I ching 易經 (*Chou I* 周易)

1. The place of the work in the Chinese tradition and its strata

It is almost inevitable that students of Chinese culture encounter this text, which is perhaps the single most important work in China's long intellectual history. Traditionally regarded as the inspired product of the 'Four sages', i.e. Fu Hsi 伏羲, King Wen 文王, Chou kung and Confucius, this enigmatic text was used in its earliest form as a manual of divination. Since at least the Han dynasty, when it was given first place among China's classics, the work has become the foundation on which innumerable commentators have erected moralistic, metaphysical, apocalyptic and soteriological constructs. While these philosophical exegeses are not without value or interest, for those who are concerned with early, i.e. pre-imperial, China they may often tend to obscure the meaning of the work in its original context.

Even in the pre-Han period the original divination text had already undergone a long process of interpretation and re-interpretation, resulting in the incorporation of a group of commentaries, the so called 'Ten Wings' (*shih i* 十翼), into what was to become one of the classical texts. By virtue of their canonical status, these commentaries, which reflect the world view of the late Warring States or Han periods, ensured that thereafter even the original stratum of the text would be interpreted according to moralistic concerns. Considerations of the context of the work that have been forthcoming in China during the past fifty years have demonstrated the anachronistic nature of this interpretation and have begun to suggest what the original meaning of the hexagram and line statements (to be explained below) must have been. For this reason, care is necessary in speaking of the *Book of Changes* as a single text. It is perhaps convenient to use the title *Chou i* to refer to the original parts (i.e. the hexagram and line statements), with special reference to the original context in which they were composed; and to use the title *I ching* as referring to the complete canonical text (i.e., inclusive of the 'Ten Wings'), with the entire text being understood as one of the Classics. This convention will be followed hereafter.

2. Content of the *Chou i*: the hexagram and line statements

The *Chou i* is organized around 64 permutations of six broken or solid lines (e.g. ䷀, ䷁) usually referred to as hexagrams, which have been regarded traditionally as resulting from combining two of eight basic trigrams (☰, ☷, ☳, ☵, ☶, ☴, ☲, ☱). However, recent research on *pa kua* 八卦 numerical symbols that have been found primarily on Western Chou bronzes but also on a few late Shang oracle bones suggests perhaps that the tradition of a development from a symbol of three lines to one of six lines lacks historical basis. These numerical symbols, which long antedate the earliest attested appearance of the solid and broken lined trigrams and hexagrams, regularly appear in sets of six; and those sets of three that do appear invariably date later than the sets of six. (See Chang Cheng-lang 張政烺, 'Shih shih Chou ch'u ch'ing t'ung ch'i ming wen chung ti I kua' 試釋周初青銅器銘文中的易卦, *KKHP* 1980:4, 403–15; translated in *EC* VI (1980–81), 80–96; and Chang Ya-ch'u 張亞初 and Liu Yü 劉雨 'Ts'ung Shang Chou pa kua shu tzu fu hao t'an shih fa ti chi ko wen ti' 從商周八卦數字符號談筮法的幾個問題, *KK* 1981:2, 155–63 and 154; translated in *EC* VII (1981–82), 46–54).

Each of these 64 hexagrams is given a name, usually derived from the most prominent image of the text which follows and which is found just after the the hexagram itself, and at the head of the 'hexagram statement' (*kua tz'u* 卦辭). This statement is normatively composed of certain formulaic divination determinations, of which the best known are the four characters *yuan heng li chen* 元亨利貞. During the Spring and Autumn and Warring States periods these terms were interpreted in a moralistic sense, as the 'four virtues' of 'sublimity', 'penetration', 'benefit' and 'steadfastness' (see *Tso chuan*, Duke Hsiang 9th year; Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, vol. V, p. 440), but modern critics have demonstrated that such an interpretation is anachronistic. Although no consensus has been attained regarding these terms, comparison of two translations ('primary receipt: beneficial to divine'; and 'perform the great sacrifice: a beneficial divination') at least illustrates agreement that the terminology is explicitly related to the practice of divination (see Edward L. Shaughnessy, 'The composition of the *Zhouyi*'; PhD. dissertation, Stanford University, 1983, 124–33 ; and Kao Heng 高亨, *Chou i ta chuan chin chu* 周易大傳今注; Chi-nan: Ch'i Lu shu she, 1973, p. 53). The usage of *chen* 貞 in particular, which is defined in the *Shuo wen chieh tzu* as *pu wen* 卜問 'to enquire by crack making' and which regularly appears in Shang oracle bone inscriptions as a general term for divination, suggests that this term is related to such practices.

