen of Jin some twenty-one years later (750 B.C.E.).[59] This has been taken to mean that when King You died, the divisions between different factions in the ruling elite were so strong that the realm effectively split into two. King Hui of Xie, King You's younger brother, was established by the senior ministers and hereditary aristocracy of Zhou. At the same time, King Ping of Zhou was based elsewhere, and would likely have had the greatest difficulty in unifying the country again were it not for the fact that his cause was supported by Marquis Wen of Jin. To add to this impression of a dangerously divided country, a quotation from the *Zhushu jinian* given by Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574–648)—not found in the transmitted text—states that King Ping was already crowned by his supporters before King You's death, suggesting that there was a succession of double monarchies in Zhou during this time.[60]

An alternative theory for understanding the sequence of events at the time of the collapse of the Western Zhou dynasty has been proposed by Wang Hui 王暉.[61] In this reading of the *Xinian*, there was no double monarchy at all—on the death of King You, his younger brother was established as the ruler. When King Hui of Xie was murdered, a further nine years of chaos ensued, followed by the establishment of King Ping, who subsequently moved the capital of his kingdom to the east. The *Xinian* states that "there was no king of Zhou for nine years" (*Zhou wang wang jiu nian* 周亡王九年). Various other scholars have attempted to explain this statement: Wang Hongliang 王紅亮 has suggested that this refers back in time to the era immediately prior to the death of King You, when the monarch had alienated his lords.[62] Alternatively, it has been suggested that it refers to the time immediately after the civil war, when King Ping and King Hui were both on the throne; however, it would seem there was a plethora of kings rather

59. See *Zhushu jinian*, B:12b. Two readings have been provided for this date: the twenty-first year of the reign of King Ping (750 B.C.E.), or the twenty-first year of the reign of Marquis Wen of Jin (760 B.C.E.), with the latter suggestion being proposed by Wang Guowei 王國維, *Guben Zhushu jinian jijiao* 古本竹書紀年輯校 (Shenyang: Liaoning renmin, 1997), 17. Modern scholars generally accept that the first of these dates is correct; see Wei Dong 魏棟, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* yu Xiewang zhi mi" 清華簡繫年與携王之謎, *Wenshi zhishi* 2013.6, 34.

60. See Kong Yingda, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushu*, 1697 (Zhao 26).

61. See Wang Hui 王暉, "Chunqiu zaoqi Zhou wangshi wangwei shixi bianju kaoyi: Jian shuo Qinghua jian *Xinian* Zhou wu wang jiu nian" 春秋早期周王室王位世系變局考異兼說清華簡繫年周無王九年, *Renwen zazhi* 人文雜誌 2013.5, 75–81.

62. Wang Hongliang 王紅亮, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhong Zhou Pingwang dong qian de xiangguan niandai kao" 清華簡繫年中周平王東遷的相關年代考, *Shixueshi yanjiu* 史學史研究 2012.4, 103.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

than an absence at that point.[63] Wang Hui therefore proposes a strictly chronological reading of the *Xinian*: King You and Prince Bopan were killed—King Hui of Xie ruled for twenty-one years—there was a nine-year interregnum—King Ping came to the throne and three years later moved the capital to the east. This would mean that King Ping's reign was nearly thirty years shorter than previously thought, and that the chaos and upheavals of the three decades following the death of King You are likely to have been much more profound than suggested in later texts; the difficulties of this era have been elided within the historical tradition aimed at enhancing the legitimacy of Zhou rule in general, and that of King Ping in particular.[64] There is a very good reason why the chronology of the *Xinian* should be so different from that found in the transmitted tradition: subsequent generations had a considerable interest in minimizing the suggestion that King Ping and the marquis of Jin were regicides.[65] A text derived from outside the mainstream Zhou tradition would be more likely to record this fact than one produced under the auspices of the descendants of King Ping and his cohort.

The third story gives an account of the rebellions launched by remnants of the Shang regime against Zhou authority in the early years of the dynasty. In the *Yizhou shu* 逸周書 (Lost History of Zhou) it says: "King Wu conquered the Shang and then he established Prince Lufu, ordering him to take charge of the Shang sacrifices. He established Guan Shu in the east and he established Cai Shu and Huo Shu in Yin, ordering them to oversee the vassals of Yin" (武王克殷. 乃立王子禄父俾守殷祀. 建管叔于東; 建蔡叔, 霍叔于殷, 俾監殷臣).[66] This makes no specific reference to the Three Guardians (Sanjian 三監); however, the Han dynasty compilation entitled the *Shangshu dazhuan* 尚書大傳 (Greater Traditions of the Book of Documents) states: "Guan Shu and Cai Shu [were responsible for] overseeing Lufu … but Lufu and the

63. The double monarchy after the death of King You is described in Chao Fulin 晁福林, "Lun Pingwang dongqian" 論平王東遷, *Lishi yanjiu* 歷史研究 1991.6, 8–23. For a reevaluation of his original conclusions in the light of the discovery of the *Xinian*; see Chao Fulin, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* yu Liang Zhou zhi jishishi de zhonggou" 清華簡繫年與兩周之際史事的重构, *Lishi yanjiu* 2013.6, 154–63.

64. Different theories concerning these events are discussed in detail in Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, *Qinghua er Xinian jijie*, 77–106.

65. This point was made strongly by Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613–1682) in his study of the 'Wenhou zhi ming 文侯之命' (Command to Marquis Wen) chapter of the *Shangshu*; see Huang Rucheng 黃汝成, *Rizhilu jishi* 日知錄集釋 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2007), 2:110.

66. Zhu Youzeng 朱右曾, *Yi Zhoushu jixun jiaoshi* 逸周書集訓校釋 (Taipei: Shijie, 1967), 48:126 ("Zuoluo jie" 作雒解).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Three Guardians rebelled" (管叔, 蔡叔, 監祿父 … 祿父及三監叛).[67] This seems to be the earliest recorded incidence within the transmitted tradition of this particular administrative title. However, the precise identity of the Three Guardians is unclear, and the *Xinian* does not assist by naming these important figures in early Western Zhou history. The majority of ancient texts mention Guan Shu and Cai Shu in tandem; a very small number also record Huo Shu, who was most likely the third of the Three Guardians.[68] However, by at least the time of the Han dynasty, these events had become confused: it is Wugeng, Guan Shu, and Cai Shu who are said to have risen in rebellion against the Zhou, only to be executed by the duke of Zhou in his capacity as regent.[69] The *Xinian* thus offers important clarification of the sequence of events. However, the identification of the Three Guardians as Guan Shu, Cai Shu, and possibly Huo Shu creates a serious problem, which has resulted in Lu Yihan 路懿菡 suggesting that this attribution is wrong.[70] As he notes, if the Three Guardians are identified specifically with Guan Shu and Cai Shu, then these two men have two irreconcilable fates attributed to them. According to the *Xinian*, they were killed by Shang loyalists; according to the transmitted tradition, most notably the *Shiji*, they were killed by the duke of Zhou for rebelling against the crown.[71] If the Three Guardians are considered to be some other (unnamed) individuals, the problem disappears. Lu Yihan's inventive suggestion unfortunately creates further problems. One issue is that his theory does not explain why a number of pre-Qin and later texts specifically associate Geng, Viscount of Lu/Wugeng with Guan Shu and Cai Shu. Furthermore, although most ancient historical texts suggest that there was only one rebellion against Zhou authority during the minority of King Cheng, Lu Yihan's theory requires that there be two: one involving Shang dynasty loyalists and one involving Guan Shu and Cai Shu, who were princes of the Zhou ruling house. On the present evidence, the issue of identification cannot be resolved.

---

67. Sun Zhilu 孫之騄, *Shangshu dazhuan* 尚書大傳 (Siku quanshu edn.), 3:3b.

68. Huo Shu is also mentioned in the account of these events given in Chen Shike 陳士珂, *Kongzi jiayu shuzheng* 孔子家語疏證 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu, 1970), 234 ("Benxing jie" 本姓解).

69. See *Hanshu*, 28B:1647.

70. Lu Yihan 路懿菡, "Cong Qinghua jian *Xinian* kan Zhouchu de Sanjian" 從清華簡繫年看周初的三監, *Liaoning shifan daxue xuebao (Shehui kexue ban)* 遼寧師范大學學報 (社會科學版) 36.6 (2013), 924–28.

71. *Shiji*, 35.1565.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Source Text B

PERICOPE FIVE

$_{23/23}$ 鄀[蔡]哀侯取妻於陳, 賽[息]侯亦取妻於陳, 是賽為=[息媽. 息媽]牆[將]歸于賽[息]迆[過]鄀=[蔡. 蔡]哀侯命歪=[止之], $_{24/24}$ 曰: "以同生[姓]之古[故]必內[入]." 賽[息]為[媽]乃內[入]于鄀=[蔡; 蔡]哀侯妻之. 賽[息]侯弗訓[順], 乃卑[使]人于楚文王 $_{25/25}$ 曰: "君盍[來]伐我. 我牆[將]求救[救]於鄀[蔡], 君玄[焉]敗之." 文王迖[起]自[師]伐賽[息]; 賽[息]侯求救[救]於鄀=[蔡. 蔡]哀侯銜[率]帀[師] $_{26/26}$ 以救[救]賽[息]. 文王敗之於新[莘]; 臒[獲]哀侯以歸. 文王為客於賽[息], 鄀[蔡]侯與從. 賽[息]侯以文 $_{27/27}$ 王歠[飲]酒. 鄀[蔡]侯智[知]賽[息]侯之誘訇[己]也. 亦告文王曰: "賽[息]侯之妻甚娟[美]. 君必命見之." 文 $_{28/28}$ 王命見之. 賽[息]侯訐[辭], 王固命見之. 既見之還. 昷[明]戠[歲]起訾[師]伐賽[息], 克之, 殺賽[息]侯取 $_{29/29}$ 賽[息]為[媽]以歸: 是生堂堵囂[敖]及成王. 文王以北啓出方成[城], 圾驫於汝, 改遊於陳, 玄[焉] $_{30/30}$ 取邾[頓]以贛[恐]陳侯.ㄴ

$_{23/23}$ Marquis Ai of Cai (r. 694–675 B.C.E.) took a wife from Chen and the marquis of Sai (Xi) (d. 683 B.C.E.) also took a wife from Chen: this was Lady Gui of Sai.[72] Lady Gui of Sai was travelling to her new home in Sai; when she passed through Cai; Marquis Ai of Cai gave orders to stop her. $_{24/24}$ He said: "Given that you are a member of the same clan, you must enter [the capital]."[73] Lady Gui of Sai thus entered Cai and Marquis Ai of Cai raped her.[74] The marquis of Sai bore a grudge about this, so he sent a messenger to King Wen of Chu $_{25/25}$ to say: "If

72. The characters Sai 賽 (sə^kh) and Xi 息 (sək) appear to have been near homophones in ancient Chinese; see Axel Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese*, 111. For a discussion of the interchangeable use of the two characters in bronze vessel inscriptions concerning the state of Xi; see Yu Haoliang 于豪亮, "Lun Xiguo he Fanguo de tongqi" 論息國和樊國的銅器, *Jianghan kaogu* 1980.2, 7–8; and He Guangyue 何光岳, "Xiguo kao" 息國考, *Shixue yuekan* 史學月刊 1988.6, 111.

73. The annotations given here by the publication team are wrong: Lord Ai of Cai makes this comment because his wife is Lady Gui of Xi's sister; see Chen Xiaoli 陳曉麗, Wan Deliang 萬德良, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* suojian Xiguo shishi xiaozha" 清華簡繫年所見息國史事小札, *Zaozhuang xueyuan xuebao* 棗莊學院學報 2013.6, 51.

74. The verb translated here as "to rape" is qi 妻, which more commonly means "to take as a wife" or "to engage in an adulterous relationship." However, given that Lady Gui has just been arrested by her brother-in-law, this cannot be a consensual relationship. The word *qi* is also used to refer to the assault inflicted by Wu Zixu 伍子胥 on the widow of King Ping of Chu 楚平王 (r. 528–516 B.C.E.) following the fall of the capital to the Wu army in 506 B.C.E.; see Yuan Kang 袁康, Wu Ping 吳平, *Yuejue shu* 越絕書 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1985), 106 ("Pianxu" 篇叙). Again, what is being described is an act of rape. When the story of Lady Gui of Xi appears in the *Zuozhuan*, 184 (Zhuang 10), the marquis of Cai is said to have lacked respect (*fu bin* 弗賓). For a comparison of how these events are described in different texts; see Cheng Wei 程薇, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* yu Xi Gui shiji" 清華簡繫年與息嬀事迹, *Wenshi zhishi* 2012:4, 45–48.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

you, my lord, come and attack me, I will request assistance from Cai and then you can defeat them." King Wen raised an army and attacked Sai, and the marquis of Sai requested assistance from Cai. Marquis Ai of Cai led his army $_{26/26}$ to rescue Sai. King Wen defeated them at Xin, capturing Marquis Ai alive and taking him home with him. King Wen went on a visit to Sai, and the marquis of Cai went with him; when the marquis of Sai offered a toast to King $_{27/27}$ Wen, the marquis of Cai realized that the marquis of Sai had tricked him. Then he said to King Wen: "The wife of the marquis of Sai is very beautiful; you really should order her to appear." King $_{28/28}$ Wen gave orders that she be presented and when the marquis of Sai refused, the king insisted that she had to appear. After he saw her, he sent her back. The following year, he raised an army and attacked Sai, conquering them. He killed the marquis of Sai and took $_{29/29}$ Lady Gui home with him: she gave birth to Du'ao (r. 676–672 B.C.E.) and King Cheng (r. 671–626 B.C.E.).[75] To the north, King Wen opened up land [on the far side of the] Fangcheng Mountains, setting the border at the Ru River.[76] He put his troops into battle formation at Chen, and then $_{30/30}$ captured the city of Cun (Dun) in order to strike fear into the marquis of Chen.

PERICOPE FIFTEEN

$_{73/74}$ 楚臧[莊]王立, 吳人服于楚. 陳公子誼[徵]郤[舒]取妻于奠[鄭]穆公, 是少孟. 臧[莊]王立十又五年, $_{74/75}$ 陳公子誼[徵]余[舒]殺亓[其]君靈[靈]公. 臧[莊]王衍[率]自[師]回[圍]陳. 王命纏[申]公屈晉[巫]迫[適]秦求自[師], 旻[得]自[師]以 $_{75/76}$ 歪[來]. 王內[入]陳殺堂[徵]余[舒], 取亓[其]室以叟[予]纏[申]公. 連尹襄老與之爭, 敓之少孟. 連尹戠[止]於河 $_{76/77}$ 滩[雍]. 亓[其]子墨[黑]要也. 或[又]室少孟. 臧[莊]王即殜[世], 龔[共]王即立[位]. 墨[黑]要也死, 司馬子反與纏[申] $_{77/78}$ 公爭少孟. 纏[申]公曰: "氏[是]余受妻也." 取以為妻. 司馬不訓[順]纏[申]公. 王命纏[申]公喁[聘]於齊. 纏[申] $_{78/79}$ 公繳[竊]載少孟以行, 自齊述[遂]逃迫[適]晉, 自晉迫[適]吳. 玄[焉]卣[始]迵[通]吳, 晉之逿[路], 教吳人反[叛]楚. $_{79/80}$ 以至靈=王=[靈王, 靈王]伐吳為南深[懷]之行執吳王子鱶[蹶]緐[由]吳人玄[焉]或[又]服于楚. 靈[靈]王即殜[世]; $_{80/81}$ 兢[景]坪[平]王即立[位]. 少帀[師]亡[無]朏[極]讜[讒]連尹顏[奢]而殺之. 亓[其]子五[伍]員與五[伍]之雞逃歸[歸]吳. 五[伍]雞逆[將] $_{81/82}$ 吳人

75. The fratricidal rivalry between Du'ao (also known as Zhuang'ao 莊敖) and his younger brother, King Cheng of Chu is recorded in *Shiji*, 40.1696. The reign dates of King Wen of Chu are disputed; the *Zuozhuan* gives him a reign of fifteen years (689–675 B.C.E.), while the *Shiji* has thirteen (689–677 B.C.E.). It is not known which is correct, but this article here follows Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, *Qinghua er Xinian jijie*, 291, in using the *Shiji* chronology for the Chu kings.

76. According to the *Zuozhuan*, 292–93 (Xi 4): "The kingdom of Chu has the Fangcheng Mountains as its walls and the Han River as its moat" (楚國方城以爲城, 漢水以爲池).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

以回[圍]州亟[來]為長澮[壑]而堕[涯]之, 以敗楚自[師]: 是雞父之堕[涯]. 競[景]坪[平]王即殜[世]; 邵[昭]王即 $_{82/83}$ 立[位]. 五[伍]員為吴大窌[宰]; 是教吴人反楚. 邦之者[諸]侯以敗楚自[師]于白[柏]豎[舉]述[遂]内[入]郢. 邵[昭]王歸[歸] $_{83/84}$ 鼜[隨]與吴人戰[戰]于析. 吴王子脣[晨]牆[將]迍[起]禍[禍]於吴=[吴. 吴]王盍[闔]虜[盧]乃歸[歸]; 邵[昭]王亥[焉]逿[復]邦.

