

## Abstracts

Sarah Allan 艾蘭

### On the Identity of Shang Di 上帝 and the Origin of the Concept of a Celestial Mandate (*Tian Ming* 天命)

上帝的本體及天命觀念的來源

This article reexamines the hypotheses of Guo Moruo and H.G. Creel that Shang Di was the high god of the Shang and Tian, that of the Zhou. It proposes that Shang Di was originally the spirit of the pole star. As such, it was the one celestial body which was higher than the ten suns, with whom the Shang ancestors were identified. Tian was not a high god, but quite literally, the sky. The sky was the location of the Shang Di and the other ancestral spirits, so it came to serve as a euphemism for Shang Di or, more broadly, for Shang Di and all the celestial phenomena and spirits who were under his aegis. The primary distinction between the Shang and Zhou was not that Shang Di was particular to the Shang, but that the Shang rulers identified themselves with the ten suns. Shang Di, as the pole star, was acknowledged by both Shang and Zhou as the highest of the spirits. Tian, as the sky, was understood primarily as the celestial bodies that inhabit it. As in later time, the sky was a spiritual force associated with patterns of time, which were revealed in the movements of the celestial bodies. Thus, the original *tian ming* 天命 (“celestial mandate” or “mandate of heaven”) was, quite literally, an astronomical sign, a “command” seen in the sky during the reign of Wen, whose son Wu founded the Zhou Dynasty.

In support of this argument, the article also examines the construction and uses of the oracle bone and bronze inscription graphs for *di* 帝, *di* 禘 and *tian* 天. It argues that the graph for *di* 帝 is made up of three combined semantic elements: a tree (*mu* 木), above (*shang* 上) and a primitive instrument used for making squares. It also argues that some of the graphs read as *da* 大 in oracle bone inscriptions should be read as *tian*; for example, inscriptions usually transcribed as *da yu* 大雨 and *da qi* 大啓 should be read as *tian yu* 天雨 and *tian qi* 天啓.

本文重新審視了郭沫若與顧立雅 (H.G. Creel) 所提出的“上帝”是商的最高神和“天”是周的最高神的假設。本文提出：“上帝”原本是指北極星的靈體。如此而言，它是一個高於商代先民所認同的“十日”的天體。“天”並非是指神，而是指天空，即其字面義。天空是“上帝”

與其他靈體的居所，故而“天”逐漸成為一個被用於指代“上帝”的敬語，或更為寬泛地被用於指代“上帝”及所有蔭於其下的天象與靈體。商、周之間的主要區別並非在於“上帝”於商有特別的意義，而是在於商的統治者自我認同於“十日”。“上帝”——即北極星，指的是一個為商、周所共同認同的至尊靈體。“天”——即天空，則被主要理解為居於其間的天體。及於後世，“天”被視作與“時”相關聯地一種靈力——這種“時”通常在天體運行中被揭示。故而，“天命”就其字面上而言原本是指一種天文徵兆，一種文王在位時在天空中所見到的“命令”，其子武王終由此而得以建立周朝。

為了支持上述論點，本文亦考察了甲骨文與金文中的“帝”字，“禘”字與“天”字的構形與文例。本文認為“帝”字由三個意符合體而成，分別為：樹木“木”、上方“上”，與一用於畫制方形的原始工具。本文亦認為部分在甲骨文中被讀作“大”的字應當讀作“天”。例如：甲骨文中通常被轉寫為“大雨”、“大啓”的詞組應當讀作“天雨”、“天啓”。

Newell Ann Van Auken 方妮安女士

Could “Subtle Words” have Conveyed “Praise and Blame”?  
The Implications of Formal Regularity and Variation in  
*Spring and Autumn (Chūn Qiū)* Records

「微言」是否能「寓褒貶」？《春秋》形式規律與變異的意涵

The *Spring and Autumn (Chūn Qiū)* is a highly formally regular chronicle of apparently objective entries recorded in the state of Lǔ for the period from 722 to 479 (or 481) B.C.E. The present study is a formal analysis of the *Spring and Autumn (Chūn Qiū)*, showing that its records were written in adherence to strict prescriptive rules governing what types of events could be recorded and the form of those records. Entries recording the same type of event were recorded using the same form, including the same degree of specificity in date notation, style of reference to individuals, as well as main verb and sentence pattern. Other variables affecting the form of records included the rank of individuals mentioned in the record and their home state. Regular diachronic changes in form may also be identified, and their presence demonstrates that the *Spring and Autumn (Chūn Qiū)* accrued over time and was not the product of a single author or editor. Classes of records associated with events, persons, or states deemed to be of greater importance were marked by inclusion of more detail such as names or precise dates, or use of special (honorific

or euphemistic) verbs. The use of formal marking to indicate the exceptional significance of classes of records apparently extended to individual records, suggesting that the value judgment associated with the class had been applied to an individual event. While the *Spring and Autumn* (*Chūn Qiū*) contains no explicit value judgments, formal irregularities may indeed have been used to express value judgments on the events recorded in the *Spring and Autumn* (*Chūn Qiū*).