(iii) Serruys, Paul L-M., 'On the system of the *pu shou* (部首) in the *Shuo wen chieh tzu*; *BIHP* 55 (1984), 651–754. This includes English translations for every one of the 540 *Shuo wen* classifiers, as well as meticulously detailed and thorough lexicographical notes for each item.

(b) Items under reference above.

(i) Boodberg, P.A., 'The Chinese script: an essay in nomenclature (the first hecaton)'; *BIHP* 29 (1957), 113–20.
(ii) Chou Tsu-mo 周祖謨, *Wen hsüeh chi* 問學集, 2 vols.; Peking: Chung hua, 1966: (a) *Hsü Shen chi ch'i Shuo wen chieh tzu* 許慎及其說文解字 (pp. 710–22); (b) *T'ang pen Shuo wen yü Shuo wen chiu yin* 唐本說文與說文舊音 (pp. 723–59); (c) *Li Yang-p'ing chuan shu k'ao* 李陽冰篆書考 (pp. 801–42); (d) *Hsü K'ai ti Shuo wen hsüeh* 徐鍇的說文學 (pp. 843–51); and (e) *Lun Tuan shih Shuo wen chieh tzu chu* 論段氏說文解字注 (pp. 852–84).
(iii) Coblin, W. South, 'The initials of Xu Shen's language as reflected in the *Shuowen* duruo glosses'; *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 6 (1978), 27–75.
(iv) Miller, Roy Andrew, 'Problems in the Study of *Shuo wen chieh tzu*'; unpublished PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1953.
(v) Miller, Roy Andrew, 'The Wu-ching i-i of Hsü Shen'; *MS* 33, 1977–78, 1–21.
(vi) Serruys, Paul L.M., 'A study of the chuan chu in Shuo wen'; *BIHP* 29 (1957), 131–95.
(vii) Thern, K.L., *Postface* of the *Shuo wen chieh tzu*; Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1966.

A full bibliography of modern *Shuo wen* studies and scholarship can be found in sections 5.1.1.3 and 12.3.4 of Paul Fu-mien Yang, *Chinese Linguistics: a Selected and Annotated Bibliography*; Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1974. This includes Chinese, Japanese and Western works up to the early 1970s.

8. Index

A Concordance to the Shouwen jiezi 說文解字逐字索引, ed. D.C. Lau and Chen Fong Ching; *ICS* series, Hong Kong: Commercial Press, forthcoming 1996.

— William G. Boltz

Shuo yüan 說苑

1. Content

The *Shuo yüan* is a collection of moral tales and political admonitions assembled by Liu Hsiang 劉向 (79–8 B.C.), with a received text that contains 639 items in 20 *chüan*. Like the *Hsin hsü*, the *Shuo yüan* mainly consists of material derived from earlier texts (see under *Hsin hsü*). Each of the 20 *chüan* is a chapter that pertains to a particular theme, and almost every *chüan* has a paragraph introducing the theme, followed by a series of illustrative stories. Many of the *chüan* centre round the idea that the ruler must employ talented and virtuous officials, and that he should not hesitate to accept their criticism and advice (nos. 12 and 7–9). No. 11 contains examples of model types of persuasion that illustrate the efficacy of heeding good advice; no. 16 is a collection of aphorisms that are mainly concerned with the proper conduct of rulers and officials. Other *chüan* discuss the necessity of caution and vigilance by individuals and the state (no. 10); tactics and schemes, which must be used only for the public good and not for self-interest (no. 13); the need for military preparedness in times of peace (no. 15); and the importance of proper ritual forms and music (no. 19), while maintaining simplicity and avoiding extravagance (no. 20).

2. Date of composition and authorship

In the entry for the *Shuo yüan* in the *Pieh lu* 別錄, Liu Hsiang states that he collated a group of texts called *Shuo yüan tsa shih* 說苑雜事, which were held in the imperial library, against texts in his own collection and those 'from the people'. He eliminated material that duplicated that which was found in the *Hsin hsü* and that which was 'superficial and not in accord with reason'; and he appended this to a collection of fanciful stories known as the *Pai chia* 百家; the remaining material he organised into a work that he named *Hsin yüan* 新苑.

