1. *Zuo zhuan* reading group《春秋左氏傳》研讀

With Yuri Pines 尤銳, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Proposed to Renmin University 人大, February 2, 2021

*Zuo zhuan* stood at the center of multiple controversies ever since the attempt by Liu Xin 劉歆 to establish it as an official commentary on the *Springs-and-Autumns Annals*. Most previous discussions revolved around questions such as the text’s authorship, the dates of its composition, and its relations to the *Springs-and-Autumns Annals*. Recent advances in textual studies, coupled with the impact of paleographic revolution, allow us to pose new questions and seek new understandings of *Zuo zhuan*. In our class we shall read selected passages from *Zuo zhuan* and try to address in particular the following issues: What were the primary sources utilized by *Zuo zhuan* compiler(s)? Who made (or invented, or modified) records of the past and for which audience? What were the goals of composers, compilers, transmitters, and editors of historical texts in the Eastern Zhou period? And how did they achieve these goals? How can we discern (if at all) different geographic, temporal, and stylistic layers in *Zuo zhuan*? How is *Zuo zhuan* related (if at all) to the *Springs-and-Autumns Annals*? And how is it related to a variety of unearthed and transmitted texts from the Eastern Zhou period?

The secondary goal of the class is to introduce the students to recent advancements in studies of *Zuo zhuan* in the West. We shall read a sample of publications by leading Western scholars of the text and discuss them parallel to our reading of *Zuo zhuan*, mostly in the second part of the reading group.

Basic editions recommended:

*Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注. 1990. Annotated by Yang Bojun 楊伯峻. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, rev. ed.

Durrant, Stephen W., Li Wai-yee, and David Schaberg. 2016. *Zuo Tradition / Zuozhuan Commentary on the “Spring and Autumn Annals.”* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Below is the preliminary plan of our meetings. This plan may be modified according to the students’ demands and the level of familiarity with the text.

**1. Introduction. *Zuo zhuan* and controversies around it. Different approaches in China, Japan, and the West.**

In the opening discussion we shall see how the parameters of the debates about *Zuo zhuan* in China, Japan, and the West, had shifted in the aftermath of Kang Youwei’s 康有爲 iconoclastic assault amplified by Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 and his fellow “doubters of antiquity” 疑古派 and how it evolved in the twenty first century. We shall examine current advances in *Zuo zhuan* studies in different countries and the problems faced by researchers.

 **Reading**: Durrant, Li, and Schaberg, “Introduction”, especially pp. XVI-XXIII and XXXVIII-LIX. (Students are welcome in addition to acquaint themselves with one or more of Chinese studies):

* Hu Nianyi 胡念貽. 1987. “*Zuo zhuan* de zhenwei he xiezuo shidai kaobian” 《左傳》的真偽和寫作時代考辨. In idem, *Zhongguo gudai wenxue lungao* 中國古代文學論稿, 21-76. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe.
* Wang He 王和 1993. “Zuo zhuan cailiao laiyuan kao”左傳材料來源, *Zhongguoshi yanjiu* 中國史研究 2: 16-25.
* Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, “Qian yan” 前言, in idem, annot., *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注.
* Zhao Guangxian 趙光賢. 1982. “*Zuo zhuan* bianzhuan kao” 左傳編撰考, *Zhongguo lishi wenxian yanjiu jikan* 中國歷史文獻研究季刊 1: 135-153 and 2: 45-58.

**2. Textual segments in *Zuo zhuan*. *Zuo zhuan* and *Chunqiu***

In this class we shall acquaint ourselves with the heterogeneity of *Zuo zhuan*. We shall compare brief annalistic records with lengthy sophisticated narratives (with a specific focus on the story of the 公叔段 rebellion in Zheng). What were the possible sources for these early records? What is the impact of this heterogeneity of sources on the records’ historical reliability? How do the authors of the 公叔段 story present their judgment of historical personalities?

