

SINGLE- AND MULTI-PIECE
MANUSCRIPTS IN EARLY IMPERIAL
CHINA: ON THE BACKGROUND AND
SIGNIFICANCE OF A TERMINOLOGICAL
DISTINCTION

Thies Staack*

Abstract

Received and excavated sources from early imperial China employ various terms for pieces of bamboo or wood that served as writing support. In many cases, neither the exact meanings nor diachronic differences in usage of these terms are sufficiently clear. What kinds of concrete objects the terms actually referred to in a certain period accordingly turns out to be quite an intricate question. This article focuses on the terms *du* 牘 and *die* 牒, which not only occur most frequently in the sources, but can also be considered as a complementary pair. Investigating differences in form and function that can be gathered from the way the terms are employed in both administrative documents and legal prescriptions of the Qin and Han period (including a newly published Qin ordinance) it argues that *du* and *die* were connected to two conceptually different types of manuscripts, namely single- and multi-piece manuscripts. It shows that these two types also entailed differences in how the manuscripts were kept for storage and transport, which were likewise reflected by special terminology. Finally, it proposes that the increasing use of multi-piece manuscripts instead of single-piece ones, especially since the time of Emperor Wu of Han 漢武帝 (r. 141–87 B.C.E.), probably had both pragmatic and economic reasons, which fit well into the setting of a gradually consolidating empire with an ever-growing volume of bureaucratic record keeping.

*Thies Staack 史達, University of Heidelberg; email: thies.staack@zo.uni-heidelberg.de.

This paper emerged from my work at the Heidelberg Collaborative Research Centre 933 “Material Text Cultures” (Subproject B09 “Bamboo and Wood as Writing Materials in Early China”), which is financed by the German Research Foundation (DFG). I would like to thank Enno Giele, Ulrich Lau, Tang Junfeng 唐俊峰 and Paul Nicholas Vogt as well as the two anonymous reviewers for many valuable suggestions and comments, which helped to improve a previous draft of this work in various ways. I am also indebted to Chen Songchang 陳松長 and his editorial team for giving me the opportunity to participate in their editorial work on the Yuelu Academy Qin manuscripts, which also greatly benefitted the writing of this paper.

Introduction

In the context of early Chinese bamboo and wood manuscripts, codicology still is rarely conceived as a distinct field of study. However, the earliest studies that touch upon codicological aspects were published more than a century ago. It seems justified to say that Wang Guowei 王國維 established this field with his seminal *Jiandu jianshu kao* 簡牘檢畧考 (“Study of slips, tablets, address plates, and their inscriptions”). Even if he was not the first scholar to discuss aspects of codicology, his was the first work that not only included evidence from newly excavated bamboo and wood manuscripts but also contained a rather comprehensive discussion of formats of writing support, layout features, and so forth.¹ Today, most introductory works on bamboo and/or wood manuscripts include a section entitled *jiandu zhidu* 簡牘制度, “the system of slips and tablets,” a term often used to refer to both textual as well as non-textual aspects of bamboo and wood manuscripts in general.² A description of this “system” therefore also includes codicological features such as “raw materials” (*sucai* 素材) or “outer appearance/material design/form” (*xingzhi* 形制 or *xingshi* 形式).

Early research on bamboo and wood manuscripts was especially deeply rooted in the philological tradition of late imperial China, and certain manuscript-related terms that are well known from received literature were prominent points of discussion. Most of these terms—for example, *jian* 簡 and *du* 牘—referred to distinct shapes or formats of pieces of wood or bamboo used as writing support.³ Therefore, from today’s point of view, they provide valuable evidence for the codicology of bamboo and wood manuscripts. Although the material and textual basis for research has grown significantly over the past century

1. See Wang Guowei 王國維, *Jiandu jianshu kao jiaozhu* 簡牘檢畧考校注, ed. and comm. Hu Pingsheng 胡平生 and Ma Yuehua 馬月華 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2004 [1914]), 14–27 and 37–41, respectively. For an earlier work see Édouard Chavannes, “Les livres chinois avant l’invention du papier,” *Journal Asiatique* 10th ser., 5 (1905), 5–75.

2. See, for example, Li Junming 李均明, *Gudai jiandu* 古代簡牘 (Beijing: Wenwu, 2003). Cf. the broader term *jianbo zhidu* 簡帛制度 used in Zhang Xiancheng 張顯成, *Jianbo wenxian xue tonglun* 簡帛文獻學通論 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2004). See also the narrower term *jiance zhidu* 簡冊制度 in Xiao Yunxiao 肖芸曉, “Qinghua jian jiance zhidu kaocha” 清華簡冊制度考察 (MA thesis, Wuhan University, 2015).

3. By “writing support” (German “Beschreibstoff”) I mean pieces of wood, bamboo, or other material intended or used to carry writing. “Shape” and “format” are understood to be sub-categories of the more general “form.” While “shape” is used to distinguish, for example, flat rectangular pieces of writing support from polygonal ones, the category “format” serves to subdivide pieces of the same basic shape according to different measurements.

due to the excavation of numerous bamboo and wood manuscripts from pre-imperial and early imperial China, the interpretation of said terms still heavily relies on a very few frequently cited *loci classici* in the received literature.⁴ And although the most recent works draw on manuscript evidence more extensively, the exact meanings of many terms and the distinctions between them remain difficult to grasp.⁵ Furthermore, diachronic or regional differences in the use patterns of these terms are usually neglected in favor of unifying descriptions.

Another aspect adding to the confusion is that some ancient terms are frequently employed as descriptive codicological terms in modern research. An illustrative example is the word *du*, which is often found in manuscript publications or excavation reports. It is commonly used to refer to comparatively wide pieces of wood or bamboo, usually with more than one column of writing, in opposition to the more frequently found narrow pieces with only one or at the most two columns of writing (usually referred to as *jian*).⁶ Their typical English equivalents “tablet” and “slip” or “strip” have already appeared in the text above.⁷ The criteria just named to distinguish between the two, however, merely reflect my own general impression of how the two terms are usually used in Chinese publications. Probably based on an implied consensus, most publications do not define them.

Whether a person living in Qin 秦 or Han 漢 China (3rd c. B.C.E. to 3rd c. C.E.) would have recognized *jian* and *du* as something resembling their modern referents is in fact an intricate question. What makes—and more importantly *made* back then—a *du* a *du* (or a *jian* a *jian*)? Was it merely the format of the writing support and the number of columns

4. See, for example, Li Junming, *Gudai jiandu*, 135–37.

5. For a recent discussion of terms for pieces of writing support see Pian Yuqian 駢宇騫, *Jianbo wenxian gangyao* 簡帛文獻綱要 (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 2015), 41–62. The overview of different interpretations of the terms *jian* 簡, *zha* 札, and *die* 牒 in that book illustrates the remaining uncertainties. See *Jianbo wenxian gangyao*, 41–43 and 46–47.

6. See, for example, Jingzhou bowuguan, “Hubei Jingzhou Jinan Songbai Han mu fajue jianbao” 湖北荊州紀南松柏漢墓發掘簡報, *Wenwu* 文物 2008.4, 24–32; Jingzhou bowuguan, “Hubei Jingzhou Xiejiaqiao yi hao Han mu fajue jianbao” 湖北荊州謝家橋一號漢墓發掘簡報, *Wenwu* 文物 2009.4, 26–42; Changsha shi wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, “Hunan Changsha Wuyi guangchang Dong-Han jiandu fajue jianbao” 湖南長沙五一廣場東漢簡牘發掘簡報, *Wenwu* 文物 2013.6, 4–26.

7. In German, the words “Tafel”/“Täfelchen” and “Leiste” or “Streifen” with similar meanings are most common. Enno Giele has recently proposed to subdivide slips/strips produced from wood and bamboo by the German words “Leiste” and “Splice” (English “splice”), respectively, to reflect different production techniques. See Enno Giele and Jörg Peltzer, with the assistance of Melanie Trede, “Rollen, Blättern und (Ent) Falten,” in *Materiale Textkulturen: Konzepte—Materialien—Praktiken*, ed. Thomas Meier, Michael R. Ott, and Rebecca Sauer (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 678.

written on it, or was it rather the fact that several *jian* were usually connected with binding strings to create a manuscript, whereas a single *du* often constituted a manuscript by itself?⁸ At least for the modern usage of the words, both criteria appear to be somewhat important, but the problem is that they are not perfectly congruent. There are in fact examples of wider pieces with several columns of writing that were connected to other similarly wide or narrower pieces via binding strings.⁹ What were these called at the time of their production? To further investigate the usage of such terms in ancient China could help to arrive at a clearer picture of how and why different terms for writing support developed and according to what criteria certain shapes and formats were distinguished.

Towards this aim, the present article analyzes the usage of two terms that may be described as a complementary pair: the aforementioned term *du* and the term *die* 牒. In contrast to what the modern expression *jianduxue* 簡牘學, or “the study of slips and tablets,” might suggest, in the Qin and Han periods *die* was among the most commonly used terms for pieces of bamboo or wood that today are usually called *jian*.¹⁰ Investigating differences in form and function that can be gathered from

8. For example, it has been proposed that *du* can be used individually but can also be tied together with other pieces. See Li Ling 李零, *Zhongguo fangshu xukao* 中國方術續考 (Beijing: Dongfang, 2000), 456. According to Ōba Osamu 大庭脩, in early imperial China the term *du* simply referred to individual tablets or boards used for writing. To use *du* to designate comparatively wide tablets (as opposed to narrower pieces) was, according to him, a later development. This view is cited in Takamura Takeyuki 高村武幸, “Shin Kan jidai no toku ni tsuite” 秦漢時代の牘について, *Jinbun ronsō: Mie daigaku jinbun gakubu bunka gakkai kenkyū kiyō* 人文論叢: 三重大学人文学部文化学科研究紀要 30 (2013), 57–71. For the view that *du* are both comparatively wide and used individually see Chen Mengjia 陳夢家, *Han jian zhuishu* 漢簡綴述 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1980), 314.