《春秋》是一本形式上非常有規律的編年書，編寫於魯國，記載自公元前 722 年至 479 年 (或 481 年) 之間發生的客觀事件條目。本論文將以形式分析來展示，《春秋》的紀錄是按照嚴格規定的書法而寫成，書法界定了何種事件該記載及其記載形式。同類之事以同樣之形式記載，包括日期之特定規格 (即有無干支之記載)、個人稱呼格式、主動辭、以及句子結構。其他能影響記錄形式之因素包含記錄所提到的人的爵位以及其國家。我們也能識別出有規律的歷時性形式變異，這些變異之存在可以證明《春秋》不是一人一時所作，而是世世代代累積而成。記載比較重要的事、人及國的紀錄類別，會用含有更多細節 (如干支、人名)，或採用特殊動詞 (如敬語、委婉語) 來加以標記。這種以形式標記來指明某些紀錄類別之特殊意涵的手法，也被延用於單獨的紀錄，暗示著與該類別相關連的價值評斷也適用於單一事件。

《春秋》雖然並沒有包含明顯的價值評斷，可是形式上的不規則確實可能用來表達對於《春秋》所記載之事件的價值評斷。

Liu Qingzhu 劉慶柱

Archaeological Discovery and Research into the Layout of the  
Palaces and Ancestral Shrines of Han Dynasty Chang'an—  
A Comparative Essay on the Capital Cities of  
Ancient Chinese Kingdoms and Empires

漢長安城宮殿與宗廟布局考古發現與研究——  
中國古代的王國與帝國都城比較研究之一

The principal function of the ancient Chinese royal capital city was political. From the perspective of archaeology, the physical manifestation of this is primarily revealed through palace buildings and ancestral shrines. Chang'an was the capital city of the Western Han Empire. After extensive excavation and research into the sites of palatial structures and ancestral shrines of Han Dynasty Chang'an city, it is clear that the two are distinct in form. Also, comparative research into the layout of the palaces

and ancestral shrines of Han Chang'an that have undergone excavation beside those palaces and shrines of the capital cities of the kingdoms of the pre-Qin era also reveals that the two architectural forms have clear differences. The difference in architectural form between palaces and ancestral shrines reflects the difference in function they performed, between rule through territorial authority and rule through kinship. From the side-by-side placement of palaces and ancestral shrines within the royal precincts of capital cities of the kingdom era (the pre-Qin period), to the separate placement of palaces and shrines in the capital cities of the imperial era (Qin-Han to Ming-Qing periods), as well as in the formation of the system centered on the royal palace, whereby the "ancestors occupy the left, while the altar of soil occupies the right," the difference in the layout of palaces and ancestral shrines in the capital cities of the kingdom era and those of the imperial era clearly explains how the palace, which represents rule by territorial authority, and the ancestral shrine, which represents rule by kinship, wax and wane in the strength of their social function with the development of society and the change in societal configuration. Archaeological discovery and research into the architectural sites of palaces and ancestral shrines of Han Chang'an city reveals that the kingdom era of ancient Chinese society was a time for the integration of rule through kinship and rule through territorial authority, while from the Qin-Han period to the Ming-Qing era was a time of centralized imperial power, where rule by territorial authority was primary, and rule through kinship was secondary.