$_{73/74}$ When King Zhuang of Chu (r. 613–591 B.C.E.) was in power, the Wu people submitted to the authority of Chu.[77] The nobleman from Chen, [Xia] Zhengshu obtained a wife from Lord Mu of Zheng (r. 627–606 B.C.E.): this was Shaomeng. In the fifteenth year of the reign of King Zhuang [599 B.C.E.], $_{74/75}$ the nobleman from Chen, Zhengshu, killed his ruler, Lord Ling (r. 613–599 B.C.E.), and King Zhuang led the army to lay siege to Chen. His Majesty ordered Qu Wu, the lord of Shen, to go to Qin to ask for an army; when he obtained the army, $_{75/76}$ he returned.[78] His Majesty entered Chen and killed [Xia] Zhengshu, taking over his entire household, and presenting it to the lord of Shen.[79] The *lianyin*, Xiang Lao, competed with him and stole Lady Shaomeng away; the *lianyin* was later taken prisoner at He $_{76/77}$ yong.[80] His son was Moyao [Heiyao]. He also married Lady Shaomeng.[81] King Zhuang then passed away and King

77. Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 56, notes that the very first reference to the kingdom of Wu in the *Zuozhuan* describes a covenant between them and the kingdom of Chu, in 601 B.C.E., the thirteenth year of the reign of King Zhuang of Chu. See *Zuozhuan*, 696 (Xuan 8). It may be these events which are being referred to here.

78. The *Zuozhuan*, 714 (Xuan 11) states that Chu attacked Chen with the other lords (*zhuhou* 諸侯), but they are not identified. In his commentary on this line, Kong Yingda, *Chunqiu jingzhuan zhengyi*, 724 (Xuan 11) suggests that these were Chu's subordinate states.

79. The *Xinian* account here agrees with that given in the *Guoyu*, 539 ("Chuyu shang" 楚語上) in saying that Lady Xia Ji was originally bestowed upon Qu Wu by King Zhuang of Chu, only for him to later change his mind.

80. In the *Zuozhuan*, 804 (Cheng 2), the *lianyin* Xiang Lao is said to have died at the battle of Bi 邲. However, the *Han Feizi*, 390 ("Yulao" 喻老) agrees with the *Xinian* that King Zhuang of Chu did fight a battle at a place named Heyong, presumably as part of the same campaign, in which his forces were victorious.

81. Some scholars have suggested that the Zidang *ding* 子蕩鼎 excavated in the northern suburbs of Liuan 六安 city in 1986, was made by the man who (according to the *Zuozhuan*) was killed in punishment after Lady Xia Ji and Qu Wu left the kingdom of Chu, since he was a member of the latter's family; see Chen Bingxin 陳秉新, "Anhui chutu Zitang [sic] ding mingwen de zai renshi" 安徽出土子湯鼎銘文的再認識, *Kaogu* 2005.7, 89–91; and Li Yong 李勇, Hu Yuan 胡援, "Chunqiu Zidang Chuqi kao" 春秋子蕩楚器考, *Nanfang wenhua* 南方文化 1993.1, 114–17. This bronze identifies the maker as a member of the Xiang family; if this is correct, then Qu Wu must have been a relative of Xiang Lao and Xiang Moyao/Heiyao. In that case the relationship between Lady Xia Ji and these three men may be an example of levirate marriage in the kingdom of Chu. The *Zuozhuan*, 804 (Cheng 2), by contrast, describes the relationship between Lady Xia Ji and Heiyao as an incestuous affair (*zheng* 烝).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gong (r. 590–560 B.C.E.) was established. Moyao also died and the Minister of War, Prince Fan, and the lord of Shen $_{77/78}$ fought for possession of Lady Shaomeng. The lord of Shen said: "This is my appointed wife," and he took her as his wife. The Minister of War held a grudge against the lord of Shen about this. The king ordered the lord of Shen to go on a diplomatic mission to Qi; the lord of $_{78/79}$ Shen secretly took Lady Shaomeng with him. From Qi they fled to Jin and from Jin they travelled to Wu. Thus for the first time [he gained knowledge of] the routes that led to Wu and Jin, and he taught the people of Wu to rebel against Chu.[82] $_{79/80}$ In the time of King Ling (r. 540–529 B.C.E.), King Ling attacked Wu and conducted the Nanhuai campaign, [during which] he captured Prince Jueyou of Wu.[83] The people of Wu then submitted to the authority of Chu. When King Ling passed away,[84] $_{80/81}$ King Jingping (r. 528–516 B.C.E.) took the throne.[85] The Junior Preceptor [Fei] Wuji slandered the *lianyin* [Wu] She and killed him; his sons Wu Yuan (d. 484 B.C.E.) and Wu Zhi Ji escaped and fled to Wu.[86] Wu Ji took command $_{81/82}$ of the people of Wu and laid siege to Zhoulai, building a long trench and then flooding it; thus he defeated the Chu army. This is the Canal of Elder Ji. When King Jingping passed away, King Zhao (r. 515–489 B.C.E.) then $_{82/83}$ took the throne. Wu Yuan became the chancellor of Wu.[87] Then he instructed the people of Wu to rebel against Chu. The lords of the states then defeated the Chu army at Boju, before entering Ying. King Zhao fled to $_{83/84}$ Sui, and he fought a battle with the people

82. The crucial role played by the lord of Shen in the development of Wu during this period is described in the *Zuozhuan*, 835 (Cheng 7).

83. These events are described in considerable detail in the *Zuozhuan*, 1270–72 (Zhao 5).

84. The *Xinian* here gives no suggestion of the actual circumstances of King Ling of Chu's demise, murdered by Prince Bi 王子比 in 529 B.C.E. However, contemporary readers of the text would undoubtedly have been aware of these notorious events, which are mentioned in many ancient Chinese texts; see for example *Zuozhuan*, 1345–50 (Zhao 13); and *Han Feizi*, 169 ("Shiguo").

85. This ruler is normally known by his posthumous title of King Ping of Chu; see *Zuozhuan*, 1474 (Zhao 26). The *Xinian* seems to be unique in terming him King Jingping of Chu.

86. Both Yuri Pines, "Zhou History and Historiography," 309–10; and Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 60, argue that Wu Ji is an invention; this name appears in the *Xinian* as a folk etymological explanation of the name of the battlefield where Wu defeated Chu in 519 B.C.E.: Jifu. This battle is mentioned in the *Chunqiu*, 1440 (Zhao 23); and *Zuozhuan*, 1446 (Zhao 23). This theory was originally put forward by Ziju 子居, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* 12–15 zhang jiexi" 清華簡繫年 12–15 章解析 (http://www.confucius2000.com/admin/list.asp?id=5413 [accessed on 20 July, 2015]). Alternatively, Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, *Qinghua er Xinian jijie*, 602, argue that Wu Ji is simply a previously unidentified member of the family.

87. Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 61, argues that the name Wu Yuan is given here in mistake for Bo Pi 伯嚭.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Wu at Xi.[88] Prince Zhen of Wu was about to start an uprising in Wu, so King Helu of Wu (r. 514–496 B.C.E.) then went home.[89] King Zhao was thus able to return to his state.

* * *

Pericope fifteen begins with an account of one of the great scandals of the Spring and Autumn period: the death of Lord Ling of Chen at the hands of the Xia family. The *Xinian* here points to the existence of an error within not only the *Zuozhuan*, but also all the other transmitted texts which recount this story. The issue is one of chronology. Lady Xia Ji was the daughter of Lord Mu of Zheng (who died in 606 B.C.E.), and according to the *Zuozhuan*, in the year 600 B.C.E., she was engaged in sexual relationships not only with Lord Ling of Chen, but also two of his ministers—Kong Ning 孔寧 and Yi Xingfu 儀行父. The following year, her son, Xia Zhengshu 夏徵叔, was so furious at the aspersions cast by his lordship upon his paternity that he assassinated Lord Ling. Lady Xia Ji is next mentioned in the year 589 B.C.E., when she eloped with Wu Chen 巫臣 (Qu Wu).[90] The problem with this sequence of events is that Lady Xia Ji would have been quite old for a Bronze Age woman who is being portrayed as incredibly beautiful and attractive: as an absolute minimum she was in her early thirties on the death of Lord Ling and in her middle forties at the time of leaving Chu. In the Han dynasty and later, thanks to this belief in her age, the legend grew up that Lady Xia Ji had achieved eternal youth and attractiveness by mastering esoteric sexual techniques; as a result she plays an important part in the development of Chinese erotica.[91] However, in terms of the historical

88. This whole sequence of events is described in almost identical wording, though much greater detail, in the *Zuozhuan*, 1542–1546 (Ding 4), with the exception of the opening statement: "Then he instructed the people of Wu to rebel against Chu …"

89. Prince Zhen of Wu can be identified as King Fugai, who attempted to sieze the throne from his older brother in 505 B.C.E. In the *Zuozhuan*, 1544 (Ding 4) account of these events it says: "King Helu's younger brother, King Fugai, [named] Zhen requested …" (闔廬之弟夫概王晨請), but the term *zhen* was previously read as meaning "in the morning." The *Xinian* makes it clear that this was King Fugai's name. At this time many members of the Wu royal family used a Chinese single-character name and a multi-character transliteration of their name in the Wu language: the two have an identical meaning; see Dong Chuping 董楚平, Jin Yongping 金永平, *Wu Yue wenhua zhi* 吳越文化志 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin, 1998), 95–96. Therefore it is likely that King Fugai's name meant "morning."

90. See *Zuozhuan*, 701–2 (Xuan 9); and 803–6 (Cheng 2) respectively.

91. See Robert van Gulik, *Sexual Life in Ancient China: A Preliminary Survey of Chinese Sex and Society from ca. 1500 BC till 1644 AD* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 314–16; and Olivia Milburn, "The Legend of Lady Xia Ji: Two Ming Dynasty Portrayals of an Ancient Chinese *Femme Fatale*" (*CLEAR*, forthcoming). The earliest references to

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

events, it is likely that the *Xinian* is correct. There was no son of Lady Xia Ji, and Lord Ling of Chen was murdered by her husband. This would then reduce her age: Lady Xia Ji's marriages probably occurred when she was in her late teens and early twenties. The mistake in the *Zuozhuan* has ended up taking on a life of its own.

Lady Xia Ji's story segues into that of Wu Zixu, who, like Qu Wu, first arrived in the kingdom of Wu as a refugee from Chu. Many ancient texts mention that when Wu She was slandered by Fei Wuji, his two sons initially both escaped arrest. Supposedly the older of his two sons, Wu Shang 伍尚, returned to Chu to be executed with his father; Wu Yuan escaped to the kingdom of Wu.[92] The *Xinian* states that two brothers travelled to Wu, and that Wu Ji was the commander of the army that destroyed Zhoulai in 529 B.C.E.[93] Wu Zixu is often said to be the single best recorded individual in the history of the Spring and Autumn period, but if the *Xinian* is correct, even such basic facts as the survival of his brother have been recorded incorrectly within the transmitted tradition.[94] The information that his brother apparently also served as a senior military commander in Wu is particularly interesting, for it means that the startling victories attributed to Wu Zixu may have been the work of two men and not one.

Lady Xia Ji's knowledge of esoteric sexual arts are found in the *Lienü zhuan* 列女傳 (Biographies of Exemplary Women); see Wang Zhaoyuan 王照圓, *Lienü zhuan buzhu* 列女傳補注 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu, 1976), 136 ("Niebi" 孽嬖): "[Lady Xia Ji] was someone who [had mastered] the techniques of internal compression, whereby even though she was old she could restore her youth" (*nei xie jishu, gai lao er fu zhuang zhe* 內挾伎術, 蓋老而复壯者).

92. The earliest reference to Wu Shang is found in the *Zuozhuan*, 1408 (Zhao 20), but at this stage, the relationship between Wu Shang and Wu Zixu is not specified. The earliest text to describe the story of the two brothers in any detail is the *Shiji*, 66.2172–73. As noted by Stephen Durrant, *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 88, the two brothers at this stage come to represent a perfect filial pair: one dies with their father and the other avenges him.

93. When this campaign is mentioned in the *Zuozhuan*, 1343 (Zhao 13), no name is given for the commander of the Wu army. Wang Yikun 王屹堃, "Chutu jianbo shiliao jiazhi chuyi: yi Qinghua jian *Xinian* wei li" 出土簡帛史料價值芻議: 以清華簡繫年為例, *Changshu ligong xueyuan xuebao (Zhexue shehui kexue ban)* 常熟理工學院學報(哲學社會科學版) 2014.1, 115 suggests that rather than identifying Wu Ji with Wu Shang, he should be considered as a previously unrecorded brother of Wu Zixu.

94. See Barry Blakeley, "Chu Society and State: Image versus Reality," in *Defining Chu: Image and Reality in Ancient China*, ed. Constance A. Cook and John S. Major (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), 66.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Source Text C

PERICOPE SIX

31/31 晉獻公之婢妾曰驪姬, 欲亓[其]子勳[奚]資[齊]之為君也. 乃譖[讒]大子龍共君而殺之. 或[又]譖[讒] 32/32 惠公及文=公=[文公. 文公]奔翟[狄]; 惠公奔于梁. 獻公卒[卒]乃立勳[奚]資[齊]. 亓[其]夫=[大夫]里之克乃殺勳[奚]資[齊] 33/33 而立亓[其]弟悼子. 里之克或[又]殺悼子. 秦穆公乃內惠公于晉. 惠公賂秦公曰: "我 34/34 句[後]果內[入], 囟[使]君涉河至于梁城." 惠公既內[入], 乃僈[背]秦公, 弗爰[予]. 立六年, 秦公銜[率]自[師]与[與] 35/35 惠公戰[戰]于觲[韓], 戠[止]惠公以歸. 惠公女[焉]以亓[其]子褱[懷]公為執[質]于秦=[秦. 秦]穆公以亓[其]子妻之. 36/36 文公十又二年居翟=[狄. 狄]甚善之而弗能內[入]. 乃迺[適]齊=[齊. 齊]人善之. 迺[適]宋=[宋. 宋]善之, 亦莫 37/37 之能內[入]. 乃迺[適]衛=[衛. 衛]人弗善, 迺[適]奠=[鄭. 鄭]人弗善, 乃迺[適]楚. 褱[懷]公自秦逃歸, 秦穆公乃訊[召] 38/38 文公於楚, 囟[使]褒[襲]褱[懷]公之室. 晉惠公卒[卒], 褱[懷]公即立[位]. 秦人迟[起]自[師]以內文公于晉=[晉. 晉]人 39/39 殺褱[懷]公而立文公. 秦晉亥[焉]飠[始]會好穆[繆]力同心. 二邦伐綽[都]遝[徙]之屯[中]城回[圍]商酋[密], 戠[止] 40/40 纏[申]公子義[儀]以歸.ㄴ

31/31 Lord Xian of Jin's (r. 676–651 B.C.E.) favourite concubine was named Lady Li Ji, and she wanted her son, Xiqi, to become the ruler.[95] Therefore she slandered the Heir Apparent, Lord Long (Gong), and killed him.[96] She also slandered 32/32 Lord Hui (r. 650–637 B.C.E.) and Lord Wen (r. 636–628 B.C.E.). Lord Wen fled to the Di people, while Lord Hui fled to Liang. When Lord Xian died, Xiqi was established. Grandee Li Zhi Ke then killed Xiqi. 33/33 They established his younger brother Daozi.[97] Li Zhi Ke also killed Daozi.[98] Afterwards Lord Mu of Qin (r. 659–621 B.C.E.) installed Lord Hui in power in Jin. Lord Hui had

95. In other texts, Lady Li Ji is said to have been one of Lord Xian's principal wives; see for example *Guoyu*, 261 ("Jinyu 1").

96. The Heir Apparent to Lord Xian had the personal name Shensheng 申生. The title he is given here is his posthumous appellation; this is also recorded in the *Guoyu*, 292 ("Jinyu 2").

97. Most ancient texts give the name Daozi as Zhuozi 卓子, an exception being the *Shiji*, 39.1649.

98. Ziju 子居, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* 5–7 zhang jiexi" 清華簡繫年 5–7 章解析 (http://www.confucius2000. com/admin/list. asp?id=5238 [accessed on October 14, 2014), suggests that the account of the death of Xiqi and Daozi given here is sufficient to ascribe this tale to a foreign source, since the murder of two rulers of Jin by a senior minister should not be recorded in a Jin text. However, this pericope begins with a description of Lady Li Ji's illegal and murderous interference in the succession of the marquisate of Jin, stressing her low status as a mere concubine of the ruler. In that case, the succession of Xiqi and Daozi is illegitimate and the proper line of succession runs from Lord Xian to Lord Hui; thus, there is no opprobium attached to describing the deaths of Xiqi and Daozi at the hands of Li Ke.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bribed Lord Mu, saying: "If $_{34/34}$ in the future I am indeed able to return [to my country], I will give you the land on the other side of the Yellow River right up to the city of Liang." When Lord Hui was installed in power, he turned his back on Lord Mu and refused to give him [this land]. In the sixth year of his reign [645 B.C.E.], Lord Mu led his army to do battle with $_{35/35}$ Lord Hui at Han, capturing Lord Hui and taking him home with him. Lord Hui then sent his son, Lord Huai (r. 637 B.C.E.), to go as a hostage to Qin. Lord Mu of Qin gave him his daughter in marriage. $_{36/36}$ Lord Wen spent twelve years living with the Di people and they treated him very well, but they were not able to put him in power. He then travelled to Qi, where the people of Qi treated him well, and he travelled to Song, where the people of Song treated him well, but they too were unable $_{37/37}$ to put him in power. He travelled through Wei, but the people of Wei did not treat him well; he travelled through Zheng, but the people of Zheng did not treat him well; then he moved on to Chu.[99] Lord Huai escaped from Qin and went home, whereupon Lord Mu of Qin summoned $_{38/38}$ Lord Wen from Chu, ordering him to take over the household of Lord Huai.[100] When Lord Hui of Jin died, Lord Huai succeeded him. The people of Qin raised an army in order to install Lord Wen in Jin. The people of Jin killed $_{39/39}$ Lord Huai and established Lord Wen.[101] From this point onwards Qin and Jin began to be allies, working together in harmony. The two states attacked Ruo, before moving on to Zhongcheng; they laid siege to Shangmi, and captured $_{40/40}$ the Honourable Yi of Shen, returning home with him.[102]

---

99. The *Xinian* gives a somewhat different itinerary for the extensive travels of the Honourable Chonger to other ancient texts. The *Zuozhuan*, 404–10 (Xi 23), and the *Shiji*, 39.1656–60 give an identical itinerary; an alternative is found in the *Guoyu*, 337–55 ("Jinyu 4") and the *Lüshi chunqiu*, 519–20 ("Shangde" 上德). As noted by Li Longxian 李隆獻, *Jin Wengong fuguo dingba kao* 晉文公復國定霸考 (Taipei: Guoli Taiwan daxue, 1988), 140, insufficient knowledge of Spring and Autum period placenames has caused significant problems with developing a chronology for these events.