9. See, for example, Xiejiqiao 謝家橋 Han tomb no. 1, where a list of grave goods written on 197 narrow pieces of bamboo was apparently tied together with three wider pieces of bamboo carrying a so-called “announcement to the world below” (*gao di shu* 告地書). See Jingzhou bowuguan, “Hubei Jingzhou Xiejiqiao yi hao Han mu fajue jianbao,” 36, 41; cf. Jingzhou bowuguan, ed., *Jingzhou zhongyao kaogu faxian* 荊州重要考古發現 (Beijing: Wenwu, 2009), 191, 194.

10. In Han administrative documents, *jian* were called either *die* or *zha* 札, depending on whether their function or their form was referred to, see further below. It is as yet unclear whether *zha* was used to refer to writing support already in the Qin period. The term *jian* was uncommon in administrative documents and in other sources often referred especially to pieces of bamboo. See, for example, *Suanshu shu* 算數書 70–71. For this manuscript, which was excavated from the early Han tomb no. 247 at Zhangjiashan 張家山, see Zhangjiashan ersiqi hao Han mu zhujian zhengli xiaozu 張家山二四七號漢墓竹簡整理小組, ed., *Zhangjiashan Han mu zhujian [ersiqi hao mu]* 張家山漢墓竹簡 [二四七號墓] (Beijing: Wenwu, 2001).

the way the terms are employed in both administrative documents and legal prescriptions of the Qin and Han period, this paper argues that *du* and *die* were connected to two conceptually different types of manuscripts, namely single- and multi-piece.¹¹ This goes back at least to a time shortly after the Qin unification in 221 B.C.E., when the term *du* may have been newly introduced in order to mirror this distinction terminologically. Although *die* referred predominantly to pieces of writing support that formed part of multi-piece manuscripts, at least during the Qin period it could likewise refer to pieces that constituted single-piece manuscripts—under certain circumstances. In the following Han period, the “narrower sense” of *die*—restricted to the context of multi-piece manuscripts—prevailed, whereas the term *du* rarely occurs in an administrative context. This probably reflects developments regarding the production, use, and storage of administrative manuscripts in the rapidly evolving manuscript culture of early imperial China.

Qin Terms for Pieces of Writing Support

Before focusing more closely on the terms *die* and *du*, it is necessary to situate them in relation to other terms for pieces of writing support used during the late Warring States and early imperial period. First, however, some preliminary remarks shall define the exact type of terms that are to be analyzed, because many different words referred to bamboo and wood manuscripts in one way or another, but not all of them are relevant to the present study. For example, throughout the Qin and Han period, the most general word for “writings” of any kind—a category that at the time comprised almost exclusively bamboo and wood manuscripts, plus a probably much smaller number of silk manuscripts—was *shu* 書, a noun derived from the verb *shu*, “to write.”¹² From Qin and

11. Throughout this article a basic distinction between single- and multi-piece manuscripts is drawn. The former are manuscripts consisting of only one piece of inscribed bamboo or wood, while the latter are all manuscripts that consist of at least two pieces connected consecutively with the help of two or more binding strings. Possible cases where, for example, a label or tag may have been temporarily attached to a single-piece manuscript with a string are not counted as multi-piece manuscripts.

12. It has been proposed that *shu* can be seen as a specific “literary form” or more precisely “any text which claims to be a contemporaneous record of a speech of an ancient king.” See Sarah Allan, “On *Shu* 書 (Documents) and the Origin of the *Shang shu* 尚書 (Ancient Documents) in Light of Recently Discovered Bamboo Slip Manuscripts,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 75.3 (2012), 557. Although this specific meaning of *shu* may have existed, the generic meaning “writings” seems to have been very common, at least by the early imperial period. See, for example, the various mathematical, legal, and medical texts in the manuscripts excavated from

footnote continued on next page

Han administrative records, we know that this word was also used as a generic term for “documents” of various types. Depending on whether a document was sealed (*feng* 封) or not, it could also be referred to with the classifier *feng* when counted:

司空曹書一封，丞印，詣零陽。¹³

One sealed document from the bureau of the Controller of Works, with [the seal impression of] the Vice Prefect’s seal, to be delivered to Lingyang.

In received literature, we find other terms that could refer to complete bamboo or wood manuscripts, such as *juan* 卷 “roll” or *ce* 冊 “mat.”¹⁴ Both terms describe multi-piece manuscripts, the former implying the usual way these manuscripts were stored, the latter being a more neutral description of their physical form. On the other hand, there were also special terms for certain types of manuscripts that consisted of only one piece of bamboo or wood, like *fu* 符 or *quan* 券. Although *fu* and *quan* were particularly used as certificates and depended on pairs (or trios) of pieces that fit together (with regard to the position of notches) to fulfil their function, each piece has to be seen as a self-contained, single-piece

Zhangjiashan tomb no. 247 that are designated as different kinds of *shu* (Zhangjiashan ersiqi hao Han mu zhujian zhengli xiaozu, *Zhangjiashan Han mu zhujian [ersiqi hao mu]*).

13. *Liye* 里耶 8-375. If not stated otherwise, the transcriptions of the manuscripts from layers 5, 6, and 8 of Liye well no. 1 follow Chen Wei 陳偉, ed., *Liye Qin jian du jiaoshi (di yi juan)* 里耶秦簡牘校釋 (第一卷) (Wuhan: Wuhan daxue, 2012). For the respective photographs see Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, ed., *Liye Qin jian (yi)* 里耶秦簡 (壹) (Beijing: Wenwu, 2012). For transcriptions and photographs of manuscripts from layers 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17 see Liye Qin jian bowuguan and Chutu wenxian yu zhongguo gudai wenming yanjiu xietong chuanguan zhongxin Zhongguo renmin daxue zhongxin, eds., *Liye Qin jian bowuguan cang Qin jian* 里耶秦簡博物館藏秦簡 (Shanghai: Zhongxi, 2016). For additional manuscripts from layers 7, 9, 14, 15, and 16 see Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye fajue baogao* 里耶發掘報告 (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 2006) 180–99, color plates 16–40.

14. Although the word *juan* might at times refer to silk manuscripts, at least the following passage provides quite reliable evidence that it was likewise used to refer to bamboo or wood manuscripts. Otherwise, the fact that rolls became “disarranged” or “mingled with each other” would be difficult to explain. See Liu Xiang 劉向, *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1985), 1195 (“Fulu: Liu Xiang shulu” 附錄：劉向書錄)：臣向言所校中戰國策書：中書餘卷錯亂相糅莠。“Your servant [Liu] Xiang ... reports on the writings of the *Zhanguo ce* from the inner [palace], which he checked by means of comparison: The more than [?] rolls with writings from the inner [palace] had become disarranged and were mingled with each other.” Punctuation modified, translation adapted from Michael Friedrich, “Der editorische Bericht des Liu Hsiang zum *Chan-kuo ts’e*,” in *Den Jadestein erlangen: Festschrift für Harro von Senger*, ed. Monika Gänsbauer (Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 2009), 246.

manuscript in its own right. In addition, there were specialized terms for inscribed pieces of wood or bamboo that were only temporarily attached to “manuscripts proper,” for example, “envelopes” or “address plates” (*jian* 檢) for administrative documents, which could also be furnished with a receptacle to accommodate sealing clay (*feng ni* 封泥).¹⁵

The terms that are the focus of this article represent yet another subgroup of all terms used to refer to bamboo or wood manuscripts or parts thereof. This group can be defined as *terms referring to individual pieces of bamboo or wood intended or already used as writing support without implying a certain type of text*. At this point, no attempt shall be made to distinguish between individual pieces of bamboo or wood that are identical to a complete manuscript (i.e., single-piece manuscripts) and those that merely constitute one part of a (multi-piece) manuscript.

From Qin manuscripts of the late Warring States and the imperial Qin period, that is, the second half of the third century B.C.E., we know that the Qin used at least four different terms that fall into the category defined above: *fang* 方, *ban* 版/板, *die* 牒, and *du* 牘. The former three are already known in the manuscripts excavated from Shuihudi 睡虎地 tomb no. 11 in 1975. *Fang* and *ban* are mentioned in the following passage of a Qin statute affiliated with the office of the “Controller of Works” (*si kong* 司空):

令縣及都官取柳及木槩（柔）可用書者，方之以書；毋（無）方者乃用版。¹⁶

Let the prefectural and the metropolitan offices collect willow [wood], as well as [other] wood that is soft and can be used for writing, and make *fang* out of it in order to write [on them]; if there are no *fang* available, use *ban* instead.

Unfortunately, the text does not give any details about the shape or format of *fang* and *ban*. The only information provided is that both seem to

15. In some cases a cloth bag or bamboo basket must have contained several distinct documents, but only one *jian* (or *jie* 揭 “label”) was attached to that container, while in other cases a *jian* was probably directly attached to one particular document. On *jian* see Li Junming 李均明, “Fengjian tishu kaolüe” 封檢題署考略, *Wenwu* 文物 1990.10, 72–78; Ōba Osamu 大庭脩, *Han jian yanjiu* 漢簡研究, trans. Xu Shihong 徐世虹 (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue, 2001), 176–204.

