Medieval Text Technologies in China and Europe
欧洲和中国中古写本史会议

Stanford Center, Peking University
北京大学斯坦福中心

September 11-13, 2014
2014 年 9 月 11-13 日

Paper Abstracts
(in the order of presentation)
论文摘要（依会中发表顺序）

The Colophon-Text Symbiosis in China and the West
Lothar Ledderose, University of Heidelberg (德·海德堡大学)

A colophon is here defined as any kind of secondary writing, which is added to a primary text or to a painting. In China, colophons until modern times tend to form a spatial, physical, material, and aesthetic symbiosis with the primary work. By contrast, colophons in the west are after the Renaissance separated from the primary work. This applies to manuscripts and, even more so, to paintings. The Chinese colophon writer thus establishes for the primary work a specific social, perhaps also political and biographical context, which stays with that work forever. Colophons inevitably guide and even control the thoughts of the reader.

In China, the practice of writing colophons to texts on silk and paper is documented on Buddhist scrolls from the 5th century onwards. In the 6th century colophons began to be added to Buddhist inscriptions engraved onto rock cliffs under the open sky. These colophons not only aim at guiding the thoughts of the reader, but also guide and control his movements through space.

中国的题跋一直到现代是和所涉及的字画相依存的。中国自第五世纪始绢上或纸上的佛教手卷便有题跋依附着出现，第六世纪始户外岩石上刻的佛经亦出现了题跋，以指引读者，也替文本或绘画提供了社会、文化或政治背景 背景。西方的题跋自文艺复兴［约第十五世纪］便和文本或绘画分开，成独立的文件。

Hybrid Books, or, When does a Manuscript Cease to be Medieval?
Siân Echard, University of British Columbia (加·英属哥伦比亚大学)

Accounts of the progress of the book tend to move through temporal and material categories often imagined as discrete; for example, we write of the middle ages or of the early modern period, or we consider manuscript books or early print. These necessary conveniences are, however, frequently resisted by the material survivals of the Middle Ages themselves. Complex transmission and reception histories mean that many medieval manuscripts are hybrids, made up of pieces that challenge scholarly and institutional categorization. This paper will consider several examples that draw attention to the alteration of medieval books across time. The responses of institutions to these alterations, I argue, both highlight and help to frame scholarly approaches to medieval manuscripts, defining what should be studied, and how. The manuscripts to be discussed include:

Various Old English manuscripts from the collection of Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury from 1559 to 1575. Parker often made up for missing parts in his manuscripts by having copies made from other manuscripts, and inserting these leaves in the manuscripts in his collection. The added folia were often copied in archaizing hands that sought to mimic Anglo-Saxon script.

Corpus Christi College 66 (now 66 and 66A). This manuscript is closely related to CUL Ff 1 27. Both are medieval historical miscellanies created by Parker out of two other medieval manuscripts: Parker split two books into two halves, and then rearranged and rebound the books to create new ones. One book remained in his library, and the other was given to the

University library, but from that point their histories differ. CCCC 66 was split into two parts in the 1970s to reflect the "original" miscellanies from which the parts were drawn, while the CUL copy remains intact in its Parkerian form.

Yale 287 and Yale 287A, and Huntington 1153. The Yale manuscript is a 15th-century Book of Hours, which was completed in the 19th century by Caleb Wing, whose added miniatures have, here, been carefully removed and reshelved as 287A. Another of Wing's restorations, however, Huntington 1153, remains intact, the library contenting itself simply with documenting the additions.

British Library Additional MSS 29704, 29705, and 44892. The Carmelite Missal, is, today, a modern scholarly pastiche, reconstructed in the 1930s from cuttings salvaged from a 19th-century scrapbook. The present object necessitated the destruction of the scrapbook, and yet it is not in any way the "original."

All of these medieval manuscripts have been subject to manipulation and alteration by a range of owners, both private and institutional, and all highlight the fact that few medieval manuscripts, by the time they come before eyes, are in anything like their original state any more. How do we decide which of the many traces of a manuscript's long life are worthy of our attention?

为方便起见，我们常把时代标签加以各文本上。但复杂的传递和接受史往往产生了成分复杂的混体书，很难区分是那一时代的。而收藏机构对写本被更改的处理方法，左右了我们对文献的看法。

1559-1575 当英国大主教的 Matthew Parker 所藏的古英文写本如果缺页，他往往用仿古字体把另一本古英文写本的一部份抄入补上。

英国康桥大学圣体学院便有两部经 Parker 重新组合的古英文写本。 Parker 将两部"杂谈"拆成两截，重新安排成两份不同的本子。一份仍归他私人收藏，另一份则送了给大学图书馆。1970 年代又有人把其中一部重新拆开，企图恢复它"杂谈"的"原貌"。

美国东岸耶鲁图书馆有本十五世纪的"时辰祷告书"，是十九世纪 Caleb Wing 编制的，他增添了绘图。耶鲁图书馆把绘图抽出来，另编目上架。美国西岸的亨廷顿图书馆有另一份则得保全身，仅有注释说绘图是后来加上的。

大英国家图书馆所藏的所谓 The Carmelite Missal［内涵是 13 至十四世纪的弥撒书］是 1930 年代有人把一本十九世纪剪贴聚珍本的东西重组而成的。

Textual Identity vs. Variability in Early Chinese Manuscripts
Matthias L. Richter, University of Colorado at Boulder (美·科罗拉多大学)

Textual variation is the rule rather than an exception in early China. Most literary and politico-philosophical texts of the pre-imperial and early imperial periods are composite in nature, i.e. they are composed of heterogeneous units of text that are often transmitted in nearly identical form as constituent parts of different texts. If we compare textual units that we recognize as cognate texts, or even as different versions of the same text, we observe variation on many levels.

Texts vary in their extension, in the sequence of their textual units, in their wording within these units, or in the graphic representation of the words (i.e. in orthography).

