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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 (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
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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. 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.). This is compatible with the date obtained by C^{14} analysis of one of the bamboo strips: 305 B.C.E. +/− 30 years. 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. 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 清華大學藏戰國竹簡 (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]).


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. 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. 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. 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. 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). It is certainly true that the second half of the text

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” 清華簡繫年的敘事體例核心與理念, Huaxia wenhua luntan 華夏文化論壇 8 (2012), 286–87.
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.
Table 1. Dates of events recorded in the *Xinian*

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

*Continued*
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* [*Zuo zhuan*], he selected the most important events, forty pericopes in all, thus forming the *Duoshi wei* (Highlights of Master Duo)”

For some scholars, in spite of the different lengths recorded for this text, the *Xinian*—if not identical to the *Duoshi wei*—then at the very least closely related to it. 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）, a text recounting a single historical story concerning conflict between Jin and Chu, has also been identified as deriving from the *Duoshi wei*. Likewise, it has been suggested that the badly damaged historical text excavated from the late Warring States era tomb at Cili 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.


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 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. Alternatively, Xu Zhaochang and Qi Dandan 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. 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 pericopes 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.

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.”
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 shiju 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.
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 (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

昔周武王監觀商王之不彝【恭】帝=【上帝】禋祀不龏【恭】=【上帝】【寅】乃乍【作】帝【籍】以登【祀】帝=【上帝】天神: 名之曰 2/2 千畝【歃】。以克反商邑，尃敷【政】天下。厲=【至於】東=【王=】厲王，厲王大遷【虜】于周卿【士】者【諸】正萬民，弗刃【忍】于芾【厥】心，【迄】乃歸東【厲】王于亳【巍】。賁【共】白【伯】和立十四年，東【厲】王生洹=【王=】宣王。宣王即立【位】。厲【共】白【伯】和歸于宋【宗】。洹=【宣】4/4 王乃白【始】弃【棄】帝執【籍】弗畋【田】。立【出】三十又九年，戎乃大敗周自【師】于千畝【歃】。
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 kô” 清華簡緯年考, Kyōto daigaku bungaku bu 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 Xinhian 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 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 xian Xinhian zhaji” 都清華簡緯年札記, Yuwen xuekan 論文學刊 2014.7, 24, suggests instead that 帝 is simply a variant form for the character di 迪, with = indication duplication rather than contraction.


24. The translation here follows the annotations in Su Jianzhou 蘇建洲, Wu Wenwen 吳雯雯, Lai Yixuan 賴怡炫, Qinghua er Xinhian 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 Zhuzhongzhi 諸侯志. see Guo Qinfan 郭慶藩, Zhuzhongzhi jishi 諸侯志集释 (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, 天子無德,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。”召公乃立宜王,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 Yixian 洪頤煊, footnotes continued on next page
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 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” 清華簡編年與周宣王‘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 Giwu; see Shanghai shifan daxue guji zhenglizu 上海師範大學古籍整理組, Giwu 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’” 由清華簡編年論‘文侯之命’, Yangzhou daxue xuebao (Renwen shehui kexue ban) 扬州大學學報 (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, Zhongguan wenwu 中原文物 1984.4, 31–32, 39.

29. The two characters Fu 吕 (pú) and Bao 鄧 (phu RI) 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.
gave birth to Bopan. Lady Fu Si was favoured by the king. His Majesty loved Bopan, and thus forced King Ping into exile: King Ping fled to Western Shen. 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 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.).

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. Marquis Wen of Jin met King Ping at Shao’e and had him take the throne in the capital. 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 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.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, Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushi 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, 8.11a respectively. Therefore, Chen Wei 陳偉, “Du Qinghua jian Xinian zhai san” 讀清華簡箋年札記三, Jianghan kaogu 江漢考古 2012.3, 118, suggests that it is unlikely that Wang yu Bopan zhui 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 徐彦, Chunqiu Gongyang zhuang zhusu 春秋公羊傳注疏 (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 1999), 94 (Huan 9). Dong Shan 董珊, “Du Qinghua jian Xinian” 讀清華簡箋年 (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 晋姜鼎.

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.
 Zhao and established his younger brother Xinshou (Meishou).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{35} King Wen of Chu then opened up land at Tanyang (Hanyang).\textsuperscript{36}

\textbf{PERICOPE THREE}

\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{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 Zuo zhuan, 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.

\textsuperscript{35} According to the Zuo zhuan, 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.