16. *Qinlü shiba zhong* 秦律十八種 131. Throughout this article all references to the Shuihudi manuscripts—except for *Qinlü shiba zhong* also *Falü dawen* 法律答問, *Feng zhen shi* 封診式, and *Wei li zhi dao* 爲吏之道—are according to Shuihudi Qin mu zhujian zhengli xiaozu 睡虎地秦墓竹簡整理小組, ed., *Shuihudi Qin mu zhujian* 睡虎地秦墓竹簡 (Beijing: Wenwu, 1990). Translation adapted from A. F. P. Hulswé, *Remnants of Ch'in Law: An Annotated Translation of the Ch'in Legal and Administrative Rules of the 3rd Century B.C. Discovered in Yün-meng Prefecture, Hu-pei Province, in 1975* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 76 (A 77).

have been normally produced from wood, not bamboo. It is also clear that *ban* were considered less suitable for manuscript production, as they were only to be used if no *fang* were available. The latter therefore appear to represent a more commonly used type of writing support, at least for manuscripts produced in an administrative context. With regard to the huge amount of administrative wood manuscripts from the Qin period that have meanwhile been excavated from well no. 1 at Liye 里耶, it seems most likely that *fang* referred to an unknown sub-group of these wood tablets of various formats, which often carry several columns of writing, sometimes on both sides.¹⁷ In his 1985 translation of the aforementioned statute, Hulswé rendered *fang* both verbally as “to make something square” and as the adjective “square.”¹⁸ However, the fact that virtually all pieces found at Liye and other Qin sites (including Shuihudi tomb no. 4, Longgang 龍崗 tomb no. 6, Haojiaping 郝家坪 tomb no. 50, Yueshan 岳山 tomb no. 36) are clearly rectangular rather than square certainly speaks against that translation.¹⁹ The cited passage in fact seems to contain the only occurrences of the words *fang* and *ban* as terms for writing support in Qin manuscripts. However, the two are occasionally used with this meaning in received literature.

久無事，則聘焉。若有故，則卒聘，束帛加書將命。百名以上書於策，不及百名書於方。²⁰

If there has been no official business [with another state] for some time, a courtesy call is made on it. If occasion call for it, then, after [the for-

17. It may be doubted that *fang* refers to the kind of polygonal rods (*gu* 觚) that were occasionally found among other Han manuscripts in the northwest of China, as originally proposed by the Shuihudi editors. See Shuihudi Qin mu zhujian zhengli xiaozu, *Shuihudi Qin mu zhujian*, 50–51 (transcription part).

18. Hulswé, *Remnants of Ch'in Law*, 76 (A77).

19. See Yunmeng Shuihudi Qin mu bianxie zu 雲夢睡虎地秦墓編寫組, *Yunmeng Shuihudi Qin mu 雲夢睡虎地秦墓* (Beijing: Wenwu, 1981), 25–26, plates 167–68; Liu Xinfang 劉信芳 and Liang Zhu 梁柱, eds., *Yunmeng Longgang Qin jian 雲夢龍崗秦簡* (Beijing: Kexue, 1997), 45, plate 27; Sichuan sheng bowuguan and Qingchuan xian wenhuaguan, “Qingchuan xian chutu Qin geng xiu tianlü mudu: Sichuan Qingchuan xian Zhanguo mu fajue jianbao” 青川縣出土秦更修田律木牘——四川青川縣戰國墓發掘簡報, *Wenwu* 文物 1982.1, 11; Hubei sheng Jiangling xian wenwuju and Jingzhou diqu bowuguan, “Jiangling Yueshan Qin Han mu” 江陵岳山秦漢墓, *Kaogu xuebao* 考古學報 2000.4, 549. For the proposal that *fang* means “rectangular” in the aforementioned passage see Robin D. S. Yates, “The Qin Slips and Boards from Well no. 1, Liye, Hunan: A Brief Introduction to the Qin Qianling County Archives,” *Early China* 35–36 (2012–13), 314n65.

20. *Yi li zhushu* 儀禮注疏 (*Shisan jing zhushu* 十三經注疏 ed., 1815; rpt. Taipei: Yiwen, 2001), 24.283. Translation adapted from John Steele, *The I-Li or Book of Etiquette and Ceremonial*, vol. 1 (London: Probsthain & Co., 1917), 232.

mal business of] the courtesy call is over, a further communication is conveyed in a letter handed in along with a bundle of silk. [A letter of] one hundred characters or more is written on slips tied together,²¹ less than one hundred characters are written on *fang*.

In this frequently cited passage from the *Yi li* 儀禮 chapter on “rites of courtesy calls” (*pin li* 聘禮),²² *fang* is contrasted with *ce* 策 as to the amount of text the respective carriers could—or should, according to ritual prescriptions—accommodate. *Fang* are only used if the number of characters does not exceed 100. At least the generally limited amount of writing that fits onto individual wood tablets such as those found in Liye would suggest that *fang* in the *Yi li* passage may refer to the same or a similar type of object constituting a single-piece manuscript. Multi-piece manuscripts (*ce* in the above passage) made of several slips of bamboo or wood are not subject to the same limitation regarding the amount of writing, as their length can generally be adapted by adding further slips. The following passage from the *Lun heng* 論衡, which contains the terms *ban* and *du*, is instructive as to how wood was processed to produce suitable writing support:

斷木爲槧，枳之爲板，力加刮削，乃成奏牘。²³

[If you] cut a tree into wood blocks,²⁴ split these to make *ban*, and diligently apply scraping [to the *ban*], then they become *du* [that can be used] for memorials/submissions.

The text describes the production sequence from raw material (*qian* 槧) to a semi-finished product (*ban*) to the final product (*du*). 板 has the same phonophoric as 版 used in the Qin stipulation cited above, and the two characters were both used to write the word *ban* “board, plank.”²⁵

21. Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 glosses *ce* 策 in this passage as *jian* 簡 “slip(s)” of bamboo or wood (*Yi li zhushu*, 24.283). It seems likely that *ce* actually meant slips that were tied together, because *ce* 策 and *ce* 冊 “mat” are often used interchangeably. See Wang Li 王力, *Wang Li gu hanyu zidian* 王力古漢語字典 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2000), 60, 876; Feng Qiyong 馮其庸 and Deng Ansheng 鄧安生, *Tongjia zi huishi* 通假字彙釋 (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 2006), 35, 733.

22. The translation of the chapter name follows William G. Boltz, “*I li*,” in *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*, ed. Michael Loewe (Berkeley: Society for the Study of Early China, Institute of East Asian Studies, 1993), 235.

23. Wang Chong 王充, *Lun heng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋, ed. and comm. Huang Hui 黃暉, 4 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1990), 12.551.

24. See the gloss *du pu* 牘樸 “wood block for [the production of] *du*” for *qian* 槧 in Xu Shen 許慎, *Shuowen jiezi zhu* 說文解字注, ed. and comm. Duan Yucai 段玉裁 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1981), 6.265.

25. Axel Schuessler, *ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2007), 155.

This passage suggests that *ban* were not regularly used for writing, as does the Qin stipulation from Shuihudi. It appears instead that an additional step of processing—according to *Lun heng*, a sort of scraping—was normally necessary to yield suitable writing support.²⁶ It is unclear whether the scraping involved a significant change in format or referred to a polishing of the surface, or both. However, *fang* was also used to refer to (not necessarily exactly square) surfaces (e.g., of land or skin).²⁷ From this, a verbal meaning like “to produce a surface; to level out, plane” may have been derived. In the context of manuscript production the corresponding noun would have to be translated as “levelled/planed piece of wood.” Since the objects to which *fang* and *du* refer can both be seen as further processed wooden boards (*ban*): Can *fang* and *du* be equated? This is what Duan Yucui 段玉裁 (1735–1815) suggests in his commentary on the entry for *du* in the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字:

牘專調用於書者。然則周禮之版，禮經之方皆牘也。²⁸

Du is a special name for [pieces of wood] used for writing. However, the *ban* mentioned in the *Zhou li* and the *fang* mentioned in the *Li jing* (i.e., the *Yi li*)²⁹ [in the context of writing] all are [referring to the same thing as] *du*.

While Duan’s comment is possibly correct with regard to the equation of *fang* and *du*, the passages from Qin statutes and the *Lun heng* discussed above contradict it, insofar as both sources suggest a clear distinction between boards (*ban*) on the one hand and further processed *du* and *fang* on the other.

The administrative documents from Liye well no. 1 provide valuable additional evidence, as the largest part of these documents consists of individual pieces of inscribed wood. With regard to the Qin statute quoted above, one would expect them to represent *fang* or, in a few cases, *ban*. Curiously, both terms are completely absent from the Liye manuscripts—at least from those published so far.³⁰ Instead, however, the terms *die* and *du* occur rather frequently. In many of these cases, they probably refer to

26. Scraping pieces of wood was one of many tasks assigned to garrison soldiers during the Han period. See Wang Guihai 汪桂海, “Handai guanfu jian du de jiagong, gongying” 漢代官府簡牘的加工、供應, *Jianbo yanjiu* 簡帛研究 2009 (2011), 144–45.

27. See *Liye* 8-1369+8-1937 as well as *Faliu dawen* 88.

28. *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 7.318.