**Reading** 隱公, years 1-3

For the 公叔段 story, read chapter 1, “Competing Lessons” in Li, Wai-yee. 2007. *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, focus on pp. 59-84.

**3-4. Becoming a hegemon: The story of Lord Wen of Jin 晉文公**

The figure of Lord Wen of Jin is one of the most fascinating in *Zuo zhuan* not only because of the literary appeal of his rags-to-riches story but also because it reflects the immense complexity of *Zuo zhuan*, multiplicity of its sources and perspectives, and the tensions among them. Newly unearthed materials allow us to assess the reliability of some of the narrated stories. In addition, further appropriations of 晉文公-related stories in Warring States-period lore exemplify the evolution of the art of didactic anecdotes in early China.

 **Reading**: The following items of *Zuo zhuan* (but read also 春秋經 for each of the relevant years; ditto for later assignments): 僖公, 23.6-24.1; Xi 24.5, 25.2, 25.3, 25.4, 25.6, 26.1-26.4, 26.6, 27 to 28.

Alternative versions in unearthed sources:

Zifan-*bianzhong*子犯編鐘 (multiple publications available); *Xinian*《清華簡‧繫年》第6、第7章

For some of the anecdotes: to the story of Xi 25.4 (“晉侯圍原”), compare to 晉侯圍原 anecdote in: 《國語·晉語》4.17； 《[呂氏春秋](http://ctext.org/lv-shi-chun-qiu)·[為欲](http://ctext.org/lv-shi-chun-qiu/wei-yu)》；《[新序](http://ctext.org/xin-xu)·[雜事四](http://ctext.org/xin-xu/za-shi-si)》

For the story of Xi 28.3 (about 魏犨、顛頡): compare to 《商君書·賞刑》第三章（“晉文公將欲明刑以親百姓”）

Secondary studies: Li Wai-yee, *The Readability*, pp. 254-275.

For the anecdotes:

* Schaberg, David. 2011. “Chinese History and Philosophy.” In: *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, vol. I: *Beginnings to AD 600*, ed. Andrew Feldherr and Grant Hardy, 394-414. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
* Van Els, Paul. 2017. “Old Stories No Longer Told: The End of the Anecdotes Tradition of Early China.” In: *Between Philosophy and History: Rhetorical Uses of Anecdotes in Early China*, ed. Paul van Els and Sarah Queen, 331-356. Albany: State University of New York Press.

 **5. Explaining the coup d’état: The story of Lord Xian of Wei 衛獻公**

*Zuo zhuan* abounds with stories of coups, counter-coups, domestic struggles, and the like. One of the major goals of these narratives is to caution future rulers to avoid the mistakes of their predecessors. Historical lessons are commonly conveyed through remonstrance 諫言 of a prescient minister or another member of the ruler’s entourage, or presented by a later observer. Some of these speeches focus on concrete problems, whereas others analyze more abstract political principles. By analyzing the story of the overthrow of Lord Xian of Wei and the speeches scattered throughout it, we shall analyze the role of the speech on the one hand and the tensions between speech and narrative details on the other. We shall also observe the problematique of the *Chunqiu* records as presented in *Zuo zhuan*.

**Reading**: 襄公 14.4 and 14.6; 20.7, 25.15, 26.2, 27.3

Schaberg, David. “Remonstrance in Eastern Zhou Historiography.” *Early China* 22 (1997): 133-79.

 **6-8. The mature *Zuo zhuan*: Lord Zhao 魯昭公 years**

Lord Zhao’s section is by far the most detailed in *Zuo zhuan*; richest both in terms of narrative details and in terms of didactic speeches. Careful analysis of different geographic segments in this narrative allows us to distinguish between different habits of narrating events employed by scribes in such states as Chu, Lu, Song, Zheng, and the Zhou royal domain. By focusing on three of these segments we shall advance into understanding similarities and differences among historiographic traditions of the late sixth century BCE. We shall also further address political sensitivities of narrating the stories of rebellion, especially when this rebellion occurs either in the Zhou royal domain on in Lu.