In the discussion of this textual variability, arguments have become popular and consequential that consider early Chinese book formats as a major, if not the predominant cause and condition for textual variation. Most of the more extensive texts in early China were written on narrow slips of bamboo or wood, bearing one line of text each and bound together to form a document. Scholars who consider variation as accidental see the disintegration of manuscript bindings and subsequent failed reconstitution of the text, in addition to scribal errors, as a major cause of variation. Some scholars who are more inclined to acknowledge intentional variation relate this phenomenon to book formats as well. They assume that the bamboo or wood slip book format was utilized to facilitate textual variation, much like a modern ring book binder.

The present paper aims to demonstrate that the rich manuscript evidence available today does not support this theory. Early Chinese manuscripts were not produced with a view to facilitating changes to the text. Rather, the producers of manuscripts devised increasingly sophisticated means of indicating the specific identity of a text in its material representation. This did not, and probably never meant to, prevent textual variation. What we do learn from the manuscripts, however, is that variation did not *depend* on the material carrier of a text. Existing texts, whether they were written or not, could be used creatively in many ways: They could be rephrased to make the same point more effectively or to make a different point altogether. They could also be used selectively as material from which to construct entirely different texts. Since these processes were not governed by book formats or other material conditions, we should seek the primary reasons for variation elsewhere. A major tendency of such variations, it appears, is an increasing ideological specification. This is usually achieved predominantly in changes on the level of wording rather than textual sequence, as an example presented in this paper will demonstrate.

中国很多古书的段落和另一部古书有相似的段落，但同中又有异：或句子长短不同，或句子排列先后不同，或用词不同， 或用了异体字。近来学者讨论异文，围绕着竹简怎样容易被打散，抄竹简的人又常不小心抄错。有些学者则主张异文不一定出于错误，有时是作者刻意利用竹简可随意重组的功能，就像我们现在用不锈钢圈可随意编排活页。

越来越多的证据则显示古人用竹简并不贪图它容易被重组，作者有巧妙的法子可表明竹简应如何编排。而且不仅仅是用竹简做载体的文稿方有异文。关键是文本是可以活用的： 同一句话可用另一方式表达，也可改动其中的字眼以表达另一个意思， 文本也可选择性地被剪裁造成另一个文本，而这往往牵涉到政治目的。

Craft, Chaos and Calligraphy in Fifteenth-century Cursive Handwriting
Daniel Wakelin, University of Oxford (英・牛津大学)

Palaeographers often suggest that people used cursive handwriting in fifteenth-century England out of a quest for ease, speed and efficiency by writing currently; they explain the need for these characteristics in the 'pragmatic literacy' of the period. By contrast, this paper will observe alongside currency and haste other qualities of calligraphic adornment in cursive handwriting, and thereby query the motives for cursivity.

First, cursive handwriting might be easier but learning to write was still rare and effortful; to call cursive handwriting 'amateurish' is misleading in most cases. A few specimens of truly amateur – untrained, unemployed – handwriting do exist; they will be noted as counter-examples. But most cursive handwriting was the product of some effort or agency at least in first learning it, if not in every later use of it. Secondly, that skill can be seen in the fact that much cursive handwriting exists in a variety of grades of execution, of increasing levels of carefulness. Not all cursive writing is current. (Those first two points will be treated quickly, as they are well known; the paper will just note their implications for this argument.)

Thirdly (as the paper will explore at more length), cursive handwriting is often adorned with calligraphic features; calligraphy is not solely the preserve of set scripts. The paper will note firstly the well-acknowledged presence of paratexts in higher grades of script, or in cursive script but with certain more calligraphic graphetic variants, and the paper will ask what that adornment tells us about the status of the main run of copying in cursive handwriting. Alongside paratexts, the paper will also consider top-line and bottom-line decorations. Top-line decoration originates in documents, like many cursive scripts, where such decoration makes documents not only as practical but as ceremonial and ornamental objects. In books, divorced from their documentary function, top-line adornments are devoid of this social function and seem to be playful explorations of calligraphy and page-design.

Fourthly, the paper will suggest that, as scribes were open to the possibility of adorning paratexts and top lines, there might be a decorative impulse in the ordinary features of cursive anglicana, especially in the later fifteenth century. Within such writing there are often variant letter-forms which seem to be less fast or efficient, more calligraphic, than others, apparently in no particular pattern. Moreover, some more common letter-forms which seem to emerge through the 'horizontal' movement encouraged by haste and ease might instead be understood as decorative: they include elaborate tails on **g** and **y**, splay on word-final sigmoid **s** and the extended loops on ascenders. Some elements of cursive handwriting might have been produced contrary to utility, taking more time and space than necessary.

The presence of these features raises questions about efficiency, ease and speed as the motives for cursivity. What we can most readily describe as consciously motivated in such handwriting are not the moments of haste or ease, in a script by the fifteenth century merely conventional, but the moments of calligraphic adornment – moments in which people reject cursivity and its supposed pragmatic motives.

一般人认为欧洲十五世纪所流行的草书主要功能是便捷。本论文关注到此时的草书有各种无须有的修饰与点缀。写草书的人固然也有完全没受到训练的，但此属例外。很多草书手稿是刻意制造的，成了带有礼仪意义的物件或艺术品。

Conduits and Containers: Textual Amulets in Medieval England

Jeanie Abbott, Stanford University (美· 斯坦佛大学)

This paper examines ways in which a text may embody power, focusing on the use of writing in medieval English amulets. All texts could be said to wield power in some form; however, in textual amulets, this power comes less from the information they convey and more from their purported connection to supernatural forces. With this in mind, I examine the construction and use

of textual amulets and charms, paying special attention to their sources of power and their method of channeling that power on behalf of the user. Looking at textual amulets in terms of their power reveals a dichotomy between the secret and the overt, private and public, inside and outside. Power may be contained or captured for the benefit of the amulet's owner, or it may be summoned and channeled through an open plea for supernatural assistance. These claims rest upon and reinforce the idea that supernatural power was conceived of as something analogous to a physical substance, something that could be molded and manipulated by the form of an amulet. I hope that establishing these broad categories of power will open new avenues of comparison among literary traditions, while also reinforcing the physicality inherent in how the makers of these amulets understood supernatural forces.