29. This probably refers to the passage already cited above: *Yi li zhushu*, 24.283.

30. However, it should be noted that *fang* actually occurs in other meanings such as “recipe” (*Liye* 8-876, etc.), “surface” (*Liye* 8-1369+8-1937) or “side” (*Liye* 12-1784).

writing support.³¹ What is most interesting is that in some instances the terms undoubtedly refer to the very piece of wood they are written on. In those cases, a definite connection between a piece of writing support and the term that was used to refer to it can be established.³² For example, one side of *Liye* 8-1566 carries a report by the head of the agricultural office:

卅年六月丁亥朔甲辰，田官守敬敢言之：疏書日食牘北（背）上。敢言之。

In the thirtieth year [of the First Emperor of Qin], on day *jiachen* of the sixth month with the first day *dinghai* (i.e., July 26, 217 B.C.E.),³³ Jing, incumbent [Overseer] of the agricultural office, ventures to report [the following]: We recorded in separate entries³⁴ the [categories and

31. For *die* see *Liye* 8-5, 8-42+8-55, 8-135, 8-164+8-1475, 8-170, 8-175, 8-183+8-290+8-530, 8-225, 8-234, 8-235, 8-317, 8-369+8-726, 8-528+8-532+8-674, 8-551, 8-602+8-1717+8-1892+8-1922, 8-645 (2x), 8-651, 8-653, 8-677, 8-686+8-973, 8-768 (2x), 8-804, 8-1041+8-104, 8-1069+8-1434+8-1520, 8-1511, 8-1514 (2x), 8-1539, 8-1559, 8-1565, 8-1715, 8-2003, 8-2035, 8-2543, 9-1869, and 9-2352. For *du* see *Liye* 7-4, 8-302, 8-487+8-2004, 8-499, 8-1019, 8-1203, 8-1494, 8-1517, 8-1566, 8-1654, and 8-2146.

32. Sumiya Tsuneko 角谷常子, "Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite" 里耶秦簡における単独簡について, *Nara shigaku* 奈良史学 30 (2012), 109. An important question, of course, is whether the text written on the pieces, including the terms *du* or *die*, was originally drafted on exactly these pieces or originally drafted on other pieces and copied onto the pieces of writing support we have before us. In the latter case, the direct connection between the terms *du* or *die* and pieces of writing support they refer to may have been lost. As all pieces discussed in this section and gathered in **Table 1** constitute documents that were very likely addressed to the prefectural court of Qianling 遷陵—at the original location of which they were also excavated—and in some cases (e.g., *Liye* 8-1566) were also furnished with notes of receipt, they are tentatively considered as "original" documents that were actually sent to the Qianling court. Cf. the discussion in Sumiya, "Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite," 111–15. For more in-depth studies on the problem of so-called originals and copies, see Maxim Korolkov, "Criteria for Discerning Individual Writing Habits of the Liye Scribes: Originals and Copies of the Official Documents and the Bureaucratic Politics in the Qin Empire" (paper presented at the Fifth European Association for the Study of Chinese Manuscripts Conference, Heidelberg, July 11–13, 2014); and Xing Yitai 邢義田, "Handai jianpu gongwenshu de zhengben, fuben, caogao he qianshu wenti" 漢代簡牘公文書の正本、副本、草稿和簽署問題, *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊 82.4 (2011), 601–78.

33. Xu Xiqi 徐錫祺, *Xi-Zhou (Gonghe) zhi Xi-Han lipu* 西周（共和）至西漢曆譜, 2 vols. (Beijing: Beijing kexue jishu, 1997), 1250.

34. The formulation *shu shu* 疏書 refers to writing something in form of a list or in separate entries. See Shuihudi Qin mu zhujian zhengli xiaozu, *Shuihudi Qin mu zhujian*, 163n3 (transcription part). This means a special kind of layout in which every entry of a list of items is started in a new column. It probably implied that the space on a certain piece of writing support was separated into several registers. On principle this separation into registers could be used on both wider tablets with space for several columns

footnote continued on next page

numbers of convicts who receive] daily food rations on the back of this *du* and [hereby] submit it. End of report.

On the other side of the same piece of wood, we find the actual list that is referred to in the report, with five separate entries:

城旦、鬼薪十八人。

小城旦十人。

舂廿二人。

小舂三人。

隸妾居費三人。

Wall pounders and firewood gatherers: 18 persons.

Minor wall pounders: 10 persons.

Grain pounders: 22 persons.

Minor grain pounders: three persons.

Female bond servants working off fines: three persons.

From the content of the text on *Liye* 8-1566, the fact that both sides of the tablet carry writing, and the lack of traces of binding strings, one may conclude that *Liye* 8-1566 constitutes a complete official document on a single piece of wood.

There are further examples of such single-piece manuscripts including the formulation *du bei* 牘背: a report on the number of households in Qianling prefecture for the years 28 to 33 (219 to 214 B.C.E.) on *Liye* 8-487+8-2004, as well as a report on officials and conscripts who are to receive food rations during an official journey to the Commander's headquarters (*wei fu* 尉府) of Dongting 洞庭 province on *Liye* 8-1517. On these pieces there are likewise no visible traces of binding strings.

of writing (as in the present example) as well as on narrow slips with only one column, see, for example, the *Wei li zhi dao* from Shuihudi. However, it is likely that the expression *shu shu* mainly referred to a particular layout for single-piece manuscripts. At least with regard to the *Liye* finds, all occurrences of *shu shu* are on single-piece manuscripts. See *Liye* 8-487+8-2004, 8-686+8-973, 8-1069+8-1434+8-1520, 8-1517, and 8-1566. For the view that *shu shu* is not confined to writing support of a particular shape or format, see Sumiya, "Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite," 122.

Similar documents provide even more examples of direct reference between a text and the piece of writing support on which it was written. However, instead of *du bei*, some texts contain the expression *die bei* 牒背. *Liye* 8-686+8-973 includes a report on the categories and numbers of convicts assigned to work in the armory of Qianling and the tasks assigned to them (*zuo tu bu* 作徒簿). On one side of the tablet we find a cover letter for the report; on the other we find the actual content in form of a list. Again, there are no traces of binding strings, which also points towards the possibility that this constitutes a single-piece manuscript. The three fragments that have been joined as *Liye* 8-1069+8-1434+8-1520 contain a comparable document possibly drafted at the same armory as *Liye* 8-686+8-973, but at a different time.³⁵ Two additional cases, in which *die* probably refers to the very piece of writing support on which it is written, are *Liye* 8-651 and 9-2352. Both pieces contain a report by the head of Qiling 啟陵 district. The cover letters on the *recto* refer to an “*ex-officio* charge” (*he* 劾) and a “forensic examination” (*zhen* 診) on “one *die*,” respectively. In both cases, these seem to be written directly before the cover letter on the same side of the respective piece. The fact that the persons who sent the two reports were also involved in drawing up the *ex-officio* charge and the forensic examination, respectively, accords well with the combination of the respective texts on the same piece of writing support.

To better compare the pieces referred to by the terms *die* or *du*, the relevant data have been collected in [Table 1](#). Based on an analysis of various documents, including many of the examples also discussed above, Sumiya Tsuneko observed that—in contrast to a widespread assumption—there seems to be no connection between the width of a piece of writing support and its designation as *du*. Furthermore, the way the terms *du* as well as *die* are used in the *Liye* manuscripts suggests that both could refer to pieces of writing support that were used individually and often carried writing on both sides.³⁶

For the term *die*, we can find an additional piece of evidence in the Shuihudi manuscripts. One of the model documents described in the

35. The text in the cover letter gives *shu shu zuo tu ri bu yi die* 疏書作徒日簿 (簿) 一牒 “we recorded in separate entries the daily register of the convicts assigned to work [in our office] on one *die*” instead of the expected *shu shu zuo tu ri bu die bei* 疏書作徒日簿 (簿) 牒北 (背) “we recorded in separate entries the daily register of the convicts assigned to work [in our office] on the back of this *die*.” However, it is clear from the text on the other side of *Liye* 8-1069+8-1434+8-1520—a list introduced by *ku Wu zuo tu bu* 庫武作徒簿 (簿) “register of the convicts assigned to work [in the armory, drafted] by Wu, [head] of the armory”—that the “one *die*” mentioned in the cover letter must refer to the very same piece of wood on which it is written.

36. Sumiya, “Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite,” 109, 122.

Table 1 Overview of Liye pieces with Self-References in Text³⁷

Item no.	Designation	Length (cm)	Width (cm)	Columns (r/v)	Year
8-487+8-2004	牘	23.2	2.3	2/4	34th (213 B.C.E.)
8-1517	牘	23.1	3.7	3/4	35th (212 B.C.E.)
8-1566	牘	23.1	1.8	2/3	30th (217 B.C.E.)
8-651	牒	>15.1	1.7	3/1	33rd (214 B.C.E.)
8-686+8-973	牒	>32.3	1.9	4/2	29th (218 B.C.E.)
8-1069+8-1434+8-1520	牒	ca. 46	3	4/2	32nd (215 B.C.E.)
9-2352	牒	47.1	3.1	4/2	28th (219 B.C.E.)

Feng zhen shi 封診式 (“Models for Sealing and Forensic Examination”) contains the following passage:

爰書：某里公士甲等廿人詣里人士五（伍）丙，皆告曰：「丙有寧毒言，甲等難飲食焉，來告之。」即疏書甲等名事關牒（牒）北（背）。³⁸

Protocol: A, holder of the first rank, and others from quarter X, 20 men in all, presented the commoner C from the [same] quarter to the authorities. They all reported: “C has ??? (*ning* 寧) poisonous words; we object to drinking and eating with him. We have come to report him.” Then we recorded in separate entries the name, status and place of residence/birth of A and the others on the back of this *die* (i.e., the same piece of writing support on which the protocol was written).³⁹

This model text of a protocol—although itself written on a sequence of bamboo slips that were tied together and only carry writing on one side—suggests that a “real” protocol could be written on a wider

37. The measurements provided in Table 1 are based on hand measurement of the photographs in Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye Qin jian* (yi). In most cases the pieces did not have exactly the same width over the whole length. The table gives the maximum width. Cf. the slightly lower measures for *Liye* 8-1517 (3.6 cm), 8-1566 (1.7 cm) and 8-1069+8-1434+8-1520 (2.8 cm) provided in Sumiya, “Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite,” 109–10. The years refer to the reign of King Zheng of Qin 秦王政, who became king of Qin in 246 B.C.E. and assumed the title First Emperor of Qin 秦始皇帝 in 221 B.C.E.