\textsuperscript{36} In the Zuo zhuan, 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.

\textsuperscript{37} The reading of the character shi 尻 as zuan 獄 follows Huang Tianian 黃天鈞, “Xinian disanzhang Chengwang shi fa Shangyi zhi shizhi bulun” 聚年第三章成王辱商邑之屎字補論 (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.

\textsuperscript{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 录子𠛳 or Sheng, Viscount of Lu 录子耿. See Shirakawa Shizuka 白川静, Kinbun tsu 金文通論 (Vol. 1A; Kobe: Hakutsuru bijutsukan, 1964), 59–60; and Yin Weizhang 殷維璋, 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.
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 廬侯簋. Tang Lan 唐蘭, Xi-Zhou qingtongqi mingwen fenmai 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 費廉.

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” 談秦人初居隴西的地理位置, 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 some of these particular people see Li Xueqin, “Qinghua jian Xinian Nuzha zhi Rong shikao” 清華簡繆年奴盧之戎試考, Shehui kexue zhanxian 社會科學戰線 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 xqian xintan” 清華簡繆年與秦人西遷新探, 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 抉 (to protect); this reading is also favoured by Yoshimoto Michimas, “Seika kan Keinen kō,” 23. Various other alternatives have been offered; Xiaohu 小弧, “Du Xinian yizha” 讀繆年貺札 (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 Xinian yu dushu xiaozuo 華東師範大學中文系戰國簡讀書小組, “Du Qinghua daxue cang Zhangguo xzhujuan er. Xinian shu hou (yi)” 讀清華大學藏戰國簡竹簡二.簡著年後 (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” 清華簡繆年與銅器銘文互證二, Shenzheng 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.).
PERICOPE FOUR

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. They thus established junior members of the ruling house [in fiefs] far and wide in order that they might act as a protective screen for Zhou. Thus they initially established Wei Diao Feng (Wei Shu Feng) at Gengqiu (Kangqiu), in order that he might rule over the remaining Yin people. The men of Wei from Gengqiu moved to Qiwei. In the seventeenth 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. 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, Zhang Maorong 張懋錦, Tian Xudong 田旭東, Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu 逸周書汇校集注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1995), 997 (“Jigong” 祭公).

47. As noted by Li Xueqin, “Qinghua jian Xinian jieda feng Wei yimi” 清華簡繁年譜 應封衛迎謎, Wenshi zhishi 文史知識 2012.3, 13–15, there has been much speculation over the terms of the “Kanggao” 康告 (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 enfeofment occurred in the reign of King Cheng.

48. The Zhushu jinian, B:315b 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 Zhuanguo jian dushu xiaozu 華東師範大學中文系戰國簡書小組, “Du Qinghua daxue chang Zhuanguo zhujian er. Xinian shuhou (er)” 華東師範大學藏戰國竹簡二集成六年書後二 (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).
was killed by him. The Di thereupon occupied Wei, and the people of Wei moved east and crossed 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. 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”] the Honourable Qifang there: he became Lord Wen (r. 659–641 B.C.E.). 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 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. The Shi ji 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 螢澤); see Zuo zhuan, 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 courtesy title, for example when indicating the individual’s status as heir.

51. According to the Shi ji, 37.1594–1955, Lord Dai and Lord Wen of Wei were brothers. However, Lord Wen’s personal name is usually given as Hui 福. The Honourable Qifang of Wei is mentioned in Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, Lushi 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” 齊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.
Yusheng 梁 Xie in the 正 misunderstanding the name “He of Gong” as an epithet. 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.

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. This raised the possibility that he survived the sack of the Zhou capital, a theory which was thoroughly explored by imperial era commentators. However, the Zhushu jinian provides a different account, which is more closely related to that found in the Xinian:

犬戎殺王子服伯, 軍衆以為歸, 申侯, 魯侯, 許男, 陳子立宜臼于申; 韬公翰立王子余臣于殊。

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.

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 zhiji 史記志疑 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2006), 103.
56. See Zuozhuan, 1476 (Zhao 26).
57. See Du Yu 杜预, Chunqiu jingzhuan jijie (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2007), 1590–91 (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” 簡語 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.
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.).

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.

