

清华大学竹书
《系年》
文献学考察

A Textual Examination
of the Tsinghua Bamboo
Manuscript *Chronicles*

武汉大学简帛研究中心
Wuhan University Centre for
the Study of Bamboo and
Silk Manuscripts

陈伟

Chen Wei

清华大学出土文献研究与保护中心编 李学勤主编
清华大学藏战国竹简 (貳)

上海文艺出版集团 中西书局

绪言 Introduction

- 清华大学藏战国竹书《系年》使用138支竹简书写，分23章。

The Tsinghua University Warring States-period text *Chronicles* is written on 138 bamboo strips, divided into 23 chapters.

绪言 Introduction

- 作为一部先秦时期的长篇史著，在文本解读、史实考订之外，它的文献学属性和特征，也是令人关注的话题。

As a long historical text on the pre-Qin era, apart from textual exegesis and historical research, its text critical genre and features are also topics worthy of note.

- 我们尝试探讨《系年》的写作年代、作者国别及其体裁，认为写作时间最可能在楚肃王之时，作者为楚人，其体裁与《竹书纪年》不同，可能与《铎氏微》有关。

I have explored the *Chronicles*' date of composition, authorship and literary style, and believe it was most likely written during the reign of King Su of Chu (r. 380-370 B.C.E.), that the author was from Chu, that its literary qualities are quite different from the *Bamboo Annals*, and that it is perhaps related to the "Duo shi wei".

- 发言集中于第三节，即《系年》与《纪年》之别。

In this presentation I will focus on the third of these topics, the differences between the *Chronicles* and the *Annals*.

整理者观点 The Editors' Viewpoint

- 《系年》原本无篇名，现在的名字是整理者拟定的。

The *Chronicles* originally was untitled, its current title having been provided by the modern editors.

整理者观点 The Editors' Viewpoint

- 整理者指出：“原无篇题，因篇中多有纪年，文字体例与若干内容又近似西晋汲冢出土的《竹书纪年》，故拟题为《系年》。”

The editors state: “Originally there was no title; because the text contains many chronological records of events, and the writing style and some of the contents are similar to the *Bamboo Annals* unearthed from the Ji tomb during the Western Jin dynasty, thus we have given it the title *Chronicles*.”

整理者观点 The Editors' Viewpoint

- 李学勤先生随后还说明：“《纪年》、《系年》叙事体例也彼此相似，有些像所谓‘纪事本末’，而不是如《春秋》那样逐年胪列。”

Li Xueqin (the head of the editorial board) also remarked soon afterward: "The *Chronicles* and the *Bamboo Annals* are written in a similar narrative style, and there are some resemblances to what are called "chronological histories," but it is not like the year-by-year entries in the *Spring and Autumn Annals*."

不同看法 Other Views

- 对于《系年》的文献性质，学者间有不同看法。

Some scholars have put forth other views on the *Chronicles* literary character.

不同看法 Other Views

- 资料正式公布之前，夏含夷先生即指出：《春秋》、《竹书纪年》属于单国的编年记，《系年》则属于多国综合性的纪年。资料发表后，夏含夷先生又指出：《系年》之名并不妥当，这个文献更像《国语》的样子。

Before the formal publication of the text, Edward Shaughnessy noted: "The *Spring and Autumn Annals* and the *Bamboo Annals* comprise annals of single states, whereas the *Chronicles* is a comprehensive annals of many states." After the publication of the text, Shaughnessy further noted that the name *Chronicles* is not at all appropriate, and that the text much more resembles the *Tales of the States* (*Guo yu*).

不同看法 Other Views

- 在《清华大学藏战国竹简（贰）》成果发布暨学术座谈会上，笔者认为《系年》与《铎氏微》类似；胡平生先生认为：《系年》可能是一部相关史料的摘抄本，可能是楚国史官从周王室史官或其他有纪年记录的史官记录中将有关楚国或者楚、晋关系的材料整理、编纂而成的，并非独立成篇的古书。

At the symposium where the second volume of *Tsinghua University Warring States Bamboo Manuscripts* was discussed, I noted that there were similarities between the *Chronicles* and the “Duo shi wei” text. Hu Pingsheng stated: “The *Chronicles* could be an extract from related historical records; it could be material arranged and compiled from the notes on or related to the state of Chu or to the states of Chu and Jin taken by the Chu historiographer from annalistic historical records of the Zhou court historiographer or some other source, and not an independent ancient text in its own right.”