Parts of Liu Hsiang's account present problems. It is not clear whether *Shuo yüan tsa shih* is the name of an actual book, or simply means 'congeries of persuasions and miscellaneus stories'. Furthermore, scholars

Following the hexagram statement there come six 'line statements' (*yao tz'u* 爻辭), each of which is introduced by a systematic two word tag designating the position of the line and its nature. Thus, *ch'u* 初 represents the bottom line; *shang* 上 the top; and the characters *erh* 二, *san* 三, *ssu* 四 and *wu* 五 the respective intervening lines; *chiu* 九 represents a solid line and *liu* 六 a broken line. These systematic identifications presumably appeared only in the third century B.C. While they are found in the manuscript version of the text from Ma-wang-tui 馬王堆 (168 B.C.; for this item see below), they do not occur in citations of the text included in such early to mid-Warring States works as the *Tso chuan* and the *Kuo yü*. In such passages, reference to a line is made by relating the original hexagram to the hexagram that would be created if the line in question were to change from solid to broken or *vice versa*; e.g., '*Ch'ien' chih 'Kou'* 乾之姤 refers to the bottom line (i.e. *ch'u chiu* 初九) of the hexagram *Ch'ien* 乾䷀, which, if changed from a solid to a broken line, would create *Kou* 姤䷫.

The line statement itself is composed of an 'image' (e.g., the 'submerged dragon' of the bottom line of *Ch'ien*) and one or more of several types of mantic terms (e.g., *chi* 吉 'auspicious'; *hsiung* 凶 'inauspicious'; *wu chiu* 无咎 'no harm'; *hui wang* 悔亡 'trouble gone'; *li yung pin yü wang* 利用賓于王' beneficial herewith to have audience with the king'). Usually the line statements cohere around a single theme and often they are differentiated in a natural progression (for the best examples, see hexagrams nos. 31 *Hsien* 咸 and 52 *Ken* 艮).

The images of the line statements have been subject to the same type of re-interpretation as that seen in the hexagram statements. If one example may be cited, the various 'dragon' (lung 龍) images of *Ch'ien* are interpreted in the 'Ten Wings' as allusions to the moral nature or proper conduct of a 'gentleman'; recent scholaship, on the other hand, has convincingly associated this 'dragon' with the 'Green dragon' (*ts'ang lung* 蒼龍), a constellation of the eastern quadrant of the Chinese firmament, thus giving it a concrete rather than an abstract referent. In general it can be said that while moralistic implications are not necessarily absent in the *Chou i*, no coherent or developed philosophy is presented in the text.

Finally it should be noted that the sequence of the text is based on paired hexagram units, one hexagram following another either on the basis of inversion (e.g., *Chun* 屯䷂ is followed by *Meng* 蒙䷃); or, when such an inversion would produce an identical hexagram, by a change in nature of all six lines (e.g., *Ch'ien* 乾䷀ is followed by *K'un* 坤䷁). While the texts of these individual 'hexagram pairs' are often related (e.g., *Sun* 損䷨ː and *I* 益䷩ hexagrams 41 and 42; or *Chi chi* 既濟䷾ and *Wei chi* 未濟䷿ nos. 63 and 64), no organisation of the text is discernible beyond these basic units.

The existence of these 'hexagram pairs' takes on great significance in a consideration of the sequence of units in the text, and in this respect the manuscript copy from Ma-wang-tui, which is the earliest known version, differs radically from that of the received versions. The ordering of the manuscript version is according to strictly mechanical combinations of the eight trigrams, arranged in two groups, each member of one group combining in turn with each of those of the second group.

3. Date and authenticity of the *Chou i*

The first significant achievement of modern criticism directed to the *Chou i* was the demonstration that the text could not have been composed by King Wen or Chou kung. Nevertheless, early critics accepted an attribution to early Western Chou as the probable date of the text's creation. Subsequent studies have suggested that it did not attain its final form until late in Western Chou, perhaps in the latter part of the 9th century B.C. The most persuasive points of this argument are linguistic, as seen in comparisons, first of the poetic usage of parts of the text with passages in the *Ya* 雅 sections of the *Shih ching*; and, second, of formulaic phrases with those found in Western Chou bronze inscriptions. There has been little or no attempt to link the composition of the text with a specific author, but it is generally assumed that the *Chou i* represents the accumulated experiences of divination of Western Chou court scribes (*shih* 史).

No one who is familiar with the text would argue that it has survived from this period in absolutely pristine form, if indeed there ever were an absolutely pristine form; and yet the quotations of the hexagram and line statements that are found in the *Tso chuan* and *Kuo yü*, and attributed there to the 7th century B.C., substantially accord with the received text. Known textual transmission from the Han dynasty to the present also suggests that there is no reason to suspect the authenticity of most of the text.