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. 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” (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. 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
than an absence at that point. 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. 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. 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。建管叔于东；建蔡叔，霍叔于殷，俾监殷臣). 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 历史研究 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構, Lishi yanjiu 历史研究 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 清華二系年記解 (Taipei: Shijie, 1970), 48:126 (“ Zuoluo jie 作緯解”.
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.
Three Guardians rebelled” (管叔, 蔡叔, 監禄父 … 監父及三監叛). 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. 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. 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 suggesting that this attribution is wrong. 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. 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, 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” 從清華簡看周初的三監, Liaoning shifan daxue xuebao (Shehui kexue ban) 廈寧師范大學學報 (社會科學版) 36.6 (2013), 924–28.
71. Shiji, 35.1565.
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.\(^2\) 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].”\(^{27}\) Lady Gui of Sai thus entered Cai and Marquis Ai of Cai raped her.\(^{27}\) The marquis of Sai bore a grudge about this, so he sent a messenger to King Wen of Chu\(^{25/25}\) to say: “If
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 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.).

To the north, King Wen opened up land on the far side of the Fangcheng Mountains, setting the border at the Ru River. He put his troops into battle formation at Chen, and then captured the city of Cun (Dun) in order to strike fear into the marquis of Chen.

PERICOPE FIFTEEN


75. The fratricidal rivalry between Du/ao (also known as Zhuang’aio 莊敬) 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 Zuo zhuan 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 Zuo zhuan, 292–93 (Xi 4): “The kingdom of Chu has the Fangcheng Mountains as its walls and the Han River as its moat” (楚國方城以為城，漢水以為池).
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.],\(^74\) 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

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.],\(^74\) 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
Gong (r. 590–560 B.C.E.) was established. Moyao also died and the Minister of War, Prince Fan, and the lord of Shen 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 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.

In the time of King Ling (r. 873–853 B.C.E.), King Ling attacked Wu and conducted the Nanhuai campaign, [during which] he captured Prince Jueyou of Wu. The people of Wu then submitted to the authority of Chu. When King Ling passed away, King Jingping (r. 853–841 B.C.E.) took the throne. The Junior Preceptor [Fei] Wuji slandered the lianyin [Wu] She and killed him; his sons Wu Yuan (d. 727 B.C.E.) and Wu Zhi Ji escaped and fled to Wu. Wu Ji took command 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. 841–763 B.C.E.) then took the throne. Wu Yuan became the chancellor of Wu. 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 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” 清華簡績年 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 jiexi, 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.
of Wu at Xi. 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. 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 Zuo zhuan, 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 Zuo zhuan, 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 and Yi Xingfu. The following year, her son, Xia Zhengshu, 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 (Qu Wu). 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. However, in terms of the historical context.

88. This whole sequence of events is described in almost identical wording, though much greater detail, in the Zuo zhuan, 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 seize the throne from his older brother in 505 B.C.E. In the Zuo zhuan, 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 Zuo zhuan, 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
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, returned to Chu to be executed with his father; Wu Yuan escaped to the kingdom of Wu. 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. 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. 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 (Biographies of Exemplary Women); see Wang Zhaoyuan, Lienü zhuan buzhu (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu, 1976), 136 (“Niebi” 奴嬖): “[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 内挟伎術, 蔼老而復壯者).

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: 以清代簡繫年為例, 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.

PERICOPE SIX


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 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 中生. 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. Ziji 子居, “Qinghua jian Xinian 5–7 zhang jiexi” 清華簡纂年 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 opprobrium attached to describing the deaths of Xiqi and Daozi at the hands of Li Ke.
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 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. 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 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. 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 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. 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 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.

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 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 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 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 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 Shi ji, 39.1656–60 give an identical itinerary; an alternative is found in the Guoyu, 337–55 (“Jinyu 4”) and the Li shi chunqiu, 519–20 (“Shangde 上德”). As noted by Li Longxian 李隆献, Jinyu fuguo dingba kao 晉文公復國定霸考 (Taipei: Guoli Taiwan daxue, 1988), 140, insufficient knowledge of Spring and Autumn period place-names 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” (惠公元婦孟子. 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.
PERICOPE SEVEN


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, \[\text{footnote 103}\] stationing troops in Gu and occupying Min. \[\text{footnote 104}\] Lord Wen of Jin was cognizant of Qi and Song’s 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. \[\text{footnote 105}\] The king of Chu did indeed lift the siege and go home, taking up residence [beyond] the Fangcheng Mountains. \[\text{footnote 106}\] 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 to defeat the Chu army at Chengpu. \[\text{footnote 107}\] 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 (“Jinzu 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 kô,” 41.

