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D. C. Lau (1921–2010)
OBITUARY

THE REMARKABLE SCHOLARSHIP OF PROFESSOR D.C. LAU (1921–2010)

Do not wake up any more,
The short dream of a life of a hundred years
Is too easy to be blown awake by the wind.

(From Dianjiangchun 點絳脣 by Lau King Tong 刘景堂, translated by Katherine Whitaker)

On 8 March 1921, Professor Lau was born into the family of Lau King Tong, a scholar and poet who had fled from the chaotic civil wars raging on the mainland to settle under the more peaceful conditions of the British colony of Hong Kong. Attending school at King’s College, he later graduated from the Chinese Department at the University of Hong Kong. He fled to mainland China in 1941 as, after a fierce battle, the Japanese moved in to occupy Hong Kong, and there he was to suffer greatly but survived. In 1946, Lau won a Victory Scholarship to become one of the first Hong Kong students to sail to Britain in the post-war era. Reading and winning a First in moral philosophy at Glasgow in the last years of that distinguished University’s half-millennium, he continued his studies in ordinary language philosophy and came under the influence of the “Oxford” philosophy of Gilbert Ryle. Ryle’s work is distinguished by the pursuit of philosophical clarity through the application of subtle linguistic and conceptual distinctions, an identifiable and even signatory feature of Lau’s scholarly papers, and of his popular translations of the early Chinese canonical texts. But there is perhaps more to the Ryle connection than the lucidity and rigor with which Lau moves between the Chinese and English languages. We might speculate that Lau’s attraction to Ryle is as much philosophical as it is linguistic. His lifelong interest in learning languages did not seem to have been so much driven by the successful acquisition of the languages as it was, in the process of learning them, of gaining some insight into the way languages work. The interest in how languages work is connected to two problems that have occupied Lau and the best minds of philosophy for the better part of a century: (1) in what way does language furnish clues into the nature of the world? And (2) in so far as we cannot think without language, what
limitations does a given language impose on thinking, and how can we
discover and articulate them?

Following his studies in philosophy at Glasgow, in 1950 Lau accepted
a lectureship at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University
of London. Recognized for the many scholarly articles and translations
that made the name of D.C. Lau ubiquitous in the Western sinological
literature, he quickly rose to become the Professor of Chinese at the University of London and Head of the Chinese section at SOAS. In this post
at SOAS, his international reputation as a scholar and teacher enabled
him to establish and invigilate a standard of scholarship that contributed
measurably to the reputation of that institution, and where together with
A.C. Graham, Paul Thompson, and Sarah Allan, he made SOAS a world
center for the study of Chinese philosophy.

I arrived at SOAS in 1975 to study for the PhD under Professor Lau’s
supervision. At our first meeting we discussed the difficult yet philo-
sophically exciting text I had selected for my research project, the Han
dynasty *Huainanzi*. In an attempt to impress Lau with my thoughtful
reading of the contemporary scholarly literature, I ventured to ask him
what he thought of the Herrlee Creel distinction between “contemplative”
and “purposive” Daoism. He politely allowed that he did not have an
opinion on this matter and was glad to have the distinction brought to
his attention. Encouraged by his response, and continuing with renewed
enthusiasm, I asked him if he thought that Thomas Metzger’s character-
ization of neo-Confucian sagehood as an “escape from predicament” was
useful. His reply was again polite, but made all the more severe because
of it. After deflecting my question again, he asked me “By the way, how
many times have you read through the *Huainanzi*?” My unconsidered
response was “ALL of it?” “Wrong answer” was his curt reply, and he
pointed me to the reference room in the SOAS library where I lived for
the next two years reading painstakingly through the text and its com-
mentaries. What I had learned from Professor Lau was that real scholar-
ship can only proceed from a diligent and comprehensive reading of the
original texts, and that secondary literature is precisely that—at its best,
of very secondary importance.

After nearly thirty years of teaching at the University of London, in
1978 Professor Lau was persuaded to return home to Hong Kong as the
University Professor of Chinese Language and Literature at The Chinese
University of Hong Kong. In many ways he flourished in this second
career at CUHK, an institution with a distinctly different set of demands
and expectations from those he knew at London. He became Dean of Arts
(1980–83), Chief Editor of *The Journal of Chinese Studies* (1979–1995), and
Director of the T.T. Ng Chinese Language Research Centre (1979–2007).
A singular contribution that he made over this latter part of his career has been his leadership in the CUHK Institute of Chinese Studies Ancient Chinese Texts Concordance Series that has become a standard reference resource on the shelves of sinologists around the world. That Lau was able to achieve such stature within the academies of two disparate cultures speaks both of the quality and the depth of his understanding of these two different worlds, and the magnanimity of his person.