所有的文字都有其本身的力量，但英国中古时代的文字护身符被赋予异常功能。此论文审视其构造与用途，它如何发挥所谓的特异功能，其中有明暗、公私、和内外之分。有些护身符企图捕捉非凡力量把它置入容器，有些凭以向非凡力量呼救，共同点是把特异功能想像成一种可控制的实物。我希望设定这些类别和分野有助于我们比较不同的文学传统。

Writing in Air: Monumental Writing and Speech Scrolls
Elaine Treharne, Stanford University (美 • 斯坦佛大学)

This paper aims to look across manuscript traditions in China and Britain in the period of the Song Dynasty (960-1279CE) to ask questions about writing, shapes, and space. 'Manuscript' will be interpreted to mean any text written by hand, and thus my paper includes the examination of monumental script in the mountains of China, script in the white space of early Chinese images, and writing in monumental books in Britain. I am also interested in investigating the use of writing when it figuratively denotes something other than just written words; for example, the use of scrolls in medieval British manuscripts to convey speech, and the possible use of floating text in Chinese images to represent celestially-visible writing. I am inspired in part by some of the questions we are asking for my NEH Project, 'Global Currents: Cultures of Literary Networks, 1050 to 1900', which employs social network analysis and visual language processing to determine patterns between very disparate sets of textual corpora. In this paper, I shall, inevitably, ask more questions than I can hope to answer.

此论文企图比较中国宋代（960-1279）时中国和英国的写本传统。此处"写本"指任何用手书写的文本，包括中国山上的石刻，中国画中留白的字，英国巨型书。英国中古文本中以舒展的手卷象征此人说的话［等于现代卡通的话泡泡］，以及中国只能从天上俯视才看得见的字，我也都有兴趣。我获美国人文基金的支持，要从社交网络和视觉语言吸收过程的角度研究 1050 至 1900 年世界各地不同的文字体系，启发我提出许多问题，而问题中有些是不可能有答案的。

Chinese Characters: Writing in the Air, Glyphomancy, and Magical Correspondence
Ronald Egan, Stanford University (美・ 斯坦佛大学)

This paper examines some of the ways Chinese characters have traditionally been used, manipulated, and conceptualized. The focus is on uses of characters that, while widespread in China and dating far back in history, may not have parallels in the way writing systems are used in other cultures. These include the Chinese habit of tracing words in the air with one's finger, as a kind of disembodied writing, the long and rich tradition of "glyphomancy" or *chaizi* 拆字 (in which a single character or phrase is broken down into graphical components and then reinterpreted to discover hidden and often prophetic meanings), and the perception of a resonance or even magical correspondence between the written character and the object in the material world that it designates. The persistence of these uses of characters in China has its inherent interest. These ways of thinking about characters may also help us to understand aspects of the writing system in China that may be distinctive, as well as features of the relationship between spoken and written languages in China that may be unmatched elsewhere. Finally, it is hoped that this brief inquiry, experimental though it may be, may shed light on the larger question of the place of the written word in Chinese civilization, which so often appears to be particularly important and central.

此论文关注文字在中国传统中具有的独特意义和功能。有些在世界别处没有的，譬如"拆字"和"书空"， 从而企图了解汉字和语言关系的特征及文字在中国文化的中心地位。

Scribes and Their Exemplars: an Early Medieval Case Study and its Impact
Aidan Conti, University of Bergen (挪威・ 卑尔根大学)

This paper will investigate the relationship between copy and exemplar to elucidate western European scribal practices with a particular emphasis on the early medieval period. Copies from known exemplars verified by external evidence are extremely rare in the Latin West, yet offer a unique insight into the relationship between scribes, layout and text. Although the value of such copies and appeals for their study can be found as early as 1911 (Louis Havet), rarely has such study been thoroughly undertaken. A direct copy from a known exemplar has little value in traditional textual reconstruction, nor can such a copy serve as a base text; consequently such manuscripts figure little in any type of editorial practice.

In this paper, I will consider a particular illustrative case of a sixth-century exemplar (Paris, Bibiothèque Nationale, Lat 2630) and its ninth-century copy (Paris, Bibiliothèque Nationale, Lat 12132). Not only does the pair illustrate the transition from one system of script to another (that is the *translitteratio* of uncial to caroline minuscule), in this case the exemplar was written without word separation (*scriptio continua*) where the copy employs incipient word separation. As a result, one can see how unfamiliar writing and reading practices were negotiated in the production of the copy. Moreover, the ninth-century copy was produced by two scribes, each of whom handled the transfer of the layout of the exemplar differently. The first, Hranngil maintained a strict correspondence to his exemplar, reproducing each of its double column pages as a single column in his copy; the second, Ioszmar wrote more freely and did not maintain a strict layout ratio from exemplar to copy.

In a relatively short consideration of this copy, Malcom Parkes (2008) asserted that one could discern the copyist's, in this case Hranngil's, transfer units, that is the conceptual unit (such as a phrase or clause) which the scribe read, committed to working memory and then reproduced. After reviewing some of the specific evidence used to discern 'transfer units', I set forth, based on a more extensive assessment of Hranngil's and Ioszmar's work, a number of other areas in which the study of a known copy can inform our understanding of relationships within textual traditions, such as, for example, the triggers for variation in copying, the rates and contexts for errors, and the distance between manuscripts, which will hopefully offer points of comparison with non-Western traditions.

Finally, while the relationship between this copy and its exemplar is particularly informative, the limits of one example are duly acknowledged. In conclusion, I will consider a number of exemplar and copy relationships (hypothesized or known) and consider how varying practices in different periods might compel more nuanced approaches to assessments of manuscript traditions and the reconstruction of texts.