中國古代王朝都城功能主要是政治性的，從考古學角度來看，其物化載體主要表現為都城的宮殿與宗廟建築。漢長安城是西漢帝國首都，漢長安城的宮殿、宗廟遺址進行了大規模考古發掘、研究，二者的形制不同。通過考古發掘的漢長安城宮殿、宗廟建築與先秦時代王國都城宮殿、宗廟建築遺址的布局比較研究，可以看出二者也有明顯不同。宮殿與宗廟建築形制不同，反映二者作為地緣政治與血緣政治的功能不同；從王國時代（先秦時代）都城宮城中的宮殿與宗廟并列布局，到帝國時代（秦漢至明清時代）都城的宮殿與宗廟分立布局，以及以宮殿為中心的“左祖右社”制度形成，王國時代都城與帝國時代都城宮殿與宗廟布局不同，說明代表地緣政治的宮殿與代表血緣政治的宗廟，隨着社會發展，社會形態改變，二者社會作用的勢力消長。漢長安城宮殿與宗廟建築遺址考古發現與研究揭示出來，中國古代社會的王國時代是血緣政治與地緣政治結合的時代，秦漢至明清時代則是以地緣政治為主、血緣政治為輔的中央集權的帝國時代。

Daniel Fried 傅雲博

“A Never-Stable Word: Zhuangzi’s *Zhiyan* and  
‘Tipping-Vessel’ Irrigation”

「不穩之言：莊子的『卮言』與欹器灌溉」

The *zhiyan* described in the “Entrusted Words” chapter of the *Zhuangzi* (“*Zhiyan* come forth daily, and are harmonized with the heavenly divisions; through this they spread out, and thus years draw to a close”) have long aroused debate and confusion among readers, as the word *zhi* usually refers to a type of wine goblet. Contemporary readers cannot easily obtain clear assistance from traditional commentaries, because the mainstream of Zhuangzi scholarship has been disturbed by Guo Xiang’s original notes: “This *zhi* is [a thing which] tips when full, rights when empty, and does not stay fixed.” The questions which arise from this note are two: (1) What sort of goblet could “tip when full, right when empty”? And (2) how would this remarkable behavior on the part of the goblet relate to the original text of the *Zhuangzi*?

Happily, Guo Xiang’s gloss is similar to a paragraph from the *Xunzi* in which Confucius is said to note an “urging vessel” in the hall of Duke Huan of Lu which also “leans when empty, rights [itself] when half-full, and tips over when full.” Early strata of material from the later text of the *Wenzi* also mention this “urging vessel” as a kind of ancient ritual object prone to tipping over. Although a few readers have considered the relationship between Guo Xiang’s gloss and the text of the *Xunzi*, only in the past several decades has there accumulated enough historical data to provide readers with a more comprehensive background for interpretation. Mainland Chinese archaeologists working in the 1950’s discovered a “narrow-bottomed jug” (or, “tipping-vessel”) which, because its handles were located below the center of gravity, tipped in the fashion described of the “urging vessel” in the classical text. More recently, researchers have returned to this topic in the 1990’s, and have discovered that the tipping-vessel since the Neolithic age was used in agriculture as an irrigation device.

By simultaneously using the *Xunzi*, *Wenzi*, and other texts, as well as modern archaeological conclusions to re-read the *Zhuangzi*, it is possible to discover that the concept of the *zhiyan* is well-suited to an agricultural interpretation. In such an interpretive context, it is possible to speculate that the linguistic skepticism Zhuangzi expresses through the term is related to a cyclical temporality associated with the use of tipping-vessels for irrigation.

莊子《寓言篇》的「卮言」之說，（「卮言日出，和以天倪，因以曼衍，所以窮年」）自古以來引起讀者的困惑與辯論，因為「卮」這個字泛指古代酒器。現代讀者也並不能容易地從傳統釋文得到明確的援助：莊學的主流還是困擾於郭象的注釋：「夫卮，滿則傾，空則仰，非持固也。」問題在於（甲）一種盛酒器怎麼會「滿則傾，空則仰」？（乙）酒器的這種特別行為，跟莊子原文有甚麼關係？

正好郭象的注釋很像《荀子》中的一段文：孔子見魯桓公廟上有「宥坐之器」，這種器皿也「虛則欹，中則正，滿則覆」。後來的「文子」中的比較早的資料也提到「侑卮」為一種欹覆的古老禮器。少數讀者雖有考慮郭象釋文與《荀子》段落的關係，到最近幾十年才開始積累充分的歷史資料可以給讀者提供完整的詮釋背景。大陸考古學家在五十年代發現了所謂的「尖底瓶」（又稱「欹器」），因為兩個把手的設計在重心之下，就像古典文本中所形容的侑卮一樣會欹覆不穩。最近九十年代的考古學家回到這個研究對象，發現欹器自新石器期後有過農業的功用，為一種灌溉用的工具。

若是同時來用荀子、文子等文本與當代的考古結論來重讀莊子原文，可以發現「卮言」之說很合乎農業背景的解說。由此推理，莊子在此表示對語言的懷疑，也許跟灌溉欹器的時空循環性有關。