4. Content of the *I ching*

The *I ching* includes seven distinct commentaries in addition to the hexagram picture, the hexagram name, the hexagram statement and the line statements, as described above. Three of these seven ((a),(b) and (d) below) are regularly divided into two portions (*shang* 上 and *hsia* 下),

thus rounding the number of commentarial portions to ten, and giving rise to the term 'Ten Wings'. The seven commentaries are as follows:

(a) *T'uan* 彖; explanations of the hexagram statements, usually combining elements of paronomastic lexicology, trigram symbolism and 'line position' (*yao wei* 爻位) theory.
(b) *Hsiang* 象; which are distinguished as 'Greater' (*ta* 大) and 'Lesser' (*hsiao* 小); of these the Greater *hsiang* are explanations of the hexagram statement and the Lesser *hsiang* correspond to each of the six line statements. The Greater *hsiang* are virtually always comprised of an explanation of the trigram symbolism, followed by a moralistic maxim that is related to the hexagram text. The Lesser *hsiang* take 'line position' and 'line virtue' (*yao te* 爻德) as primary heuristic devices.
(c) *Wen yen* 文言; complete and multi-faceted commentaries for the first two hexagrams *Ch'ien* and *K'un*.
(d) *Hsi tz'u* 繫辭; often referred to as the 'Great Treatise' (*Ta chuan* 大傳); a synthetic explanation of the text, its composition, function and meaning. The significance of this commentary reached its highest point in the metaphysical thought of the Sung Neo-Confucians.
(e) *Shuo kua* 說卦; in two parts; of these the first is a philosophical account of the creation of the hexagrams; the second lists attributes (e.g., type of personality, animal, bodily element, social status) for the eight trigrams. In the text found at Ma-wang-tui, the first of these parts is found embedded within the *Hsi tz'u* commentary with which it is indeed similar in format.
(f) *Hsü kua* 序卦; a moralistic attempt to explain the order in which the hexagrams are found.
(g) *Tsa kua* 雜卦; random one word or one phrase characterizations of each half of the 32 hexagram pairs.

There have been two traditions regarding the distribution of these commentaries within the text. Most editions place the glosses of the *T'uan*, *Hsiang* and *Wen yen* commentaries immediately after the hexagram or line statement to which they correspond, with the other four commentaries appended at the end of the text. A separate textual organization, wherein the three line commentaries are separated from the line texts and placed together at the end of the basic text, was suggested by the Sung classical scholars Lü Tsu-ch'ien 呂祖謙 (1137–1181) and Chu Hsi 朱熹 (1130–1200). Evidence from both the Han stone classics versions (A.D. 175) of the *I ching* and the Ma-wang-tui manuscript (168 B.C.) suggests that this latter organisation was indeed the original format of the *I ching*, with the more usual interspersing of commentary deriving from the textual tradition of Fei Chih 費直 (*c.* 50 B.C.–A.D. 10) and Cheng Hsüan 鄭玄 (127–200).

5. Date and authenticity of the *I ching*

As evidence that the canonical *I ching* commentaries derived from the sages, most traditional classical scholars have pointed to the following comment of Ssu-ma Ch'ien 司馬遷 (?145–?86 B.C.) *Shih chi* 47, p. 1937):

> Late in life, Confucius enjoyed the *I*, putting in order the *T'uan*, *Hsi* [*tz'u*], *Hsiang*, *Shuo kua* and *Wen yen*, thrice wearing out the leather binders in reading the *I*.

However, beginning with Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072), these commentaries have often been regarded with suspicion. Ou-yang Hsiu's own argument about the authenticity of the Confucian authorship can be summarized in three points: (a) the inclusion of divergent, at times contradictory, statements demonstrates that the commentaries are not from one hand; (b) that the glosses are frequently mundane, and sometimes nonsensical, suggests that they could not have come from the hand of the great sage; and (c) the occurrence of the expression *tzu yüeh* 子曰 proves that the texts come from the hands of later disciples.

A millennium later, scholars of the *Ku shih pien* 古史辨 movement of the 1920's and 1930's attempted to prove that not only was Ou-yang Hsiu correct in his rejection of the Confucian authorship, but that moreover virtually all of the texts were products of the Han dynasty. With the recent discovery of the Han Ma-wang-tui manuscript version of the text (168 B.C.) complete with the *Hsi tz'u*, it now appears that these modern scholars were rather over zealous in their suspicions of the past. Still, there can be no question that the commentaries were not produced by Confucius. Although each one remains to be dated independently, in general it would seem that they attained their present form in the mid-third to the early second century B.C., with the probable exception of the *Hsü kua* which would seem to date from the Later Han period.