100. "Household" (*shi* 室) specifically refers to Lord Huai's wife; see Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 40. The same kind of usage can be seen in the *Zuozhuan*, 2–3 (Yin 1), when it says: "Lord Hui's first wife was Lady Zi of Meng. Lady Zi of Meng died, and then he 'continued his household' with Lady Zi of Sheng" (惠公元妃孟子. 孟子卒, 繼室以聲子).

101. When these events are reported in the *Zuozhuan*, 413–14 (Xi 24), it makes it clear that Lord Wen took power thanks to the support of the Qin army *before* Lord Huai was dead. The legality of such an action being highly questionable, it is not surprising that in this section of the text, which is strongly associated with Jin, does not stress this point.

102. The attack on Ruo, the siege of Shangmi, and the capture of the Honourable Yi also figure in the *Zuozhuan*, 434–35 (Xi 25); these events took place in 635 B.C.E. The reference to Zhongcheng is, however, unique to the *Xinian*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PERICOPE SEVEN

41/41 晉文公立四年，楚成王銜[率]者[諸]侯以回[圍]宋，伐齊，戍穀[穀]，居鑮[緡]. 晉文公囟[思]齊及宋之 42/42 悳[德]，乃及秦自[師]回[圍]曹及五鏖[鹿]，伐鼜[衛]以敓[脱]齊之戍及宋之回[圍]. 楚王豫[舍]回[圍]歸居方城. 43/43 命[令]尹子玉述[遂]銜[率]奠[鄭]，鼜[衛]，陳，鄀[蔡]，及羣絲[蠻]尸[夷]之自[師]以交文=公=[文公. 文公]銜[率]秦，齊，宋，及羣戎 44/44 之自[師]以敗楚自[師]於城儽[濮]. 述[遂]朝周襄王于衡瀕[雍]. 獻楚俘馘誓[盟]者[諸]侯於墡[踐]土.ㄴ

41/41 In the fourth year of the reign of Lord Wen of Jin [633 B.C.E.], King Cheng of Chu led the various lords to lay siege to Song and attack Qi,[103] stationing troops in Gu and occupying Min.[104] Lord Wen of Jin was cognizant of Qi and Song's 42/42 virtuous behavior, so in concert with the Qin army he laid siege to Cao and Wulu, as well as attacking Wei, in order to lift the occupation of Qi and the siege of Song.[105] The king of Chu did indeed lift the siege and go home, taking up residence [beyond] the Fangcheng Mountains.[106] 43/43 The Prime Minister, Ziyu, then led the armies of Zheng, Wei, Chen, Cai, and the various Man and Yi peoples to intercept Lord Wen; Lord Wen led the armies of Qin, Qi, Song, and the various Rong peoples 44/44 to defeat the Chu army at Chengpu.[107] He then paid court to King Xiang of Zhou (r. 651–619 B.C.E.) at Hengyong and presented the captives and ears

103. King Cheng of Chu's attack on Song is also mentioned in the *Guoyu*, 377 ("Jinyu" 4), as occurring in the fourth year of Lord Wen of Jin's reign. However, when these events are mentioned in the *Zuozhuan*, 442 (Xi 26), they are attributed to the year 634 B.C.E. This problem in chronology is discussed in Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 41.

104. This reading of the character 鑮 as *min* 緡, follows the annotations by Sun Feiyan 孫飛燕, "Du *Xinian* zhaji sanze" 讀繫年劄記三則 (http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/SrcShow.asp?Src_ID=1801 [accessed on 20 July, 2015]).

105. The "virtuous actions" (*de* 德) of Qi and Song refers specifically to their treatment of the future Lord Wen during his time in exile; see *Zuozhuan*, 406, 408 (Xi 23).

106. The repeated stress on the strategic significance of the Fangcheng Mountains to Chu is one of the hallmarks of the *Xinian*; see Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 42.

107. The *Xinian* suggests that the two sides at the battle of Chengpu were relatively evenly matched; the *Zuozhuan*, 457 (Xi 28) states that the Chu army was at minimal strength. The *Xinian* is also unusual in recording extensive participation in this battle by nomadic non-Huaxia peoples. The only transmitted text to mention this is the *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策 (Stratagems of the Warring States); see Zhu Zugeng 諸祖耿, *Zhanguo ce jizhu huikao* 戰國策集注匯考 (Nanjing: Fenghuang, 2008), 459 ("Qince" 秦策 5): "Lord Wen employed bandits from Zhongshan and thus was victorious at Chengpu" (文公用中山盜而勝於城濮). However, Zhongshan was a state founded by the Di people and not the Rong.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from Chu.[108] He performed a blood covenant with the other lords at Jiantu.[109]

PERICOPE EIGHT

$_{45/45}$ 晉文公立七年秦晉回[圍]奠=[鄭. 鄭]降秦, 不降晉=[晉. 晉]人以不愬. 秦人豫戍於奠=[鄭. 鄭]人豉[屬]北門之笑[管]於秦=之= $_{46/46}$ 戍=人[秦之戍人. 秦之戍人]吏[使]人歸[歸]告曰: "我既旻[得]奠[鄭]之門笑[管], 也丞[來]𠦪[襲]之."[110] 秦自[師]牆[將]東𠦪[襲]奠=[鄭. 鄭]之賈人弦高牆[將]西 $_{47/47}$ 市遇之;乃以奠[鄭]君之命裳[勞]秦三衙[帥]. 秦岂[師]乃逿[復], 伐鼏[滑], 取之. 晉文公卒[卒]未𡈼[葬], 襄公新[親] $_{48/48}$ 衙[率]自[師]御[禦]秦自[師]于山嵣[崤], 大敗之. 秦穆公欲與楚人為好, 玄[焉]縈[脫]繡[申]公義[儀]囟[使]歸[歸]求成. 秦玄[焉] $_{49/49}$ 𠂤[始]與晉敉[執]衡, 与[與]楚為好.ㄴ

$_{45/45}$ In the seventh year of the reign of Lord Wen of Jin [630 B.C.E.], Qin and Jin laid siege to Zheng, and Zheng surrendered to Qin, but did not surrender to Jin. The people of Jin were unhappy about this. The people of Qin occupied Zheng and the people of Zheng handed over authority for the northern gate to the occupying forces $_{46/46}$ from Qin.[111] The occupying forces of Qin sent someone home to report: "We have obtained control over the gates of Zheng; come secretly and make a surprise attack on them."[112] The Qin army was about to go east and make a surprise attack upon Zheng, but the Zheng merchant Xian Gao who was heading west $_{47/47}$ to trade, met with them; in accordance with an order from the ruler of Zheng he feasted the three armies of Qin. The

108. The presentation of ears taken from the enemy dead was a part of post-battle ritual in the Eastern Zhou dynasty; see for example *Zuozhuan*, 399 (Xi 22); and 651 (Xuan 2); and *Lüshi chunqiu*, 289–90 ("Guyue" 古樂). It is much more frequently recorded in bronze inscriptions, implying that it probably took place more regularly than transmitted texts suggest.

109. The sequence of events at the covenant of Jiantu is described in some detail in *Zuozhuan*, 463–66 (Xi 28).

110. The form of the character *xi* 𠦪[襲] (to make a surprise attack) used in this pericope is commonly found in texts derived from the state of Jin; see Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, *Qinghua er Xinian jijie*, 397. This fits with the theory that the *Xinian* is derived from written materials taken from more than one source.

111. This translation follows the reading of *yu* 豫 (literally: "to prepare") as *she* 舍 (to occupy) given by Sun Feiyan, "Du *Xinian* zaji sanze." Alternatively, Huadong shifan daxue zhongwenxi Zhanguo jian dushu xiaozu, "Du *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian er*. *Xinian* shu hou (er)," reads *yu* 豫 as *shi* 釋 (to position).

112. This translation follows the reading given by Chen Wei, "Du Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhaji," 119, which suggests that the character given as *ye* 也 in the original transcription should instead be read *yin* 陰 (in secret). Alternatively, Chen Jian 陳劍, [accessed on 20 July, 2015], has suggested reading *ye* as *yi* 已 (already), in which case this sentence would read: "We have already obtained control over the gates of Zheng; come and make a surprise attack on them."

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

army then returned; they attacked Hua and captured it.[113] Lord Wen of Jin had died but was not yet buried when Lord Xiang (r. 627–621 B.C.E.) personally $_{48/48}$ led his armies to intercept the Qin army at Xiao and inflicted a terrible defeat upon them.[114] Lord Mu of Qin wanted to make an alliance with the people of Chu, so he released the Honourable Yi of Shen and sent him home to request a peace treaty. From this point onwards, Qin $_{49/49}$ began to be hostile towards Jin, and ally with Chu.

PERICOPE NINE

$_{50/50}$ 晉襄公卒[卒], 靈[靈]公高幼夫=[大夫]聚朁[謀]曰: "君幼未可舉承也. 母[毋]乃不能邦? 猷求弞[强]君." 乃命 $_{51/51}$ 右[左]行瘧[虔]与與隰[隨]會卲[召]襄公之弟雍[雍]也于秦. 襄而【夫】人竀[聞]之乃佖抱靈[靈]公以虐[號]于廷曰: "死人可[何]臯[罪]? $_{52/52}$ 生人可[何]黏[辜]? 豫[舍]亓[其]君之子弗立而卲[召]人于外, 而玄[焉]牆[將]寘[寘]此子也." 夫=[大夫]悖[閔]乃虜[皆]北[背]之曰: "我莫命卲[招] $_{52/53}$ 之." 乃立靈[靈]公玄[焉]䎽[葬]襄公.ㄴ

$_{50/50}$ When Lord Xiang of Jin died, Lord Ling [whose personal name was] Gao (r. 620–607 B.C.E.) was but a small child.[115] The grandees gathered to discuss the situation and said: "His lordship is a young child and he cannot yet assume responsibility. What is to be done about the fact that he is not able to govern the country? We need an adult ruler!"[116] They ordered $_{51/51}$ [Xian] Mie, Infantry General of the Left,[117] and [Shi] Hui of Sui to summon Lord Xiang's younger brother, Yong,

113. The sequence of events described here is recorded in very similar terms in the *Zuozhuan*, 494–98 (Xi 33); and *Lüshi chunqiu*, 989–90 ("Huiguo" 悔過); see also He Xiu 何休, Xu Yan 徐彦, *Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan zhushu* 春秋公羊傳注疏 (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 1999), 270–71 (Xi 33).

114. The *Chunqiu*, 492 (Xi 33) does not mention leadership of this campaign; while the *Zuozhuan* attributes it to Xian Zhen 先軫. The *Gongyang zhuan*, 272 (Xi 33); and Zhong Wenzheng 鍾文烝, *Chunqiu Guliang jingzhuan buzhu* 春秋谷梁經傳補注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1996), 355–56 (Xi 33), both mention traditions that it was Lord Xiang of Jin himself who was in command; the *Xinian* clearly belongs to this group of texts. Both the *Gongyang* and the *Guliang* agree that Lord Xiang's presence was not mentioned in the *Chunqiu* because it was inappropriate for the ruler to have taken off his mourning and gone out on campaign.

115. Elsewhere, Lord Ling's personal name is given as Yigao 夷皋; see *Chunqiu*, 650 (Xuan 2); or as Yigao 夷獋; see *Gongyang zhuan*, 324 (Xuan 2).

116. This translation follows the annotations of the original publication in reading *qiang* 弞[强] as meaning "adult," rather than "strong"; following the *Liji* 禮記 (Records of Ritual). See Sun Xidan 孫希旦, *Liji jijie* 禮記集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2007), 12 ("Quli shang" 曲禮上).

117. This translation follows the annotations of the original publication in reading *youhang* 右行 (Infantry General of the Right) as *zuohang* 左行 (Infantry General of the Left). This amendment is based upon the account of Xian Mie's military office given in the *Zuozhuan*, 474 (Xi 28).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from Qin.[118] When Lord Xiang's wife heard this, she caused a scene in the court, holding Lord Ling in her arms. She said: "What crime has the dead man committed? $_{52/52}$ Why should the living be punished? You have abandoned your ruler's son and refused to establish him, seeking someone from outside: are you really going to set aside this child?"[119] The grandees panicked and they all betrayed [those who had been sent on this mission]. They said: "No-one has given orders to summon $_{52/53}$ him."[120] They then established Lord Ling and afterwards buried Lord Xiang.[121]

PERICOPE TEN

$_{53/54}$ 秦康公衔[率]自[師]以遾[送]癰[雍]子. 晉人迟[起]自[師]敗之于殽岳. 右[左]行癸[蔑]隓[隨]會不敢歸[歸], 述[遂] $_{54/55}$ 奔秦. 靈[靈]公高立六年, 秦公以戰[戰]于聶岳之古[故], 銜[率]自[師]為河曲之戰[戰].ㄴ

$_{53/54}$ Lord Kang of Qin (r. 620–609 B.C.E.) led his army to escort Yong, the unratified ruler. The people of Jin raised an army and defeated them at Jinyin.[122] [Xian] Mie, the Infantry General of the Left, and [Shi] Hui of Sui did not dare to go home, so $_{54/55}$ they fled to Qin. When Gao, Lord Ling [of Jin] had been established for six years [615 B.C.E.], the

118. The original text here reads *Yong ye* 癰也, and the editors of the Qinghua collection suggest that this is a mistake for *Yong zi* 雍子: that is Ziyong 子雍. See Li Xueqin, ed., *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian*, 158n7. Su Jianzhou, "Du Xinian zhaji" suggests that *ye* should be considered as an auxiliary particle.

119. Lord Xiang's wife's appeal is recorded in virtually identical terms in the *Zuozhuan*, 558 (Wen 7).

120. This translation follows the commentary to the original publication. However, Chen Wei, "Du Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhaji," 119, suggests reading *mo* 莫 as *wei* 未 (not yet) or *bu* 不 (not); that is: "We haven't yet given orders to summon him" or "We haven't given orders to summon him."

121. It is known from other ancient texts that the senior minister behind first the plan to set Lord Ling aside, and then the decision to establish him after all, was Zhao Dun 趙盾 (d. 601 B.C.E.). It is striking that he is not mentioned at any stage in this passage, given his well-recorded troubles with the court historians of Jin over how his role in Lord Ling's reign would be described. See *Zuozhuan*, 662–63 (Xuan 2). For discussion of how this case influenced traditional concepts of the role of the court historian; see Wang Qing 王青, "Dong Hu yu 'Shu fa bu yin'" 董狐與'書法不隱', *Shixue yuekan* 2011.6, 114–16; and Tang Damin 湯大民, "'Shu fa bu yin' wu yin ma? Dong Hu shian zhiyi" '書法不隱'無隱嗎董狐史案質疑, *Shixue yuekan* 2010.5, 85–91.

122. This translation follows the commentary to the original publication, in reading this placename as Jinyin, which is mentioned in the *Zuozhuan*, 560 (Wen 7) in connection with these events. Ziju 子居, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* 8–11 zhang jiexi" 清華簡繫年 8–11 章解析 (http://www.confucius2000.com/admin/list.asp?id=5300 [accessed on October 14, 2014]) suggests instead that this placename should correctly be read as Xiyin 隰陰.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ruler of Qin led his army at the battle of Hequ, [in order to avenge] the battle of Jinyin.[123]

* * *

The stories found in Source Text C form a group with a strong chronological connection. Furthermore, this seems to be very closely related to the transmitted tradition, providing an account of events that is extremely similar—though consistently shorter and less detailed—to that given in the *Zuozhuan*. Yuri Pines suggests that rather than the *Xinian* being considered as a précis of the *Zuozhuan*, that some of the anecdotes incorporated into this text (here grouped into Source Text C) may have been derived from the same history of the state of Jin as that used by the compilers of the *Zuozhuan*. However, where the *Zuozhuan* adds more detail, records more speeches, and provides further moralizations and didactic messages, the *Xinian* pares down the information and presents it in a bald, skeletal form, concentrating on the key historical events and their most significant consequences.[124] It is the contention of this article that material found in other source texts for the *Xinian*, though sometimes recording the same events, lacks the really close connection with the *Zuozhuan* seen in Source Text C.

