

古代中國論文彙

Ancient China: Studies in Early Civilization

**Edited by
David T. Roy and Tsuen-hsuei Tsien**



The Chinese University Press

**Ancient China:
Studies in
Early Civilization**

Dedicated to

HERRLEE GLESSNER CREEL

Martin A. Ryerson Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus
Department of Far Eastern Languages and Civilizations
and of History
The University of Chicago

Preface

This volume of essays on various aspects of Chinese civilization from its beginnings through the Han dynasty has been brought together in honor of Herrlee Glessner Creel, who celebrated his seventieth birthday in 1975. It has been a pleasure for all of the scholars associated with this undertaking to have an opportunity to give tangible expression to their admiration for his accomplishments. It is not given to many men in any generation to have the impact on a significant area of scholarship that Herrlee Creel has had on our understanding of early Chinese civilization.

From the appearance of his first book in 1929 until the present time he has been in the forefront of sinological scholarship. Some indication of the lasting value of his work may be seen in the fact that though he has been publishing in this field for half a century all of his major books remain in print. This fact is due not only to the quality of his scholarship but also, in no small part, to that of his prose style which consistently exemplifies standards of cogency, lucidity, and grace rarely to be found in academic writing. In his ability to explore the frontiers of knowledge, no matter how esoteric or complex his subject matter, and report his findings with a degree of clarity and elegance that makes them readily accesible not only to specialists but to every interested layman, he has set standards to which the rest of us can only aspire.

We did not ask the contributors to write on specific topics so long as their subjects were relevant to the early period of Chinese civilization which ended in the third century A.D. This restriction was made by the editors in the hope of producing a volume which would have greater coherence than the usual festschrift. Despite the heterogeneous nature of the contents, which reflects the differing areas of specialization of the contributors, we feel that this aim has been largely achieved. Since many of the articles cross disciplinary

Preface

boundary lines, we have chosen to arrange them, in so far as possible, in chronological rather than topical order. The reader will find that the individual articles have something significant to say, from one disciplinary point of view or another, about every important period from pre-historic archaeology through the abdication of the last Han emperor in A.D. 220. A glance at the table of contents will indicate that the disciplinary approaches represented include archaeology and anthropology; epigraphy, philology, and linguistics; intellectual, cultural, economic, and institutional history; and philosophy, art, and literature. Such catholicity of approach is only appropriate in a volume which is inspired by the work of a scholar who has made significant contributions to every one of these fields.

The editors would like to take this opportunity to express our thanks to the many people who have helped to bring this project to fruition. The individual contributors, without whose cooperation this book could not exist, deserve our thanks for the promptness with which they responded to our original letters of inquiry and the patience with which they have awaited the outcome. June Work compiled the bibliography of Herrlee Creel's publications in the appendix and also assisted with some of the editorial work. Gail Oman, Diane Perushek, and John Grobowski helped in the compilation and typing of the index. Marvin Waschke played a significant role in the launching of this project and rendered material assistance during its early stages. Others who have helped in important ways include Ma Tai-loi and Lois Fusek. The editorial work could not have been done without the excellent facilities provided by the Far Eastern Library of the University of Chicago and its staff. We are especially grateful for the expert assistance rendered by the staff of the Chinese University Press. Finally we wish to acknowledge our gratitude to the Center for Far Eastern Studies at the University of Chicago, and to its director Tetsuo Najita, for their willingness to offer the financial assistance which made this publication possible.

June, 1978
Chicago

David T. Roy
Tsuen-hsuei Tsien

List of contributors

NOEL BARNARD

Senior Fellow, Department of Far Eastern History, Australian National University.

DERK BODDE

Professor Emeritus, Department of Oriental Studies, University of Pennsylvania.

CHANG KWANG-CHIH

Professor, Department of Anthropology, Harvard University.

CHENG TE-K'UN

Visiting Professor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor, The Chinese University of Hong Kong; and Reader Emeritus in Chinese Archaeology, University of Cambridge.

