



Errata

EARLY CHINA 9-10 (1983-1985)

On the contents page, abstracts page, and page 21, the correct title of Keightley's article should be: "Reports from the Shang: A Correction and Some Speculations."

Page 258, last line, to page 259, line 1: Delete: "scholarly publications and other conferences in China, the exchange."

EARLY CHINA 11-12 (1985-1987)

Contents, page 2, line 1: For "Civilization" read "Civilisation."

Abstracts, THE EARLY CHINA FORUM, "ZHOUYUAN ORACLE-BONE INSCRIPTIONS: ENTERING THE RESEARCH STAGE?" EDWARD L. SHAUGHNESSY, line 13: After ". . . of these inscriptions" insert "were divined by men of Shang. The reviewer contends that the inscriptions"; then continue with "recording sacrifices to."

Page 44, lines 4 to 1 from bottom: Under "month number" for "3" read "3-1"; for "4" read "4-2"; for "5" read "5-3"; for "6" read "6-4."

Page 47, Table 1, line 16 from bottom, entry 6: For "11/50" read "11/60."

Page 58, line 1: For "Geng Ding" read "Kang Ding."

Page 124, 6 lines from bottom: For "Kenchtges" read "Knechtges."

Page 143, n. 168: For "Ch'u" read Ch'ü."

Page 156, line 9: Add the Chinese character "大" after the three dots at the end of the line.

Page 158, 12 lines from bottom: For "occurence" read "occurrence."

Page 183, 18 lines from bottom: For "Mangjia" read "Mengjia."

Page 186, 10 lines from bottom: For "Prince Ying" read "Prince Yang."

Page 190, line 5: For "lineagae" read "lineage."

Page 194, line 6: For "Forthoming" read "Forthcoming."

Page 209, lines 6 to 9 from the top: The publication data should precede Herforth's name, not follow it.

Page 325, line 4 from bottom: For "underling" read "underlying."

Page 332, line 9, and page 333, first paragraph, *passim*: For "gianmo" read "qianmo" [underlined in all cases, but with the underlining omitted here to avoid any confusion between the "g" and "q"].

Page 342, line 18: For "researche" read "researches."

Page 389, line 6: For "Univ. of" read "Chinese Univ. of."

Page 389, line 13: For "East West" read "East and West."

Page 394, line 1: For "Ochi, Shigeaki" read "Ochi Shigeaki."

Page 394, line 3: For "Memoires" read "Memoirs."

Page 401, line 11: Delete the "=".

Page 402, line 11: For "Harbsmeir" read "Harbsmeier."

Page 410, line 15: For "Yanshao" read "Yangshao."

Page 421, 3 lines from bottom: For "Verdigres" read "Verdigris."

Page 428, 9 lines from bottom: For "0" read "0¹⁸."

Page 440, 19 lines from bottom: For "palaography" read "paleography."

- - - - -

The following revised Chinese abstract of Thomas A Metzger's "Some Ancient Roots of Modern Chinese Thought," *Early China* 11-12 (1985-1987), is printed here at the request of the author:

近代中國思想幾項古代的淵源：入世主義樂觀性的認識論
學說主義，以及自覺考慮能力的興起

從東周的軸性時代(axial age)到今天為止，中國思想對知識最流行的看法是一種樂觀性的認識論，即是無論是儒家的主流還是二十世紀的各種學派，它們都以爲人心有能力了解到客觀性的道德標準。而西洋文化，則除了樂觀性的認識論以外，也有強調人心沒有這個能力的悲觀性的認識論或懷疑主義。何況這個懷疑主義在近代歐美文化中有很重要的角色。

本文是談中國這個樂觀性認識論在孔子墨子時代的淵源。他們的認識論與他們的入世主義很有關係。按照這種入世主義，人類最後的判斷或評估與完全公平的賞罰不是從上帝在死後時間受到的，而是從賢人或政治領導在死前時間或這個世界中受到的。這樣一來，假如人心沒有能力了解到客觀性的道德標準，那麼人類最後的評估或判斷沒有辦法公平，而人民沒有辦法得到每一個人所應該得到的揀位，尊敬，或懲罰。

和孔子比較，墨子更有自覺考慮能力，可是他這個能力沒有導致悲觀性的認識論，反而它是與一種學說主義交織在一起。即是墨子以爲正確的思想系統能把世界所有道德性或政治性的問題解決了。換句話說，假如一個學說正確，那麼聽到這個學說的人一定會了解，了解則肯定，肯定則去實行，去實行則一定成功了。這個看法就是孔子沒有而墨子有的學說主義(doctrinality)。

我們應該把這個學說主義與墨子各別的學說分別出來。儒家反駁他兼愛節用等等的學說而卻是不知不覺地受到他的學說主義的影響。

本文很強調墨子的創造能力而談到他如何給中國思想的主流帶來一些不爲論語包含的言語和概念。這樣一來我們也可以了解墨子自覺考慮所依靠的字彙。

因爲在中國文化中，人對人在... 看爲一個就環繞禮和上下關係的社會。即是“事上”，“敬人”，以及“知人”是儒家社會的一些不完全一樣的方面。所以本文是把評估這個過程在論語思想中的角色分析一下。本文關於研究周代思想的方法也有一些意見。