38. *Feng zhen shi* 91–92. Translation adapted from Hulsewé, *Remnants of Ch'in Law*, 206 (E 24).

39. The character 牒 was occasionally used to write *die* 牒. Several examples of this can be found in received literature. See Feng Qiyong and Deng Ansheng, *Tongjia zi huishi*, 956; Wang Hui 王輝, *Gu wenzi tongjia zidian* 古文字通假字典 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2008), 773.

piece (of wood?). The other side of such a piece was—if not regularly, at least in some cases—used to record the personal details of the reporting persons.⁴⁰ This once again shows that *die*, like *du*, could refer to pieces of writing support that were used individually.

However, it is important to note that the term *die* also frequently occurs in the Liye manuscripts preceded by a number. This serves to specify the length of a submission, probably to enable recipients to judge its completeness upon arrival. It cannot be determined without doubt whether a description such as *yu jiao nianyi die* 獄校廿一牒 “verifications/checks of criminal cases on 21 *die*” (*Liye* 8-164+8-1475) referred to several documents of the same type, each written on one *die*, or to one document of a certain type written on several *die*. However, it seems more likely that multi-piece manuscripts are meant.⁴¹ An analysis of all Liye documents containing the term *die* sheds further light on the matter. In cases where *die* probably refers neither to the piece of writing support on which it is written nor to an entirely different document, it usually occurs in a cover letter referring to an attachment that consists of additional *die* (see Appendix A). This use of *die* seems to be even more common in administrative documents of the Han period.⁴² Although one could argue that the mentioned *die* may merely have been submitted together with the piece carrying the cover letter rather than physically bound to it, there are some examples where traces of binding strings are visible on “cover letter pieces.”⁴³ This suggests that in at least some cases *die* referred to additional pieces that—together with the piece car-

40. An example of an actual administrative document with a textual structure similar to this *Feng zhen shi* model is *Liye* 8-439+8-519+8-537. There we also find a protocol (*yuanshu* 爰書) that begins with a report (*gao* 告), albeit without the details on the reporting persons on the back of the tablet. Only a description of the reported person and his personal belongings is recorded on the same side as the protocol.

41. The formulation *shang jie die* 上解牒 on *Liye* 8-804, which could be understood as “to submit those *die* [the binding strings of] which have become loose,” might be seen as a case in which several *die* were originally tied together with binding strings.

42. Gao Heng 高恒, *Qin Han jian du zhong fazhi wenshu jikao* 秦漢簡牘中法制文書輯考 (Beijing: Shehui kexue, 2008), 365n8. See also further below.

43. This is definitely the case for *Liye* 8-183+8-290+8-530 (with traces on fragments 8-183 and 8-530) and possibly also for *Liye* 8-551 and 8-1559. See the photographs in Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye Qin jian (yi)*. Overall, traces of binding strings are rarely observable on the available Liye photographs, which in large part are infrared scans better suitable for identification of the carbon ink writing. Even the photographs of pieces *Liye* 8-755 to 8-759, which according to the editors were once tied together, do not exhibit any obvious traces of binding strings. See Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye Qin jian (yi)*, 49 (transcription part). With this in mind, it seems likely that the circumstances in well no. 1 may have promoted the complete disintegration of binding strings to the extent that barely any traces of them are left.

rying the cover letter—formed a multi-piece manuscript. A further hint towards this is that cover letter pieces referring to an attachment mostly measure less than 3 cm in width and carry only one or two columns of writing (see Appendix A).⁴⁴ Comparing this with the multi-piece manuscript *Liye* 8-755 to 8-759—the pieces of which are up to 2.4 cm wide and carry two columns of writing—it seems possible that many if not all of the cover letter pieces once constituted multi-piece manuscripts together with the attached *die*.⁴⁵

In the Qin manuscripts from the Yuelu Academy 嶽麓書院 collection there are further instances which can be assumed with some certainty to refer to one multi-piece manuscript consisting of several *die*. For example, two criminal case records are concluded by letters of recommendation for the officials who solved these particularly difficult cases. Both letters state the number of *die* for the original case records submitted by the investigating officials:

為奏九牒，上。⁴⁶

[The Judicial Secretary Yang ...] drew up a submission on nine *die* and submitted it [to the higher authorities].

今獄史觸、彭沮、衷得微難獄，磔臯（罪）一人。為奏十六牒，上。⁴⁷

Now the Judicial Secretaries Chu, Peng Ju, and Zhong have solved an obscure and difficult case of one person who committed an offence being punished with quartering. They drew up a submission on 16 *die* and submitted it [to the higher authorities].

44. *Liye* 8-164+8-1475 with a width of 4.2 cm represents the widest example. *Liye* 8-170, 8-768, 8-1514, 8-1559, and 8-1565 are each narrower but likewise have three columns of writing. Of the overall eighteen pieces in Appendix A on which the text probably refers to an attachment, twelve carry one or two columns, while only six carry three columns of writing. Note that three of four single-piece manuscripts on which *die* refers to the same piece carry four columns of writing, at least on one of their sides (see Table 1).

45. The cover letter pieces in Appendix A furthermore usually do not carry writing on their *verso* apart from brief notes of receipt or the name of the scribe who drafted the respective document. Cf. similar notes on confirmed multi-piece manuscripts, like *Xie shou* 歇手 “handled by Xie” on the *verso* of *Liye* 8-755.

46. *Wei yu deng zhuang si zhong* 為獄等狀四種 148. All references to this manuscript are according to Zhu Hanmin 朱漢民 and Chen Songchang 陳松長, eds., *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (san)* 嶽麓書院藏秦簡 (叁) (Shanghai: Shanghai cishu, 2013). Translation adapted from Ulrich Lau and Thies Staack, *Legal Practice in the Formative Stages of the Chinese Empire: An Annotated Translation of the Exemplary Qin Criminal Cases from the Yuelu Academy Collection* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 225.

47. *Wei yu deng zhuang si zhong* 168–69. Translation adapted from Lau and Staack, *Legal Practice*, 244.

That the indicated number of *die* does not exactly accord with the number of bamboo slips on which the case records are written is probably due to the fact that the records are merely copies of the original case files, and might have been abbreviated, extended, or otherwise modified.⁴⁸ The actual amounts of six and eighteen slips, respectively, are in fact not too far off the numbers given in the attached letters of recommendation (nine and sixteen, respectively).⁴⁹ One may gather that the term *die* here likely refers to individual pieces that are part of a multi-piece manuscript. As at least the copies of the original records are written on slips of bamboo, one cannot exclude the possibility that bamboo was also used as writing support for the original records and *die* may therefore also refer to pieces of bamboo.

Even more persuasive evidence for the use of the term *die* to refer to pieces of multi-piece manuscripts can be found in the recently published fifth volume of the Yuelu Academy manuscripts. The volume contains a Qin ordinance written on a total of eight bamboo slips.⁵⁰ The text on the very last slip reads as follows:

贖。令七牒。尉郡卒令第七十六

redemption fees. Ordinance on seven *die*. Ordinances distributed to/by the Minister of Trials and the provinces, B76⁵¹

48. Another possibility is that the original case files were written on slips of a different length, which could therefore have accommodated a higher or lower number of characters, leading to a different number of slips necessary to make a complete copy.

49. A count of the number of slips on which the case records are written gives six slips (*Wei yu deng zhuang si zhong* 142–47) for case II.9; the record for case II.10 is written on seventeen slips (*Wei yu deng zhuang si zhong* 150–66) to which one assumed missing slip would have to be added. The count includes only the slips from the beginning of the respective case record until the passage where the punishment for the offender is noted (*Yi lun zhe* X 已論磔X. “Judgement has already been passed to quarter X.”), as this is probably where the original case file ended. What follows is a letter of recommendation attached to a copy of the original case file. It should be noted that even in the copies of the original case files there are a few short narrative passages that are likely to be later interpolations. On narrative elements and literary embellishments in the *Zouyan shu* 奏讞書 criminal case records excavated from Zhangjiaoshan tomb no. 247 see Anthony J. Barbieri-Low and Robin D. S. Yates, *Law, State, and Society in Early Imperial China: A Study with Critical Edition and Translation of the Legal Texts from Zhangjiaoshan Tomb no. 247*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 32–33, 98–109.

50. *Yuelu Lüling* 嶽麓律令 138–45. See Chen Songchang 陳松長, ed., *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)* 嶽麓書院藏秦簡 (伍) (Shanghai: Shanghai cishu, 2017). If not stated otherwise, in the following, *Yuelu Lüling* refers to the slips published as part of that volume, following the numbers of the edition. For yet unpublished *Yuelu Lüling* slips, the original item numbers are given.

51. On the title of this ordinance see the discussion in Chen Songchang 陳松長, “Yuelu Qin jian zhong de ji ge lingming xiaoshi” 嶽麓秦簡中的幾個令名小識, *Wenwu* 文物 2016.12, 61–64. Chen considers *zu* 卒 to have the meaning *gong* 共 “to supply, distribute” in this context.