法国国家图书馆有一份六世纪写本以及其九世纪的写本。这两份文本的字体不同，而且范文的字间没有空隙而抄本字间有空隙。抄本是经两位抄写员完成的。第一位遵循范本字栏的宽度，而且显然经小心把原文读过后断句。我们比较这两位抄写员的作品，可分析两者对范本的忠实度，两人的错谬率，以及其他差异。这案例的分析方法或许可应用到不同时代和地域抄写员对抄书的态度。

Transcribers, Generators and Carriers:
A Study of the Textual Production in Medieval Turfan and Dunhuang
By Rebecca Shuang Fu 傅爽, University of Pennsylvania (美·宾夕法尼亚大学）

In this paper, I will propose a method for salvaging "authorship" from the danger of its being taken for granted. The question of authorship has recently become a common topic in the study of medieval Chinese literature. However, the "floating world of manuscript culture" of medieval China (200–1000) has bequeathed a complex and messy history with which, in many cases, medievalists in Chinese studies cannot avoid dealing. That is, a given piece of work, as well as its references, before arriving in the hands of its modern readers, has been through a long and complicated transmission history of being heard and read, circulated, revised, recorded, collected, and collated, and is consequently far from "original." Consequently, its reception history has turned into a layering of essentially different strata, whose given "author", thought of as the "origin" or the "creator," is by no means always clear. This complexity of "authorship," which is to say of both origin *and* reception, is the major issue that the methodology proposed in this study hopes to clarify.

Manuscripts discovered in Turfan and Dunhuang, two ancient towns along the Silk Road, both part of the Tang Empire in late medieval China (600–1000), will serve as our main primary sources. Instead of emphasizing the textual content, I attempt to reconstruct these manuscripts' multi-dimensional production and transmission history. In order to achieve this shift of emphasis I begin my exploration by examining the role of each participant play in producing a text. In short, the purpose of this study is to sketch people's participation in text-based activities, outline the roles that they play in textual production and transmission, and reconstruct certain parts of the multi-layered history of a literary work's authorship.

唐代文本辗转传到现代读者手中前，经历无数层的口传、阅读、传阅、修改、记录、搜集、编撰，离所谓"原文"甚远；"作者"往往是分辨不清的。此论文企图重构吐鲁番和敦煌出土的唐代写本的制作和传授史，讨论"作者"这概念。

唐诗文本论纲
Outline of a Study of the Texts of Tang Poetry
陈尚君, 复旦大学
Chen Shangjun, Fudan University

经过对唐诗文献近三十三年的研究，特别经历了近年的一些变故，我决以一己之力，完成全部唐诗的校订和整理。工作量之钜大，所涉文献和学术之繁复，以及期待学术目标之讲求，确实都超过了我的预期，所幸一切都还顺利。我始终认为，每一位唐代诗人，每一首唐诗，都有各自的传播接受史，都有其文献流传衍变的特殊记录。要做彻底的清理，就必须调查所有与唐诗保存有关系的文献，包括所有的存世写本和刻本，并逐一地加以记录。检书求备，用书求善，引书求早，论断求稳，是始终坚持的原则。因为这些工作的进行，得以对所有唐诗文本流传中的问题，有不少新的认识，也不断调整工作计划和体例。

在此我想主要谈几个问题，即一、唐诗文本应该包括那些义项，应该如何确定收录范围；二、五万多首唐诗是通过那些途径得以保存至今，要尽可能地接近唐诗写作的原貌应在群籍利用中注意哪些问题；三、唐诗最初文本的面貌是如何的，产生歧互的原因有那些；四、在求全和求真难以两全其美的情况下，当然应以求真为第一要义，但也应分层次地将各种复杂原因造成的传讹、依托、疑伪、确伪的作品揭载出来。全文计划写十万字以上，目前仅是一万字的提纲。附录几篇样稿，用供参考。

After nearly thirty-three years spent studying the texts of Tang poetry, and particularly in the light of recent developments, I decided that I would, all by myself, undertake a comprehensive textual redaction and reediting of the *Complete Tang Poetry*. The enormity of the task, the complexity of the sources involved, and the academic community's anticipated outcome all exceeded what I originally expected. Fortunately, the work has continued to proceed advantageously. My constant belief has been that every Tang poet and even every Tang poem each has its own history of reception and dissemination, and each has its own record of textual transmission and change. To carry out a thorough sorting out and clarification of the material, it is necessary to examine all surviving documentation that bears on it, including all manuscripts and printed editions that have survived, and to thoroughly documents the findings, one by one. To be complete in the sources consulted, to be discriminating in the sources used, to rely upon the earliest possible citation, to be consistent in editorial judgment—these have been the abiding principles to which I have steadfastly held. As my work has proceeded, I have gained considerable new understanding of problems involved in the circulation and transmission of Tang poetic texts, and have had to continuously refine the plan and rules guiding my project.

In this paper I want to address a few of these questions. First, what should be included in the designation of "Tang poetry," and how should we define the scope of the subject? Second, through which pathways have the more than fifty thousand Tang poems passed as they were transmitted down to us today, and what questions should we focus on in order to recover as best as humanly possible their original appearance? Third, what was the original form of Tang poetic texts, and what were the reasons behind the appearance of textual variants? Fourth, as we seek both completeness and reliability (two goals that tend to conflict with each other), of course we should make reliability our highest priority. At the same time, we should clearly identify and analyze each of the multiple factors that contributed towards poems traditionally misattributed, deliberate misattributions, suspected misattributions, and indisputable misattributions. My plan for the complete paper runs to over one hundred thousand words. Presently, I am offering an outline of about ten thousand words, to which are appended a few case studies for our mutual consideration.