**6. The boring rebellion? The story of Prince Zhao 王子朝**

The rebellion of Prince Zhao had shaken the Zhou royal domain reverberating for five years (with repercussions felt for twelve more years). Despite its role in the further weakening of the royal power, it was rarely noticed by later historians, probably because of the uncharacteristically boring form of its narration in *Zuo zhuan*. This narration is extraordinarily detailed, but the details overshadow all other means of conveying meaning, such as predictions, analytical speeches, and the like. We shall try to understand the reasons for this peculiar narrative and for its preservation in *Zuo zhuan*.

**Reading**: 昭公22.3, 22.5, 23.1, 23.6, 24.1, 24.3, 24.5, 24.6, 24.8, 25.7, 26.5, 26.7, 26.9

Durrant, Stephen W. Forthcoming. “The Problem of ‘Other Annals’ Embedded in *Zuozhuan*.”

**7. Intrigues and tragedies: Chu narratives of Lord Zhao period**

In marked contrast to the boring nature of the Zhou narratives, those from the state of Chu in Lord Zhao’s section belong to literary masterpieces in *Zuo zhuan*. Reading a sample of these stories (particularly those concerned with King Ling of Chu 楚靈王, Wu Zixu 伍子胥, and the malicious plotter Fei Wuji 費無極) we shall explore the reasons behind the divergence between Chu and Zhou royal domain’s historiography and also briefly address the impact of the Chu historiography on the proliferation of oral accounts of the past in that state.

 **Reading**: 昭公12.11+13.2 (靈王) (consult also and 4.4, 5.4, 7.2), 19.2+19.6+20.2 (伍子胥), 21.7+27.3+27.6 (費無極), 襄公22.6 (觀起), 昭公23.7 (司馬薳越)

《清華簡‧繫年》第15章

Li Wai-yee, *The Readability*, pp. 307-312.

**8. Dealing with sensitive topics: the overthrow of Lord Zhao of Lu 魯昭公**

The overthrow of Lord Zhao of Lu in 517 BCE was a doubly sensitive event. First, it brought about the unprecedented situation in which an important state was ruled for seven years by a coalition of powerful ministerial lineages without even a puppet monarch on the throne. Second, this event occurred in the state of Lu during Confucius’s life time, exemplifying the aggravating crisis of the ritual-based social order that Confucius advocated. How can one explain this? We shall see how *Zuo zhuan* and its source materials’ authors carefully navigated among multiple sensitivities. We shall also address the political stance of *Zuo zhuan* in the context of ongoing ruler-minister struggles in the Springs-and-Autumns period world.

 **Reading:** Zhao 25.2, 25.4, 25.6, 25.8, 25.9, 25.10, 26.3, 26.4, 27.4, 27.5, 27.7, 28.1, 29.1, 29.3, 30.1, 31.1, 31.2, 32.1, 32.4

**9. Summary: A new look at *Zuo zhuan***

This meeting will focus on new understandings that derive from our discussions of *Zuo zhuan*. The students are expected to participate actively in debates about new insights that we gained from the reading sessions. Ideas for future research will be discussed. Alternatively (based on students’ requirements) we shall focus on the ideological contents of *Zuo zhuan* through the prism of Yan Ying 晏嬰 (Yanzi 晏子) speeches. (In the latter case alternative readings will be provided).

**Reading**: Li Wai-yee, forthcoming. “Inconvenient and Unnecessary Details in *Zuozhuan*.”

Yuri Pines. Forthcoming. “*Zuo zhuan* source materials in light of the newly unearthed manuscripts.”