Source Text D

PERICOPE ELEVEN

$_{55/56}$ 楚穆王立八年, 王會者[諸]侯于发[厥]𡈼[貉], 牆[將]以伐宋=(宋. 宋)右帀[師]芋[華]孫兀[元]欲褮[勞]楚帀[師]. 乃行 $_{56/57}$ 穆王思[使]毆[驅]禦[孟]者[諸]之麋霎[徙]之徒嗇. 宋公為右[左]芋[孟]; 奠[鄭]伯為右芋[孟]. 纏[申]公弔[叔]侯智[知]之, 宋 $_{57/58}$ 公之車蔂[暮]翬[駕]用晚[抶]宋公之馭[御]. 穆王即殐[世]牆[莊]王即立[位]. 吏[使]孫[申]白[伯]亡[無]愄[畏]喁[聘]于齊, 段[假]逄[路] $_{58/59}$ 於宋=[宋. 宋]人是古[故]殺孫[申]白[伯]亡[無]愄[畏], 貥[奪]亓[其]玉帛. 牆[莊]王衍[率]自[師]回[圍]宋九月. 宋人亥[焉]為成. 以女子 $_{59/60}$ 與兵車百韾[乘], 以芋[華]孫兀[元]為敎[質].ㄴ

$_{55/56}$ In the eighth year [618 B.C.E.] of the reign of King Mu of Chu (r. 625–614 B.C.E.), the king met with the other lords at You [one unknown character] (Juehao), for he was going to attack Song.[125] The

123. The battle of Hequ is mentioned in *Zuozhuan*, 590–92 (Wen 12); the *Xinian*, however, appears to be unique in explicitly attributing the motives behind this campaign to revenge for the battle of Jinyin.

124. Yuri Pines, "Zhou History and Historiography," 311–14.

125. Su Jianzhou 蘇建洲, "Du *Xinian* zhaji" 讀繫年札記 (http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/SrcShow.asp?Src_ID=1972 [accessed on September 30, 2014]) notes a number

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

commander of the right army of Song, Hua Sunwu (Sunyuan), wanted to feast the Chu army. He then proceeded with $_{56/57}$ King Mu to hunt deer in Mengzhu, [after which] they moved on to Tulin.[126] The duke of Song was in the left hunting chariot; the earl of Zheng was in the right hunting chariot. The lord of Shen, Shuhou, found out about this, and when the duke $_{57/58}$ of Song's chariot set out late, he whipped the duke of Song's charioteer.[127] When King Mu passed away, King Zhuang came to the throne. He sent Wuwei, the earl of Shen, on a diplomatic mission to Qi, during which he borrowed a road $_{58/59}$ from Song. The people of Song killed Wuwei, the earl of Shen, for this reason and stole his jade and silk.[128] King Zhuang led his army to lay siege to Song for nine months. The people of Song then made peace. They gave him men and women, $_{59/60}$ as well as one hundred chariots; in addition, they gave him Hua Sunwu as a hostage.[129]

PERICOPE TWELVE

$_{60/61}$ 楚臧[莊]王立十又四年, 王會者[諸]侯于醻[厲]; 奠[鄭]成公自醻[厲]逃歸. 臧[莊]王述[遂]加奠[鄭]蠲[亂]. 晉成 $_{61/62}$ 公會者[諸]侯以救[救]奠[鄭]. 楚自[師]未還, 晉成公率[卒]于扈.ㄴ

$_{60/61}$ In the fourteenth year of the reign of King Zhuang of Chu [598 B.C.E.], His Majesty met with the other lords at Li.[130] Lord Cheng of Zheng fled

---

of problems with this pericope. First, these events are recorded in the *Zuozhuan*, 577 (Wen 10) as having occurred in 617 B.C.E. Furthermore, the name of the Song commander as given in the following line, Hua Sunwu, seems to be a mistake for Hua Yushi 華御事. Therefore he suggests that this particular story was recorded comparatively carelessly.

126. The placename Tulin is thought to refer to the Yunmeng marshes, the hunting grounds of the kings of Chu; see Yuan Jinping 袁金平, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* Tulin kao" 清華簡繫年徒林考, *Shenzhen daxue xuebao (Renwen shehui keuxue ban)* 30.1 (2013), 72–75.

127. The terms in which these events are described suggest that Shengong Shuhou 申公叔侯 (the lord of Shen, Shuhou) and Shenbo Wuwei 申伯無畏 (Wuwei, the earl of Shen) were one and the same person; see Su Jianzhou, "Du *Xinian* zhaji." However, as noted by Kang Xiaoyan 康小燕, "Qinghua Zhanguo zhujian *Xinian* dishiyi zhang jianshu" 清華戰國竹簡繫年第十一章箋疏, *Yuwen xuekan* 語文學刊 2013.8, 31, this is not necessarily correct.

128. The *Zuozhuan*, 760–61 (Xuan 15) stresses that King Zhuang of Chu knowingly sent Wuwei, the lord of Shen, to his death with a view to creating an excuse to invade Song. However, this text does not mention the theft of the lord of Shen's diplomatic gifts.

129. In the transmitted tradition, the peace treaty between Song and Chu is mentioned in the *Lüshi chunqiu*, 1400 ("Xinglun" 行論); the peace treaty and the granting of a hostage in the *Zuozhuan*, 761 (Xuan 15). The other gifts are not mentioned.

130. This interstate meeting at Li is not mentioned in any other ancient text. When these events are described in the *Zuozhuan*, 716 (Xuan 11), they are referred to as: "the

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

homewards from Li,[131] so King Zhuang then provoked conflict in Zheng.[132] Lord Cheng of Jin (r. 607–600 B.C.E.) $_{61/62}$ met the other lords with a view to rescuing Zheng; before the Chu army had turned back, Lord Cheng of Jin died at Hu.[133]

PERICOPE THIRTEEN

$_{62/63}$ … 【莊】王回[圍]奠[鄭]三月. 奠[鄭]人為成. 晉中行林父衛[率]自[師]救[救]奠[鄭]. 臧[莊]王述[遂]北. $_{63/64}$ … 【楚】人明[盟]. 邻[趙]罟[旃]不欲成, 弗卲[召], 欮[席]于楚軍之門. 楚人 $_{64/65}$ 被翬[翼]以自[追]之, 述[遂]敗晉自[師]于河【上】 …

$_{62/63}$ … [134] King [Zhuang] laid siege to Zheng for three months, whereupon the people of Zheng made peace. Zhonghang Linfu of Jin led the army to rescue Zheng, and King Zhuang then turned north. $_{63/64}$ … The people [of Chu] performed a blood covenant.[135] Zhao Zhan did not want this peace treaty. Since he could not make [the king of Chu] attend [a blood covenant], he took up position at the gate to the Chu army

campaign at Li" (*Li zhi yi* 厲之役), suggesting some kind of battle. This has caused much confusion; see Sun Feiyan 孫飛燕, "Shi *Zuozhuan* de Li zhi yi" 釋左傳的厲之役, *Shenzhen daxue xuebao (Renwen shehui kexue ban)* 29.2 (2012), 58–59. In the commentary by Du Yu, *Chunqiu jingzhuan jijie*, 580n1 (Xuan 11), he notes that these events did not take place in the year that they are mentioned in the *Zuozhuan*, suggesting instead that they occurred in Xuan 6 (603 B.C.E.). The rationale behind this choice of date is not clear.

131. At this point the ruler of Zheng was Lord Xiang 鄭襄公 (r. 605–587 B.C.E.); the original commentary on the *Xinian* suggests that this error arose from a confusion with his contemporary Lord Cheng of Jin mentioned below.

132. As noted by Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, *Qinghua er Xinian jijie*, 476–77, no other ancient text records these events, so it is not at all clear what exactly King Zhuang did in Zheng.

133. According to the *Zuozhuan*, 701, 703 (Xuan 9), Lord Cheng of Jin died in Hu in 600 B.C.E., just after attending an interstate meeting there. Subsequently, King Zhuang of Chu attacked Zheng. The *Xinian* seems to suggest that some previous military conflict occurred.

134. Seven to eight characters are missing at the beginning of this pericope, which is the most severely damaged in the entire text. Hou Wenxue, Li Mingli, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* de xushi lili, hexin yu linian," 288 suggest that these missing characters are the date: "In the seventeenth year of the reign of King Zhuang of Chu …" (*Chu Zhuangwang li shiqi nian* 楚莊王立十七年 …). The events described here occurred in 597 B.C.E.; see *Zuozhuan*, 718–38 (Xuan 12).

135. Eleven to twelve characters are missing from the beginning of this broken strip. Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, *Qinghua er Xinian jijie*, 485, suggest that this strip would originally have read: "Chu requested a peace treaty with Jin, and the people of Jin agreed, whereupon they performed a blood covenant with the people of Chu" (【楚求成于晉=[晉. 晉]人許之, 遂與楚】人明[盟]). This suggestion is derived from the account of these events given in the *Zuozhuan*, 734 (Xuan 12).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[camp].[136] The people of Chu $_{64/65}$ had to put armour onto their horses in order to chase him away. Then they defeated the Jin army at He[shang] …[137]

PERICOPE SIXTEEN

$_{84/85}$ 楚龍[共]王立七年, 命[令]尹子禫[重]伐奠[鄭], 為汚之自[師]. 晉兢[景]公會者[諸]侯以救[救]鄭=[鄭. 鄭]人戡[止]芸[鄖]公義[儀], 獻 $_{85/86}$ 者[諸]兢=公=[景公. 景公]以歸[歸]. 一年, 兢[景]公欲與楚人為好, 乃敓[脫]芸[鄖]公囟[使]歸[歸]求成. 龍[共]王卖[使]芸[鄖]公鳴[聘]於 $_{86/87}$ 晉, 曼[且]許成. 兢[景]公卖[使]翟[糴]之伐[茷]鳴[聘]於楚, 曼[且]攸[修]成. 未還, 兢[景]公卒[卒]. 東[厲]公即立[位]. 覌[共]王卖[使]王 $_{87/88}$ 子脣[辰]鳴[聘]於晉, 或[又]攸[修]成. 王或[又]卖[使]宋右帀[師]芋[華]孫兀[元]行晉楚之成. 昷[明]戡[歲], 楚王子波[罷]會晉文 $_{89/89}$ 子嫈[燮]及者[諸]侯之夫=[大夫]明[盟]於宋. 曰: "爾[弭]天下之虓[甲]兵." 昷[明]戡[歲], 東[厲]公先起兵, 衍[率]自[師]會者[諸]侯以伐 $_{90/90}$ 秦. 孛=[至于]涇. 鼚[共]王亦衍[率]自[師]回[圍]奠[鄭]. 東[厲]公救[救]奠[鄭], 敗楚自[師]於隀[鄢]. 東[厲]公 亦見禍[禍], 以死亡逡[後].ㄴ

$_{84/85}$ In the seventh year [584 B.C.E.] of the reign of King Long (Gong) of Chu (r. 590–560 B.C.E.), the Prime Minister Zizhong attacked Zheng and stationed his army at Fan. Lord Jing of Jin (r. 599–581 B.C.E.) met with the other lords with a view to rescuing Zheng.[138] The people of Zheng arrested Yi, lord of Yun, and presented $_{85/86}$ him to Lord Jing.[139] Lord Jing returned home with him. One year later [583 B.C.E.], Lord Jing wanted to have a peace treaty with the people of Chu, so he released the lord of Yun and sent him home to request the peace treaty.[140]

136. Some scholars, such as Xiaohu, "Du *Xinian* yizha"; and Qinghua daxue chutu wenxian dushuhui 清華大學出土文獻讀書會, "*Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* (er) yandu zhaji (er)" 清華大學藏戰國竹簡 (二) 研讀劄記 (二) (http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/SrcShow.asp?Src_ID=1760 [accessed on 20 July, 2015]), gloss *jue* 敓 as *she* 射 (to shoot). Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 51–52, considers this to be the result of a misreading of the text of the *Zuozhuan*, 736 (Xuan 12).

137. This damaged pericope of the *Xinian* refers to the great victory won by the Chu army over Jin in the Battle of Bi 邲 in 597 B.C.E. As described in the *Zuozhuan*, 737–43 (Xuan 12), when the Chu army chased off Zhao Zhan, they ended up routing the Jin army. When these events are described in the *Shiji*, 40.1702, the battle is said to have taken place at Heshang.

138. This meeting is recorded in the *Chunqiu*, 832 (Cheng 7).

139. As noted by Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 62, the contraction *zhu* 諸 seen here is unusual in late Warring States era texts, when the *Xinian* is presumed to have been copied out. What is more, in other sections of the *Xinian*, the term is given in full: *zhi yu* 之於. This supports the theory that this text was compiled from multiple sources.

140. According to the *Zuozhuan*, 845 (Cheng 9), the lord of Yuan was released from captivity in 582 B.C.E. Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 63, therefore considers that the "one year later" (*yi nian* 一年) is not to be taken entirely literally.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

King Long sent the lord of Yun on a diplomatic visit to 86/87 Jin, furthermore, he agreed to the peace treaty. Lord Jing sent Di Zhi Fa to pay a diplomatic visit to Chu, whereupon the peace treaty was confirmed.[141] Before he had returned, Lord Jing of Jin died and Lord Li (r. 580–573 B.C.E.) succeeded. King Long sent Prince 87/88 Chen on a diplomatic visit to Jin, and again reconfirmed the peace treaty.[142] The king also sent the Song Preceptor of the Right, Hua Sunwu (Sunyuan), to enact the treaty between Chu and Jin. The following year [579 B.C.E.], Prince Ba of Chu met [Fan] Wen 89/89 zi [Shi] Xie of Jin and the grandees representing the other lords and they performed a blood covenant in Song.[143] They said: "Let us stop the fighting all over the world."[144] The following year [578 B.C.E.], Lord Li was the first to raise an army and led his troops to meet the other lords, with a view to making an attack upon 90/90 Qin.[145] He arrived at Jing.[146] King Long also led his troops to lay siege to Zheng; but Lord Li rescued Zheng and defeated the Chu army at Yan. Lord Li then suffered disaster and died, leaving no descendants.[147]

---

141. According to the *Zuozhuan*, 848 (Cheng 10), Di Fa's visit took place in 581 B.C.E. As is frequently the case, the *Xinian* gives names in the vocative form; the *Zuozhuan* in the more usual nominative.

142. According to the *Zuozhuan*, 847 (Cheng 9) the visit of Prince Zhen of Chu to Jin occurred in 582 B.C.E., and Lord Jing did not die until the following year.

143. As noted by Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 63, Wenzi was the posthumous title of Shi Xie 士燮 of Jin; who also used the alternative surname Fan 范 in honor of his fief.

144. The *Zuozhuan*, 856 (Cheng 12) describes a covenant between only two parties: Chu and Jin. It also records a much more complex agreement: "Now Jin and Chu will not go to war against each other, and they will face good and evil together. They will both show compassion for [those states] which have suffered a natural disaster or are in danger; and they will help those who are suffering. If there is anyone who harms Chu then Jin will attack them; if something happens in Jin, then Chu will do the same. When ambassadors come and go, the roads will not be blocked. We will take measures against the uncooperative and punish those who do not pay court to us. If anyone contravenes this covenant may the Bright Spirits destroy him, ruining his armies and cutting off the line of inheritance in his state." (凡晉楚無相加戎, 好惡同之, 同恤菑危, 備救凶患. 若有害楚, 則晉伐之. 在晉, 楚亦如之. 交贊往來, 道路無壅, 謀其不協, 而討不庭. 有渝此盟, 明神殛之, 俾隊其師, 無克胙國).

145. The *Xinian* here clearly states that it was Jin that was responsible for breaking the terms of the peace treaty; however, when these events are described in the *Zuozhuan*, 857–58 (Cheng 12), it is Chu who is blamed.

146. The *Zuozhuan*, 866 (Cheng 13) describes a battle between the coalition army led by Jin and the Qin army at Masui 麻隧. Given that Masui is in modern Jinyang County 涇陽縣, it would seem that the *Xinian* correctly sites these events on the banks of the Jing River.

147. Lord Li was murdered at the behest of senior ministers in Jin in 573 B.C.E.; see *Zuozhuan*, 906 (Cheng 18). The title then passed to a different branch of the family, with

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PERICOPE NINETEEN

104/104 楚靈]王立既勝[縣]陳, 鄀[蔡]. 兢[景]坪[平]王即立[位], 改邦陳, 鄀[蔡]之君, 囟[使]各遠[復]亓[其]邦. 兢[景]坪[平]王即殜[世], 邵[昭] 105/105 【王】即立[位]. 陳, 鄀[蔡], 猒[胡]反楚, 與吴人伐楚. 秦異公命子甫[蒲], 子虎衍[率]自[師]救[救]楚, 與楚自[師]會伐陽[唐], 勝[縣]之. 106/106 邵[昭]王既遠[復]邦, 玄[焉]克猒[胡], 回[圍]鄀[蔡]. 邵[昭]王即殜[世]. 獻惠王立十又一年, 鄀[蔡]邵[昭]侯繒[申]懼, 自歸[歸]於吴=[吴. 吴]縵[洩]用[庸], 107/107 以自[師]逆鄀[蔡]邵[昭]侯, 居于州荼[來]. 是下鄀[蔡]. 楚人玄[焉]勝[縣] 鄀[蔡].

104/104 When King Ling of Chu was on the throne, he made Chen and Cai into counties. When King Jingping was on the throne, he gave different territory to the rulers of Chen and Cai and restored each of them to their states.[148] When King Jingping passed away, [King] 105/105 Zhao was established. Chen, Cai, and Hu rebelled against Chu, and joined with the people of Wu in attacking Chu.[149] Lord Yi of Qin (r. 536–501 B.C.E.) ordered Zipu and Zihu to lead an army to rescue Chu; they met with the Chu army and attacked Tang, turning it into a county.[150] 106/106 When King Zhao returned to his country, he attacked Hu and laid siege to Cai.[151] King Zhao passed away. In the eleventh year [478 B.C.E.] of King Xianhui (r. 488–432 B.C.E.),[152] Shen, Marquis Zhao of Cai (r. 518–491 B.C.E.) became frightened, so he personally gave his allegiance to Wu.[153] Man Yong (Xie Yong) 107/107 of Wu took the army to

---

Lord Li being succeeded by Zhou 周, a descendant of Lord Xiang of Jin. It is not clear whether there were other lines of the ruling house whose claims were disallowed, though the *Zuozhuan*, 907 (Cheng 19) does mention that Zhou had an older brother who was mentally handicapped, who was passed over in the succession.