In this case, *die* must refer to the individual pieces of a multi-piece manuscript, because the actual text of the ordinance that precedes the note “ordinance on seven *die*” is written on almost exactly this amount of slips. Only *shu* 贖, the last word of the last sentence of the ordinance text, was written on the eighth slip, together with the note on the number of *die* and the title of the ordinance. Among the yet unpublished Qin ordinances there can actually be found a near duplicate of this ordinance, likewise written on a total of eight bamboo slips, which differs only in the framing of the ordinance text.⁵² In that case, two more words of the last sentence were written on the eighth slip. It is therefore likely that both copies of this ordinance faithfully record the original number of bamboo or wood slips on which the ordinance was written when it was approved by the emperor. After approval, the original form may not always have been exactly imitated in the process of distribution, such that copies of the original ordinance might slightly exceed seven slips.

To gather a few preliminary findings on the Qin terms for individual pieces of writing support:

1. The four terms (*fang*, *ban*, *du*, and *die*) were definitely all used to refer to pieces of wood. Only in the case of *die* do we have hints that it was also used for pieces of bamboo.
2. All four terms were probably (and *du* and *die* were definitely) used to refer to pieces of writing support that were employed individually (as single-piece manuscripts) and therefore could conveniently bear writing on both sides. Only *die* was likewise used to refer to pieces that were part of multi-piece manuscripts and therefore normally carried writing on only one side.⁵³
3. The two observations above suggest a tentative distinction between three “terms for pieces of wood that were used as single-piece manuscripts” (*fang*, *ban*, and *du*) and one “term for pieces of bamboo or wood that were used as single-piece manuscripts or as part of multi-piece manuscripts” (*die*).

52. See *Yuelu Liling* 0378, 0581, J21, 0682, 0710, 0362, 0330, and 0476 (unpublished).

53. That is, with the exception of titles, which were often written on the *verso*, or other brief notes such as scribal “signatures” in administrative documents. However, the use of both sides for writing was even in these cases normally restricted to the very first or last piece(s) of a multi-piece manuscript. On one- vs. two-sided writing see also n. 10 in Momiyama Akira 初山明, “Amu koto to tabaneru koto: Senryō ken ni okeru bunsho hokan to gyōsei jitsumu (2)” 編むことと束ねること—遷陵縣における文書保管と行政實務 (2), January 13, 2014 (<http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/users/Ejina/note/note06%28Momiyama%29.html>), accessed November 21, 2017.

4. Extant pieces of writing support that were referred to by the terms *die* and *du* do not enable a clear distinction between the two with regard to form (length, width, or number of columns) apart from the fact that *du*—unlike *die*—was seemingly not used for pieces longer than 30 cm (see Table 1).
5. As of now, the only possible distinction between *fang*, *ban*, and *du* is that *ban* was apparently used to refer to coarser, less processed pieces of wood than *fang* and *du*.⁵⁴ The latter two may in fact be synonyms.

As has been seen, it is difficult to clearly distinguish the pieces of writing support referred to by *fang*, *ban*, *die*, and *du*, because they seem to show a certain overlap with regard to form. Furthermore, the ambiguous use of the term *die* for pieces used in both single- and multi-piece manuscripts seems to prevent a clear-cut distinction according to function. As will be shown below, the use of *die* is indeed less ambiguous than it appears to be. But before examining further evidence for the distinction of *die* and *du* from a Qin ordinance, some additional aspects hinting at a conceptual distinction between single- and multi-piece manuscripts shall be discussed—namely the different forms in which these manuscripts were kept for storage and transport.

For Storage and Transport: Bundles or Stacks Instead of Rolled-Up Mats

One can assume that the fundamentally different forms of single- and multi-piece manuscripts must also have entailed differences in how such

54. One may hypothesize that *ban* refers to wood pieces with a comparatively large format and/or thickness such as the boards excavated from Qin tomb no. 1 at Fangmatan 放馬灘. The tomb contained four wooden boards with maps drawn on them. One of the maps consisted of three connected boards, the other three of one board each. The maps measure 26.7×18.1×1.1 cm, 26.6×15×1.1 cm, 26.5×18.1×2.1 cm, and 26.8×16.9×1 cm, respectively. See Gansu sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, ed., *Tianshui Fangmatan Qin jian* 天水放馬灘秦簡 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2009), 73–76, 119–20, as well as color plates 3–7. Cf. the comparatively large piece *Liye* 8-461, measuring roughly 28×13 cm. It is noteworthy that all four Fangmatan maps as well as *Liye* 8-461 have a similar format, which may hint towards a certain standard for production. However, there are other possibilities. For example, if the hypothesis that the term *fang* refers to plane or levelled pieces (see above) is correct, this would imply that the respective pieces at least ideally had only right angles and six plane faces. A *ban* then could be anything similar that does not fulfil the criteria “right angles” and/or “plane faces,” for example, because of rounded faces on pieces of wood cut from the outermost part of a tree trunk. On the other hand, note Zheng Xuan’s *Yi li* commentary, which states that a *fang* is a *ban* with five, seven, or nine columns of writing (*Yi li zhushu*, 39.463).

manuscripts were kept for storage and transport. Sumiya has drawn attention to a noteworthy detail in the Shuihudi statute discussed above that mentions the terms *fang* and *ban*. The cited passage referring to these two types of wooden pieces is immediately followed by prescriptions specifying the materials with which they are to be tied together:

其縣山之多茳（菅）者，以茳（菅）纏書。⁵⁵

In prefectures where there are many sedges in the hills, use sedge to tie documents together.

Sumiya correctly noted that the use of the word *chan* 纏 suggests that the previously mentioned *fang* and *ban* were not tied together consecutively as multi-piece manuscript, since that way of binding is commonly referred to as *bian* 編.⁵⁶ Instead, a cord was wrapped around a bundle or stack of *fang* or *ban*, such that the individual pieces remained self-contained units.⁵⁷ This observation ties in well with a suggestion by Momiyama Akira 籾山明. Based on an analysis of wood pieces among the Liye materials that bear the term *shu* 束, he proposed that this term referred to “bundles” (Japanese: *taba*) of tablets or slips rather than pieces of wood with a ladder- or stair-like shape, as formerly argued by the Liye editors.⁵⁸ The topmost part of most pieces on which the term *shu* occurs was painted black, a feature usually found on pieces carrying titles or similar brief summaries.⁵⁹ Momiyama suggests that *shu* could

55. *Qinlü shiba zhong* 131. Cf. the translation in Hulsewé, *Remnants of Ch'in Law*, 76 (A 77): “In prefectures where there are many sedges in the hills, write on sedge tied together.”

56. See, for example, *Shi ji* 史記 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1959), 20.1059, 47.1937; *Han shu* 漢書 (Beijing, Zhonghua, 1962), 51.2367. Judging from his translation of the passage, Hulsewé appears to understand *chan* 纏 in the same way as *bian* 編.

57. Sumiya, “Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite,” 123. The Shuihudi editors translated *chan* as *chan shu* 纏束 “to tie together in a bundle.” See Shuihudi Qin mu zhujian zhengli xiaozu, *Shuihudi Qin mu zhujian*, 51 (transcription part). Enno Giele brought to my attention that in principle *chan* would not necessarily have to be restricted to single-piece manuscripts. It is also possible that rolled-up multi-piece manuscripts were tied together with a string that was wrapped around the outside. Accordingly, both *chan* and *bian* might be expected to occur in the context of multi-piece manuscripts. Note that a Qin ordinance (*Yuelu Lüling* 103–4) also refers to strings that are wrapped around a document and to which sealing clay is attached as *chan*. Still, it seems that only *chan* could have been used, whenever several single-piece manuscripts were tied together.

58. The latter is proposed in Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, “Liye yi hao jing de fengjian he shu” 里耶一號井的封檢和束, *Hunan kaogu jikan* 湖南考古輯刊 8 (2009), 68–69. Cf. Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye Qin jian (yi)*, preface, 2.

59. Momiyama Akira, “‘Taba’ to hyōdai kan no kankei ni tsuite: Senryō ken ni okeru bunsho hokan to gyōsei jitsumu (1)” 「束」と表題簡の關係について—遷陵縣におけ

footnote continued on next page

indeed be the term used to refer to bundles or stacks of individual documents that were tied together. The aforementioned pieces with descriptive titles containing the term *shu* may thus have been attached to such bundles as labels.⁶⁰ One can imagine pragmatic considerations with regard to transport or storage as possible motives for this.

The existence of bundles of wood tablets is indeed attested by the archaeological record. For example, the excavation report on Shuihudi Han tomb no. 77 describes wood and bamboo tablets (referred to as *du* by the authors of the report) that were stored as “bundles” inside a bamboo basket.⁶¹ Another example is Songbai 松柏 Han tomb no. 1, in which 63 wood tablets (likewise named *du* by the authors of the excavation report) were “tied in bundles according to content.”⁶² The Liye

る文書保管と行政實務 (1), January 13, 2014 (<http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/users/Ejina/note/note05%28Momiya%29.html>), accessed November 21, 2017. The pieces cited by Momiya are *Liye* 8-204+8-1842, 8-306+8-282, 8-1242, 8-1556, 8-1728, 11-14, and 16-38. The top of *Liye* 8-204+8-1842 is fragmented and therefore no judgement on the existence of a blackened top is possible. For the reconstruction of *Liye* 8-306+8-282 see He Youzu 何有祖, “Liye Qin jian du zhuihe (liu)” 里耶秦簡牘綴合 (六), June 4, 2012 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=1708), accessed November 21, 2017. For *Liye* 11-14 and 16-38 see Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, “Liye yi hao jing de fengjian he shu,” 68.