The Study of Letter Writing in Early and Early Medieval China: Transmitted Letters and Manuscripts

Antje Richter, University of Colorado, Boulder (美·科罗拉多大学)

Few types of text depend as much on their materiality as letters. In order to reach their addressee, these communications—written on a tangible medium by one historical person and addressed to another—have to undergo some form of physical transmission involving third parties, and they are usually part of an exchange. Considering both the documentary value of many letters and how much they were cherished by their recipients not just for their content but also for their calligraphy and as physical objects, it is regrettable that letters from early and early medieval China have mostly been transmitted to us in printed form. They were collected in anthologies or quoted, in part or in full, in other texts, especially biographies, which generally involved both abridgement and embellishment. Other letters were transmitted because of their calligraphic appeal, while their content was treated as of lesser importance. These letters were copied in a way that aimed primarily to preserve their handwriting, which often lead to modifications that compromise their authenticity as letters. The relatively small number of recently discovered manuscript letters (mostly official, and in rare instances also personal), promise a glimpse of actual communicative practices unaffected by influences of copying and editing. Introducing representative examples in these three different epistolary corpora, this talk will focus on the challenges each type of source presents for the study of epistolary culture in ancient China and reflect on their respective source value.

书信对收者来说，不但内容重要，其书法与物体本身也是弥足珍贵的。可惜我们见得到的早期书信，大多数是印刷品，被收到文集或传记内， 并已经删节或润色。有些书信则因其书法优美而得传，失去了其为书信的本色。幸而近年来发现了一些手写的书信，让我们得以窥见书信的原貌。此论文讨论我们见得到的此三类中国古书信。

中国上古时期写本特征及文献学意义
Characteristics of Ancient Chinese Manuscripts and
Their Significance in Textual Studies

傅刚, 北京大学

Fu Gang, Peking University

　　由于书写材料的限制，中国上古时期的文献，大多没有存藏下来，幸运的是，近年来的出土材料说明，上古时期有些深埋在墓里的竹、木简和帛书文献竟得以保存，这些文献毫无疑问保留了早期文献的面貌。从这些文献看，它与传世文献不尽相同，这些不同，不尽是文字的异文，有些在结构上也有一些变化，比如《老子》，如郭店简《老子》，整理者分为三组，其中各章文字与传世本《老子》有的相合，有的只是今本的部分，又其文本不分章，排列顺序与今本及帛本亦不相同，内容只有今本的五分之二。又如清华简《说命》，整理者分为上、中、下三部分，但其上、下二篇与伪古文完全不同，当然，伪古文不足论，然其文字全未见先秦文献征引，这就出现许多学术上讨论的问题了，此点留待下文讨论，无论如何，可见出土文献与传世文献似乎发生了许多不同，这也许就是启发了一些学者对先秦文献怀疑的证据。比如最近几年见到部分西方汉学家对先秦文献的质疑，他们主要依据于西方写本的研究经验，对中国古代文献进行重新审视，主要的依据是以西方的写本概念和研究模式来理解中国上古文献，这种观点认为中国上古文献因为写本没有保存下来，所以对汉代以後经过整理的传世文献产生了怀疑，认为这些文献不可以作为先秦时期可信材料看待。应该说，西方汉学家提出的这些质疑，有一定的理论依据，也有他们学术考察的方法和视角，的确值得我们重视，同样针对这些出土文献，为什么中国学者不会提出这样的疑问呢？这可能是中、西学者由于具有不同学术背景而会产生不同视角和不同判断的原因吧。那么中国学者对传世文献的相信以及对相关记载的信赖，其学术依据和方法，西方学者是如何考虑的呢？

　　我们认为，这是对中国古代学术史及教育史的特点的理解不同而引起的。首先，我们说，在刻本出现之前，无所谓写、抄本，因为假使排除掉手稿概念的话，其实只有一种文本形态，即都是抄本在流传，除了载体的材料有区别外。中国上古时期的文献可信吗？是否如持这些观点的学者所说的，是经过了汉代学者整理，已经不能作为先秦时期可信的文献了呢？因此，我们有必要对中国古代文献的特征、流传的途径、流传中改动的可能性等进行讨论。

　　Owing to the many limitations of written materials, the majority of writings from the ancient period of Chinese history have not been preserved and transmitted. Fortunately, however, as we know from recent archaeological finds, many ancient writings on bamboo slips, wooden tablets, and silk, which were buried deep in tombs, have been preserved. Without question, such archaeologically discovered materials allow us to see the forms that writing took in ancient times. Examining these writings, we find that they differ in certain ways from those transmitted through received textual tradition. There are not only differences in individual words and phrases, there are also differences in the ways particular texts are divided and arranged. Consider the *Laozi*: those who edited the *Laozi* found among the Guodian bamboo slips divided it into three *Laozi* recensions. Chapters in each of them have material that matches passages in the received text of *Laozi*, yet there is much that is missing. Moreover, the Guodian *Laozi* is not divided into separate books, and the

order of passages is not the same as in either the received text or the silk manuscript *Laozi*. In fact, the Guodian version only contains roughly two-fifths of the received *Laozi* text. Again, as for the Tsinghua University bamboo slips version of the "Shuoming" chapter of the *Classic of Documents*, the editors divided it into three parts (A, B, C). Parts A and C are completely different from the text in the pseudo-ancient text recension of the chapter. Of course, the discrepancies with the pseudo-ancient text version are of no consequence. But the fact that these passages are completely unknown, through quotations, in other pre-Qin texts has given rise to many questions posed in recent scholarship. These are issues that await further discussion. It is indisputable, nevertheless, that archaeologically unearthed texts display many differences from those in the received orthodox tradition. This has been taken by many scholars as support for doubting the reliability of pre-Qin texts in the received tradition. In recent years many Western Sinologists have raised questions about pre-Qin writings. Basing themselves largely on the experience of Western manuscript studies, they are carrying out a rethinking of ancient Chinese texts, mostly utilizing concepts and approaches that have been applied to manuscript studies in the West. They point out that pre-Qin manuscripts have largely been lost, and so they question the reliability of the early texts in the received tradition that, as we know, were edited and standardized into their present form in Han and later times, maintaining that such texts cannot be taken as reliable of pre-Qin works. We must acknowledge that these questions raised by Western Sinologists have a definite theoretical grounding, and likewise derive from accepted methodologies and viewpoints used in their scholarly investigations. These certainly are questions that deserve serious consideration. As they study the very same archaeologically discovered texts, why is it that scholars in China do not raise the same questions? Probably it is because Chinese and Western scholars are grounded in different scholarly traditions, which lead to divergent viewpoints and judgments. What, then, about Chinese scholars' acceptance of the received textual tradition and their trust of the reliability of related documentation: how would Western scholars evaluate the methodology and scholarly basis that the Chinese scholars are using?