**10. Afterword: The *Han Feizi* exegesis of *Zuo zhuan***

In my forthcoming study I argue that the chapter “Objections 4” of *Han Feizi* 《韓非子‧難四》presents the heretofore unnoticed case of the first ever exegetical reading of *Zuo zhuan*. This interpretation of *Han Feizi* is closely linked to the analysis of *Zuo zhuan* proposed in the current reading group. We shall read the chapter as standing at the nexus of Han Fei’s political thought and *Zuo zhuan* exegesis and ask what the implications of my interpretation of that chapter are for the early history of *Zuo zhuan*’s transmission.

**Reading:** “Objections 4” of *Han Feizi* 《韓非子‧難四》.

**Assignment**: Identify relevant passages in *Zuo zhuan* without which Han Fei’s discussion cannot be understood.

**Major Western studies of *Zuo zhuan***

The first major breakthrough in *Zuo zhuan* studies in the West was achieved a century ago by a Swedish scholar Bernhard Karlgren in his “On the Authenticity and Nature of the *Tso Chuan*”, *Göteborgs Högscholas Årsskrift* 32 (1926): 1-65. The article by now is outdated, but its pioneering role in utilizing linguistic parameters for determining the text’s dating and authenticity is still very much admirable. Then came a very long lull in publications followed by a few studies that focused on literary qualities of *Zuo zhuan* narrative and were inevitably limited to just a few segments of the text:

* Egan, Ronald G. 1977. “Narratives in the *Tso Chuan*”, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 37. 2: 323-352.
* Johnson, David. 1981. “Epic and History in Early China: The Matter of Wu Tzu-Hsu.” *Journal of Asian Studies* 40.2: 255-271.
* Wang, John C.Y. (Wang Jingyu 王靖宇). 1977. “Early Chinese Narrative: The Tso Chuan as Example.” In *Chinese Narrative*, ed. Andrew H. Plaks, 3-20. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
* Watson, Burton. 1989, “Introduction.” In idem, *The Tso Chuan: Selections from China’s Oldest Narrative History*. New York: Columbia University Press.

In the very end of the twentieth century, *Zuo zhuan* was rediscovered by Western scholars. Two almost simultaneously finished dissertations by David Schaberg and Yuri Pines resulted in two monographs, which were followed by another major study, by Li Wai-yee (李惠儀). The three scholars present different angles of discussion and disagree on several points, but their studies should be read as complementary:

* Schaberg, David. 2001. *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
* Pines, Yuri. 2002. *Foundations of Confucian Thought: Intellectual Life in the Chunqiu Period, 722–453 B.C.E.* Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
* Li, Wai-yee. 2007. *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.

The new breakthrough in Western studies of *Zuo zhuan* came with the superb study cum translation by Durrant, Li, and Schaberg. This publication is valuable not only due to its excellent introduction, translation cum annotation, but also because of highly important introductory comments to most items in the text which allow their better contextualization within the general framework of *Zuo zhuan*. This publication is highly recommended even to those who do not need English translation as such. And it is expected to bolster studies of *Zuo zhuan* among Western scholars in general.

* Durrant, Stephen W., Li Wai-yee, and David Schaberg. 2016. *Zuo Tradition / Zuozhuan Commentary on the “Spring and Autumn Annals.”* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Durrant, Li, Pines, and Schaberg continue to study *Zuo zhuan* and published many articles dealing with various aspects of this text. Their new insights—along with those by other scholars—will appear in the forthcoming volume about *Zuo zhuan* and early Chinese historiography, co-edited by Martin Kern, Nino Luraghi, and Yuri Pines. Aside from these scholars, there are several notable studies that deal with selected aspects of *Zuo zhuan*. Eric Henry’s “‘Junzi yue’ and ‘Zhongni yue’ in *Zuozhuan*.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59.1 (1999): 125-161 is a very engaging study of differences between *junzi* and Confucius’s comments scattered along *Zuo zhuan*. Newell Ann van Auken is the only Western scholar who focuses on the *Chunqiu* Annals. Her findings are presented in Van Auken, Newell Ann. 2016. *The Commentarial Transformation of the Spring and Autumn*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