148. This restoration is also recorded in the *Zuozhuan*, 1361 (Zhao 13).

149. According to the *Zuozhuan*, 1542 (Ding 4), the participants in the 506 B.C.E. campaign against Chu were the Wu monarch, and the marquises of Cai and Tang.

150. The name of the ruler of Qin at this time is normally given as Lord Ai 秦哀公. However, the *Shiji*, 6.287 gives his posthumous title as Lord Bi 畢公, and the *Suoyin* commentary mentions another variant: Lord Bi 珌公; see *Shiji*, 5.197n5.

151. King Zhao's revenge on Hu and Cai is described in the *Zuozhuan*, 1601 (Ding 15); and 1604 (Ai 1) respectively.

152. The posthumous title of this monarch is usually given as King Hui of Chu; however, the *Mozi* 墨子 does also record him under the same name as the *Xinian*: King Xianhui of Chu; see Sun Yirang 孫詒讓, *Mozi xiangu* 墨子閒詁 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2001), 440 ("Guiyi" 貴義).

153. Clearly there is a problem with the chronology here. Li Xueqin, ed., *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian*, 185n7 suggests that the description of the would–be surrender of authority of Cai to Wu is a historical fact, but this occurred in 491 B.C.E., following the chronology given in *Zuozhuan*, 1625 (Ai 4). The destruction of the state of Chen occurred in 478 B.C.E.; see *Zuozhuan*, 1709 (Ai 17). Somehow the two events have become confused in this text, possibly due to a problem with the original source.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

meet Marquis Zhao of Cai, and he took up residence at Zhoulai: this was Lower Cai.[154] The people of Chu then made Cai into a county.

PERICOPE TWENTY-ONE

$_{114/114}$ 楚柬[簡]大王立七年, 宋悼公朝于楚, 告以宋司城竖之約公室. 王命莫囂[敖]昜為衍[率] $_{115/115}$自[師]以定公室, 城黃池, 城鼜[雍]丘. 晉畏[魏]卑[斯], 灼[趙]关[浣],[155] 倝[韓]啟章衍[率]自[師]回[圍]黃池, 遣[迵]而歸之 $_{116/116}$ 於楚. 二年, 王命莫囂[敖]昜為衍[率]自[師]戠[侵]晉, 墩[奪]宜昜[陽], 回[圍]赤塿以遠[復]黃池之自[師]. 畏[魏]卑[斯], 灼[趙]关[浣], 倝[韓]啟 $_{117/117}$ 章衍[率]自[師]栽[救] 赤壠. 楚人豫[舍]回[圍]而還, 與晉自[師]戰[戰]於長城. 楚自[師]亡工[功], 多云[棄]幦[旃]莫[幕], 肖[宵]鼕[遯]. 楚以 $_{118/118}$ 與晉固為肯[怨].

$_{114/114}$ In the seventh year [422 B.C.E.] of the reign of King Jianda of Chu (r. 428–403 B.C.E.), Lord Dao of Song (r. 421–404 B.C.E.) came to pay court to Chu.[156] He reported that the Minister of Works of Song, [one unknown character], had severely weakened the ducal house. His Majesty ordered the Mo'ao Yangwei to lead $_{115/115}$ the army to settle the ducal house; he built fortifications at Huangchi and at Yongqiu.[157]

154. Xie Yong/She Yong 舌庸 is elsewhere recorded as an important figure in the government of the kingdom of Yue; see for example *Guoyu*, 604 ("Wuyu" 吳語); and Zhou Shengchun 周生春, *Wu Yue chunqiu jijiao huikao* 吳越春秋輯校匯考 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1997), 87 ("Fuchai neizhuan" 夫差內傳). Ziju 子居, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* di shiliu-shijiuzhang jiexi" 清華簡繫年第十六十九章解析 (http://www.confucius2000.com/admin/list/asp?id=5525 [accessed on November 6, 2014]) suggests that this man was temporarily working for the government of the kingdom of Wu, after the surrender of King Goujian in 494 B.C.E. and before the reestablishment of Yue as an independent kingdom.

155. According to the annotations by Wu Jiabi 武家璧, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhanmu" 清華簡繫年幛幕 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=1614 [accessed on September 30, 2014]) the personal name of the ruler of Zhao should be transcribed as Guan 盥.

156. Liang Liyong 梁立勇, "Du *Xinian* zhaji" 讀繫年札記, *Shenzhen daxue xuebao (Renwen shehui kexue ban)* 29.3 (2012), 59 suggests maintaining the *Shiji* traditional dates given for King Jian of Chu's reign (431–408 B.C.E.), but reading *qi* 七 (seven) as an orthographic mistake for *shi* 十 (ten), for then Lord Dao of Song could potentially have paid court to King Jian of Chu in 422 B.C.E., after his father's death but before officially assuming the title the following year. However, this translation follows the corrected chronology of the Chu kings given in Bai Guangqi, "You Qinghua jian *Xinian* dingzheng Zhanguo Chu nian," whereby the seventh year of King Jian of Chu's reign is 422 B.C.E.

157. Mo'ao is a Chu title, thought to be similar to Minister of War (Sima 司馬); Yangwei may be a two character surname, or a surname and personal name. The Mo'ao Yangwei is not mentioned within the transmitted textual tradition, however, a bamboo strip recording his name was excavated from the tomb of Yi, Marquis of

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wei Si, Zhao Huan, and Han Qizhang of Jin led their forces to lay siege to Huangchi; after fighting a battle they made them retreat back 116/116 to Chu. In the second year [421 B.C.E.], His Majesty ordered Mo'ao Yangwei to lead the army to invade Jin. He captured Yiyang and laid siege to Chi'an, to avenge the campaign at Huangchi. Wei Si, Zhao Huan and Han Qi 117/117 zhang led their armies to rescue Chi'an, whereupon the Chu army lifted the siege and went home. They fought a battle with the Jin army at the [Chu] Great Wall. The Chu army was not victorious and they had to abandon many of their battle standards and tents, running away under cover of darkness.[158] Because of this, Chu 118/118 intensified their hatred for Jin.

PERICOPE TWENTY-TWO

119/119 楚聖[聲]趄[桓]王即立[位]. 兀[元]年, 晉公止會者[諸]侯於邳[任]. 宋殫[悼]公酋[將]會, 晉公巒[卒]于鬚. 軌[韓]虔, 灼[趙]蘆[籍], 虒[魏] 120/120 繫[擊]衍[率]自[師]與戊[越]公殿[翳]伐齊=[齊. 齊]與戊[越]成以建昜[陽]邸陵之田, 曼[且]男女服. 戊[越]公與齊侯貣[貸], 魯侯侃[衍] 121/121 明[盟]于魯稷門之外. 戊[越]公內[入], 言[饗]於魯=[魯. 魯]侯馭[御], 齊侯晶[參]龔[乘]以內[入]. 晉虒[魏]文侯臭[斯]從晉=自=[晉師. 晉師]大賊[敗] 122/122 齊自[師]. 齊自[師]北; 晉自[師]述[逐]之, 內[入]至汧水. 齊人曼[且]又[有]陳麇子牛之褟[禍]. 齊與晉成. 齊侯 123/123 明[盟]於晉軍. 晉三子之夫=[大夫]內[入]齊, 明[盟]陳和與陳涅於溫門之外. 曰: "母[毋]攸[修]長城; 母[毋]伐鬠[廩] 124/124 丘." 晉公獻齊俘馘於周王, 述[遂]以齊侯貣[貸], 魯侯鼻[顯], 宋公畋[田], 衛侯虔, 莫[鄭]白[伯]𠂤[駘]朝 125/125 周王于周.

119/119 When King Shenghuan of Chu (r. 404–401 B.C.E.) was established, in his first year [404 B.C.E.], the lord of Jin met with the other rulers at

---

Zeng 曾侯乙. Further references to the Mo'ao Yangwei were found among the Xincai 新蔡 texts: Jia san 甲三. 36: "[The year] that [one illegible character] the great Mo'ao Yangwei fought [a battle] at the Great Wall" (口大莫囂[敖]傷為【戰】於長城之【歲】); and Jia san. 296: "[One character illegible] the Mo'ao Yangwei fought a battle with the Jin army at the Great [one character illegible]" (口莫囂[敖]昜為晉帀[師]戰[戰]於長口); see Bing Shangbai 邴尚白, *Geling Chujian yanjiu* 葛陵楚簡研究 (Taipei: Taida chuban zhongxin, 2009), 38, 52. Some scholars have sought to identify this person as Prime Minister Zichun 子春 of Chu, a very important figure in Chu at this time; see for example Li Shoukui 李守奎, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* Mo'ao Yangwei kaolun" 清華簡繫年莫囂昜為考論, *Zhongyuan wenhua yanjiu* 中原文化研究 2014.2, 50–54.

158. Li Xueqin, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* ji youguan gushi wenti" 清華簡繫年及有關古史問題, *Wenwu* 2011.3, 73, suggests this line should be read as: "they had to abandon many of their old items, and Mo[ao] ran away under cover of darkness" (*duo qi chan, Mo*[*ao*] *xiao dun* 多棄幝, 莫[囂]宵遁). This translation follows the alternative reading given by Guo Yongbing 郭永秉, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* chanzi biejie" 清華簡繫年幝字別解 (http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/SrcShow.asp?Src_ID=1445 [accessed on November 19, 2014]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ren. Lord Dao of Song was about to meet with the ruler of Jin when the latter died at [unknown placename]. Han Hu, Zhao Ji, and Wei $_{120/120}$ Ji led their armies to attack Qi with Yi, Duke of Yue.[159] Qi made peace with Yue, giving them the fields of Jianyang and Juling, as well as men and women. The duke of Yue performed a blood covenant outside the Ji Gate of Lu, together with Dai, Marquis of Qi (r. 404–391 B.C.E.) and Yan, $_{121/121}$ Marquis of Lu (r. 410–377 B.C.E.). The duke of Yue then entered the city to hold a banquet in Lu: the marquis of Lu acted as his charioteer and the marquis of Qi rode beside him in the chariot as they entered the city. Si, Marquis Wen of Wei (r. 445–396 B.C.E.) led the Jin army, and the Jin army inflicted a terrible defeat on the $_{122/122}$ Qi army. The Qi army fled northwards and the Jin army pursued them, as far as the Qian River. The people of Qi then suffered the troubles of Chen Qing Ziniu.[160] Qi made peace with Jin, and the marquis of Qi $_{123/123}$ held a blood covenant with the Jin army. Grandees representing the three great families of Jin entered the state of Qi, where they performed a blood covenant outside the Ying Gate with Chen He and Chen Hao.[161] The agreement said: "Do not repair the Great Wall; do not attack Lin $_{124/124}$ qiu."[162] The ruler of Jin presented captives from the Qi army

159. Here, the *Xinian* gives the name of the ruler of Yue in the same form as the *Shiji*, 41.1747; and the *Zhushu jinian*, B.22b. However, in the *Yuejue shu*, 58 ("Jidi zhuan" 記地傳), this monarch is called King Buyang of Yue 越王不揚. There are no bronzes which record the name Buyang, but Cao Jinyan 曹錦炎, "Xinjian Yuewang bingqi ji qi xiangguan wenti" 新見越王兵器及其相關問題, *Wenwu* 2000.1, 72, mentions a sword sold in Hong Kong in 1994 (now in a private collection in Taiwan), with an inscription stating that it was made for King Zhiyi of Yue 越王旨殹, who presumably is the Yi, Duke of Yue mentioned here.

160. Ma Weidong 馬衛東, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* San Jin fa Qi kao" 清華簡繫年三晉伐齊考, *Jinyang xuekan* 晉陽學刊 2014.1, 16–22, suggests that the "troubles of Ziniu" centered around the murder of Chen/Tian He 田和, whose death did indeed occur in this year. However, the terms in which these events are described in the *Xinian* means this theory cannot possibly be correct, since Chen He was still alive at the time.

161. As noted by Chen Zhi 陳直, *Shiji xinzheng* 史記新證 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2006), 98, although it is frequently asserted that the Chen family changed their names to Tian in the time of Chen Wan 陳完, the son of Lord Li of Chen 陳厲公 (r. 706–700 B.C.E.), the texts of bronze vessels produced for members of this clan show that they continued to use the Chen surname centuries after they moved to Qi. Similarly, the surnames Chen and Tian seem to have been used interchangeably in the transmitted tradition; see Zhang Xiaolian 張曉連, "Qiguo Tianshi houyi kaolüe" 齊國田氏後裔考略, *Guanzi xuekan* 管子學刊 2000.2, 89. Tian (* lîn) and Chen (* drin R!) were used as phonetic loans in ancient Chinese; for the reconstructed pronunciations, see Axel Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese*, 320.

162. It is recorded in the *Zhushu jinian*, B.21b; and *Shiji*, 46.1886 that in 405 B.C.E., a major rebellion was launched in Linqiu by a man named variously as Gongsun Hui 公孫會 (a member of the Jiang ruling house of Qi) or Tian Hui 田會 (a member of the

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and ears to the king of Zhou. Afterwards Dai, Marquis of Qi; Xian, Marquis of Lu; Tian, Duke of Song (r. 403–381 B.C.E.); Qian, Marquis of Wei; and Dai, Earl of Zheng paid court to the 125/125 Zhou king in Zhou.[163]

PERICOPE TWENTY-THREE

126/126 楚聖[聲]趄[桓]王立四年, 宋公畋[田], 奠[鄭]白[伯]忌[駒]皆朝于楚. 王衍[率]宋公以城賸闡[關], 是[寘]武旁[陽]. 秦人 127/127 敗晉自[師]於茖[洛]會[陰], 以為楚斁[援]. 聖[聲]王即殜[世], 勿[悼]折[哲]王即立[位]. 奠[鄭]人戠[侵]櫝闡[關]. 昜[陽]城洹[桓]悉[定]君衍[率] 128/128 犢闡[關]之自[師]與上或[國]之自[師]以这[交]之, 與之戰[戰]於珪[桂]陵. 楚自[師]亡工[功]. 兢[景]之賈與虧[舒]子共戠[止]而死. 昷[明] 129/129 戠[歲]晉腫余衍[率]晉自[師]與奠[鄭]自[師]以內[入]王子定. 遊[魯]昜公衍[率]自[師]以这[交]晉=人=[晉人. 晉人]還, 不果內[入]王子. 昷[明]戠[歲] 130/130 郎臧[莊]坪[平]君衍[率]自[師]戠[侵]奠=[鄭. 鄭]皇子=[子, 子]馬, 子池, 子垏[封]子衍[率]自[師]以这[交]楚=人=[楚人. 楚人]涉沬[氾]. 牆[將]與之戰[戰]; 奠[鄭]自[師]逃 131/131 內[入]於蔑. 楚自[師]回[圍]之於鄹. 聿[盡]逾奠[鄭]自[師]與亓[其]四邇[將]軍以歸[歸]於郢. 奠[鄭]大窅[宰]愉[欣]亦迉[起]禍[禍]於 132/132 奠=[鄭. 鄭]子昜[陽]用滅, 亡逡[後]於奠[鄭]. 昷[明]戠[歲]楚人歸[歸]奠[鄭]之四牆[將]軍與亓[其]萬民於奠[鄭]. 晉人回[圍]津[津], 長陵, 133/133 克之. 王命坪[平]亦[夜]悼武君衍[率]自[師]戠[侵]晉, 逾鄴[鄚], 戠[止]郩公涉瀕以歸[歸], 以逿[復]長陵之自[師]. 晉[厭]年軌[韓] 134/134 緅[取], 虜[魏]繾[擊]衍[率]自[師]回[圍]武旁[陽], 以逿[復]鄴[鄚]之自[師]. 遊[魯]昜公衍[率]自[師]救[救]武昜[陽], 與晉自[師] 戰[戰]於武昜[陽]之城 135/135 下. 楚自[師]大敗. 遊[魯]昜公, 坪[平]亦[夜]恐[悼]武君, 昜[陽]城洹[桓]悉[定]君, 三執珪之君, 與右尹卲[昭]之邶[竣]死玄[焉]. 楚人聿[盡]云[棄]亓[其] 136/136 幦[旃]幕車兵, 犬達[逸]而還. 陳人玄[焉]反而內[入]王子定於陳. 楚邦以多亡城. 楚自[師]牆[將]戠[救]武昜[陽]. 137/137 王命坪[平]亦[夜]悼武君孳[使]人於齊陳洦求自[師]. 陳疾目衍[率]車千韾

usurping ministerial house). For the former theory; Chao Fulin 晁福林, *Chunqiu Zhanguo de shehui bianqian* 春秋戰國的社會變遷 (Beijing: Shangwu, 2011), 172–78; for the latter see Yang Kuan 楊寬, *Zhanguo shi* 戰國史 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin, 1980), 270, and Wang Sen'ge 王森閣, Tang Zhiqing 唐致卿, *Qiguo shi* 齊國史 (Ji'nan: Shandong renmin, 1992), 363. When this rebellion failed, he threw in his lot with the state of Zhao. Quite how this is related to the subsequent warfare which broke out in Qi, not to mention the "troubles of Ziniu," is not at all clear.