CHOW TSE-TSUNG

Professor and Chairman, Department of East Asian Languages and Literature and Professor, Department of History, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

A. C. GRAHAM

Professor, Department of Chinese, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

HSÜ CHO-YÜN

Professor, Department of History, University of Pittsburgh.

DAVID R. KNECHTGES

Associate Professor, Department of Asian Languages and Literature, University of Washington.

LAO KAN

Professor Emeritus, Department of Oriental Languages, University of California at Los Angeles.

List of contributors

CARL LEBAN

Associate Professor, Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures,
University of Kansas.

GÖRAN MALMQVIST

Professor, Department of Chinese Studies, Institute of Oriental Languages,
University of Stockholm.

EDWIN G. PULLEYBLANK

Professor, Department of Asian Studies, University of British Columbia.

SYDNEY ROSEN

Former Assistant Professor, Department of History and Government,
Colby College.

RICHARD C. RUDOLPH

Professor Emeritus, Department of Oriental Languages, University of
California at Los Angeles; and Director, University of California Study
Centre, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

KENNETH STARR

Director, Milwaukee Public Museum.

BENJAMIN E. WALLACKER

Professor, Department of Oriental Languages, University of California at
Davis.

Copyright © 1978 by The Chinese University of Hong Kong

All rights reserved

International Standard Book Number: 962-201-144-6

Typesetting by the Chinese University Press, Hong Kong
Printing by Wing Tai Cheung Printing Co. Ltd., Hong Kong

Contents

Preface	ix
List of contributors	xi
Some new discoveries in Prehistoric and Shang China Cheng Te-k'un	1
<i>T'ien kan</i> : a key to the history of the Shang Chang Kwang-chih	13
The childbirth myth and ancient Chinese medicine: a study of aspects of the <i>wu</i> tradition Chow Tse-tsung	43
The early use of the tally in China Lao Kan	91
Changing conceptions of the hegemon in Pre-Ch'in China Sydney Rosen	99
Emphatic negatives in classical Chinese Edwin G. Pulleyblank	115
What <i>did</i> the master say? Göran Malmqvist	137
Marshes in <i>Mencius</i> and elsewhere: a lexicographical note Derk Bodde	157
The organization of the Mohist <i>Canons</i> A. C. Graham	167
The nature of the Ch'in "Reform of the Script" as reflected in archaeological documents excavated under conditions of control Noel Barnard	181

Han Confucianism and Confucius in Han	215
Benjamin E. Wallacker	
Uncovering the sauce jar: a literary interpretation of Yang Hsiung's "Chü Ch'in mei Hsin"	229
David R. Knechtges	
Agricultural intensification and marketing agrarianism in the Han dynasty	253
Hsü Cho-yün	
The enjoyment of life in Han reliefs of Nanyang	269
Richard C. Rudolph	
An "old rubbing" of Later Han <i>Chang Ch'ien pei</i>	283
Kenneth Starr	
Managing heaven's mandate: coded communication in the accession of Ts'ao P'ei, A. D. 220	315
Carl Leban	
Appendix: Bibliography of Herrlee Glessner Creel	343
Index	347

Some new discoveries in Prehistoric and Shang China

Cheng Te-k'un

In giving an account of some new discoveries in Prehistoric and Shang China, the recent exhibition of archaeological finds of the People's Republic of China may be taken as the starting point. The exhibition which was held at the Burlington House in London in the winter of 1973-74, presents a total of 385 objects, all archaeological materials which were unearthed under scientific control in recent years, especially during the Great Cultural Revolution. They are selected from a great exhibition which had been on show in Peking in 1972.¹ The collection went first to Paris² before coming to London³ and other cities in Europe and America.⁴ Supported with many maps, charts, ink-rubbings and photographs, and a series of explanatory notes, it covers the entire range of cultural development in ancient China from the Lan-t'ien Man 藍田人, 600,000 years ago to the Yüan dynasty in the 14th century when modern history began.