Among the published works of Lau, the authoritative Penguin translations of the core Chinese classics—the *Lao Tzu*, the *Mencius*, and the *Analects of Confucius*—are unequalled in their sales and popularity, and have done much over these past generations to foster Western literacy in the Chinese philosophical literature. Given his fascination with the way that culture is sedimented into language, it is not surprising that his scholarship begins from a penetrating sensitivity to the Chinese language where he was a “boshi 博士” or literatus in the traditional understanding of that term. Having assimilated the classical corpus through a lifetime of careful study and reflection, Lau took the comparison and analysis of the ancient documents as a methodology for textual reconstruction. Juxtaposing related passages from contemporaneous sources he was able to draw upon the intertextuality of texts belonging to a shared historical epoch, and to find clues to restore the integrity to passages and unravel textual knots along the way. Relying as much upon his memory as his library, Lau had a panoramic view of the entire corpus, and treated it as his text.

Professor Lau’s extraordinary facility with the Chinese language was legendary, and we his students benefited enormously from it. But what is more difficult to admit is how much better his proficiency in English was than that of his Western students and colleagues. His disciplined study of the many classical and modern languages that had converged over the millennia to produce the English language—German, Greek, Latin—enabled him to appreciate the historical and literary nuances that are beyond the grasp of even the most schooled of native speakers. For many summers after I had finished my PhD on the *Huainanzi* under his supervision at SOAS, I would return to his personal study on the CUHK campus to continue to read and to translate this difficult text. We would begin from my draft translations, and with piles of books all around us, he would proceed to demonstrate all too clearly who was the joyful master and who was the uncertain novice. He would ask: “Roger, do you mean ‘careful’ or ‘cautious’ here? Shouldn’t this be ‘dexterity’ rather than ‘agility’? Surely this should be ‘insidious’ rather than ‘sinister’?” And yes, he could explain the difference.

In reading and watching and listening as Professor Lau would craft his translations of the canonical texts, I became aware of a persistent
feature of his choice of language that made his versions of these works remarkable when compared with those of other scholars. A pervasive characteristic of Lau’s translations is his uncommon preference for the Anglo-Saxon vocabulary of English—a concrete and powerfully imagistic “language within a language” of a pre-Latinized and pre-Christianized Britain. This interpretive strategy of preferring the Anglo-Saxon language for his translations goes far beyond a general stylistic contrast between the clarity and sensibleness of British academic prose and its more freewheeling, sometimes bold and sometimes obtuse North American counterpart. At the end of the sixth century, Augustine and a wave of Rome-sponsored monks, scholars, and teachers brought Greek and Hellenistic learning to Britain to change the philosophy of a nation and to establish this world as a major seat of scholastic learning. One of the virtues of Anglo-Saxon words—“grasp” rather than “comprehend,” “cow” rather than “bovine,” “see” rather than “perceive”—is that they have by and large remained ordinary expressions in use in everyday communication and have escaped being drafted into the technical vocabulary. Being unencumbered by explicit philosophical content, Anglo-Saxon words are available to express the very different philosophical sensibilities of classical Chinese philosophy that stand in rather stark contrast to the classical Greek metaphysical tradition.

In addition to Lau’s appeal to Anglo-Saxon language, another distinctive feature of his contribution is his profile as a broadly read sinologist rather than as a narrowly defined technical philosopher. He was an interdisciplinary scholar whose tool box of different kinds of philological, historical, and literary skills were most effective for reporting on the intellectual tradition of ancient China that is in its character biographical, literary, situational, and resolutely historical.

He was an exceedingly private man yet relished his personal relationships; he was a bit of a recluse but enjoyed the happy company and the devotion of his many students and colleagues. The life of Professor D.C. Lau as a scholar and as a person was exemplary. And his passing is mourned by many of us in both of his worlds who have learned so much from him. In saying goodbye today we must allow that without his warm and generous mentorship, our lives would have amounted to much less.