163. The use of posthumous titles in this pericope suggests a date of composition after the death of Marquis Wen of Wei in 396 B.C.E., but before the deaths of Lord Kang of Qi 齊康公 in 379 B.C.E., Lord Mu of Lu 魯穆公 in 377 B.C.E., and Lord Xu of Song 宋繻公 in 381 B.C.E. The revised dates of these rulers are taken from Tao Jin, "You Qinghua jian *Xinian* tan Huanzi Meng Jiang hu xiangguan wenti"; however, problems with the chronology and nomenclature of the rulers of Wei and Zheng have yet to be resolved.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[乘]以從楚自[師]於武昜[陽]. 甲戌, 晉楚以 _/138 戰[戰]. 丙[丙]子, 齊自[師]至邿, 述[遂]還.

126/126 In the fourth year of the reign of King Shenghuan of Chu [401 B.C.E.], Tian, Duke of Song, and Dai, Earl of Zheng, both paid court to Chu. The king led the duke of Song to fortify the Yu Pass and strengthen his position in Wuyang. The people of Qin 127/127 defeated the Jin army at Luoyin, when they came to the assistance of Chu.[164] King Sheng passed away, and King Daozhe (r. 400–380 B.C.E.) was established.[165] The earl of Zheng invaded the Yu Pass and Lord Huanding of Yangcheng led the troops 128/128 from Yu Pass and the troops from the Upper States to intercept them, fighting a battle with them at Guiling. The Chu army failed to achieve victory. Jing Zhi Jia and Zigong of Shu were taken prisoner and died. The following 129/129 year [399 B.C.E.], [one partially illegible character] Yu of Jin led the Jin army and the Zheng army to install Prince Ding in power. The duke of Luyang led his army to intercept the people of Jin.[166] The people of Jin turned back, and thus were unable to install the prince. The following year [398 B.C.E.], 130/130 Lord Zhuangping of Lang led his army to invade Zheng.[167] Huangzi of Zheng, together with Zima, Zichi, and Zifengzi,

164. The description of events given here clarifies the text of the Biao Qiang 鏢羌 bells, excavated from a tomb near Luoyang in 1931. Given that these events are not well-recorded in the transmitted tradition, the interpretation of the text inscribed on these fourteen bells has proved highly controversial; see Wang Hongliang 王紅亮, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhong de Biao Qiang zhong xiangguan shishi fafu" 清華簡繫年中的鏢羌鍾相關史事發覆, *Gudai wenming* 2013.7, 64–68.

165. This double title had only been seen once before, in a text excavated in 1983 from Tomb 2 at Xiyangpo 夕陽坡, at the city of Changde 常德 in Hunan Province. However, at that time, the posthumous title was considered to refer to King Su of Chu 楚肅王 (r. 397–368 B.C.E.); see Liu Binhui 劉彬徽, *Zaoqi wenming yu Chu wenhua yanjiu* 早期文明與楚文化研究 (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 2001), 217. Now it is clear that King Daozhe was the monarch otherwise known as King Dao of Chu.

166. Luyang was the hereditary fief of the descendants of Marshal Ziqi 司馬子期 of Chu, the son of King Ping, from 479 B.C.E. onwards; see *Guoyu*, 582 ("Chuyu xia" 楚語下). A number of excavated documents such as strips 162 and 195 from the tomb of Yi, Marquis of Zeng, and strips 2 and 4 from Tomb 2 at Baoshan 包山 contain references to a duke of Luyang; see Hubeisheng bowuguan 湖北省博物館, *Zenghou Yi mu* 曾侯乙墓 (Beijing: Wenwu, 1989), 498, 500; and Hubeisheng Jingsha tielu kaogudui 湖北省荆沙鐵路考古隊, *Baoshan Chujian* 包山楚簡 (Beijing: Wenwu, 1991), 17. However, at present, the exact relationship between the dukes of Luyang and the Lord of Luyang (Luyangjun 魯陽君) who was a patron of Mozi, is unclear; see Zheng Wei 鄭威, "Mozi you Chu Luyang niandai kao: jian tan chutu cailiao suojian Chuguo xian dafu yu fengjun zhi chengwei" 墨子游楚魯陽年代考: 兼談出土材料所見楚國縣大夫與封君之稱謂, *Jianghan kaogu* 2012.3, 83–84.

167. Dong Shan, "Du Qinghua jian *Xinian*," suggests reading the placename Lang 郎 as Liang 梁.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

led the army to intercept the people of Chu. The people of Chu crossed the Fan [River]. They were just about to fight a battle with them when the Zheng army ran away $_{131/131}$ and entered into Mie. The Chu army laid siege to them in Mie, capturing the entire Zheng army and their four generals, returning home with them to Ying.[168] Chancellor Xin of Zheng then caused a massacre in $_{132/132}$ Zheng,[169] and Ziyang of Zheng's [family] was killed, so that he had no descendants in Zheng.[170] The following year [397 B.C.E.], the people of Chu returned Zheng's four generals and their people to Zheng. The people of Jin laid siege to Jìn and Changling, $_{133/133}$ capturing them. The king ordered Lord Daowu of Pingye to lead an army to invade Jin.[171] He conquered Gao and arrested Shexian, lord of Teng, returning home with him.[172] Thus he avenged the campaign of Changling. The year after that [396 B.C.E.] Han $_{134/134}$ Qu and Wei Ji led their armies to lay siege to Wuyang, in order to avenge the campaign at Gao. The duke of Luyang led his army to rescue Wuyang, and he fought a battle with the Jin armies below $_{135/135}$ the walls of Wuyang. The Chu army suffered

168. In the original publication of the *Xinian* manuscript, the authors note that in Chu texts, the term *yu* 逾, which literally means "to surpass" is used instead to mean "to conquer" or "to capture"; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian*, 199n15. This gloss has been followed in this translation.

169. The massacre caused by Chancellor Xin of Zheng is also mentioned in the *Han Feizi*, 972 ("Shuoyi" 說疑).

170. Both Chancellor Xin and Ziyang, who held the title of Prime Minister of Zheng, are mentioned in transmitted texts. It has been suggested that they were one and the same person; see Tong Shuye 童書業, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan yanjiu* 春秋左傳研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin, 1980), 264–265. Alternatively, a number of scholars have argued that Ziyang was the same person as Lord Ai of Zheng 鄭哀公, a tradition which dates back to the Gao You 高誘 (fl. 205) commentary on the *Lüshi chunqiu*, 1300n54 ("Shiwei" 適威). See for example Zhang Dainian 張岱年, Du Yunhui 杜運輝, "Guanyu Liezi" 關於列子, *Zhongguo zhexue shi* 中國哲學史 2011.2, 5–11; and Zhou Xunchu 周勛初, *Han Feizi zhaji* 韓非子札記 (Nanjing: Jiangsu renmin, 1980), 284–286. For a detailed study of the importance of the *Xinian* in understanding the history of Zheng at this time; see Ma Weidong 馬衛東, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* yu Zheng Ziyang zhi nan xintan" 清華簡繫年與鄭子陽之難新探, *Gudai wenming* 2014.4, 31–36.

171. The tomb at Xincai, which has yielded a number of damaged bamboo strips describing historical events at the beginning of the Warring States era, is the grave of Cheng, Lord of Pingye 平夜君成; see Song Huaqiang 宋華强, *Xincai Geling Chujian chutan* 新蔡葛陵楚簡初探 (Wuhan: Wuhan daxue, 2010). It has been suggested that this Lord of Pingye is one and the same person as Lord Daowu of Pingye, whose death is recorded in this pericope of the *Xinian*; see Chen Yingfei 陳穎飛, "Chu Daowang chuqi de dazhan yu Chu fengjun: Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhaji zhi yi" 楚悼王初期的大戰與楚封君: 清華簡繫年札記之一, *Wenshi zhishi* 2012.5, 107.

172. This translation follows the annotations in the original publication, in reading 郯 as Teng 滕; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian*, 200n22.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a terrible defeat and the three lords who held batons of jade—the duke of Luyang, Lord Daowu of Pingye, Lord Huanding of Yangcheng—died there, together with the Governor of the Right, Zhao Zhi Si.[173] The people of Chu abandoned their $_{136/136}$ battle standards, tents, chariots and weapons, and fled like dogs. The people of Chen then rebelled and installed Prince Ding in Chen. The state of Chu lost a large number of cities because of this. The Chu army was about to rescue Wuyang $_{137/137}$ when the king commanded Lord Daowu of Pingye to send someone to request troops from Chen Hao of Qi.[174] Chen Jimu [of Qi] led one thousand chariots to follow the Chu army to Wuyang. On Jiawu day, Jin and Chu $_{-/138}$ fought a battle because of this. On Bingzi day, the Qi army arrived at Nie, and then turned back.

* * *

All the stories in Source Text D are dated according to the Chu calendar. The history of the kingdom of Chu in the late Spring and Autumn period and early Warring States era is not well recorded, hence the *Xinian* may serve to fill this lacuna.[175] In this respect, the last couple of pericopes in Source Text D are of particular importance, for the information contained here has no equivalent within the transmitted tradition. According to the *Shiji*, in the chapter on the hereditary house of Chu: "In the eighth year [of the reign of King Jian], Marquis Wen of Wei, Viscount Wu of Han, and Viscount Huan of Zhao were numbered among the lords [of the Central States] for the first time" (八年, 魏文侯, 韓武子, 趙桓子始列為諸侯). This juxtaposition has resulted in a number of scholars suggesting that some event occurred involving the kingdom of Chu which is not recorded within the transmitted textual tradition, which concerns the Three Jins.[176] Pericope twenty-one of the *Xinian* describes a successful campaign by the three lords of Zhao,

173. Chen Yingfei, "Chu Daowang chuqi de dazhan yu Chu fengjun," 106, suggests that the term *zhigui zhi jun* 執珪之君 (here translated as "lords who hold batons of jade") represents the highest title of nobility of the time.

174. There is clearly some problem with the transcription of the text at this point; given that Lord Daowu of Pingye is dead, he cannot be sending someone to request troops from Qi. As a tentative suggestion, I would like to read 王命坪[平]亦[夜]悼武君孷[使]人於齊陳淏求自[師] as "The king commanded Lord Daowu of Pingye's son to go and request troops from Chen Hao of Qi" (王命坪[平]亦[夜]悼武君之子入於齊陳淏求自[師]).

175. This point is made in Liu Jianming 劉建明, "*Xinian* de shiliao jiazhi he xueshu jiazhi" 繫年的史料價值和學術價值, *Mianyang shifan xueyuan xuebao* 綿陽師范學院學報 2012.10, 112.

176. See for example Qian Mu 錢穆, *Xian-Qin zhuzi xinian: San Jin shi hou kao* 先秦諸子系年三晉始侯考 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1985), 141–42; and Yang Kuan 楊寬, *Zhanguo shiliao biannian jizheng* 戰國史料編年輯証 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2001), 142–43.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wei, and Han against Chu during which a couple of major battles were fought. This took place just before Zhao, Wei, and Han were recognized as independent states and it is extremely tempting to see these two events as connected.

The theme of the three lords seeking to establish their authority at the expense of others is then continued in pericope twenty-two, which concerns their campaigns against Qi. Although it is not specifically named in the *Xinian*, this text appears to make reference to the battle fought at Linqiu in 405 B.C.E., which resulted in an appalling defeat for the Qi army.[177] The following year was marked by a further major defeat for Qi. As was well understood at the time, the aim was not to overthrow the already deeply unstable regime of Lord Kang of Qi. For the rulers of Han, Wei, and Zhao, the issue was much more straightforward. They needed an excuse to demand that the Zhou king recognize that the state of Jin had collapsed and that their regimes deserved recognition as independent governments. This is quite explicitly stated in the *Huainanzi* 淮南子 (Book of the Master of Huainan):

> 三國伐齊, 圍平陸. 括子以報于牛子曰: "三國之地, 不接於我, 逾鄰國而圍平陸, 利不足貪也. 然則求名於我也."
>
> The three states attacked Qi and laid siege to Pinglu (Pingyin). Kuozi reported this to Niuzi, saying: "The lands of the three states [of Han, Wei, and Zhao] are not contiguous to ours. The profits to be gained by bypassing neighbouring countries and laying siege to Pinglu are hardly worth the effort. The reason that they are doing this is to become famous on the back of us."[178]

Such references support the reading of Chinese scholars of the *Xinian* text, that this material should be understood specifically in the context of attempts by the rulers of the Three Jin states to establish their own authority as independent rulers. The theme of the serious political problems for Chu in the early Warring States era is continued in pericope twenty-three, which describes a further series of lost battles, many of which were associated with the attempts of Prince Ding to gain power. The commentators on the original publication assumed that the Prince Ding mentioned here is the same as the Zhou prince who

177. The *Lüshi chunqiu*, 925("Buguang" 不廣), speaks of the Qi commander being killed, and the Zhao forces capturing two thousand chariots and slaughtering thirty thousand soldiers. A similar description of the casualties is given in the *Kong Congzi* 孔叢子; see Song Xian 宋咸, *Kong Congzi zhu* 孔叢子註 (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji, 1988), 226–227 ("Lunshi" 論勢).

178. He Ning 何寧, *Huainanzi jishi* 淮南子集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2006), 1261 ("Renjian xun" 人間訓).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fled to Jin in 399 B.C.E., who is mentioned in the *Shiji*.[179] However, as noted by Liu Quanzhi 劉全志, although the year is correct, this attribution is unlikely.[180] The Prince Ding recorded in the last pericope of the *Xinian* must from context have been a member of the Chu royal house. This perception is confirmed by the fact that a number of inscribed bronze vessels made for Prince Ding of Chu are known, however, these provide no further historical information to explain the events described here.[181] Hence, the precise identity of this prince is at present unknown, but his capacity for causing trouble is clear. Although King Shenghuan was eventually able to assert his authority, this seems to have come at the cost of great loss of life, including a number of important lords.

Source Text E

PERICOPE FOURTEEN

$_{65/66}$ 晉兢[景]公立八年, 隓[隨]會衔[率]自[師]會者[諸]侯于幽[斷]道. 公命邹[駒]之克先哂[聘]于齊. 曼[且]邵[召]高之固曰: $_{66/67}$ “今晉[春]亓[其]會者[諸]侯, 子亓[其]與臨之.” 齊同[頃]公囟[使]亓[其]女子自房宷[中]觀邹=之=克=[駒之克. 駒之克]牏[將]受[授]齊侯 $_{67/68}$ 卟[幣]女子芙[笑]于房宷[中]. 邹[駒]之克墜[降]堂而折[誓]曰: “所不遠[復]頓[詢]於齊, 母[毋]能涉白水.” 乃先 $_{68/69}$ 歸[歸]邆[須]者[諸]侯于幽[斷]薑[道]. 高之固至莆池, 乃逃歸[歸]. 齊三辟[嬖]夫=[大夫]南亳[郭]子, 鄹[蔡]子, 安[晏]子衔[率]自[師]以 $_{69/70}$ 會于幽[斷]薑[道]. 既會者[諸]侯, 邹[駒]之克乃敎[執]南薑[郭]子, 鄹[蔡]子, 安[晏]子以歸[歸]. 齊同[頃]公回[圍]魯=[魯. 魯]牆[臧]孫譽[許] $_{70/71}$ 迫[適]晉求救[援]. 邹[駒]之克衔[率]自[師]栽[救]魯; 敗齊自[師]于磊[靡]开[笄]. 齊人為成, 以鶾[顱]骼[賂]玉笁[璆]與鼻[淳]于之 $_{71/72}$ 田. 昷[明]戠[歲],齊同[頃] 公朝于晉兢[景]公. 邹[駒]之克走救[援]齊侯之緧[帶], 獻之兢[景]公, 曰: “齊侯之盉[來]也, $_{72/73}$ 老夫之力也.”乚

$_{65/66}$ In the eighth year of the reign of Lord Jing of Jin [592 B.C.E.], [Shi] Hui of Sui led the army to meet the other lords at Duandao; his lordship ordered Ju Zhi Ke to go in advance on a diplomatic mission to Qi.[182] In

179. See *Shiji*, 15.710.

180. See Liu Quanzhi 劉全志, “Qinghua jian *Xinian* Wangzi Ding ji xiangguan shishi” 清華簡繫年王子定及相關史事, *Wenshi zhishi* 2013.6, 24–30.

181. See Zhang Guangyu 張光裕, “Xinjian Chushi qingtongqi qiming shishi” 新見楚式青銅器器銘試釋, *Wenwu* 2008.1, 73–84; Wu Zhenfeng 吳鎮烽, “Jing Zhi Ding tongqi qunkao” 兢之定銅器群考, *Jianghan kaogu* 2008.1, 82–89; and Yu Xiucui 余秀翠, “Dangyang Jijiahu Chumu fajue jianbao” 當陽季家湖楚墓發掘簡報, *Jianghan kaogu* 1991.1, 17–19.