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 《竹书纪年》与《春秋》类似，
是一种比较原始的编年体。

The *Bamboo Annals* and the *Spring and Autumn Annals* are similar texts, both written in an early annalistic style.

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 《春秋经传集解后序》指出：“其《纪年》篇，起自夏、殷、周，皆三代王事，无诸国别也。唯特记晋国，起自殇叔，次文侯、昭侯，以至曲沃庄伯。庄伯之十一年十一月，鲁隐公之元年正月也。皆用夏正建寅之月为岁首，编年相次。晋国灭，独记魏事，下至魏哀王之二十年。盖魏国之史记也。……其著书文意，大似《春秋》经。”

The Postface to the *Collected Commentaries to the Spring and Autumn Annals* states: “The *Annals* text, which begins from the Xia, Shang and Zhou dynasties and covers the affairs of the period from the perspective of the royal house, does not separate the records of the various states. Jin is the only special case, beginning with Shang Shu, followed by Marquis Wen, Marquis Zhao, as far as Zhuang Bo of Quwo. The eleventh month of the eleventh year of the reign of Zhuang Bo was the first month in the first year of the reign of Duke Yin of Lu. The annals used throughout the Xia Calendar for the first month of the year, and chronological records follow accordingly. After Jin was destroyed, only the affairs of Wei were recorded, down to the twentieth year of King Ai of Wei. These are the historical records of Wei...in literary style, they greatly resemble the *Spring and Autumn Annals*.”

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 《晋书·束皙传》也说：“盖魏国之史书，大略与《春秋》皆多相应。”《春秋》的体例，杜预《春秋左氏传序》指出：“记事者，以事系日，以日系月，以月系时，以时系年，所以纪远近、别同异也。”

The “Biography of Shu Xi” chapter in the *Jin shu* also says: “The historical records of Wei in general correspond to the *Spring and Autumn Annals*.” On the style of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, in his Preface to the Zuo Commentary to the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, Du Yu states: “It is a historical record, with events tied to days, days to months, months to seasons, and seasons to years. It is a record of events both recent and distant (in time), and separates the commonplace from the extraordinary.”

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 有学者把《春秋》、《竹书纪年》看作“大事记一类编年史”，“属编年体史书的初级形态”；《左传》有完善的叙事，是“更完备的编年体史书”。

Some scholars regard the *Spring and Autumn Annals* and the *Bamboo Annals* as “a type of annalistic history of great events”, or “belonging to an early form of an annalistic history”, and the *Zuo Commentary* (to the *Spring and Autumn Annals*) as a consummate narrative of events, a “more complete annalistic history.”

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 《左传》昭公二十六年《正义》引《纪年》云：“平王奔西申，而立伯盘以为太子，与幽王俱死于戏。先是，申侯、鲁侯及许文公立平王于申，以本太子，故称天王。幽王既死，而虢公翰又立王子余臣于携，周二王并立。二十一年，携王为晋文公所杀。以本非適，故称携王。”

In the 26th year of Duke Zhao, the “Zheng yi” commentary to the *Zuo Commentary* quotes the *Annals*, saying: “King Ping fled west to Shen and established Bo Pan there as crown prince; along with King You, dying together at Xi. Originally, the Marquises of Shen and Lu and Duke Wen of Xu had established King Ping at Shen, since he was the original crown prince, and named him ‘heavenly king.’ After King You died, Duke Han of Guo also established Prince Yuchen at Xie, thus two kings of Zhou reigned at the same time. In the twenty-first year, the King of Xie was killed by Duke Wen of Jin because he was not in direct line (to be Zhou King); thus he is called the ‘King of Xie’.”