Roger T. Ames
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Paul Fischer 方破

Authentication Studies Methodology and the Polymorphous Text Paradigm

辨偽學方法論與多形文獻範式

The foundation of Chinese intellectual history is a group of texts known as “masters texts” (子書). Many masters texts were authored in the Han dynasty or earlier and many of these have as their title the name of a master who was generally regarded as the author. The inclination to treat a given book as the product of a single writer is apparently a strong one. Nevertheless, from the very beginning there were Chinese scholars who doubted the veracity of the putative authorship of some of these works and suggested that they may in fact have been the product of several authors. Over time, such scholars developed criteria by which to judge the authenticity of ancient masters texts. But as such textual criticism grew more penetrating, the object of its scrutiny began to come apart at the seams. In the last two decades there has been a growing consensus that most early Chinese masters texts were originally quite permeable and that only later were their received forms settled upon.

The branch of textual criticism that deals with authenticating early Chinese texts is called “Authentication studies.” This paper is a survey of the methodological advances made in the field of Authentication studies over the last two millennia. It is not a history of the field, as such a history would be a much longer project. The survey concludes with the idea of the “polymorphous text paradigm,” a paradigm that paradoxically obviates much of the preceding scholarship in its own field. Simply put, if authentication relies largely on anachronism, and anachronism relies largely on the dates of the putative author, then a multi-author work with no known “last author” will be impossible to authenticate. Furthermore, the polymorphous text paradigm does not posit these texts as necessarily having earlier and later “layers,” but rather as having had no set structure over the course of their early redactional evolution.

This survey examines the contributions of seventeen scholars to Authentication studies methodology, and concludes with how the changes in this field have influenced the work of three modern, Western scholars.
諸子書是研究中國思想史的基礎。其中許多書成於漢代及其前代的，而這些書往往以被視為書的作者之名為書名。人們也傾向將某一部子書視為單一作者所著。儘管如此，很早就有中國學者對上述推定作者的觀點表示懷疑，而他們就提出多數子書其實是由許多作者所共同完成的。隨著時間過去，這些持懷疑論的學者發展並形成了一套判斷古書真偽的標準。但是，這種文獻學的驗證越是敏銳，它所檢視對象的可信度也就開始分崩離析。在最近二十年，有種日益為人接受的看法，即認為早期中國的子書原具有較大的滲透性，到後來才漸漸形成固定的文本形式。

文獻學中處理古書真偽問題的學科稱之為“辨偽學”。本文檢視兩千年來辨偽學方法的進展，用意不是要計劃寫一部辨偽學史，後者需要更長遠的研究才能完成。文章以“多形文獻範式”作為總結，這種範式似是而非推翻了存在其前的辨偽論點。簡而言之，如果判定文獻真偽的主要根據是時代的錯置，而著作時代錯置的推論又依據於所假定的作者所處的年代，則一部多人創作而無法確知其“最後作者”的著作將無從判定其真偽。此外，本文所舉出的“多形文獻範式”並不假定這些文獻必有先後層次，而是認定其在早期傳抄過程中有無固定結構的樣貌。

本文評述了歷來十七位學者對辨偽學方法的貢獻，最後也提及此一領域的變遷如何影響了三位現代西方學者的研究工作。

Elisabeth Hsu 許小麗

Outward Form (xing 形) and Inward Qi 氣: the ‘Sentimental Body’ in Early Chinese Medicine

外形內氣: 早期中國醫學中的“感知體”

What did the early Chinese medical body look like before it was inhabited by the five viscera and before canonical medical rationale was framed in terms of the five agents (wuxing 五行)? This article makes the case for a body with an outwardly visible ‘form’ (xing 形) that housed invisible qi 氣 internally. The qi contained in this body was not the universal qi and all-pervasive stuff that we encounter in later medical texts. Nor can it be limited to the ‘breath’ referred to in the context of meditation techniques, since the term referred also to a moral dimension, thoughts and feelings. In the body’s upper spheres, qi took on yang 陽 qualities and was associated with feelings of grief or joy; in its lower ones, it took on yin 陰 qualities and was associated with anger. Since this body was
ABSTRACTS

primarily a function of emotional and moral aetiologies, it is in what follows called a ‘sentimental body’, and is contrasted with the canonical ‘body ecologic’ which was most importantly a function of the seasons.