60. Momiya, “Amu koto to tabaneru koto.”

61. As a notable coincidence, the modern word *shu* 束 is actually used by the archaeologists to describe the bundles. At the same time they note that “some of the tablets carry writing on both sides” but also that “most of them show traces of two binding strings.” See Hubei sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo and Yunmeng xian bowuguan, “Hubei Yunmeng Shuihudi M77 fajue jianbao” 湖北雲夢睡虎地M77發掘簡報, *Jiang Han kaogu* 江漢考古 2008.4, 35. It is as yet unclear exactly which tablets show traces of binding strings. However, it seems possible that the pieces with writing on both sides were not tied together as multi-piece manuscripts but stored in a form that at least in Qin times may have been called “bundles” (*shu*), while the others might have been part of multi-piece manuscripts. One should bear in mind that even in bundles the outermost two pieces could also exhibit traces of binding strings that may be difficult to distinguish from those used in multi-piece manuscripts. It is also noteworthy that in other cases the existence of traces of binding strings, for example, on both sides of *Liye* 16-5 (see the photos in Liye Qin jian bowuguan et al., *Liye Qin jian bowuguan cang Qin jian*, 68, 142), points to the fact that even comparatively wide pieces with writing on both sides were occasionally tied together with other pieces consecutively in a multi-piece manuscript. See also the discussion on *Liye* 8-159, etc. in Momiya, “Amu koto to tabaneru koto.” However, considering the number of examples for this practice, it seems to have been an exception rather than the rule.

62. Jingzhou bowuguan, “Hubei Jingzhou Jinan Songbai Han mu fajue jianbao,” 29. Note that six tablets without writing were apparently used as covers on the top and bottom of certain bundles. Another example of stacked single-piece manuscripts may be found in Yinwan 尹灣 tomb no. 6. At least the archaeological drawing suggests that the overall twenty-three wood tablets in the tomb were found in two stacks. See Lianyungang shi bowuguan, Donghai xian bowuguan, Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan

footnote continued on next page

manuscripts provide further evidence. According to Zhang Chunlong 張春龍, during excavation of well no. 1 there were only three examples of groups of tied-together pieces remaining intact.⁶³ Of these, the group *Liye* 9-1 to 9-12 has been frequently discussed. Each of the twelve tablets constitutes a single-piece manuscript, and an analysis of mirror-inverted imprints of writing has shown that the tablets must have been stored in stacked form before they ended up in the well.⁶⁴ Momiyama considers this to be an example of a bundle (*shu*).⁶⁵

A close relationship between the words *chan* 纏 and *shu* 束 (at least for the second century C.E.) is in fact suggested by the definition of *yue* 約 in the *Shuowen jiezi*:

約：纏束也。⁶⁶

Yue means “to tie together in a bundle.”

It is possible that, already in the Qin period, *shu* was also used verbally in the context of tying bundles of tablets. A hint towards this is the formulation *shu fu* 束符 in the Yuelu Academy collection of criminal cases, which has been rendered abstractly as “to be bound by a credential” (with the grammatical subject/logical object being the members of a group of five soldiers) in a recent translation.⁶⁷ In the light of the above analysis of the term *shu*, the translation “to tie the credentials (*fu* 符) together in a bundle” seems possible as well. Bundles of similar single-piece manuscripts with a certifying function, namely tallies (*quan* 券), are mentioned in the *Liye* manuscripts.⁶⁸

jianbo yanjiu zhongxin, and *Zhongguo wenwu yanjiusuo*, eds., *Yinwan Han mu jiandu* 尹灣漢墓簡牘 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1997), 172, nos. 17, 18. I thank Enno Giele for pointing out this example.

63. These are *Liye* 8-154 to 8-159, 9-1 to 9-12, and 16-5 to 16-7. Cited according to *Liye Qin jian bowuguan* et al., *Liye Qin jian bowuguan cang Qin jian*, 15. *Liye* 8-154 to 8-159 are described as having stuck together.

64. Xing Yitian 邢義田, “Hunan Longshan *Liye* J1(8)157 he J1(9)1-12 hao Qin du de wenshu goucheng, biji he yuandang cunfang xingshi” 湖南龍山里耶J1(8)157和J1(9)1-12號秦牘的文書構成、筆跡和原檔存放形式, *Jianbo* 簡帛 1 (2006), 275-96; Momiyama, “Amu koto to tabaneru koto.” For a neat presentation of the twelve documents and the mirror-inverted imprints see *Liye Qin jian bowuguan* et al., *Liye Qin jian bowuguan cang Qin jian*, 12-13.

65. Momiyama, “Amu koto to tabaneru koto.”

66. *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 13.647.

67. *Wei yu deng zhuang si zhong* 240, 243. Cf. the translation in Lau and Staack, *Legal Practice*, 298-99, 302-3.

68. See the formulation *shu quan shu* 鼠券束 (*Liye* 8-1242); cf. the explanation in Chen Wei, *Liye Qin jian du jiaoshi (di yi juan)*, 298. In contrast to the interpretation of Chen Wei and his team, who suspect *shu quan* 鼠券 to be “tallies regarding rats/mice,”

footnote continued on next page

The previous section has already clarified that certain terms (i.e., *fang*, *ban*, and *du*) seem to have been employed only to refer to pieces of writing support used as single-piece manuscripts, but not to pieces used as part of multi-piece manuscripts. As can be seen, this distinction is also reflected in the use of the special terms *chan* or *shu* (instead of *bian*) when referring to several single-piece manuscripts that were put together for the purpose of storage or transport.

A Clearer Picture of *die* and *du*: Prescriptions for the Drafting of Administrative Documents in a Qin Ordinance

As argued above, *die* seems to have been the only one of the four Qin terms under investigation that could refer to both pieces of writing support that were used as single-piece manuscripts and pieces that were part of multi-piece manuscripts. Qin regulations concerning the drafting of administrative documents from the Yuelu Academy manuscript collection serve to further elucidate the relation between *die* and *du*. For the most part these regulations imply a clear-cut distinction between the two. However, there is one notable exception. As a basis for discussion, the relevant regulations, which are written on ten consecutive bamboo slips, are first cited and translated below:⁶⁹

諸上對、請、奏者，其事不同者，勿令同編及勿連屬，事別編之。有請，必物一牒，各斲（徹）之，令易（易）智（知）。其一事₁₁₂而過百牒者，別之，毋過百牒而為一編，必皆散。取其急辭（辭），令約具別白，易（易）智（知）毆。其獄奏毆，各約為鞫₁₁₃審，具傳其律令，令各與其當比編而署律令下曰：「以此當某某」，及具署舉人毆（繫）不毆（繫）。雖同編者，必章□₁₁₄之，令可別報、繫卻毆。

Whenever [several] answers⁷⁰ [to enquiries or decisions], requests, or memorials are submitted to a superior, if these are [concerned with] dif-

shu 鼠 more likely means “to give, bestow” here. Before the character 予 became the standard way of writing “to give, bestow,” the form 鼠 was frequently used. See Chen Kanli 陳侃理, “Liye Qin fang yu ‘shu tong wenzi’” 里耶秦方與“書同文字”, *Wenwu* 文物 2014.9, 77–79. For an actual example of a *quan* concerning a bestowal see *Liye* 10-1157. Furthermore, *Liye* 8-1554 mentions a tally in connection with a bestowal of slaves, grain, money, etc. (see n. 73 below). Hence, although the existence of “rat/mouse tallies” can of course not be ruled out, it seems more suitable to understand *shu quan shu* as “bundle of bestowal tallies.”

69. *Yuelu Lüling* 112–21 (with modifications).

70. From the coordination with two other types of submission that are directed towards a superior (*qing* 請 and *zou* 奏) and the use of the verb *shang* 上, it can be gathered that *dui* 對 must refer to answers to earlier enquiries, decisions, etc. by a superior authority. The exact difference between *dui*, *qing*, and *zou* is as yet unclear. If *zou* must

footnote continued on next page

ferent official matters, do not let [the respective pieces of writing support] be tied together [in the same multi-piece manuscript]⁷¹ and do not join [previously independent manuscripts] continuously;⁷² tie them as separate [manuscripts] according to [different] official matters. If there is a request, there must be one *die* per [requested] item⁷³ and each [requested item/request] is to be thoroughly [described]⁷⁴ in order to make it easy

be interpreted as a general term for “submission” (including both *dui* and *qing*), this would mean that a twofold distinction between *dui zou* “answer submission” and *qing zou* “request submission” is made in the present passage, instead of a threefold one. During the Qin period, a *zou* 奏 “memorial” was not yet necessarily directed to the emperor as in later times. For different meanings of *zou* in the Qin period see Tao An 陶安 (Arnd Helmut Hafner), “Wei yu deng zhuang si zhong biao ti jian ‘zou’ zi zi jie ding-zheng: jian lun Zhangjiashan Han jian Zouyan shu timing wenti” 《為獄等狀四種》標題簡“奏”字字解訂正——兼論張家山漢簡《奏讞書》題名問題, *Zhongguo gudai falü wenxian yanjiu* 中國古代法律文獻研究 8 (2014), 22–48.

71. Note the use of *bian* 編, not *chan* 纏 or *shu* 束.

72. For *lian shu* 連屬 “line up continuously; form an unbroken line” see also *Shi ji*, 12.4.63 (cf. William H. Nienhauser, Jr., ed., *The Grand Scribe’s Records, Volume II: The Basic Annals of Han China* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002], 232): 使者存問所給, 連屬於道。 “[T]he envoys sent to present greetings and inquire after his needs formed a continuous line on the road.” The exact difference between *tong bian* 同編 “tie together” and *lian shu* “line up continuously” is as yet unclear. Could the first expression refer to a multiple-text manuscript (MTM) and the latter to a composite manuscript? (On these concepts see Michael Friedrich and Cosima Schwarke, eds., *One-Volume Libraries: Composite and Multiple-Text Manuscripts* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016], esp. the introduction.) Another possibility could be that the terms distinguish an “unsorted” from a “sorted” way (e.g., with regard to chronology) of tying manuscripts concerned with different official matters together.