2、“思想的艺术”课程说明

Lecture 1: “‘What Are We Reading?’ and Non-Deductive Argumentation”

One of the first questions that readers must ask themselves, regardless of their hermeneutic framework, is what they are reading. In Chinese philosophy, the question is not often raised, in part because of the longstanding but specious assumption that the eight classic philosophical texts were written by the great masters whose names they bear. Sustaining this fiction comes with serious interpretive costs. Most patently, it encourages a presumption of philosophical coherence where there may be scant historical warrant for it. More insidiously, it disregards the extent to which transmitters, redactors, and commentators shaped the text for their own audiences and purposes, whether by engineering new implications through new juxtapositions or by foregrounding the passages that appealed to them and mitigating—if not simply excising—those that did not.

One longstanding criticism of Chinese thought is that it is not truly “philosophical” because it lacks viable protocols of argumentation. Thus it qualifies at best as “wisdom”: Confucius might provide valuable guidance, or thoughtful epigrams to savor, but nothing in the way of formal reasoning that would permit his audience to reconstruct and reconsider his arguments in any conceivable context. Such hand-wringing bespeaks the prejudgment that satisfactory argumentation must be deductive. Three general types of non-deductive argumentation in classical Chinese philosophy merit extended discussion: paradox, analogy, and appeal to example. Classical Chinese arguments that *can* be restated in terms of propositional logic leave no doubt that audiences were aware of principles of deduction, and thus suggest that Chinese philosophers crafted non-deductive arguments as a deliberate choice.

Lecture 2: “Confucius and His Disciples in the *Analects*”

Confucius was apparently the first ritual master to have his teachings documented by his disciples, and emphasized the moral aspect of correct ritual practice to an unprecedented degree. The prime difficulty facing any reader today is that Confucius did not leave behind any written work. A modern reader, then, is faced with this task: using the *Analects* and perhaps a handful of other early texts, none of which was written by Confucius himself, to reconstruct the philosophy of a master who would have preferred to teach you personally. Fortunately, careful reading of the *Analects* reveals a unique and consistent philosophical attitude. Confucius himself insists that although his teachings may appear disparate, there is “one thing with which to string [everything] together.”

Lecture 3: “*Mozi*”

If we know frustratingly little about the historical Confucius, we know even less about Mo Di, his first great philosophical rival. Mohists detested Confucian philosophy, which they regarded as partisan and conducive to nepotism: we should love everyone, not just the people closest to us. In addition, they regarded Confucian doubts about ghosts and spirits as impious, and struggled to offer rationally persuasive defenses of such beliefs. Historically speaking, Mohism failed: by the end of antiquity, there were no longer any avowed adherents; if Mozi was cited by other philosophers, it was in order to point out the errors of his teachings. In explicating Mohism, then, philosophers and historians part company: the former tend to ask what aspects can be salvaged and perhaps repurposed today, while the latter try to understand what it stood for in its own time, and why it was ultimately rejected.

Lecture 4: “*Mencius*”

Mencius poses many of the same interpretive problems as Confucius. He did not write the surviving repository of his teachings, the eponymous *Mencius*, which was compiled after his death. Mencius is famous for having argued that human nature is good, but his position is complex and requires careful unraveling. All human beings are endowed by Heaven with what he called the “Four Beginnings” of virtue. Mencius’s proof is that when we are presented with a sudden and unforeseen moral crisis, and have no opportunity to calculate how we should act, we unthinkingly act with compassion. But since no one can claim that he or she lacks the Four Beginnings, Mencius never tolerates false pretexts or mere velleities when it comes to the serious business of moral self-cultivation. If morality is your stated aim, you must pursue it with every ounce of energy; otherwise, you may as well acknowledge that you do not care enough to do more.