We believe that these discrepancies arise from differences in the traditions of the study of ancient China, inside and outside of the country, and in educational approaches. First, we should acknowledge that in the time before printing, there was no such thing as "manuscript" or "manuscript copy" because once we do away with the notion of original manuscript, there was only one kind of text, that is, copies that were variously circulating, regardless of the fact that the materials on which they were written differed. Are writings transmitted form ancient China reliable? Or is it as the skeptical scholars say, that since those texts were edited and standardized by Han dynasty academicians, the writings can no longer be viewed as reliable pre-Qin documents? Further discussion is certainly needed regarding these matters, including the special characteristics of ancient Chinese texts, their transmission, and the possibilities of their alteration during that transmission.

中国写本典籍在日本的传抄与接受
The Copying and Reception of Chinese Manuscripts in Japan

刘玉才，北京大学
Liu Yucai, Peking University

　　古代中国是向周边地区辐射的文化源地，东亚的朝鲜半岛、日本列岛，东南亚的越南等地，全面受容中国文化，形成以汉字、儒教、中国式律令、科技、中国化佛教为基本要素的汉字文化圈。在汉字文化圈内，书籍传播成为重要的交流形式。根据文献记载，早在两汉之际，《诗经》、《论语》等中国经典就流入朝鲜半岛，并辗转传入日本。在写本繁盛的中国隋唐时期，日本列岛诸国屡有遣隋使、遣唐使远赴中国，其中重要任务就是访求书籍。官方使臣之外，入唐求法的留学僧侣也携回大量书籍。日本现存汉籍古写本的数量，据阿部隆一《本邦汉籍古写本类所在略目录》的标准统计，即有近千部，其中不乏以中国唐及之前写本为其底本来源的严格意义古抄本，以及部份中国古写本。这些汉籍写抄本，保存了丰富的中国古本信息，因为所据中国古写本多已不存，故其学术价值不亚于敦煌发现的写本文献。此外，汉籍传入日本之后，即被广泛传抄学习，留下大量日本写本。汉籍传抄过程，同时亦是接纳吸收的过程。接受汉籍薰陶的日本文士不仅通过训点、批注加入自己的阅读理解，还进行摘编改纂，衍生出相当数量的本土汉籍文献品种，且体现出日本当时社会的文化旨趣。因此，欲窥知日本古代的知识系统，汉籍研究亦不可或缺。本文以日本古写本《论语》、《幼学指南抄》、《千载佳句》为例，略作阐述。

China in the ancient period was the origin of cultural forms that radiated out through neighboring lands. In East Asia, the Korean peninsula and the Japanese archipelago, and in Southeast Asia, Vietnam and other kingdoms, all absorbed Chinese culture, in which Chinese characters, Confucianism, Chinese-style legal codes, technology, and Sinicized Buddhism were the essential elements of the Chinese cultural sphere. In this cultural sphere, the spread and circulation of Chinese writings was an important form of cultural contact. According to the historical records, as early as the Han dynasty (206 BCE – 220 CE), classics such as *The Confucian Analects* and *The Classic of Songs* were already transmitted to the Korean peninsula and from there were introduced into Japan. In the Sui and Tang dynasties (581-907 CE), when manuscript culture flourished in China, the various states in the Japanese archipelago repeatedly sent ambassadors to the Sui and Tang courts, and one of the key purposes of these missions was to acquire copies of Chinese books. Aside from official missions, monks from Japan and Korea also came to study Buddhism in China, and they likewise carried large numbers of Chinese books with them when they returned home. As for the number of ancient Chinese manuscripts preserved today in Japan, according to the standard calculations found in Abe Ryuichi's *Classified Catalogue of Manuscripts of Early Chinese Writings in Japan*, nearly one thousand can be counted. Many of these are facsimile copies in the strictest sense of Tang or earlier manuscripts; there are also other early Chinese manuscript copies. These manuscripts convey a wealth of information about early Chinese writings, particularly because so few of the Chinese manuscripts on which they are based survive. Their scholarly value is not less than manuscripts discovered in modern times at Dunhuang. In addition to these Chinese manuscripts, after such writings were transmitted to Japan, they were widely studied and recopied there, so that a large number of Japanese manuscript copies were also produced. The copying and recopying of Chinese writings in Japan was also a process of Japanese acceptance and absorption of Chinese culture. As they adopted and were influenced by Chinese texts, not only did Japanese scholars add their own philological glosses and annotations, reflecting their own readings of these texts, they also compiled selections and anthologies of the Chinese works, thus producing a large number and variety of Japanese works written in Chinese, which reveal much about the cultural values pervasive in Japanese society of the time. Consequently, to understand the intellectual world of early Japan, these Japanese materials written in Chinese must not be neglected. This paper looks

at three early Japanese manuscripts in this light, manuscripts of *The Confucian Analects*, *A Primer for Childhood Education*, and *Outstanding Phrases to Last One Thousand Years*.