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 李学勤先生认为：《纪年》、《系年》叙事体例也彼此相似，有些像所谓“纪事本末”，而不是如《春秋》那样逐年胪列。今本《纪年》则把古本这一段割裂，分列于幽王五年、八年、十一年和平王二十一年，显然是不对的。

Li Xueqin believes “the *Annals* and the *Chronicles* have the same narrative style, more or less similar to the ‘Chronological Histories’, but are unlike the year-by-year lists of events of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. The *Current Annals* divides up this passage of the Ancient text, placing entries in King You’s 5th, 8th and 11th years and King Ping’s 21st year, which is clearly wrong”

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 其实《正义》所引，可能是对多个年份《纪年》文字的综合，并不表示《纪年》原本如此。《太平御览》卷一四七皇亲部引《纪年》说：“幽王八年，立褒姒之子曰伯服，为太子。”就是一个直接的证据。这类转引的文字，不宜看作否定《纪年》编年体特征的依据。

However, the quotation from the “Zheng yi” commentary is likely a composite of text from several individual year entries from the *Annals*, and does not at all represent the original edition of the *Annals*. Chapter 147 of the *Taiping yulan* (from the “Imperial Relatives” section) quotes the *Annals*, saying: “In King You’s 8th year, he established Bo Fu, the son of Bao Si, as crown prince,” which is direct evidence. This sort of indirect quotation is an unsuitable basis on which to refute *Annals* written in an annalistic style.

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 至于清华简《系年》，大多数的章都包含比较多的时间节点，而不同的章之间，节点又或相交叉、重叠。

The majority of chapters in the Tsinghua *Chronicles* manuscript mention events over a relatively long period of time, some of which intersect or are repeated in different chapters.

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 比如第一章讲武王作千亩、克商，厉王虐，宣王千亩之役；第三章讲武王克殷，杀三监，迁商盖之民，以至秦之始大。

For example, the first chapter relates how King Wu of Zhou divided the land for cultivation and defeated the Shang, along with King Li's cruelty and King Xuan's labors to cultivate the lands, and the third chapter relates the events from when King Wu defeated the Shang, killed the Three Supervisors, moved the people of Shang Gai, and down to the first expansion of the state of Qin.

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 又如15、20二章都说到申公屈巫“自晋蹠吴，焉始通吴晋之路”，15、18章都说到灵王“伐吴，为南怀之行”。

Chapters 15 and 20 both speak of Duke Shen Quwu, who “went from Jin to Wu, and thereby connected the route between Wu and Jin”, and chapters 15 and 18 both speak of King Ling, who “attacked Wu and made the Nanhuai Road”.

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 《纪年》、《春秋》等编年体史籍，以时间为坐标，不致出现重复。《系年》以事件为脉络，这种情形固难以避免。

The *Annals* and the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, historical records in an annalistic style, use chronology to organize events without such duplication. The *Chronicles* uses events for contextualization, so this type of duplication is surely difficult to avoid.

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 与此相关的是，《纪年》在记年之外，有时也记月、日。如《水经·涑水注》引云：“晋献公二十五年正月，狄人伐晋。”《史记·魏世家》集解引云：“梁惠王六年四月甲寅，徙都大梁也。”

Related to this, apart from the yearly records in the *Annals*, at times the month and day are also recorded. For example, a quote from the commentary to the “Su River” chapter of the *Classic of Waters* states: “In the first month of the 25th year of the reign of Duke Xian of Jin, the Di people attacked Jin.” Or, as the *Jijie* commentary to the “House of Wei” chapter of the *Records of the Historian* states: “On day *jiayin* of the fourth month of the sixth year of the reign of King Hui of Liang, the capital was moved to Daliang.”

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 记月、记日的情形，《春秋》中更为常见。

The practice of recording the day and month is even more common in the *Spring and Autumn Annals*.

区别之二 Discrepancies : Section 2

- 《礼记·玉藻》云：“动则左史书之，言则右史书之。”《艺文志》云：“左史记言，右史记事，事为《春秋》，言为《尚书》，帝王靡不同之。”似显示早期史载记言、记事有别。

The “Yu zao” chapter of the *Record of Rites* states: “Movements are written down by the historians of the left; speeches are written down by the historians of the right.” The “Yi wen zhi” chapter of the *Han shu* states: “The historians of the left record speeches, and the historians of the right record events; events comprise the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, speeches comprise the *Classic of History*. None of the past emperors and kings varied from this.” This seems to demonstrate that in the early histories, there was a generic difference between speeches and records of events.