104. This reading of the character 蠻 as min is, follows the annotations by Sun Feiyuan 孫飛燕, “Du Xinian zhaji sanze” 讀繫年削記三則 (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 kô,” 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 (Strategems 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” 泰策 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.
from Chu. He performed a blood covenant with the other lords at Jiantu.

PERICOPE EIGHT

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 from Qin. 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.” 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 to trade, met with them; in accordance with an order from the ruler of Zheng he feasted the three armies of Qin. The...
army then returned; they attacked Hua and captured it. Lord Wen of Jin had died but was not yet buried when Lord Xiang (r. 627–621 B.C.E.) personally led his armies to intercept the Qin army at Xiao and inflicted a terrible defeat upon them. 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 began to be hostile towards Jin, and ally with Chu.

PERICOPE NINE

When Lord Xiang of Jin died, Lord Ling [whose personal name was] Gao (r. 620–607 B.C.E.) was but a small child. 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!” They ordered [Xian] Mie, Infantry General of the Left, and [Shi] Hui of Sui to summon Lord Xiang’s younger brother, Yong, 50/50. 

The sequence of events described here is recorded in very similar terms in the Zuo zhuan, 494–98 (Xi 33); and Li shi chunqiu, 989–90 (“Huigu” 晷過); 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). 51/51.

The Chunqiu, 492 (Xi 33) does not mention leadership of this campaign; while the Zuo zhuan attributes it to Xian Zhen 先軫. The Gong yang zhuan, 272 (Xi 33); and Zhong Wenzheng 鍾文烝, Chunqiu Guliang jing zhuan 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. 52/52.

Elsewhere, Lord Ling’s personal name is given as Yi gao 夷皋; see Chunqiu, 650 (Xuan 2); or as Yi gao 夷皋; see Gongyang zhuan, 324 (Xuan 2). 53/53.

This translation follows the annotations of the original publication in reading qiang 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). 54.

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 Zuo zhuan, 474 (Xi 28).
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


\(^{53}/^{54}\) 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 烏也, 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 duxue 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’” 賽狐與‘書法不陰’, Shixue yuekan 2011.6, 114–16; and Tang Damin 湯大民, “Shu fa bu yin wu yin ma? Dong Hushian zhiyi” ‘書法不陰’無陰嗎董狐史案質疑, 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” 清華簡箋年 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 陽陰.
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 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.

footnote continued on next page
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 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 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. Therefore he suggests that this particular story was recorded comparatively carelessly.

126. The placename Tulin is thought to refer to the Yunneng marshes, the hunting grounds of the kings of Chu; see Yuan Jinping 袁金平, “Qinghua jian Xinian Tulin kao” 清華簡竹紙年林考, 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” 清華戰國竹簡卷第十一章箋疏, 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 Lishi 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
homewards from Li, so King Zhuang then provoked conflict in Zheng. Lord Cheng of Jin (r. 607–600 B.C.E.) met the other lords with a view to rescuing Zheng; before the Chu army had turned back, Lord Cheng of Jin died at Hu.

PERICOPE THIRTEEN


62/63 … 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. … The people [of Chu] performed a blood covenant. 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= adequate|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).
PERICOPE SIXTEEN

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 Xiaoahu, “Du Xinian yizha”; and Qinghua daxue chutu wenxian dushuhui 清華大學出土文獻讀書會, “Qinghua daxue cong Zhangguo 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 射 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 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 zuhu 謂 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 ya 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” (yī nian 一年) is not to be taken entirely literally.
King Long sent the lord of Yun on a diplomatic visit to 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. Before he had returned, Lord Jing of Jin died and Lord Li (r. 580–573 B.C.E.) succeeded. King Long sent Prince Chen on a diplomatic visit to Jin, and again reconfirmed the peace treaty. 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] Wenzi [Shi] Xie of Jin and the grandees representing the other lords and they performed a blood covenant in Song. They said: “Let us stop the fighting all over the world.” 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 Qin. He arrived at Jing. 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.

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 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.”

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 涞陽縣, 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
PERICOPE NINETEEN

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. When King Jingping passed away, [King] Zhao was established. Chen, Cai, and Hu rebelled against Chu, and joined with the people of Wu in attacking Chu. 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. When King Zhao returned to his country, he attacked Hu and laid siege to Cai. King Zhao passed away. In the eleventh year [478 B.C.E.] of King Xianhui (r. 488–432 B.C.E.), Shen, Marquis Zhao of Cai (r. 518–491 B.C.E.) became frightened, so he personally gave his allegiance to Wu. Man Yong (Xie Yong) 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 昔公, and the Suoyin commentary mentions another variant: Lord Bi 昔公; see Shiji, 5.197ns5.