The Chinese Sword of the Sepulchral Effigy of Jean d'Alluye (Cloisters): Crusader Contacts with Far Eastern Cultures in Western Manuscripts and Sculptures
Marisa Galvez, Stanford University (美・ 斯坦佛大学)

Among the sculptures in The Cloisters at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, an armored gisant of Jean d'Alluye from the Abbey of La Clarté-Dieu, which he founded in 1239 and where he was entombed about 1248, represents the idealized image of a crusader in the classical age of chivalry. The life-size sepulchral effigy of Jean d'Alluye illustrates the equipment typical of a knight of the first half of the thirteenth century. In addition to wearing the expected long-sleeved mail shirt with a hood, surcoat, shield, spurs, and mail chausses over his legs, the knight depicted in early manhood bears a surprising object. First noted by Helmut Nickel, Jean d'Alluye's sword has a trilobate pommel that is completely different from the standard ovals or disks found in swords of Western Europe at this period. Using manuscript illustrations and surviving examples of medieval swords, Nickel convincingly argues that the sword was most likely forged in China, as it resembles archaic Chinese swords and their representations in Chinese art prevalent by the twelfth century. Biographical information about Jean d'Alluye gives a few possible scenarios for the acquisition of the sword. It is known that Jean took the cross and went to the Holy Land in 1241. He returned home in 1244 with a relic of the True Cross given to him by the bishop of Hiera Petra in Crete. By carefully representing the Chinese sword with a scabbard and sword belt in the Western European style on his gisant, Jean shows that the object was a cherished possession brought back from overseas or *Outremer*, important enough for him to be portrayed with him for posterity. In his article treating the provenance of this sword, Nickel proposes that Jean acquired the sword either in a peaceful trade along the Silk Road, through an encounter with "a raider in the conquering hordes of the Mongols," in an "exotic collector's item in the bazaar of some Levantine port," or as "booty on a Syrian battlefield" (Nickel 126).

In this paper, I'd like to speculate further upon the cultural value of this sword for a thirteenth-century French crusader. The Chinese sword provides an opportunity to reflect upon a Western—specifically French—encounter with an "Other" that fits neither in the category of Saracen Other seen in *chansons de geste* of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, nor in the 'marvels of the East' (e.g. the legend of Prester John) that emerged with the eruption of Mongol power in the East during the thirteenth century. More likely the acquisition of the sword is the result of contacts and exchanges between European crusaders and Mediterranean commercial élite; transactions taking place within what historians have called the "tributary empires controlling fabulous emporia like those of Baghdad, Samarcand, and Khanbaliq" (Kinoshita, "Marco Polo's *Le Devisement dou monde* and the Tributary East," 61). As Sharon Kinoshita explains, "despite their religious differences…Byzantine, Islamic, and Mongol [empires] were linked by their ways of articulating power relations through a constellation of ceremonial practices…often marked by the exchange of beautiful precious objects rendered as a tribute, bestowed as favours, or given as diplomatic gifts" (Kinoshita 62). The ceremonial display of Jean's sword on his gisant makes us wonder what kind of

cultural value it held for him: was it a ritual presentation of booty, like the prized horses of San Marco acquired in the sack of Constantinople? Might it signify a new awareness of Eastern cultures due to the Mongols' expansion of power, and by the 1240s, the possibility of Latin Christendom's alliance with the Mongols?

Taking various Western manuscripts with illustrations of eastern people and lands during the thirteenth century as my examples—Matthew of Paris' *Chronica Majora* (1238), Marco Polo's *Le Divisament dou monde* (c. 1298) and other illustrated manuscripts for courtly patrons—in the beginning of this paper I will describe typical European representations of Asian people (Tartars or Mongols): as non-Christian heathens, foreigners who are assimilated to Western culture, and as armed pagan warriors. The 'mixed' representations of Eastern people and lands indicates how late medieval readers imagined the distant Orient with a medieval sense of wonder or *admiratio*—fascination, disgust, or dread. Western manuscripts can relate misinterpretations of ritual culture of the East, pragamatic mercantile or evangelical interests, or such *admiratio*. The sword of Jean's gisant perhaps reflects another mode of *admiratio* as a mixture of pragmatic use and spiritual ambitions: a new knowledge of Eastern armorial craftsmanship for funerary sculpture, and a personalized wonder and appropriation of the unknown. We can't know for sure how Jean acquired the sword in his travels, but we do know that as a "portable object" acquired through trade, diplomacy, or military conflict, some kind of East to West transfer of power or *translatio* occurs in his insistence on being represented as a pious crusader with a non-Western sword.

纽约大都会艺术馆所藏的雕刻中，有尊与真人等大的卧墓雕像［本来放在墓上的］，墓主为法国骑士 Jean d'Alluye, 卧墓像来自他 1239 年捐款创办的修道院，他 1248 年就在此修道院内入葬。这雕像全副武装：长袖锁链衫，盔甲，盾等等，典型的欧洲中古骑士装备，但却持着一把不同寻常的剑。［中古武器学者］Helmut Nickel ［1924- ］发现剑首是十二世纪在中国制造的剑才有的，这点可在当时写本的绘画与得以保留的实物中得以证实。墓主如何得获这么一把剑呢？我们知道他 1241 年参加十字军到巴力斯坦远征，1944 年带了据说是耶稣受被钉的十字架木残片回法。卧墓像上除了此剑外，还雕刻了剑履和携剑腰带，表示墓主对此剑十分珍重，必定是他从海外带回来的东西，足以向后世炫耀。Nickel 臆想剑是墓主在丝绸之路上买到的，也可能来自蒙古士兵，或来自某地中海海港的古董市场，抑或是在叙利亚战场上获的战利品。我猜想它也有可能是欧洲十字军和地中海大商贾互相馈赠的珍贵物品之一。因十三世纪蒙古势力扩张后，蒙古、拜占庭和回教文明虽然宗教信仰不同，但不断靠各种礼仪维系着不即不离的关系。我们要问这把剑对墓主有何文化意义呢？它是否仅仅是战利品，还是代表对东方文明一种新的认识和憧憬？或者于蒙古帝国 1240 年代占领了欧亚大片土地后，寄望欧洲和蒙古联盟抵抗回教势力？我们从十三世纪的写本图绘中可看出，当时欧洲人对亚洲人（鞑靼或蒙古人）非常好奇兼严恶和恐惧，而此雕像中的虔诚基督徒骑士佩戴这把来自东方的剑也许也带着这些复杂的情感。

Democratising Literature: The Coming of Paper to the West
Orietta Da Rold, University of Cambridge （英 • 康桥大学）

The introduction of paper to the West has been described as one of those key technological revolutions which have deeply influenced the way in which we disseminate information and transmit texts. This technological revolution was introduced in Europe around the twelfth century. Paper, of course, is a Chinese invention and evidence suggests that the first paper mill was established in Spain in 1150, then Italy (Genoa 1235; Fabriano 1264), France (Marseille 1348) and Germany (Nuremberg 1390). If we compare the long history of the making and use of paper in China and in the East, the introduction of paper in the West can be defined as a rather late revolution. England probably for its position to the far West is one of the very last countries to adopt paper as a commodity, especially for writing.