Lecture 5: “*Laozi* and *Sunzi*”

Regardless of the intractable question of its authorship, *Laozi* marks a major philosophical turning point: the conceptualization of “the Way” (*dao*) as a cosmic principle. We cannot be sure that *Laozi* was the very first text to use the word *dao* in its radically new sense, but the text is representative of intellectual trends that emerged around the fourth century B.C. and whose significance was grasped almost immediately. This chapter lays out a centrist interpretation of the text on the basis of the Wang Bi recension, then asks how much of this account needs to be adjusted in the light of the recently discovered Guodian manuscripts, which present a vision that is already recognizable as a *Laozi* vision, only more disjointed and less compellingly phrased than the recension we have known for centuries.

*Sunzi* or *Sunzi Bingfa* (*Master Sun’s Methods of War*) is a military treatise attributed to Sun Wu (which means Grandson Warlike), an all too appropriately named general who is said to have transformed the harem of King Helu of Wu (r. 514*–*496 B.C.) into a fearsome battalion in order to demonstrate his qualifications. But the vocabulary of the text is not in keeping with the world of 500 B.C. One specific anachronism is that *Sunzi* refers to crossbows and triggers, which were not widely used before the late fourth century. More generally, the philosophical lexicon suggests a milieu in which concepts such as Heaven and the Way had already become influential. Although the author or authors of *Sunzi* may have had real combat experience, one of its rhetorical purposes was to carve out a place for military affairs in philosophical discourse.  *Sunzi* anticipates an audience well versed in classical philosophical literature, and argues that “the commander” (*jiang*) should be added to everybody’s list of technical terms.

Lecture 6: “*Zhuangzi*”

Although virtually all serious scholars accept that *Zhuangzi* comprises layers of diverse origin and date, the commonplace notion that the so-called inner chapters are the most authentic is based on the dubious assumption that Guo Xiang, the redactor of the received text, would have been in a position to make such judgments, even though he lived some six centuries after Zhuang Zhou, and was himself relying on previous editions compiled by unknown hands applying unknown criteria. Accordingly, the discussion here refers to relevant passages from the outer and mixed chapters without embarrassment. Moreover, the inquiry is delimited by a necessary recognition: what we find in *Zhuangzi* are repeatedly revisited philosophical *themes* (rather than sustained and internally consistent philosophical *arguments*), including the relativity of perspectives, the need for a holistic vision of the cosmos, the limitations of language in communicating ideas, and the usefulness of uselessness.

Lecture 7: “*Xunzi*”

For most of imperial Chinese history Xunzi was a *bête noire* who was typically cited as an example of a Confucian who went astray by rejecting Mencian convictions. Only in the last few decades has Xunzi been widely recognized as one of China’s greatest thinkers. Unlike the texts examined in previous chapters, the bulk of *Xunzi* probably consists of essays by Xunzi himself. Xunzi did not envision himself as a teacher whose sphere was limited to direct contact with his disciples; rather, he was a new breed of thinker, one who aimed, through writing, to influence readers across the land. Moreover, whereas earlier Confucians had made only the barest statements about the nature of the cosmos, and did not regard the study of cosmology as indispensable to moral self-cultivation, Xunzi had a robust theory of the universe and its relation to moral philosophy. Indeed, Xunzi considered morality impossible without an understanding of the patterns of the cosmos.

Lecture 8: “*Han Feizi*”

Although Han Fei is probably responsible for the lion’s share of the extant *Han Feizi*, this does not permit readers to identify the philosophy of Han Fei himself with the philosophy (or philosophies) advanced in *Han Feizi*, as though these were necessarily the same thing. What Han Fei said varied with his expected audience, a point that scholarship has not always appreciated. Most of his chapters are addressed to kings and offer impersonal administrative techniques (called *fa*) to keep self-interested ministers in line, but at least one, “The Difficulties of Persuasion” (“Shuinan”), is addressed to those same ministers, and advises them to daze their king with self-serving rhetoric. Throughout *Han Feizi*, what we read are statements not about truth, but about how truths can be profitably applied.