6. Textual history

The process whereby the text was transmitted suggests some of the reasons for the divergent uses to which it was put, first in its original form for purposes of divination, and later as a classical fount of wisdom. Presumably the text of the *Chou i* was created by the scribes of the Western Chou court; but there is at least some suggestion in the *Tso chuan* (Duke

Chou i i wen k'ao 周易異文考 of Hsü Ch'in-t'ing 徐芹庭 (Taipei: Wu-chou, 1975). At present, Hsü's study is the most rewarding, based as it is on both Ch'ing scholarship and also on such recently discovered sources as the Han stone classics and the manuscript from Tun-huang; but even this study requires revision in light of the later finds.

8. Principal commentaries

Fragments of more than a score of Han commentaries can be culled from three T'ang sources: the *Chou i cheng i* 周易正義 of K'ung Ying-ta; the *Chou i chi chieh* 周易集解 of Li Ting-tso 李鼎祚 (8th century); and the *Ching tien shih wen* 經典釋文 of Lu Te-ming 陸德明 (556–627). Selections of a number of these have been compiled by Ch'ing scholars such as Ma Kuo-han 馬國翰 (1794–1857).

For the pre-Sung period, certainly the most important and influential commentary is the *Chou i chu* 周易注 of Wang Pi, completed by Han K'ang-po 韓康伯 (d. *c.* 385). Perhaps more than any other treatment in the history of the text, Wang's systematic explanation made the *I ching* the cornerstone of Chinese philosophy. His explanation was elaborated during the Sung period, when the commentaries of Ch'eng I 程頤 (1033–1107), *Chou i Ch'eng shih chuan* 周易程氏傳, and Chu Hsi 朱熹, *Chou i pen i* 周易本義, stand out among many excellent works. But just as Wang Pi's interpretation represented a reaction against the orthodoxy of the Han scholars, so too did the new Sung orthodoxy precipitate a reform movement; in this case this was an attempt to return to the original meaning of the text.

One of the first notable proponents of this movement was the Ming scholar Lai Chih-te 來知德 (1525–1604), whose work was entitled *Chou i Lai chu t'u chieh* 周易來註圖解. Subsequently, the movement came to full flower during the Ch'ing period, with such works as the *I yin* 易音 of Ku Yen-wu 顧炎武 (1612–81), the *Chou I shu* 周易述 of Hui Tung 惠棟 (1697–1758), and the *I chang chü* 易章句 of Chiao Hsün 焦循 (1763–1820). Another work of the Ch'ing period that is worthy of mention is the *Chou i che chung* 周易折中 of Li Kuang-ti 李光地 (1642–1718). Prepared as a result of an imperial decree in 1715, this item acquired significance in Western studies of the *I ching* as the text used by both James Legge and Richard Wilhelm in their translations. Of the hundreds of commentaries written in recent years, the *Chou i ku ching chin chu* 周易古經今注 of Kao Heng 高亨, one of the field's pre-eminent context critics, has almost certainly been the most influential in scholarly circles; for details, see under 12 (a) below).

9. Recent editions

The foregoing list of commentaries should be considered only as a beginning to the vast wealth of Chinese secondary literature on the *I ching*. Virtually every notable thinker in China's intellectual history, and many who are not so notable, have had occasion to discuss the text. Fortunately, modern scholars have made some attempt to gather together the richest contributions to this wealth. By far the most valuable of these efforts is the *Wu ch'iu pei chai I ching chi ch'eng* 無求備齋易經集成 compiled by Yen Ling-feng 嚴靈峯 (Taipei: Ch'eng-wen, 1975). This 195 volume collection consists primarily of photographic reproductions of the oldest extant editions; it contains 362 works by 319 different scholars from the Han to the Republican period. The works are arranged chronologically according to the following categories: commentaries, comprehensive discussions, occasional notes, questions and answers, phonologies, diagramatic discourses, general examples, divination texts, apocrypha, textual recensions, commentarial redactions and miscellaneous works. While it would be possible to fault the *I ching chi ch'eng* for certain omissions (particularly in respect of recent works from Taiwan), it does conveniently assemble nearly all of the most important traditional Chinese studies of the *I ching*, and provides at least some introduction to all of its principal exegetical traditions.

10. Translations

The first complete published rendering of the *I ching* into a Western language was the Latin translation of the Jesuit priest Jean-Baptiste Regis (1663–1738), which was published in two volumes in 1834 and 1839. But the text will be encountered by most English speaking students in one of two translations: (a) that of Legge, *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. 16; re-issued on numerous occasions; and (b) that of Richard Wilhelm (*The I Ching or Book of Changes*; translated by Cary F. Baynes; 2 vols., Bollingen Series 19, New York, 1950). Wilhelm's translation is certainly the more readable of the two, and while it cannot be used for any historical study of the text, it has the virtue of faithfully presenting the text as it was understood by traditional Chinese Confucian scholars towards the end of the Ch'ing dynasty. Some care is necessary in distinguishing between the different parts of the *Chou i*, the 'Ten Wings' and Wilhelm's own comments.