The exhibition is by itself an excellent academic exercise, a beautiful display of art objects supported with archaeology. Arranged in 12 well-defined sections, it covers the development of ancient China in three stages: the

¹ See *Historical relics unearthed in new China* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1972); *Wen-hua ta-ko-ming ch'i-chien ch'u-t'u wen-wu* 文化大革命期間出土文物, Part I (Peking: Wen wu, 1972); and *Chung-hua Jen-min Kung-ho-kuo ch'u-t'u wen-wu chan-lan chan-p'in hsian-chi* 中華人民共和國出土文物展覽展品選集 (Peking: Wen wu, 1973).

² Vadime Elisséeff and others, *Tresors d'Art Chinois* (Paris, 1973); and Hsia Nai, "600,000 years of labor and struggle—exhibition of archaeological finds in new China," *China Reconstructs*, 1973.6, 20-27; 1973.7, 30-37.

³ William Watson, *The genius of China* (London: Times Newspaper, 1973).

⁴ National Gallery of Art and Nelson Gallery—Atkins Museum, *The Chinese exhibition: an illustrated handlist of the exhibition of archaeological finds of the People's Republic of China* (Washington, D. C. and Kansas City, 1975); similar catalogs were also published in San Francisco, Toronto and other cities, where the exhibition was held.

Primitive Society in Paleolithic and Neolithic times, the Slave Society in the Shang and Chou dynasties, and the Feudal Society beginning from the 5th century B.C. The exhibition presents in a most concrete fashion a summary of the contributions made by the Chinese archaeological workers in the last few decades and demonstrates how archaeology in China now serves not only as a handmaiden of Chinese history but also as a foundation for the study of Chinese art.

In a way the exhibition is limited in scope and highly selective in nature. It contains only a very small part of the entire corpus of archaeological materials up to the end of 1971. They include, of course, the best and well-preserved specimens which are of interest to specialists as well as to ordinary spectators. This paper aims at reviewing some important discoveries which are not included in the exhibition in order to present a more detailed picture of the archaeology of ancient China up to the end of 1973. It covers the three early periods namely the Paleolithic, the Neolithic, and the Shang, the early historical period, as shown in the table accompanying.

PALEOLITHIC PERIOD—600,000-10,000 YEARS AGO

Evidence for Man in the Lower Pleistocene in China is still lacking. In 1946, Franz Weidenreich came up with a theory that *Gigantopithecus*, a giant ape from south China, may be directly ancestral to Man. But the investigation of the early caves in Kwangsi in recent years has recovered enough fossils to reconstruct the lower mandible of the giant ape, giving definite proof that *Gigantopithecus*, though widely distributed in south China, is not a hominid and has no connection with the evolution of Man.

By the Middle Pleistocene, around 600,000-400,000 years ago, China was populated by a human type of *Homo erectus*. The exhibition presents two distinct sub-species, the *Lantienensis* along the river and lake marshes of Shensi and the *Pekinensis* in the limestone caves in Hopei. To these we may add now a third, the *Yuanmouensis* in the forest regions of Yunnan. The early man is represented by two teeth discovered in the red loam of the Shang-pang-wei 上邦煒 region in Yuan-mou 元謀.⁵ They are two upper medial incisors, ash-white and deeply fossilized. The depressions on the back of the teeth constitute a prominent feature; such teeth are called shovel-shaped and are noticeable not only in the Lan-t'ien Man and Peking Man but also in most of the later inhabitants including the majority of the modern Chinese. The new discoveries show that the *Homo erectus* in China were able to adapt themselves to the widely different environments in the various parts of the

⁵Cheng Te-k'un, "Metallurgy in Shang China," *T'oung Pao*, 64 (1973), 1-3.