In a recent article, Martha Rust argues: 'The delay in the acceptance of paper in England was the effect of a stubborn skepticism about the material in both Europe and England that stemmed from perceptions running the gamut from the practical to fairly paranoid: from an early and relatively well- founded concern about its fragility, to Christian intolerance for anything associated with Muslims and Jews, to a more vaguely expressed distaste for its ambiguity and heterogeneous composition' (Martha Rust, 'Love Stories on Paper in Middle English Verse Love Epistles', *Journal of the Early Book Society* 15 (2012), 101-44, p. 103). Rust again argues that: 'While paper was used very rarely for books at the beginning of the century (fifteenth), it is estimated that about 20 percent of books were made of paper by mid-century, and 50 percent or more by the end' (p. 101). In this paper, I shall revisit these assumptions, and build on this scholarship by showing the popularity of paper in the fourteenth century. Interpretation and scholarly arguments, of course, rest on the type of evidence which is available to one scholar, and disagreement brings about interesting conversations. It is with this spirit that I wish to offer some of my own observations on the introduction and acceptance of paper in England. I shall contend that evidence of paper use needs a fresh reassessment, regarding when, how and for what commodities paper was used which does not ignore fourteenth century material. I will use literary and documentary evidence (from *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and Chaucer, particularly) to show the popularity of paper in the fourteenth century and to try to understand some of the literary conceits used by late medieval authors and constructed specifically with paper in mind. I shall contend that in order to do so paper had to be a well established material sharing a common cultural value and meaning.

纸自从第十二世纪传入欧洲后，欧洲人起初对它持怀疑的态度。纸当然是中国人发明的，证据显示欧洲第一家纸厂于 1150 年在西班牙设立，意大利于 1235 和 1264 也先后设立了纸厂，法国要等到 1348 年，德国则迟至 1390 年，而英国殿后。［圣罗马帝国的］Frederick II 大帝于 1231 禁止朝廷办事处使用纸，此后不少高层教士强调纸的脆弱，不如羊皮坚韧。英国人不喜欢用纸，还和他们排斥所有和回教徒与犹太人的事物有关。但纸不久便广泛第被采用。15 世纪初罕见用纸制作的书，世纪中段却已达到百分之二十，而世纪末纸书超半。我们现在可凭纸模上的手指印得以辨别一张纸和另一张是否同属一批， 从而了解纸文化所波及的读者群以及抄写员的职责。共用一批纸可能表示抄写员间有协定，也可能表示读者或作者间同属某种网络。我们要问：除行政用途外，皇家、私人、学校、宗教机构何时开始采用纸？ 最初用纸的人有何种社会、文化、和文艺背景？纸可帮助我们了解文本产生的区域吗？纸在制造业担任了何种角色？此论文重估纸对英国中古文学的影响。

Organizing Literary Information in China Before the Spread of Printing

Christopher Nugent, Williams College （美• 威廉斯学院）

The period from the late fourth through tenth centuries CE in China saw an unprecedented explosion of the creation and circulation of written texts due to a range of factors, from the widespread use of paper to long-term social stability and economic development in the second half of the period. It also saw an increased focus on the literary inheritance as something that had concrete utility; the literate elite saw literary texts as containing information that they could use to negotiate social and economic status, whether through skillfully composing extemporaneous verse in a social gathering or achieving success on the civil service exam. Of course the notion of the literary inheritance having concrete utility had always been part of the tradition: Confucius emphasized not only the aesthetic and moral value of the shi 詩 （"Odes"）, but also noted that they could be used "to recognize the names of many birds, beasts, plants, and trees." I would argue that the medieval period witnessed an increasing instrumentalization of the literary inheritance that, in combination with the ever greater volume of materials, changed the way people related to it in specific ways.

My paper investigates how literate people in this period prior to the widespread use of printing in China organized this flood of literary information into forms and structures that facilitated its use. I use the term "literary information" to refer the literary inheritance (and in some case contemporary works as well) in part to emphasize that this inheritance was seen as something with concrete utility that had to be mastered. My specific focus here is on a small number of leishu 類書 （"categorized writings"）and children's primers. Looking at both content and form, including, for the latter, examples from Dunhuang manuscripts, I examine how (and why) these works organized the increasingly vast corpus of literary sources so as to provide ease of use in a wide range of educationally, socially, and politically meaningful contexts. My contention is that while some of these works were consultative, serving as references works for the literary elite, others were structured in ways that indicate they were meant to be internalized to an extent that, though not reaching full memorization, did provide learners with a substantial store of allusions and cultural references that they could call upon to aid composition in a number of different genres.

中国自公元第四世纪末至第十世纪间文本爆发式地产生与流传。用纸便捷固然是个原因，但社会大致稳定经济迅速发展也是重要因素。精英文人视文本为改进自身社会与经济地位的工具，包括帮助他们应试以及在社交场合赋诗互相唱和。因文本有种种教育、 社交和政治的实用价值，于是启蒙课本和"类书"应运而生。此论文以敦煌出土的写本为例，探讨类书如何把文本的资讯分门别类，便于文人参考，有些类书则特别让他们赋诗行文之际可随手撷取文本的典故以及其他文化指涉。