The textual material presented in this article suggests that the ‘sentimental body’ with its two yinyang spheres was an early Chinese medical body conception. From an extensive computer search that systematically compared passages on xing and qi in the Yellow Emperor’s Inner Canon with texts in the early medical manuscripts from Mawangdui and Zhangjiashan, it emerged as a distinctive body. While the canonical ‘body ecologic’, framed in a pentic numerology, became prominent in medical reasoning during the Han dynasty (206 B.C.E.–220 C.E.), the ‘sentimental body’, which alludes to yinyang cosmologies, dates to the Warring States period (475–221 B.C.E.).

When the major exception of the Yi jing, we have neither formal canons nor commentaries for most early Chinese mantic traditions. Indirect reflections on these traditions appear in scattered commentaries, in biographical narratives, and, importantly, in excavated texts. The major

Lisa Raphals 瑞麗

Divination in the Han shu Bibliographic Treatise

《漢書·藝文志》與占卜研究

With the major exception of the Yi jing, we have neither formal canons nor commentaries for most early Chinese mantic traditions. Indirect reflections on these traditions appear in scattered commentaries, in biographical narratives, and, importantly, in excavated texts. The major
source for mantic materials from the received textual tradition is the lists of their titles in *Han shu* 30, the “Yiwen zhi” or Bibliographic Treatise. It is a guide to the categories of knowledge used by Han thinkers, and created an influential paradigm for the classification of texts and knowledge. The present study provides a necessarily selective survey of mantic texts in the “Yiwen zhi,” with a specific view to: (1) how it underscored the authority of some techniques and marginalized others; (2) its relation to what we know of Han mantic practices; and (3) what it reveals about the role of the mantic arts as constituents of scientific observation and systematic inquiry in early China.

除了《易經》以外，中國卜筮傳統並不保留其他經典或註解文獻。盡管如此，間接關於卜筮傳統的各種評語思考散布在現存註書，傳記，以及——更重要的——出土文獻中。傳統文獻中關於卜筮的質料主要來源於《漢書·藝文志》所保存的篇名表。此表包含著漢代思想家對知識的分類，也是後代分類書籍學問具有影響力的楷模。本文意在概觀《藝文志》中關於卜筮的質料，主要探討(1)《藝文志》如何提高某些卜筮技巧的權威性而排斥其他技巧，(2)此篇與在我們所了解中的漢代卜筮實踐之間的關係，以及(3)此篇對於我們了解卜筮在古代中國科學觀察與有系統的研究中所扮演的角色所給予的線索。

Charles Sanft 陳力強

Decree of Monthly Ordinances for the Four Seasons in Fifty Articles from 5 C.E.: The Wall Inscription Discovered at Xuanquanzhi—
Introduction and Translation

元始五年詔書四時月令五十條：
懸泉置遺址出土的壁書——簡介與試譯

This article is an introduction to and translation of the wall inscription “Zhaoshu sishi yueling wushitiao” dating to 5 C.E., which was recovered from the Xuanquanzhi site, located near Dunhuang, Gansu Province. “Zhaoshu sishi yueling wushitiao” is the sole known example of a Han edict in wall inscription form. It provides new information about the processes by which an edict was created and disseminated in late Western Han times, and about the nature and scope of seasonal governance. The core of this article is an annotated translation of the entire inscription. By way of introduction, the article includes an overview of the Xuanquanzhi excavation; a brief discussion of the people named in the inscription, their titles, and related events; and an examination of the parallels between the inscription and transmitted texts. The two
appendices present a transcription of “Sishi yueling” in the original vertical format, and a table showing the correspondences between “Sishi yueling” and its transmitted parallels.

本文為敦煌懸泉置出土的元始五年“詔書四時月令五十條”壁書試譯與簡介。“詔書四時月令”是迄今為止唯一漢朝詔書寫成壁書的實例，提供對西漢末年政治思想、法律、制度等方面歷史研究的寶貴資料。本文核心為“詔書四時月令”的英文翻譯。簡介分三大部分：一，考古發掘過程與收穫的概況；二，壁書中人物和相關事情的綜述；三，詔書內容與傳世文獻關係的簡介。附錄有豎形釋文以及“詔書四時月令”與主要三種傳世文獻對照表.