MAN AND CULTURE IN ANCIENT CHINA

Geological period	Man	Culture	Proposed dating (years ago)
HOLOCENE	Shang Chinese	HISTORIC An-yang Cheng-chou Yen-shih (City and dynastic)	3,100
	Proto-Chinese	NEOLITHIC Upper: Lung-shan Ch'ing-lien-kang Ch'ü-chia-ling Yang-shao (Village and agriculture, Gobi microlithic)	4,000
		Lower: (Polished stone industry, corded ware, cord industry, transitory settlement, Gobi microlithic)	7,000
PLEISTOCENE	Upper: <i>Homo sapiens</i> Upper Cave Man Ting-ts'un Man Ordos Man Lai-pin Man Tzu-yang Man Liu-chiang Man	PALEOLITHIC Upper: (Neolithic element, bone industry, Gobi microlithic, chopping-tool tradition)	10,000
	<i>Homo neanderthalensis</i> Ordos Man Ch'ang-yang Man Ma-pa Man	Middle: (Primary microlithic, chopping-tool tradition)	100,000
	Middle: <i>Homo erectus</i> <i>Pekinensis</i> <i>Lantianensis</i> <i>Yuanmouensis</i>	Lower: (Chopping-tool industry)	200,000
	Lower: Ape <i>Gigantopithecus</i>		600,000
			1,000,000

country. Their culture, characterized by the chopping-tool industry and the use of fire, is recognized as Lower Paleolithic. A few specimens are on display in the Burlington House.

The lack of Middle and Upper Paleolithic and Lower Neolithic cultures in the exhibition does not mean that China was depopulated during this prolonged period, which ended around 7,000 years ago. In fact the early population continued to evolve and increase in number. The Middle Paleolithic Man is now represented by three groups of fossils in the three main river basins in China. They are the Ordos Man 河套人在 Inner Mongolia at the northern bend of the Huangho, the Ch'ang-yang Man 長陽人在 Hupei in the middle Yangtse, and the Ma-pa Man 馬壩人在 Kwangtung in the Sikiang valley. Morphologically they are all recognizable as Neanderthal Man, but they have transitional features between the typical Neanderthal Man and *Homo sapiens*. An upper incisor of the Ordos Man is clearly shovel-shaped. The stone industry of these peoples is basically in the chopping-tool tradition of the *Homo erectus*, but because of geographical differences and the supply of raw materials, new techniques were evolved. In Inner Mongolia, for instance, the Ordos Man began to make small flakes with neat secondary trimming at the cutting edge. These are described as "Gobi microliths," but evidence seems to show that the tradition was evolved from the advanced chopping-tool industry at this stage. It was destined to become a dominant trait in the semi-arid north, playing an important role in the shaping of Chinese culture.

Archaeological evidence of Man in China during the Upper Pleistocene is even more abundant and has been recorded in several areas in various sorts of environment. So far six groups of Upper Paleolithic Man, all *Homo sapiens*, have been found, three in south China and three in the north. The three southern fossils were in various stages of development, with Liu-chiang Man 柳江人 from Kwangsi as the oldest, followed by Tzu-yang Man 資陽人 from Szechwan and Lai-pin Man 來賓人 also in Kwangsi in chronological order. They all bear primitive mongoloid features which seem to suggest that they were in an evolutionary stage towards racial specialization, and it has been suggested that the Mongoloid race might have its cradle in south China.

The cultures of the three Upper Paleolithic men in north China are quite different from one another. The Ting-ts'un Man 丁村人, who lived in the watersheds of southern Shansi, continued to use pebble and flake chopping-tools. The industry may be regarded as a Middle Paleolithic survival into the Upper Pleistocene. The upper incisors of the Ting-ts'un Man are also shovel-shaped. The Ordos Man, who occupied the oasis in Inner Mongolia, practiced the microlithic type of industry which began to flourish in the steppe and desert north, stretching southward into the Central Plain and

westward into Tibet.⁶ The human fossils found in the Upper Cave 上洞 at Chou-k'ou-tien comprise several types of *Homo sapiens*, which had been previously classified into three races, but now, with the new materials from south China for comparison, it seems clear that they are all fundamentally Mongoloid, but in various degrees of specialization. The skeletal remains represent no less than ten individuals, including three complete skulls, who were the weaker members of the group—an old male, a middle-aged and a young woman. Among these skulls, two had been perforated by a violent blow on the side while a third suffered a fatal blow on the neck. They seem to have belonged to a primitive familial social unit and were attacked by their enemies. They led, to some degree, a sedentary way of life and practiced a recognizable burial rite. Besides, among the artifacts, there are polished stone and bone, including a needle for tailoring, and the bow and arrows were presumably in use. All these neolithic elements evolved right at the very beginning of the Holocene without a transitional Mesolithic stage. With these situations in view, the Upper Cave culture may now be dated to about 10,000 years ago, marking the end of the Paleolithic period in China.⁷