182. Ju Zhi Ke is better known as Xi Ke 郤克; Li Xueqin, ed., *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian*, 168n2, suggests that Ju 邹[駒] was the name of his fief.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

addition, he summoned Gao Zhi Gu and said: $_{66/67}$ "Since this spring he is going to meet the other lords, you ought to observe them with him." Lord Qing of Qi (r. 598–572 B.C.E.) sent his daughter to watch Ju Zhi Ke from inside the room. Ju Zhi Ke was about to present silk to the marquis of Qi $_{67/68}$ when the girl laughed from inside the room.[183] Ju Zhi Ke walked down from the hall and swore the following oath: "If I cannot avenge the humiliation [I have received] from Qi, I will not cross the Yellow River."[184] He then $_{68/69}$ went home ahead of the others and awaited the other lords at Duandao. Gao Zhi Gu got as far as Puchi, and then fled homewards. The three lesser grandees from Qi, Master Nanguo, Master Cai, and Master Yan led their forces to $_{69/70}$ attend the meeting at Duandao. When they met the other lords, Ju Zhi Ke arrested Master Nanguo, Master Cai, and Master Yan, returning home with them.[185] Lord Qing of Qi then laid siege to Lu.[186] Zangsun Xu of Lu travelled to $_{70/71}$ Jin to request assistance. Ju Zhi Ke led his troops to rescue Lu; he defeated the Qi army at Miji.[187] The people of Qi made peace, offering bronze vessels and jade chimes, as well as the fields $_{71/72}$ of Chunyu.[188] The following year [588 B.C.E.], Lord Qing of Qi paid court to Lord Jing of Jin, whereupon Ju Zhi Ke walked forward holding the marquis of

183. The translation here follows the amendment proposed by Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, *Qinghua er Xinian jijjie*, 504, of reading *shou* 受 (to receive) as *shou* 授 (to present).

184. The story recorded here is somewhat different from that found in the *Zuozhuan*, 772 (Xuan 17), which states that Xi Ke was humiliated by being mocked by a female member of Lord Qing's family (*furen* 婦人). In the *Guliang zhuan*, 470–71 (Cheng 1), the woman is identified as Lord Qing's mother. She was supposedly amused by the fact that a number of foreign powers were represented by disabled people: Xi Ke was blind in one eye, while the ambassador from Wei was lame, and the ambassador from Cao was hunchbacked. The *Guliang zhuan* version of events is often used to explain this story when it appears in other texts, but that does not necessarily mean that it is correct.

185. The *Zuozhuan*, 773 (Xuan 17) suggests that the three men were not together when they were arrested: Master Yan was stopped at Yewang 野王, Master Cai at Yuan 原, and Master Nanguo at Wen 溫.

186. The terms in which this is described in the *Xinian* might suggest that Lord Qing of Qi was laying siege to the capital city. The *Zuozhuan*, 786 (Cheng 2) states that the city of Long 龍 on the northern border was the place concerned.

187. Both the *Chunqiu*, 785 (Cheng 2), and the *Zuozhuan*, 791–792 (Cheng 2) make it clear that the main battle was fought at An 鞌. Miji represents a preliminary skirmish, which took place the day before; see *Zuozhuan*, 790 (Cheng 2).

188. This translation follows the reading of the original commentators that "they used bronze vessels to offer them jade chimestones and the fields of Chunyu" (以鶡[鬫]骼[賂]玉笏[璆]與鄟[淳]于之田), should be understood as: "offering bronze vessels and jade chimes, as well as the fields of Chunyu" (骼[賂]以鶡[鬫]玉笏[璆]與鄟[淳]于之田). The gloss of *shao* 笏 as *qiu* 璆 (jade chimestone) is taken from Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, *Qinghua er Xinian jijie*, 520.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Qi's belt and presented it to Lord Jing. He said: "The presence of the marquis of Qi is all thanks to $_{72/73}$ my efforts."[189]

PERICOPE SEVENTEEN

$_{91/91}$ 晉臧[莊]坪[平]公即立[位]兀[元]年, 公會者[諸]侯於睨[涅]梁. 述[遂]以鼜[遷]譖[許]於鄴[葉]而不果. 自[師]造於方城. 齊高厚 $_{92/92}$ 自自[師]逃歸[歸]. 坪[平]公衙[率]自[師]會者[諸]侯, 為坪[平]佘[陰]之自[師]以回[圍]齊, 焚亓[其]四鼞[郭]毆[驅]車爭[至于]東昔[畝]. 坪[平]公 $_{93/93}$ 立五年, 晉鬲[亂]. 繆[欒]綆[盈]出奔齊=[齊. 齊]臧[莊]公光衙[率]自[師]以逐繆=綆=[欒盈. 欒盈]鼜[襲]巷[絳] 而不果. 奔內[入]於曲夭[沃]. 齊 $_{94/94}$ 臧[莊]公涉河, 鼜[襲]朝訶[歌], 以逿[復]坪[平]佘[陰]之自[師]. 晉人既殺繆[欒]綆[盈]于曲夭[沃]. 坪[平]公衙[率]自[師]會者[諸]侯, 伐齊, $_{95/95}$ 以逿[復]朝訶[歌]之自[師]. 齊蓑[崔]芋[杼]殺亓[其]君臧[莊]公以為成於晉.ㄴ

$_{91/91}$ In the first year [557 B.C.E.] of the reign of Lord Zhuangping of Jin (r. 557–532 B.C.E.),[190] his lordship met the other lords at Juliang.[191] He then tried to move Xu to Ye, but without result.[192] The army was stationed at the Fangcheng Mountains. Gao Hou of Qi $_{92/92}$ fled homewards from the army.[193] Lord Ping led his troops to meet the other lords and laid siege to Qi, thus making the campaign of Pingyin. He burned their four outer city walls and sped his chariot towards Dongmu.[194] In the fifth

189. When the meeting between Lord Qing of Qi and Lord Jing of Jin is described in the *Zuozhuan*, 815 (Cheng 3), it says: "The marquis of Qi paid court to Jin and was about to hand over the jade [baton of office]" (齊侯朝于晉, 將授玉). When these events are mentioned in the *Shiji*, 39.1678, it says: "Lord Qing of Qi went to Jin and wanted to treat Lord Jing of Jin with the respect due to a king" (齊頃公如晉, 欲上尊晉景公為王). It has been suggested either that Sima Qian misunderstood the term *shouyu* 授玉 as *zun wei wang* 尊為王 (to respect as a king), or that he misread the character *yu* 玉 as *wang* 王; see for example Kong Yingda, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushu*, 822 (Cheng 3).

190. In the transmitted tradition, this ruler of Jin is always given the title Lord Ping of Jin; see for example Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, *Mengzi yizhu* 孟子譯注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2007), 237 (10.3 "Wanzhang xia" 萬章下); *Lüshi chunqiu*, 56 ("Qusi" 去私); and *Zuozhuan*, 1318 (Zhao 10). The name Lord Zhuangping of Jin is not used consistently in the *Xinian*; the same individual is also termed Lord Ping.

191. The meeting at Juliang is mentioned in the *Chunqiu*, 1025 (Xiang 16), which names eleven participants.

192. The attempt to move Xu is described in the *Zuozhuan*, 1027 (Xiang 16). The commentary by Yang Bojun notes that no destination is given in this account and suggests that it is because the move was not successful. There also seems to be some confusion here, since the *Chunqiu*, 872 (Cheng 15), records that Xu was moved to Ye in 576 B.C.E.

193. Gao Hou's sudden and premature departure is mentioned in the *Zuozhuan*, 1027 (Xiang 16).

194. The original editors read Dongmu as a placename; however, it is not recorded elsewhere. Chen Wei, "Du Qinghua jian *Xinian* zhaji," 119–120, suggests instead that these two characters should be read as Donghai 東海 (East Sea): the pre-Qin name for the Bohai gulf.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

year of the reign of Lord Ping [553 B.C.E.], 93/93 Jin was thrown into a state of civil war.[195] Luan Ying fled to Qi. Lord Zhuang of Qi (r. 553–548 B.C.E.), named Guang, led his army and pursued Luan Ying. Luan Ying made a surprise attack on Jiang but it did not succeed; he therefore fled to Quwo. Lord Zhuang 94/94 of Qi crossed the Yellow River and made a surprise attack upon Chaoge, in order to avenge the campaign at Pingyin. The people of Jin then killed Luan Ying at Quwo.[196] Lord Ping led his army to meet the other lords and attacked Qi, 95/95 to avenge the campaign at Chaoge. Cui Shu of Qi killed his ruler, Lord Zhuang, in order to make peace with Jin.

PERICOPE EIGHTEEN

96/96 晉臧[莊]坪[平]公立十又二年, 楚康王立十又四年, 命[令]尹子木會邻[趙]文子武及者[諸]侯之夫=[大夫]明[盟] 97/97 于宋. 曰: "爾[弭]天下之虩[甲]兵."康王即殐[世], 乳=[孺子]王即立[位]. 靈[靈]王為命=尹=[令尹. 令尹]會邻[趙]文子及者[諸]侯之夫=[大夫]明[盟]于 98/98 鄗[虢]. 乳=[孺子]王即殐[世], 靈[靈]王即立[位]. 靈[靈]王先起兵會者[諸]侯于繡[申], 敎[執]郤[徐]公, 述[遂]以伐郤[徐], 克滿[賴], 邾[朱]邡[方]. 伐吴 99/99 為南深[懷]之行, 闕[縣]陳, 鄀[蔡], 殺鄀[蔡]靈[靈]侯. 靈[靈]王見禍[禍], 競[景]坪[平]王即立[位]. 晉臧[莊]坪[平]公即殐[世], 邵[昭]公呵[頃]公虘[皆] 100/100 曇[早]殐[世], 柬[簡]公即立[位]. 競[景]坪[平]王即殐[世], 邵[昭]王即立[位]. 譽[許]人屬[亂], 譽[許]公妬出奔晉=[晉. 晉]人羅, 城汝昜[陽], 居 101/101 譽[許]公妬於頌[容]城. 晉與吴會為一, 以伐楚. 閔方城, 述[遂]明[盟]者[諸]侯於型[召]陵, 伐中山. 晉自[師]大疫, 102/102 叟[且]飢, 飤[食]人. 楚邵[昭]王戠[侵]汭[伊]洛, 以逿[復]方城之自[師]. 晉人叟[且]又[有]軦[范]氏与[與]中行 氏之禍[禍]. 七戠[歲]不解虩[甲]. 103/103 者[諸]侯同纂[盟]于鹹泉, 以反晉. 至今齊人以不服于晉=[晉. 晉]公以仍[弱].ㄴ

96/96 In the twelfth year of the reign of Lord Zhuangping of Jin [546 B.C.E.], which was the fourteenth year of the reign of King Kang of Chu (r. 559–545 B.C.E.), the Prime Minister [of Chu] Zimu met Wenzi of Zhao, personal name Wu, and the grandees working for the other lords.[197] They performed a blood covenant 97/97 at Song, which said: "Let us stop the fighting all over the world." When King Kang passed away, King Ruzi (r. 544–541 B.C.E.) was

195. Other accounts of these events state that Jin descended into civil war as the Fan 范 family—one of the great ministerial clans in Jin—attempted to wrest control of the government from the Luan family in 552 B.C.E., that is, in the sixth year of Lord Ping of Jin's rule. See for example *Zuozhuan*, 1058–1061 (Xiang 21).

196. Luan Ying's death at Quwo in 550 B.C.E. is mentioned in the *Zuozhuan*, 1084 (Xiang 23).

197. Yuri Pines, "Zhou History and Historiography," 294, on the basis of this double date, classifies pericope eighteen as a "Jin-Chu" anecdote.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

established.[198] King Ling was the Prime Minister,[199] and as Prime Minister, he met Wenzi of Zhao and the grandees working for the other lords, and held a blood covenant at $_{98/98}$ Guo.[200] When King Ruzi passed away, King Ling was established. King Ling was the first to raise an army and meet the other lords at Shen, whereupon he arrested the ruler of Xu and launched an attack on Xu,[201] conquering Lai and Zhufang.[202] He attacked Wu $_{99/99}$ on account of the Nanhuai campaign, and made Chen and Cai into counties, killing Marquis Ling of Cai (r. 542–531 B.C.E.).[203] When King Ling met with disaster, King Jingping took the throne.[204] After Lord Zhuangping of Jin passed away, Lord Zhao (r. 531–526 B.C.E.) and Lord Qing (r. 525–512 B.C.E.) both $_{100/100}$ died young, so Lord Jian (usually known as Lord Ding of Jin 晉定公, r. 511–475 B.C.E.) was established. When King Jingping passed away, King Zhao came to the throne. The people of Xu rose up in civil war, so the ruler of Xu, Tuo, fled to Jin, and the people of Jin were worried about this.[205] They fortified Ruyang, and had $_{101/101}$ Tuo, the ruler of Xu, live at Rongcheng. Jin and Wu met

198. The *Zuozhuan*, 1223 (Zhao 1) records a different posthumous title for this ruler, Jia'ao 郟敖, which was apparently derived from the location of his tomb. This title appears in a number of ancient historical texts; see for example *Shiji*, 40.1703. In this context, *ao* 敖 is thought to mean "leader" or "ruler," but to be of lower status than a monarch; see Zhang Shuguo 張樹國, "Xinchu wenxian yu Chu xianyishi ji xiangguan wenxue wenti" 新出文獻與楚先逸史及相關文學問題 (*Beijing daxue xuebao (Zhexue shehui kexue ban)* 北京大學學報(哲學社會科學版) 50.6 (2013), 83.

199. The future King Ling is also said to have been Prime Minister of Chu in the *Zuozhuan*, 1155 (Xiang 29), except that this text uses his pre-accession name: Prince Wei 王子圍.

200. The covenant at Guo is recorded in the *Chunqiu*, 1197–98 (Zhao 1).

201. As noted by Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 68, the campaign launched by King Ling against the state of Xu is not mentioned in any other ancient text.

202. The campaign against Zhufang was intended to capture Qing Feng 慶封, one of the chief conspirators in the murder of Lord Zhuang of Qi in 548 B.C.E. See *Zuozhuan*, 1253 (Zhao 4).

203. The highly controversial circumstances in which Lord Ling of Cai was tricked into meeting the king of Chu, only to be made drunk and first arrested, then murdered, and the subsequent execution of his son, are described in some detail in the *Zuozhuan*, 1323–27 (Zhao 11).

204. King Ping was the last of the three sons of King Gong of Chu to become the ruler; he was preceded by his two older half-brothers, King Kang and King Ling. According to the *Zuozhuan*, 1350 (Zhao 13), this had been foretold by prophecy when King Gong was wondering which of his sons to establish as his heir.

205. The name of this ruler of Xu is also now attested to by a cup excavated in 2003, bearing the inscription: "The cup of Tuo, the lord of Xu" (鄦[許]子庅[佗]之盞盂). This discovery is discussed in Huang Jinqian 黃錦前, "Xuzi Tuo yu Xugong Tuo: Jiantan Qinghua jian *Xinian* de kekaoxing" 許子佗與許公佗: 兼談清華簡繫年的可靠性 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=1756 [accessed on August 5, 2015]).

and formed an alliance, attacking Chu and breaking through the Fangcheng Mountains. Then they performed a blood covenant with the other lords at Shaoling, and attacked Zhongshan. The Jin army suffered a terrible outbreak of plague $_{102/102}$ and they were starving, so they were eating human flesh.[206] King Zhao of Chu invaded Yi and Luo, in order to avenge the campaign at the Fangcheng Mountains. The people of Jin suffered the disaster of the Fan and Zhonghang families, whereby for seven years they did not take off their armour.[207] $_{103/103}$ The lords held a blood covenant together at Xianquan, with a view to overturning the authority of Jin.[208] Right up to the present day the people of Qi do not obey the authority of Jin, and the ruler of Jin has become weak.

PERICOPE TWENTY

$_{108/108}$ 晉兢[景]公立十又五年, 繒[申]公屈晉[巫]自晉迺[適]吳玄[焉]訐[始]迵[通]吳晉之逵[路]. 二邦為好以至晉悼=公=[悼公. 悼公] $_{109/109}$ 立十又一年, 公會者[諸]侯以與吳王壽夢相見于鄦[虢]. 晉柬[簡]公立五年, 與吳王盍[闔]虜[盧]伐 $_{110/110}$ 楚. 盍[闔]虜[盧]即殜[世]; 夫秦[差]王即立[位]. 晉柬[簡]公會者[諸]侯以與夫秦[差]王相見于黃池. 戊[越]公句戔[踐]克 $_{111/111}$ 吳. 戊[越]人因衰[襲]吳之與晉為好. 晉敬公立十又一年, 灼[趙]趄[桓]子會【諸】侯之夫=[大夫]以與戊[越]命[令]尹宋翌[盟]于 $_{112/112}$ 郢. 述[遂]以伐齊=[齊. 齊]人玄[焉]訐[始]為長城於濟, 自南山逗[屬]之北海[海]. 晉幽公立四年, 灼[趙]狗衍[率]自[師]與戊[越] $_{113/113}$ 公株[朱]句伐齊. 晉自[師]閱長城句俞之門. 戊[越]公, 宋公敗齊自[師]于襄坪[平]. 至今晉戊[越]以為好.ㄴ

$_{108/108}$ In the fifteenth year of the reign of Lord Jing of Jin [544 B.C.E.], Qu Wu, the lord of Shen, fled to Wu from Jin, and they then began to become conversant with the roads between Wu and Jin. The two countries were allied right up until the time of Lord Dao of Jin (r. 572–558 B.C.E.). In the eleventh year of the reign of $_{109/109}$ Lord Dao of Jin [562 B.C.E.], his lordship met the other lords and then had an audience with King Shoumeng of Wu (r. 585–561 B.C.E.) at Guo.[209] In the fifth

206. This disastrous campaign is not mentioned in any transmitted text, presumably because it was so embarrassing a failure; see Zhang Yuanshan 張遠山, "Baidi Zhongshan Wei shu Zhongshan mishi: Jian bo *Shiji* Zhongshan fuguo miushuo" 白狄中山魏屬中山秘史: 兼駁史記中山復國謬說, *Shehui kexue luntan* 社會科學論壇 2013.4, 16–55.

