

Preface 2

The researches of Bruce and Taeko Brooks on the classical Chinese texts gained a forum in 1993 with the creation of the Warring States Project at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Thus began an ongoing dialogue of papers and meetings. With its sister journal *Alpha*, which includes Biblical and comparative studies, Warring States Papers makes portions of this material available in easily citable form.

Basic to our approach is the idea that the standard historical-philological methods are applicable to all fields of humanistic endeavor. What are those methods?

As William L Holladay said in his 1986 Jeremiah commentary, “The first question is the integrity of the passage: Is it one unit or more?” We recognize interpolations, strata, and other signs of text growth which the internal evidence may suggest. We remember (with Tischendorf) that, of two related passages, the one which is more readily seen as giving rise to the other is likely to be the earlier. With Ranke, we prefer the earlier evidence, while being aware that all texts have their own agendas. We apply the test of coherence to the individual results, and the criterion of historical plausibility to the gradually emerging larger picture.

We recognize the appeal for modern persons, precisely because they are nearer in time to our modern sensibilities, of such passages as the racy Dzwǒ Jwàn narratives (in which we see the first flowering of Chinese fiction), as against the Chūn/Chyōu, the court chronicle of Lǚ for the centuries which are fictionalized in the Dzwǒ Jwàn. These later literary developments are also a part of history, but they are a *later* part. Our concern has been to ask, of all of this, *what actually happened?*

Subject Groups in WSP are: (1) Methodology and Comparative, (2) Texts, and (3) Historical Studies. The order of papers within groups is roughly chronological.

Dates of papers are those of submission or previous presentation in a conference or other public format; most have been revised for their publication here.

Papers of special interest may appear in both WSP and in *Alpha*, not necessarily in the same year, or with the same pagination. Duplicated articles are not distinguished by any special mark, in either journal.

This Volume includes further studies of the Shī, Shū, and Yì, and the Chūn/Chyōu plus the inevitable Dzwǒ Jwàn. Studies of the Dàu/Dǎ Jīng and the associated Gwōdyèn texts, the Mencius, the military texts, and the Mwōdž are preparatory to cumulation in planned later monographs. Other ongoing topics, such as the Jwāngdž, will have their repository in the pages of WSP itself. On the historical side, we continue to focus on the rise of the mass infantry army, and the resource bureaucracy which sustained it: the deep structural transformation which defined the transition to the aptly named Warring States period: the age of total war.

Of special long-term interest is the introduction of a measure of stylistic difference which has proved to be sensitive to intertextual relations, not only in Chinese, but also in Biblical and Homeric Greek. We expect that it will join the classical methods of philology as part of the basic toolkit of the historian, in clarifying questions of textual integrity and intertextual affinity, in all the antiquities.

Conventions observed in WSP, its “house style,” include the following:

Dates. As a more universal convention, we use a leading zero in place of the linguistically parochial BC(E). 479 BC thus becomes 0479, while AD 218 is simply 218. Similarly, the “03rd century” is the 3rd BC, and “3rd” is the 3rd AD; “03rd century” may be shortened to “03c.” The advantages of zero over a minus sign are that it allows hyphenation of dates in spans (as, Confucius, 0549-0479) and avoids a conflict with the usage of astronomers (whose “-479” is *not* the “-479” of historians). We suggest that dates be given as precisely as possible, perhaps as spans (0345/0339) or centered ranges (0342 ± 3). We avoid the term “Eastern Jōu” as implying an effective Jōu dominance after 0771. *In those years*, 東周 denoted the eastern half of the Lwò River enclave (JGT #4, #19). The several states saw themselves as living in a power vacuum (MC 7B38) and strove for Jōu-type dominion, universally (MC 1A6) or regionally (LY 17:4, “in the East”). Scholarly usage may appropriately conform. Several early 05c social and cultural changes suggest the usefulness of continuing to distinguish the Spring and Autumn (0770-0479) from the Warring States (0478-0221). For the entire period 0770-0221, the standard term is “pre-Chín” 先秦.

Textual Emendations are given as [請 > 謂] “for 請 read 謂,” [-也] “也 is to be omitted,” and [+其] “其 is to be supplied.” Difficultly readable characters are given in brackets [然]; illegible ones have been replaced by the usual squares: □ □ 王. Simplified characters have been standardized throughout the journal.

Common Alphabetic. The pleas of Kennedy (1953) for a pronounceable, and Boodberg (1959) for a humanistically intelligible, Chinese romanization remain unmet by current systems. To be “guessable” by readers with English alphabetic reflexes, a spelling should respect the mnemonic “consonants as in English, vowels as in Italian.” For vowels *not* in Italian, we use: æ as in cat, v (the linguist’s inverted v, or ʌ, but *uninverted*) as in cut, r as in fur, z as in adz, and yw (after l and n, simply w) for “umlaut u.” Tones are hīgh, rīsing, lōw, and fālling. An equivalence table between this “Common Alphabetic” Romanization and two other systems frequently encountered is given on p251-254.

References. Short citations (eg Surname **Keyword**) are expanded at the end of each paper; for abbreviations, see the lists at the end of the volume.

Acknowledgements. The Project is grateful to Don and Loretta Gibbs and the Mercer Trust, for fiscal support along the way. Since its founding in 1993, the Project has been sustained by a series of patrons in the University administration, whose recognition and assistance are much appreciated. We also thank friends and advisors who have noted errors or suggested further possibilities in work nearing completion.

Envoi. We are pleased to introduce these papers to a wider scholarly audience. The Project hopes that they will stimulate further research on the nature and significance of the Warring States centuries, the most constitutive of all Chinese historical periods, and the classical age of China’s philosophers; its intellectual and political tradition. May they also suggest that, at the methodological level as in some specific details, humanity, and the study of humanity, are ultimately one

The Editors