LOWER NEOLITHIC PERIOD—10,000-7,000 YEARS AGO

The inhabitants of Holocene China were no doubt Mongoloid, but we know very little about their life at the beginning of the period. Most of the sites consist of the remains of impermanent settlements along rivers, around lakes, and by the sea, apparently with economies based on fishing. It may be presumed that they were linked to one another through the numerous waterways throughout the land. Their ways of life varied from region to region according to the respective environments. In the southwest, where the topography was mainly covered by dense vegetation and forests, the early inhabitants continued to use pebble and flake implements in the chopping-tool tradition. In its later development, pecking and polishing were introduced, but never replaced the paleolithic techniques completely. Along the sea coast, the stone implements consist of both chipped and polished artifacts together with fragments of bone arrowheads and awls. The semi-arid steppe region in the north was populated by people with the Gobi microlithic industry. Their settlements are usually found in the consolidated sand dunes of ancient oases. In the loess region of the middle Huangho basin, some Gobi microlithic remains were found scattered among a large number of pebble-flake-using settlements. These facts seem to indicate that some cultural mixing

⁶"New finds in archaeology and palaeontology," *China Reconstructs*, 1972.8, 40-41.

⁷Cheng Te-k'un, "The beginning of Chinese civilization," *Antiquity*, 47 (1973), 197-209.

had taken place here in the Central Plain, destining it to become the cradle of Chinese civilization.

The most common finds in the Lower Neolithic deposits were fragments of pottery, a coarse gritty ware fired at a low temperature and decorated mainly with cord marks, and occasionally with mat impressions and incised patterns. We do not know yet where, when and how pottery making was first invented, but the useful industry spread fast and wide. By this time it had already a wide distribution in East Asia, covering not only China, but also the neighboring areas, from Siberia and Japan in the north to Assam and Indo-China in the south. The tradition served as a foundation for the ceramic industry in these regions throughout the ages. No carbon dates for Lower Neolithic China are available at present, but for Japan, the corded ware, known in the island world as the Jōmon phase, is dated as 9,000 years ago, so it seems reasonable to presume that the industry was in service on the mainland right at the beginning of the Holocene around 10,000 years ago.⁸

UPPER NEOLITHIC PERIOD—7,000-4,000 YEARS AGO

Around 5000 B.C. China was teeming with busy life, especially in the Huangho basin. There was already a large population of agriculturists who lived in villages with a subsistence economy based on cereal cultivation supplemented by animal husbandry, though hunting and fishing were still practiced. Thousands of Upper Neolithic sites have been recorded and a number of the more important ones thoroughly excavated. Some of them are surprisingly extensive and must imply large social units. In the exhibition this stage is represented by 45 specimens from three different phases in north China, namely, the Yang-shao 仰韶 in Shensi and Kansu, the Ch'ing-lien-kang 青蓮崗 in northern Kiangsu, and the Lung-shan 龍山 in Shantung. In the past they had been regarded as three different cultures, but later discoveries revealed that they were basically similar, though in various stages of development. They can easily be distinguished from one another by the type of ceramic wares which they produced: the painted red pottery of Yang-shao, the black burnished pottery of Lung-shan, and another type of painted pottery of Ch'ing-lien-kang.

The stratigraphical sequences gathered from hundreds of these Upper Neolithic sites give concrete evidence of the fact that the development of this new way of life may be traced to the Central Plain in the Huangho valley. It is a small basin where the Huangho is joined by its two great tributaries, the Fen-shui from Shansi and the Wei-shui from Shensi. Being the most eastern

⁸*Ibid.*