An exhaustive list of the many translations that have been published in recent years may be found in Hellmut Wilhelm, 'The Book of Changes in the Western Tradition' (*Parerga* 2, 1975).

Chao, year 2; Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, vol. 5, p. 583) that the circulation of the text was still relatively circumscribed up to the middle of the sixth century B.C. Thereafter, if the evidence of the *Tso chuan* can be considered to be historically reliable, that century marked a widening usage of the *Chou i*, both as a manual of divination that was open to others as well as the nobility, and as a wisdom text that was susceptible of rhetorical quotation. It is also to this time that the first moralistic re-interpretations of the text date, as in the use of the 'four virtues' to explain the phrase *yüan heng li chen* 元亨利貞.

That this period also coincides with the lifetime of Confucius may or may not be fortuitous. Traditionally, Confucius was considered to be the transmitter and editor of the basic text and the author of the 'Ten Wings'. It has already been shown that this last association is due to later hagiographical tradition, but there is some evidence in the *Analects* (XIII, 22; see Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, vol. 1, p. 272) to suggest that Confucius both knew the text and subscribed to the moralistic re-interpretation of his own time. Regardless of Confucius' personal involvement in the transmission of the text, members of his school are said to have been directly concerned.

Chapter 88 ('Ju lin chuan' 儒林傳) of the *Han shu* (88, p. 3597) traces the transmission of the text from Confucius' first generation disciple Shang Chü 商瞿 (b. 523 B.C.) through five generations to T'ien Ho 田何 (*c.* 202–143 B.C.), at the beginning of the Han dynasty. Having survived the burning of the books in Ch'in by virtue of its functional nature as a manual for divination, the text was passed from T'ien Ho to four disciples, the most important in the chain of transmission being Ting K'uan 丁寬 (*c.* 180–140 B.C.). Ting's text was in turn passed to T'ien Wang-sun 田王孫 (*c.* 140–90 B.C.), and thence to Shih Ch'ou 施讎, Meng Hsi 孟喜 and Liang-ch'iu Ho 梁丘賀 (all *c.* 90–40 B.C.). The texts of these three scholars, all members of the Imperial Academy, were then accepted as orthodox; one further recension, that of Ching Fang 京房 the younger (77–37 B.C.), who was a second generation disciple of Meng Hsi, was also subsequently accepted as being orthodox.

By the end of the later Han dynasty these traditions had apparently lost currency. The textual traditions of Shih Ch'ou and Liang-ch'iu Ho died out in the third century, and while the Meng and Ching texts were still extant as late as the Sui dynasty, they appear to have had little or no influence. Meanwhile a separate tradition, characterized as *ku wen* 古文 and deriving from one Fei Chih 費直 (*c.* 50 B.C.–A.D. 10) appeared towards the end of the Former Han period. Though receiving no official recognition, this tradition gained in ascendancy during the two centuries of Later Han through such notable adherents as Ma Jung 馬融 (79–166), Cheng Hsüan 鄭玄 (127–200), Hsün Shuang 荀爽 (128–190) and Lu Chi 陸績 (188–219). This was in turn the textual tradition used by Wang Pi 王弼 (226–249), author of the earliest commentary that still survives in its entirety. By the time of K'ung Ying-ta 孔穎達 (574–648), Wang Pi's commentary and text were recognised as orthodox, and from that time on virtually all of the hundreds of commentaries and studies still extant are based on Wang Pi's text.

Several archaeological discoveries of the present century have revived interest in these earlier textual traditions. Two segments of an early T'ang manuscript of Wang Pi's commentary were found at Tun-huang (see Lo Chen-yü 羅振玉 (1866–1940), *Tun-huang ku hsieh pen Chou i Wang chu* 敦煌古寫本周易王注; and Wang Chung-min 王重民, *Tun-huang pen Chou i Wang chu chiao chi* 敦煌本周易王注校記; both in *I ching chi ch'eng*, as cited under 12 (d) below, vol. 167). Shortly afterwards there followed the publication of rubbings of pieces of the Han stone classics, inscribed between A.D. 175 and 183. To date some 20 percent of this text, which has been identified as that of the Liang ch'iu school, has been recovered, and facsimiles and transcriptions have been published in Ma Heng 馬亨 (1881–1955) *Han shih ching chi ts'un* 漢石經集存 (Peking: K'o hsüeh, 1957); for the most complete discussion of these fragments see Ch'ü Wan-li 屈萬里 (1907–79), *Han shih ching Chou i ts'an tzu chi cheng* 漢石經周易殘字集證 (Nan-kang: Academia Sinica, 1961).