207. As stated by Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Seika kan *Keinen* kō," 71, the *Xinian* quite correctly ascribes seven years to this terrible period of civil warfare, which endured from 497–491 B.C.E.

208. This covenant is mentioned in both the *Chunqiu*, 1559 (Ding 7); and the *Zuozhuan*, 1561 (Ding 7), but both texts state that it took place at Xian 鹹.

209. This interstate meeting is not recorded within the transmitted tradition, which mentions only two such events for the reign of King Shoumeng of Wu: one at Zhongli 鍾離 in 576 B.C.E., and one at Zu 柤 in 563 B.C.E. See *Zuozhuan*, 876–77 (Cheng 15); and 974 (Xiang 10), respectively.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

year of the reign of Lord Jian of Jin [507 B.C.E.], he attacked 110/110 Chu with King Helu of Wu.[210] When King Helu passed away, King Fuqin (Fuchai) (r. 495–473 B.C.E.) came to the throne.[211] Lord Jian of Jin met with the other lords and had an audience with King Fuqin at Huangchi.[212] Goujian, Duke of Yue (r. 496–465 B.C.E.), conquered 111/111 Wu.[213] The people of Yue took over from Wu in making an alliance with Jin.[214] In the eleventh year [446 B.C.E.] of the reign of Lord Jing of Jin, Zhao Huanzi met the grandees [serving] the other lords.[215] He performed a blood covenant with Prime Minister Song of Yue at 112/112 [unknown character], after which they attacked Qi. The people of Qi then began to build the Great Wall at Ji, which stretched from the southern mountains to the northern sea.[216] In the fourth year [434 B.C.E.] of Lord You of Jin (r. 437–416 B.C.E.), Zhao Gou led his army to attack Qi in concert with Zhugou, duke of 113/113 Yue.[217] The Jin army attacked

210. These events are not mentioned in any other ancient texts.

211. There are well-known problems concerning the nomenclature of many of the kings of Wu, who seem to have used a number of different names simultaneously. Furthermore, there was no standard form of transliteration for the Wu language, resulting in various different characters being used for the same name. King Fuchai, however, seems to have asserted a remarkably consistent naming policy, using only his Wu language two character name, in the form Fuchai 夫差, which appears in both transmitted texts and excavated bronze inscriptions. See Dong Chuping 董楚平, *Wu Yue Xu Shu jinwen jishi* 吳越徐舒金文集釋 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang guji, 1992), 71–75, and 133–49. It is not clear why the *Xinian* should be the only source to name him as Fuqin.

212. The covenant at Huangchi occurred in 482 B.C.E.; see *Zuozhuan*, 1676–79 (Ai 13).

213. Although there is no mention in the *Xinian* of the passing of time, the conquest of Wu by Yue took place nine years after the covenant at Huangchi, in 473 B.C.E.; see *Zuozhuan*, 1719 (Ai 22).

214. As noted by Wang Yikun, "Chutu jianbo shiliao jiazhi chuyi," 114, this alliance between Jin and Yue is not recorded in any transmitted text.

215. In the transmitted tradition, this ruler of Jin is accorded the posthumous title of Lord Ai 晉哀公 (r. 456–438 B.C.E.). The title Lord Jing of Jin is also found in the *Zhushu jinian*, B.19b.

216. For a detailed history of this construction; see Zhang Huasong 張華松, *Qi changcheng* 齊長城 (Ji'nan: Shandong wenyi, 2004). For a study of how the information contained within the *Xinian* can be used to interpret the history of the Qi Great Wall; see Luo Gong 羅恭, "Cong Qinghua jian *Xinian* kan Qi changcheng de xiujian" 從清華簡繫年看齊長城的修建, *Wenshi zhishi* 2012.7, 104–7.

217. The name of this ruler of Yue is given in the same form as that found in the *Zhushu jinian*, B.20a: Zhugou 朱句. In the *Shiji*, 41.1747; and the *Yuejue shu*, 58 ("Jidi zhuan"), this monarch is named King Weng of Yue 越王翁. To date, fifteen bronzes have been discovered which record this monarch's name, which is always given as Zhougou 州句; see for example Kong Lingyuan 孔令遠, "Yuewang Zhougou ge mingwen kaoshi" 越王州句戈銘文考釋, *Kaogu* 2010.8, 87–90; and Li Jiahao 李家浩, "Yuewang Zhougou fuhe jian mingwen ji qi suo fanying de lishi: jian shi bazi mingzhuan zhong mingwen" 越王州句復合劍銘文及其所反映的歷史: 兼釋八字鳥篆鍾銘文, *Beijing daxue xuebao (Zhexue shehui kexue ban)* 1998.2, 221–26.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Juyu Gate at the [Qi] Great Wall. The duke of Yue and the duke of Song defeated the Qi army at Xiangping.[218] To the present day, Jin and Yue are allies.[219]

* * *

Although the major focus of Source Text E is on the state of Jin, pericope seventeen provides important information concerning events in Qi during the reign of Lord Zhuang. He was the son of Lord Ling of Qi 齊靈公 (r. 581–554 B.C.E.); having been dispossessed of his rights in favour of a younger half-brother, he was put in power by a coup launched by a senior minister, Cui Shu. Lord Zhuang was then murdered by Cui Shu in 548 B.C.E. According to the *Zuozhuan* and other transmitted texts, the murder was provoked by Lord Zhuang's seduction of Cui Shu's wife, Lady Tang Jiang 棠姜:

> 乙亥公問崔子, 遂從姜氏. 姜入于室與崔子自側户出. 公拊楹而歌. 侍人賈舉止衆從者而入, 閉門. 甲興. 公登臺而請, 弗許. 請盟, 弗許. 請自刃於廟, 弗許. 皆曰: "君之臣杼疾病, 不能聽命. 陪臣干掫有淫者, 不知二命." 公踰牆, 又射之. 中股., 反隊, 遂弑之.
>
> On Yihai day, his lordship [went to the mansion] to ask after Master Cui, then set off in pursuit of Lady Jiang. Lady Jiang entered her own quarters [and locked the door]; she and Master Cui left by a side entrance. His lordship tapped on the pillar and sang a song. The servant Jia Ju stopped his escort [from entering the house], then he went in and barred the door. [Cui Shu's] soldiers rose up. His lordship climbed a tower and asked [to be set free] but they would not agree. He asked to make a blood covenant, but they did not agree. He asked to be allowed to commit suicide in the ancestral temple, but they did not agree. Everyone said: "Your lordship's minister, Cui Shu, is extremely sick and he cannot attend to your lordship's commands. [He ordered us] to go on night patrol [and arrest] any evildoers. We do not recognize any other orders." His lordship [tried to] scramble over the wall and then they shot at him again, hitting his thigh. He fell and then they assassinated him.[220]

---

218. Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, *Qinghua er Xinian jijie*, 787, argue that the duke of Song mentioned here is Lord Zhao of Song 宋昭公 II (r. 469–404 B.C.E.).

219. Peng Yushang 彭裕商, "Yuewang Chaixu ge mingwen shidu" 越王差徐戈銘文釋讀, *Kaogu* 2012.12, 86–90, uses the references to Yue history contained within this pericope of the *Xinian* to argue that previous readings of this particular bronze inscription, where Chaixu was read as a verb-object construction meaning "to assist Xu" (*zuo Xu* 佐徐) are wrong, and that this must refer to the personal name of a Yue monarch.

220. *Zuozhuan*, 1097–98 (Xiang 25).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The assassination of Lord Zhuang occurred just as the forces of Jin invaded Qi, with the intention of punishing them for their role in Luan Ying's invasion. Thus, the *Xinian* describes the marquis of Qi's death as a political necessity. Since Lord Zhuang was dead, Cui Shu was able to negotiate a peace treaty with Jin, presenting a vast array of bronzes to Lord Ping of Jin, and bribing all the most senior military officials in Jin. Thus, a peace treaty was signed at Yiyi 夷儀, within days of the murder.[221] It is quite possible that such a treaty could not have been achieved if Lord Zhuang was still alive. The story of affair with Lady Tang Jiang preserved in the *Zuozhuan* may be largely fictional; first, on the grounds of their respective positions and ages (Cui Shu's wife being at this time the mother of an adult son); secondly, because Lord Zhuang ought to have been otherwise occupied given that a large enemy army was bearing down on his state; and thirdly, because if the murder of Lord Zhuang was entirely unpremeditated and provoked solely by the seduction of Lady Tang Jiang, then Cui Shu made a truly remarkable recovery to be in a position to conclude a peace treaty with the enemy just days after the assassination.

A couple of stories incorporated into the *Xinian* make reference to important individuals from the history of Yue, beginning with King Goujian; however, the *Xinian* also consistently refers to the rulers of Yue as dukes (*gong* 公). This contradicts a large number of inscribed bronzes which state that Goujian (and his successors) bore the title of king (*wang* 王); furthermore, this terminology is odd in the sense that other foreign monarchs mentioned in this text are referred to as kings, such as King Helu of Wu and his son, King Fuchai.[222] There are a number of texts within the transmitted tradition which do not refer to the kings of Yue with the title *wang*, using instead the term *zi* 子, meaning a ruler whose position was not ratified by the Zhou king.[223] The kingdom of Yue was an extremely powerful state during the early Warring States era, only to be conquered by Chu in around 330 B.C.E.[224]

---

221. The precise date that the peace treaty was agreed cannot be ascertained. However, in the *Chunqiu*, 1094 (Xiang 25), the death of Lord Zhuang is said to have occurred on Yihai day in the fifth lunar month and the next dated entry is an attack on Chen on Renzi 壬子 day of the sixth lunar month; that is seven days later. Given that the peace treaty at Yiyi was signed between these two dates, it must have been at the very latest six days after Lord Zhuang of Qi died.

222. See for example Dong Chuping, *Wu Yue Xu Shu jinwen jishi*, 200–247.

223. For example, the *Zuozhuan*, 1595 (Ding 14); and the *Zhushu jinian*, B.19a record the *zi* title. This usage is intended to be derogatory; see *Shiji*, 47.1943.

224. See Meng Wentong 蒙文通, *Yueshi congkao* 越史叢考 (Beijing: Renmin, 1983), 35; and Li Xueqin, "Guanyu Chu mie Yue de niandai" 關於楚滅越的年代, in *Li*

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although it is clear that this conquest did take place, its completeness is highly debatable, since the descendants of King Goujian of Yue would remain powerful in the region to the Han dynasty and beyond, with many of them assuming the title of king.[225] This being the case, the decision to describe the ruling house of Yue as dukes has to be explained. To date, Chinese scholars have not suggested a reason for this peculiar and incorrect nomenclature, so I would like to propose that it was intended by the compilers of the *Xinian* as a way of denigrating the monarchs of Yue, suggesting that they were inferior to the kings of Chu. Addressing other monarchs such as the rulers of Wu as kings would be uncontroversial at the time that the *Xinian* was compiled, since this kingdom had ceased to exist.

At the same time as the *Xinian* uses the term "duke" for the Yue monarchs, this text makes clear that this state was extremely powerful at the beginning of the Warring States era. As has been noted by many scholars, records concerning the history of the kingdom of Yue are extremely hard to come by, and such texts as do survive tend to date from the late Warring States to Han dynasty.[226] The *Xinian*, dating as it does to around the middle of the fourth century B.C.E., represents a very early source. One vexed issue in the history of Yue during the early Warring States era is that according to many accounts, King Goujian of Yue moved the capital of his kingdom to Langya 琅琊 on the Shandong peninsula.[227] If this is correct, it would imply a significant shift in the balance of power between the Central States and the

---

Xuqin ji: Zhuisu, kaoju, gu wenming 李學勤集追溯考据古文明 (Harbin: Heilongjiang jiaoyu, 1989), 248–54. Other scholars place the conquest later, to around 323–306 B.C.E.; see for example Ni Shiyi 倪士毅, *Zhejiang gudai shi* 浙江古代史 (Linzhou: Zhejiang renmin, 1987), 27.

225. For a discussion of textual evidence that the Yue kings coexisted with Chu viceroys after the kingdom of Yue was officially destroyed; see Xu Jianchun 徐建春, *Zhejiang tongshi: Xian Qin juan* 浙江通史: 先秦卷 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin, 2005), 138. At least one bronze inscription records the existence of a king of Yue after the supposed conquest; see Zhu Dexi 朱德熙, Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, "Pingshan Zhongshan wangmu tongqi mingwen de chubu yanjiu" 平山中山王墓銅器銘文的初步研究, *Wenwu* 1979.1, 42–52. The history of various southern kingdoms such as Minyue 閩越 and Donghai 東海, whose rulers claimed descent from King Goujian, is recorded in *Shiji*, 114.2979–85.

226. For example, according to the word-count done by Su Tie 蘇鐵, "Wu Yue wenhua zhi tancha" 吳越文化之談查, in Wu Yue shidi yanjiuhui 吳越史地研究會, ed., *Wu Yue wenhua luncong* 吳越文化論叢 (Shanghai: Shanghai wenyi, 1990), 374, in the *Zuozhuan*, accounts concerning the kingdom of Yue make up less than 1 per cent of the entire text. In the case of the *Guoyu*, which devotes two chapters to Yue, the focus is entirely on the reign of King Goujian of Yue.

227. See for example *Yuejue shu*, 19 ("Ji Wudi zhuan" 記吳地傳). For a study of the evidence concerning the move; see Xin Deyong 辛德勇, "Yuewang Goujian xidu Langya shi xiyi" 越王勾踐徙都琅邪事析義, *Wenshi* 文史 2010.1, 1–44.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

southern kingdom of Yue at this point, and the evidence concerning the move is both patchy and highly controversial.[228] In pericope twenty, although the moving of the capital is not mentioned, it is clear that in the period 450–430 B.C.E., the Yue army was regularly fighting battles in Shandong; and that in concert with their allies in Jin, they posed a major threat to the security of the state of Qi. As noted by Chen Minzhen, this would suggest that the so-called "Shandong period" (*Shandong shiqi* 山東時期) in the history of Yue is no later invention—although it is not yet clear whether the capital did actually move at this time, there can be no doubt that there was a significant expansion of influence northwards on the part of the kings of Yue.[229]

Conclusion

The *Xinian* should be considered as a historical text produced from a compilation of various different sources; that the origins of the source texts should be considered as lying in different countries can be demonstrated from the fact that some sections in the *Xinian* use the Chu calendar and some use the Jin calendar. Likewise, although the text as it stands contains a certain amount of repeated material, when the different source texts are separated out, there is no repetition within each section. Hence, it can be asserted that although the manuscript appears to be the product of one scribe, and is written in uniform Chu orthography, relatively little intervention has occurred regarding the contents. This suggests that we might consider the *Xinian* as representing a privileged view into the early stage in the development of longer texts during the Warring States era. In order to produce the *Xinian*, it appears that at least five individual source texts were compiled into a single document, having been carefully arranged into more or less chronological order. However, at the time it was placed within a tomb, the process of integration for this text had only just begun. If the *Xinian* had continued in circulation, it is likely that eventually it would have been rearranged to follow a single calendar, and the nomenclature and sequence of events might equally have been adapted to fit with other records of the same events. Likewise, more material might have been added to fill in some of the gaps in the chronology, or more dates added to create an annalistic history. It is fortunate that

228. See Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛, *Suzhou shizhi biji* 蘇州史志筆記 (Suzhou: Jiangsu guji, 1987), 32.

229. See Chen Minzhen 陳民鎮, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* suojian Yueguoshi xin shiliao" 清華簡繫年所見越國史新史料 (http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.SrcShow.asp?Src_ID=1804 [accessed on November 19, 2014]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2016.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the *Xinian* text was buried when it was, because it thus preserves historical information that is not related to the transmitted textual tradition. Whether this historical information is correct or not is another issue; however, the contents of the *Xinian* should not be dismissed out of hand simply because it does not always accord with what is recorded in the *Zuozhuan* and other ancient texts.

Of the five source texts, A seems to be the most controversial and contains the material which to date has received the most scholarly attention. This is largely because this source text concerns events which are well-described within the transmitted tradition, and hence a meaningful comparison can be sustained. However, it is likely that in the longer term the information provided by Source Texts D and E will prove particularly significant, since these sections of the *Xinian* describe the history of the early Warring States era, which is extremely badly recorded within the transmitted tradition. Hence, although these sections may well contain errors and inaccuracies, the information contained within them allows for the filling in of some blank spaces within the history of China during the Eastern Zhou dynasty. However, a great deal more research is required to fully appreciate the value of the *Xinian*, particularly through the comparison of this text with information contained within ancient bronze inscriptions. Furthermore, it is likely that our understanding of this text will be modified in the future, with further archaeological discoveries.

清華大學藏戰國竹簡《繫年》譯釋

米歐敏

提要

2008年清華大學入藏一批楚簡: 此文獻内有一部久已佚失的史書, 被稱爲《繫年》。此書之二十四章的文字篇幅概述從周朝建立至戰國早期的歷史大事, 學術價值彌足珍貴。2011 年由李學勤主編清華大學出土文獻研究與保護中心編著的《清華大學藏戰國竹簡（貳）》問世, 此即《繫年》。已經有不少學者對此書進行研究，取得了很多的成果, 尤其是内容與傳世文獻大致相同的章節。《繫年》有許多史事不見於傳世文獻, 對《左傳》等典籍有重大的訂正作用。特別是關於戰國前期歷史的各章, 《繫年》提供的新材料可填補古史之空白, 十分珍貴。

Keywords: *Xinian*, bamboo books, history, *Zuozhuan*, Zhou dynasty
繫年, 竹簡, 歷史, 左傳, 周代