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 xiangyu 墨子箋譯 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2001), 440 (“Guixi” 貴義).

153. Clearly there is a problem with the chronology here. Li Xueqin, ed., Qinghua daxue cang Zhangguo zhuyian, 18597 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.
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

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 jiijiao huikao 吳越春秋校匯考 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1997), 87 (“Fuchai neizhuan” 夫差內傳). Ziju 子居, “Qinghua jian Xinian di shiliu-shijiuzhang jiexi” 清華簡纂年第六十九章解析 (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” 清華簡纂年簡幕 (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 竓.

156. Liang Liyong 梁立勇, “Du Xinian zhaji” 魯 Xinian 記, Shenzhen daxue xuebao (Renwu shenhui kexue ban) 29.3 (2012), 59 suggests maintaining the Shi Ji traditional dates given for King Jian of Chu’s reign (431–408 B.C.E.), but reading 七 (seven) as an orthographic mistake for 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 Zhangqiu 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
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

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, 曾乙. Further references to the Mo’ao Yangwei were found among the Xincai texts: Jia san 甲三. 36: “[The year] that [one illegible character] the great Mo’ao Yangwei fought [a battle] at the Great Wall” (口大莫敖放戰於長城之【戰】); and Jia san. 296: “[One character illegible] the great Mo’ao Yangwei fought a battle with the Jin army at the Great [one character illegible]” (口莫敖放為易為秋[戰] 【戰】於長城); see Bing Shangbai 葛尚白, 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” 清華簡卷新簡莫敖為易為考論, Zhongyuan wenhua yanjiu 中原文化研究 2014.2, 50–54.

158. Li Xueqin, “Qinghua jian Xinian ji youguan gushi wenti” 清華簡卷年紀及有關古史問題, 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 多棄銘, 莫敖小遁). This translation follows the alternative reading given by Guo Yongbing 郭永秉, “Qinghua jian Xinian chanzi biejie” 清華簡卷年曆字別解 (http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/SrcShow.asp?Src_ID=1445 [accessed on November 19, 2014]).
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 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 zhuans” 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 Yueweng bingqi ji qi xianguan 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 越王旨殷, 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 齊史學刊 2000.2, 89. Tian (* lin) 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 Linqu 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
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


usurping ministerial house). For the former theory; Chao Fulin 晁福林, Chunqiu Zhangguo de shehui bianqian 春秋戰國的社會變遷 (Beijing: Shangwu, 2011), 172–78; for the latter see Yang Kuan 楊觀, Zhanguo shi 戰國史 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin, 1980), 270, and Wang Sen'ge 王森閣, Tang Zhiquing 唐致卿, Qigu shi 齊國史 (Jinan: 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 卞公 in 379 B.C.E., Lord Mu of Lu 靜公 in 377 B.C.E., and Lord Xu of Song 宋公 in 381 B.C.E. The revised dates of these rulers are taken from Tao Jing, “You Qinghua jian Xinian tan Huanzi Meng Jiang hu xiangguan wenti”; however, problems with the chronology and nomenclature of the rulers of Wei and Zhenge have yet to be resolved.
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 year 129/129, [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 [399 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 報羌 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, “Qinghua jian Xinian zhong de Biao Qiang zhong xiangguan shishi fafu” 清華簡報年中的瞭羌鐘相關史事發覆, 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 趙杞文明與楚文化研究 (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 nian dai kao: jian tan chutu cailiao Chuguo xian dafu” 莫子遊楚魯陽年代考: 兼談出土材料所見楚國縣大夫與封君之稱謂, Jianjiang kaogu 2012.3, 83–84.

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 131/133, 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 Jin 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 Shexion, 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 迹, which literally means “to surpass” is used instead to mean “to conquer” or “to capture”; see Li Xueqin, ed., Qingshu daxue cang Zhangwu zhujian, 1991, p. 15. 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 ("Shuozi" 説疑).