Undoubtedly the most important discovery was made in 1973, when a complete manuscript copy of the text, written on silk and dating from *c.* 168 B.C., was discovered in tomb no. 3 Ma-wang-tui (for photographs, see *WW* 1974.7, Plate I and *WW* 1984.3, Plates I, II; for a transcription, see *WW* 1984.3, 1–8). Finally, a second manuscript which is closely contemporary with the text from Ma-wang-tui was found at Fu-yang 阜陽 (An-hui) in 1977; this was written on some 300 wooden or bamboo strips (see *WW* 1983.2, p. 22).

7. Critical recensions

Since the canonical status enjoyed by the text from the Han dynasty onwards has served to ensure its faithful transmission; and since the text of Wang Pi is the basis of all extant editions, there are relatively few problems of recension involved in reading the *I ching*. Nevertheless three critical recensions should be mentioned as being the most complete; the *I ching i wen shih* 易經異文釋 of Li Fu-sun 李富孫 (1764–1843); the *Chou i chiao k'an chi* 周易校勘記) of Juan Yüan 阮元 (1764–1849); and the

11. Japanese editions

A. *Kambun taikei;* no.16, 1913, edited by Hoshino Tsune and Itō Tōgai (Nagatane).

B. *Kanseki kokujikai zensho;* nos. 3, 4, 1910, edited by Mase Chūshū and Matsui Rashū.

D. *Kokuyaku kambun taisei;* no. 2, 1922, edited by Uno Tetsuto.

E. *Kambun sōsho,* 1927, edited by Tsukamoto Tetsuzō and Hayashi Taisuke.

F. *Keisho taikō;* no. 8, 1939 (*Hsi tz'u chuan* only).

H. *Shinshaku kambun taikei;* nos. 23, 24, 63 edited by Imai Usaburō.

J. *Chūgoku no shisō;* no. 7, 1965, edited by Maruyama Matsuyuki.

K. *Chūgoku koten bungaku taikei;* no. 1, 1972, edited by Akatsuka Kiyoshi.

L. *Chūgoku koten shinsho,* 1974, edited by Akatsuka Kiyoshi.

M. *Shintei Chūgoku koten sen;* no.1, edited by Honda Wataru.

12. Recent studies and research aids

(a) Any listing of recent historical studies of the *I ching* necessarily begins with the third volume of the *Ku shih pien,* edited by Ku Chieh-kang 顧頡剛 (1893–1980) published in 1931. Containing studies by Ku Chieh-kang, Ch'ien Mu 錢穆, Hu Shih 胡適 (1891–1962), Li Ching-ch'ih 李鏡池, Yü Yung-liang 余永梁 and others, this volume established criticism of the work in its context as the most important branch of modern studies of the *I ching*. Mention of the most recent of the numerous works of that type that have appeared in the intervening fifty years would include:

(i) Kao Heng, *Chou i ta chuan chin chu* 周易大傳今注; Chi-nan: Ch'i Lu, 1979; this is a revised version of the author's *Chou i ku chin chu* (1947), expanded to include discussion of the 'Ten Wings'.

(ii) Li Ching-ch'ih, *Chou i t'an yüan* 周易探源 (Peking: Chung hua, 1978); a collection of Li's seminal essays on *I ching* context criticism.

(iii) Chang Li-wen 張立文, *Chou i ssu hsiang yen chiu* 周易思想研究; Hu-pei: Hu-pei jen min, 1980, with historical studies of both the *Chou i* and *I ching*.

(iv) Kao Huai-min 高懷民, *Liang Han i hsüeh shih* 兩漢易學史 Taipei: *Chung kuo hsüeh shu chu tso chiang chu wei yüan hui ts'ung shu,* 54, 1970; the first, and still the most important, study of *I ching* scholarship during the Han period.

(b) Noteworthy studies in Western languages include:

(i) Waley, Arthur, 'The Book of Changes'; *BMFEA* 5 (1933), 121–42.

(ii) Wilhelm, Hellmut, *Change: Eight Lectures on the I ching;* translated by Cary F. Baynes; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.

(iii) Wilhelm, Hellmut, *Heaven, Earth and Man in the Book of Changes;* Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1977.

(iv) Shchutskii, Iulian K., *Researches on the I Ching,* translated by William L. MacDonald, Tsuyoshi Hasegawa and Hellmut Wilhelm; London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.