区别之二 Discrepancies : Section 2

- 时代较早的编年体史籍，如《纪年》、《春秋》，一事一记，行文简短，并无言论方面的记述。只有到比较复杂的历史著作，如《左传》、《国语》，才带有长篇大论。

Early historical records in the annalistic style, such as the *Annals* and the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, contain one record per event; the writing style is terse and speeches are not recorded or narrated. Only in relatively complex historical writings, such as the *Zuo Commentary* and the *Tales of the States* does one encounter these types of lengthy speeches.

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 《系年》没有出现一次月份的记载。23章末尾云：“甲戌，晋楚以战。丙子，齐师至岳，遂还。”通篇仅有的这两处记日，因为未带月份，记时的效果大打折扣。

Not one mention of a specific month appears in the *Chronicles*. At the end of Chapter 23, it states: “On day *jiaxu*, Jin and Chu fought a battle. On day *bingzi*, the Qi army arrived at Yan, and then returned.” These are the only two notations of specific days in the entire work, and as the month was not recorded, the consequence of the record is greatly diminished.

区别之一 Discrepancies : Section 1

- 其所以如此，大概也与《系年》并非编年体史书、不重视时间的绝对刻度有关。

The reason for this is doubtless related to the *Chronicles* not being an annalistic history, and not emphasizing the absolute measure of time.

区别之二 Discrepancies : Section 2

- 从这个角度看，《系年》似介于《纪年》、《春秋》与《左传》、《国语》之间，是一种趋向复杂的历史著述。

From this perspective, the *Chronicles* seems to fit somewhere between the *Annals* or *Spring and Autumn Annals* and the *Zuo Commentary* or *Tales of the States*, and is a work that stimulated more complex types of historical writings.

区别之二 Discrepancies : Section 2

- 《系年》与《纪年》还有一个明显的区别。就是后者只记事件，而前者在记事件时，往往附带有一些人物话语的记录。如第5章两记蔡哀侯之语，一记赛（息）侯之语；第6章记晋惠公之语；第8章记秦戍人之语；第9章两记大夫之语，一记襄夫人之语；14章两记郤之克（郤克）之语；15章记申公之语。

There is one additional clear difference between the *Chronicles* and the *Annals*. The latter contains only historical events, while the former includes some records of people and speeches in the recounting of events. For example, Chapter 5 twice records Marquis Ai of Cai's speech and once records Marquis of Xi's speech; Chapter 6 records the speech of Duke Hui of Jin; Chapter 8 records speech by frontier garrison soldiers of Qin; Chapter 9 twice records speech by senior officials and once records of speech by Lady Xiang; Chapter 14 twice records speech by Ke of Ju, and Chapter 15 records speech of Duke Shen.

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 《纪年》以及《春秋》，均有记叙的主体。

The *Annals* and the *Spring and Autumn Annals* both have a narrative subjectivity.

- 《纪年》为魏国史书，故以“我”代称魏国。

The *Annals* is the historical record of the state of Wei, and thus the use of the pronoun “we” represents Wei.

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 《水经·丹水注》引云：“晋烈公三年，楚人伐我南鄙，至于上洛。”《沁水注》引云：“梁惠成王元年，赵成侯偃、韩懿侯若伐我葵。”

A quote in the commentary to the “Dan River” chapter of the *Classic of Waters* states: “In the third year of Duke Lie of Jin, the people of Chu attacked our southern frontier, reaching as far as the upper Luo river.” A quote in the commentary to the “Qin River” chapter states: “In the first year of King Huicheng of Liang, Yan, Marquis Cheng of Zhao and Ruo, Marquis Yi of Han attacked our (city) Kui.”

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 《济水注》引云：“梁惠成王五年，公子景贾率师伐郑，韩明战于阳，我师败逋泽北。”

A quote in the commentary to the “Ji River” chapter states: “In the fifth year of King Huicheng of Liang, Prince Jinggu led his troops to attack Zheng and Han Ming battled at Yang; our troops were defeated and fled to Zebei.”