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 Yue 高誘 (fl. 205) commentary on the Lushi 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 she 中國哲學史 2011.2, 5–11; and Zhou Xunchu 周勖初, Han Feizi zhaiji 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, “Qingshu jian Xinian yu Zheng Ziyang zhi nan xintan” 清華簡經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 Huaqian 宋穎, 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: Qingshu jian Xinian zhaiji zhi yi” 楚悼王初期的大戰與楚封君: 清華簡經年札記之一, Wenshi zhishi 2012.5, 107.

172. This translation follows the annotations in the original publication, in reading 鄭 as Teng 廣; see Li Xueqin, ed., Qingshu daxue cang Zhangwu zhujian, 2001, 22.
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. The people of Chu abandoned their 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 when the king commanded Lord Daowu of Pingye to send someone to request troops from Chen Hao of Qi. Chen Jimu [of Qi] led one thousand chariots to follow the Chu army to Wuyang. On Jiawu day, Jin and Chu 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. 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. Pericope twenty-one of the Xinian describes a successful campaign by the three lords of Zhao,
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). Kuozzi 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).
fled to Jin in 399 B.C.E., who is mentioned in the Shiji.\textsuperscript{179} However, as noted by Liu Quanzhi 劉全志, although the year is correct, this attribution is unlikely.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{181} Hence, the precise identity of this prince is at present unknown, but his capacity for causing trouble is clear. Although King Shenghuang 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.

\section*{Source Text E}

\textbf{PERICOPE FOURTEEN}


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.\textsuperscript{182} In

\textsuperscript{179} See Shiji, 15:710.

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


\textsuperscript{182} Ju Zhi Ke is better known as Xi Ke 邢克; Li Xueqin, ed., Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian, 168n2, suggests that Ju 郗[駒] was the name of his fief.
addition, he summoned Gao Zhi Gu and said: "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 when the girl laughed from inside the room. 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." He then 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 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. Lord Qing of Qi then laid siege to Lu. Zangsun Xu of Lu travelled to Jin to request assistance. Ju Zhi Ke led his troops to rescue Lu; he defeated the Qi army at Miji. The people of Qi made peace, offering bronze vessels and jade chimes, as well as the fields of Chunyu. 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 jijie, 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 南. 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 chimes and the fields of Chunyu” (以鈷[鈷]以鈷[鈷]玉璆[璆]與璆[璆]于之田). should be understood as: “offering bronze vessels and jade chimes, as well as the fields of Chunyu” (鈷[鈷]以鈷[鈷]玉璆[璆]與璆[璆]于之田). The gloss of shao 賦 as qiu 璫 (jade chasmine) is taken from Su Jianzhou, Wu Wenwen, Lai Yixuan, Qinghua er Xinian jijie, 520.
Qi’s belt and presented it to Lord Jing. He said: “The presence of the marquis of Qi is all thanks to my efforts.”  

PERICOPE SEVENTEEN


01/01 In the first year [557 B.C.E.] of the reign of Lord Zhuangping of Jin (r. 557–532 B.C.E.), 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 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” (齊侯公如晋, 欲上尊晉公為王). 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 (“Quzi” 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 556 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 zhajj,” 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.
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 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 family—one of the great ministerial clans in Jin—attempted to wrest control of the government from the Lu 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.
established.\textsuperscript{198} King Ling was the Prime Minister,\textsuperscript{199} and as Prime Minister, he met Wenzhi of Zhao and the grandees working for the other lords, and held a blood covenant at \textit{Guo}.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{201} conquering Lai and Zhufang.\textsuperscript{202} He attacked Wu on account of the Nanhuai campaign, and made Chen and Cai into counties, killing Marquis Ling of Cai (r. 542–531 B.C.E.).\textsuperscript{203} When King Ling met with disaster, King Jingping took the throne.\textsuperscript{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 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.\textsuperscript{205} They fortified Ruyang, and had Tuo, the ruler of Xu, live at Rongcheng. Jin and Wu met

\textsuperscript{198} The \textit{Zuozhuan}, 1223 (Zhao 1) records a different posthumous title for this ruler, Jia’o 邾敖, which was apparently derived from the location of his tomb. This title appears in a number of ancient historical texts; see for example \textit{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” 新出文献與楚先逸史及相關文學問題 (Beijing daxue xuebao 社科院學報, 50.6 (2013), 83.

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

\textsuperscript{200} The covenant at Guo is recorded in the \textit{Chunqiu}, 1197–98 (Zhao 1).

\textsuperscript{201} As noted by Yoshimoto Michimasa, “Seika kan \textit{Keinen kō},” 68, the campaign launched by King Ling against the state of Xu is not mentioned in any other ancient text.