(v) Schmitt, Gerhard, *Sprüche der Wandlungen auf ihrem geistesgeschichtlichen Hintergrund;* Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Nr 76, 1970.

(vi) Ch'en Ch'i-yün, 'A Confucian Magnate's Idea of Political Violence: Hsün Shuang's (A.D. 128–190) Interpretation of the *Book of Changes*'; *TP* 54 (1968), 73–115.

(vii) Peterson, Willard J., 'Making Connections: "Commentary on the Attached Verbalizations" of the *Book of Changes*'; *HJAS* 42:1 (June 1982), 67–116.

(c) A number of doctoral (PhD) dissertations regarding the early history of the text have been written in recent years:

(i) Swanson, Gerald W., 'The Great Treatise: Commentatory Tradition to the Book of Changes'; University of Washington, 1974.

(ii) Shaughnessy, Edward L., 'The Composition of the *Zhouyi*'; Stanford University, 1983.

(iii) Kunst, Richard A., 'The Original *Yijing*: a Text, Phonetic Transcription, Translation, and Indexes, with Sample Glosses'; University of California, Berkeley, 1985.

(iv) Goodman, Howard L., 'Exegetes and Exegeses of the *Book of Changes* in the Third Century A.D.: Historical and Scholastic Contexts for Wang Pi'; Princeton University, 1985.

(v) Fendos, Paul George Jr., 'Fei Chih's Place in the Development of *I-ching* Studies'; University of Wisconsin, 1988.

(d) The most valuable research aids are:

(i) *A Concordance to Yi Ching*: Harvard-Yenching Index no. 10; first edition Peiping: 1935; reprinted Taipei: Ch'eng wen, 1966.

(ii) *I hsüeh lun ts'ung* 易學論叢; Taipei, 1971; this volume includes the most complete bibliographical studies of the text.

(iii) Yen Ling-feng, ed., *I ching chi ch'eng* 易經集成; Taipei: Ch'eng-wen, 1975; volume 1 includes the table of contents for the set of 195 volumes, brief biographical notes on the authors and bibliographical information on the editions selected.

(iv) Wilhelm, Hellmut, 'The Book of Changes in the Western Tradition'; see under (10) above; a selective bibliography of Western translations and studies of the *I ching*.

13. Indexes

(a) See under (12) (d) above.

(b) *A Concordance to the Zhou yi* 周易逐字索引, ed. D.C. Lau and Chen Fong Ching; *ICS* series, Hong Kong: Commercial Press, forthcoming 1994.

– Edward L. Shaughnessy

I Chou shu 逸周書 (*Chou shu*)

1. Title of the work

The text is commonly named by three different titles, *I Chou shu*, *Chi chung Chou shu* 汲冢周書 and simply *Chou shu*. The term *I* 逸, as in the first of these three, derives from the tradition that the text is a compendium of passages that were not included by Confucius among the one hundred chapters of the *Book of Documents*. *Chi chung* derives from a second tradition, according to which the text had been among the writings on bamboo strips that were unearthed *c*. 280 from the tomb of King Hsiang 襄 of Wei 魏 (reigned 318–296 B.C.), in Chi hsien 汲縣, Ho-nan. Since both of these traditions can be shown to be without foundation, and since the earliest citations of the text uniformly refer to it as *Chou shu*, there is now a general scholarly consensus that the title of the text should in fact read simply as *Chou shu*.

2. Content of the work

The text originally consisted of seventy separate *p'ien* together with a preface modelled on the pseudo K'ung An-kuo 孔安國 'Preface to the Documents' (*Shu hsü* 書序). Fifty-nine of those *p'ien* are still extant, and in each one the title ends with the term *chieh* 解. Although there is no discernible organisation of the text, in which there is a considerable number of *lacunae*, it has been demonstrated that 32 of these *p'ien* are remarkably consistent in both language and thought, and should be regarded as the basic core of the text. These 32 are named as follows (with *chieh* following in each case):

1 *Tu hsün* 度訓
2 *Ming hsün* 命訓
3 *Ch'ang hsün* 常訓
4 *Wen cho* 文酌
6 *Wu ch'eng* 武稱
7 *Yün wen* 允文
8 *Ta wu* 大武
9 *Ta ming wu* 大明武
10 *Hsiao ming* 小明
12 *Ch'eng tien* 程典
21 *Feng pao* 豐保
22 *Ta k'ai* 大開
23 *Hsiao k'ai* 小開
24 *Wen ching* 文儆
25 *Wen chuan* 文傳
26 *Jou wu* 柔武
27 *Ta k'ai wu* 大開武
28 *Hsiao k'ai wu* 小開武