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 《春秋经传集解后序》云：“其《纪年篇》……下至魏哀王之二十年。……哀王二十三年乃卒，故特不称谥，谓之‘今王’。”这也体现出记叙者作为魏人的立场。

The Postface to the *Collected Commentaries to the Spring and Autumn Annals* states: “The text of the *Annals*...covers down to the 20th year of the reign of King Ai of Wei... In the 23rd year of his reign, King Ai of Wei died, therefore he alone was not referred to by a posthumous title but was called ‘the current king’.” This too reflects the narrator having the standpoint of a person of Wei.

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 《春秋》则往往显露出鲁人的立场。

The *Spring and Autumn Annals* frequently reveals the perspective of a person of the state of Lu.

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 隐公元年：“三月，公及邾仪父盟于蔑。”孔疏云：“公，隐公也。及，与也。……史书鲁事，以公为主，言‘公及’，及者，言自此及彼，据鲁为文也。”

The “First year of Duke Yin” chapter: “In the third month, the Duke and Yifu of Zhu made a covenant at Mie.” The Kong subcommentary states: “‘Duke’ means ‘Duke Yin’. ‘And’ means ‘together with’....The historian is recording the events of the state of Lu and uses ‘The Duke’ as the main subject, saying ‘The Duke and’; the ‘and’ means that it is *from this extending to* the other, and is consequently written on the basis of Lu.”

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 又“秋，七月，天王使宰咺来归惠公、仲子之赙。”杜注云：“来者，自外之文；归者，不反之辞。”

Or again, for “Autumn, Seventh Month: the Heavenly King dispatched Chief Minister Xuan to come and send back the funeral equipage for Duke Hui and Zhongzi.”, the Du (Yu) commentary states: “‘To come’ means ‘to come from outside’; ‘to send back’ is a phrase meaning not to return’.”

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 《系年》正好相反，叙事、行文，尽量执持客观、超然的立场，对诸国平行视之。我们在《昭王毁室》、《简大王泊旱》等竹书中比较容易观察到的楚人气息，在这里不复可见。在这一点上，《系年》与《纪年》明显有异，而与《左传》、《国语》相似。

The *Chronicles* is quite the opposite in its narration and literary style. It maintains objectivity and detachment as best it can, and this can be seen in the equanimity with which it treats the various states. In other bamboo manuscripts, such as “Zhao wang hui shi” and “Jian da wang bo han”, we can more easily observe the perspective of a person of Chu, but in this text, it is no longer apparent. From this it can be seen that the *Chronicles* is obviously different from the *Annals*, and is more similar to the *Zuo Commentary* and the *Tales of the States*.

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 梁启超论述《左传》、《国语》三特色，第一曰：“不以一国为中心点，而将当时数个主要的文化国，平均叙述。盖自春秋以降，我族已渐为地方的发展，非从各方面综合研究，不能得其全相。当时史官之作，大抵皆偏重王室或偏重于其本国（例如《春秋》以鲁为中心，《竹书纪年》自周东迁后，以晋为中心；三家分晋后，以魏为中心）。左氏反是，能平均注意于全部。其《国语》将周、鲁、晋、郑、楚、吴、越诸国分篇叙述，无所偏畸。”

In his discussion of the three distinguishing characteristics of the *Zuo commentary* and the *Tales of the States*, Liang Qichao stated: First, “the text does not make the point of view of a single state its focus, but is rather a balanced account of the major civilized states of the time. From the Spring and Autumn period on down, China gradually developed geographically; if you don't study it from all aspects, one cannot obtain a full picture. In the works of the historiographers of the time, in general they all stress (the perspective of) either the royal house or one's own state (for example, the *Spring and Autumn Annals* focuses upon the state of Lu and the *Bamboo Annals* focuses upon the state of Jin after the Zhou court moved east, and after the three families divided Jin, Wei became the focus). The author of the *Zuo commentary*, on the contrary, could take a balanced view of all events. His *Tales of the States* are divided impartially by chapter among the various states of Zhou, Lu, Jin, Zheng, Chu, Wu and Yue.

区别之三 Discrepancies : Section 3

- 夏含夷先生关于单国的编年记与多国综合性纪年之说，也有类似的意味。

Professor Edward Shaughnessy has expressed similar sentiments about annals which record the events of a particular state as compared to those which are a synthesis of the historical records of many states.