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Zuo zhuan}, 1253 (Zhao 4).

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Zuozhuan}, 1323–27 (Zhao 11).

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Zuozhuan}, 1350 (Zhao 13), this had been foretold by prophecy when King Gong was wondering which of his sons to establish as his heir.

\textsuperscript{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” (鄰[許]子佗[佗]之盞盂). This discovery is discussed in Huang Jinqian 黃錦前, “Xu Zi Tuo yu Xugong Tuo: Jiantan Qinghua jian Xintian de kekaoxing” 許子佗與許公佗: 開設清華簡編年的可靠性 (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.\footnote{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.\footnote{207} The lords held a blood covenant together at Xianquan, with a view to overthrowing the authority of Jin.\footnote{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

In the fifteenth year of the reign of Lord Jing of Jin \[544 \text{ B.C.E.}\], 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 \text{ B.C.E.}). In the eleventh year of the reign of \[109/109\] Lord Dao of Jin \[562 \text{ B.C.E.}\], his lordship met the other lords and then had an audience with King Shoumeng of Wu \(r. 585–561 \text{ B.C.E.}\) at Guo.\footnote{209} In the fifth

\footnote{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: 間伯史籍中山復國謬說, Shehui kexue luntan 社會科學論壇 2013.4, 16–55.\footnote{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 \text{ B.C.E.}\footnote{208} This covenant is mentioned in both the Chunqiu, 1559 (Ding 7); and the Zuo zhuan, 1561 (Ding 7), but both texts state that it took place at Xian 壽.\footnote{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 鎮離 in 576 \text{ B.C.E.}, and one at Zu 山 in 563 \text{ B.C.E.} See Zuo zhuan, 876–77 (Cheng 15); and 974 (Xiang 10), respectively.
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 吳越徐鸞金文集釋 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang guji, 1992), 71–75, and 133–49. It is not clear why the Xinnian 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 Xinnian 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.10b.

216. For a detailed history of this construction; see Zhang Huasong 張華松, Qi changcheng 奇長城 (Ji’nan: Shandong wenyi, 2004). For a study of how the information contained within the Xinnian can be used to interpret the history of the Qi Great Wall; see Luo Gong 羅恭, “Cong Qinghua jian Xinnian kan Qi changcheng de xiujian” 從清華簡集年看齊長城的修建, 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 趙勾. In the Shiji, 41.1747; and the Yuejue shu, 58 (“Jidi zhan”), this monarch is named King Weng of Yue 湧王翁. To date, fifteen bronzes have been discovered which record this monarch’s name, which is always given as Zhougou 州勾; see for example Kong Lingyuan 孔令遠, “Yuewang Zhougou ge mingwen kaoshi” 越王州勾戈銘文考釋, Kaogu 2010.8, 87–90; and Li Jiahao 李家毫, “Yuewang Zhougou fuhe jian mingwen ji qi suo fanying de lishi: jian shi bazi mingzhuan zhong mingwen” 越王州勾復合劍銘文及其所反映的歷史: 兼釋八字鳥篆銘文, Beijing daxue xuebao (Zhexue shehui kexue ban) 1998.2, 221–26.
the Juyu Gate at the [Qi] Great Wall. The duke of Yue and the duke of Song defeated the Qi army at Xiangping. To the present day, Jin and Yue are allies.

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 (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 晉姜:

乙亥公問崔子，遂從姜氏。姜入於室與崔子自側戶出。公拊楹而歌。侍人賈舉止眾從者而入，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 evil-doers. 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.

---

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.

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 尹儀, within days of the murder. 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. 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.

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.

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...
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. 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. 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. If this is correct, it would imply a significant shift in the balance of power between the Central States and the

---


225. For a discussion of textual evidence that the Yue kings coexisted with Chu viceroy 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, Wenshi 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 yanjiu 戈越史地研究會, ed., Wu Yue wenhua luncong 吳越文化論叢 (Shanghai: Shanghai wenyi, 1990), 374, in the Zuo zhuan, 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 zhu” 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.
southern kingdom of Yue at this point, and the evidence concerning the move is both patchy and highly controversial. 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.

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 魏頡剛, Suzhou shizhi biji 蘇州史志筆記 (Suzhou: Jiangsu guji, 1987), 32.
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; 此文獻內有一部久已佚失的史書, 被稱為《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, 尤其是內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。
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