73. It seems that a request connected with one and the same official matter (*shi* 事) could involve several items (*wu* 物). An actual example of a list of items can be found on *Liye* 8-1554r (punctuation modified): 卅五年七月戊子朔己酉, 都鄉守沈爰書: 高里士五 (伍) 廣自言: 「謁以大奴良、完、小奴嚙、饒、大婢闌、願、多、□、禾稼、衣器、錢六萬, 盡以予子大女子陽里胡。」凡十一物, 同券齒。 “35th year, day *jiyou* of the seventh month with the first day *wuzi*, protocol of Shen, incumbent [Overseer] of the metropolitan district: Commoner Guang from Gao quarter stated on his own behalf: ‘I hereby request that the adult male slaves Liang and Wan, the minor male slaves Chou and Rao, the adult female slaves Lan, Yuan, Duo, and X, as well as grain, clothing, and vessels, and money to the amount of 60,000 cash are completely bestowed upon my daughter, the adult woman Hu from the Yang quarter.’ Overall eleven items, in accordance with the notches on [the side of] this tally.” As can be seen, *wu* can include different categories of things or even persons (e.g., slaves). Therefore, the abstract translation “item” appears most suitable.

74. The character 徹 is used in the Shuihudi Qin manuscripts to write the words *che* 撤 “to clear away, remove” (*Qinlü shiba zhong* 10) and *che* 徹 “to penetrate (e.g., a wall)” (*Feng zhen shi* 74, 76) or “to achieve, reach (intentions, goals, etc.)” (*Wei li zhi dao* 42.2–43.2, 48.2–49.2), but neither of these meanings appears to fit the present context very well. However, *che* 徹 obviously refers to different forms of “going all the way,” both in a concrete and in a more abstract sense. Therefore, a meaning such as “to be exhaustive/thorough” or “completely, thoroughly, exhaustively” may have been intended with

footnote continued on next page

to understand.⁷⁵ In case [a submission concerns] one official matter but exceeds 100 *die*, divide it up, so that no more than 100 *die* are tied together in one and the same multi-piece manuscript (*bian* 編). [The separate parts/manuscripts] must in every case be scattered.⁷⁶ Select a key word⁷⁷

regard to the drafting of official documents. As *che* must be a transitive verb in the present context, one would have to add another (implied) verb such as “to describe” or “to render” for the translation. Cf. *Yuelu Lüling* 252: 及諸作官府者，皆日斲（徹）溥（簿）之，上其廷。廷日校案次編，月盡為取（最），固臧（藏），令可案毀。“as well as those who are working at government offices, in every case thoroughly record [these persons] in a register every day and submit [the records] to the [prefectural?] court. The court daily checks and ties [the submitted records] together [with the earlier ones] according to the [chronological?] sequence. At the end of the month [the court officials] compile a summary, and store [both records and summary] securely, to enable [later] consultation.” The Yuelu Academy editors propose that *che* in the present passage has the meaning “to spread/set out; enumerate, list,” citing a passage from the *Fang yan* 方言. See Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian* (*wu*), 153n31. With regard to the fact that the use of *che* in that meaning would reflect a dialect spoken in the far east of the Qin Empire, which had only been conquered in 221 B.C.E., this interpretation does not seem likely, although the meaning “to list” would indeed fit the context.

75. Or “to make [the requested items] easy to distinguish/recognize.”

76. This is probably meant to stress that separate multi-piece manuscripts (*bian* 編) are not to be tied together in any way, even if they are concerned with the same official matter. The Yuelu Academy editors do not end the sentence after *san* 散 but rather read *san* and the following *qu* 取 continuously. See also the discussion of *Yuelu Lüling* 105 in n. 77 below.

77. *Ji ci* 急辭 (辭), literally “urgent words,” occasionally means abbreviated or concise wording in received literature. See, for example, *Guliang zhuan zhushu* 穀梁傳注疏 (*Shisan jing zhushu* 十三經注疏 ed., 1815; rpt. Taipei: Yiwen, 2001), 13.132. In the present context, it probably refers to some kind of brief description or key word, which may have been noted on each separate part of a submission if it consisted of several multi-piece manuscripts. Cf. *Yuelu Lüling* 105 (punctuation modified): 今曰：上事散書取急用者，上勿調刺。“The ordinances state: [The labels/tags] used [to note] selected key words whenever [one] official matter is submitted in scattered documents shall not be referred to as ‘cards’ (*ci* 刺) by the superiors/in the submission.” On the various meanings of *ci* 刺 in Han administrative documents see Li Junming 李均明, “Jiandu wenshu ‘ci’ kaoshu” 簡牘文書“刺”考述, *Wenwu* 文物 1992.9, 55–59. *Qu ji* 取急 in this closely related ordinance probably refers to the same thing as *qu qi ji ci* 取其急辭 (辭) in the passage under discussion. Therefore, it may not be suitable to understand *qu ji* as “to take leave due to urgent matters (such as a funeral of a relative),” a meaning in which the formulation occurs in Han administrative documents. See, for example, *Juyan* 居延 52.57 or *Juyan xinjian* 居延新簡 E.P.T48:138. For transcriptions of the “old” *Juyan* manuscripts (*Juyan*) see Xie Guihua 謝桂華, Li Junming 李均明, and Zhu Guozhao 朱國昭, eds., *Juyan Han jian shiwen hejiao* 居延漢簡釋文合校, 2 vols. (Beijing: Wenwu, 1987); for the “new” *Juyan* manuscripts (*Juyan xinjian*) see Gansu sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, Gansu sheng bowuguan, Wenhua bu gu wenxian yanjiushi, and Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan lishi yanjiusuo, eds., *Juyan xinjian: Jiaqu houguan yu di si sui* 居延新簡——甲渠候官與第四燧 (Beijing: Wenwu, 1990). This kind of leave appears to have been called *gao gui* 告歸 (*Qinlü shiba zhong* 46) or simply *gui* 歸 (*Yuelu Lüling* 285–87) during Qin times.

[to be attached to each separate part/manuscript]; let it be brief but complete, distinct and evident,⁷⁸ in order to make [the submission] easy to understand. As far as memorials regarding criminal cases are concerned, in each case briefly draw up a finding of fact and assure that [the facts] have been firmly established, fully append the relevant statutes and ordinances, let each of them be tied together with the applicable precedents,⁷⁹ make a record below the statutes and ordinances stating "This is applicable to XYZ," and also fully record whether the offenders are kept under detention or not.⁸⁰ Even if [different parts of a submission concerning the same official matter] are tied together [in a multi-piece manuscript, the manuscript] must be [visually marked/separated(?)]⁸¹ according to text sections in order to enable separate responses⁸² [with a decision by the higher authorities] as well as accumulated⁸³ rejections.⁸⁴

用牘者，一牘毋過五行。五行者，牘廣一寸九分寸八；¹¹⁵四行者，牘廣一寸泰半寸；三行者，牘廣一寸半寸。皆謹調謹（護）好浮書之。尺二寸牘，一行毋過廿六字；尺¹¹⁶牘，一行毋過廿二字。書過一章者，章□之；辭（辭）所當止，皆陸之，以別易（易）智（知）。

If *du* are used, one *du* shall not [contain] more than five columns [of writing per side]. [If they carry] five columns, *du* have a width

78. Cf. *Han shu*, 56.2514–15: 前所上對 ... 辭不別白，指不分明。 "In the reply earlier submitted [to You, Majesty, ...] my words were not distinct and evident, my allusions not definite and clear."

79. Instead of interpreting *bi* 比 as "precedent," the Yuelu Academy editors read *bi bian* 比編 as "to let documents be close to each other by tying them consecutively." See Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 153n39.

80. Cf. the translation of this sentence in Lau and Staack, *Legal Practice*, 47n334.

81. The fragmented character following *zhang* 章 has not yet been identified. It is clear, however, that the unidentified character must stand for a transitive verb. With regard to the beginning of the sentence the meaning of this verb in all likelihood is "to separate" or "to mark," for example, with the help of spaces or brush-written marks, but certainly a layout feature. Both spaces as well as large or small round marks were used to divide sections of criminal case records in the *Zouyan shu* from Zhangjiashan tomb no. 247 as well as in the Yuelu Academy *Wei yu deng zhuang si zhong*. See also n. 91 below.

82. Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 153n42.

83. It is unclear which word the character 彙 stands for. The Yuelu Academy editors interpret it as *ju long* 聚攏 "to gather together, accumulate." See Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 153n43. It is possible that the character is a graphic variant of 彙 used to write the word *lei* 彙/累 "to accumulate." Cf. the character 贏 apparently used to write the same word in *Wei yu deng zhuang si zhong* 95, 102, 106 (cf. Lau and Staack, *Legal Practice*, 180–82, 184): 贏 (彙/累) 論 "pass judgement based on the accumulation [of sentences]." See also the formulation *rui bian zhi* 彙編之 on *Yuelu Liling* 118 below.

84. On the opposition between *bie bao* 別報 and *rui que* 彙卻 see Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 153n44.

of one inch and eight ninths of an inch (c. 4.4 cm);⁸⁵ [if they carry] four columns, *du* have a width of one inch and two thirds of an inch (3.85 cm); [if they carry] three columns, *du* have a width of one and a half inches (c. 3.5 cm).⁸⁶ In all cases diligently take care [to preserve/produce]⁸⁷ a pleasant appearance [of the characters]⁸⁸ while writing [on a *du*].⁸⁹ On *du* [with a length] of one foot and two inches

85. There is a space without writing in the lower third of slip 115, i.e., between 牘廣一寸九分寸八 and the following 四行者, which begins on slip 116. However, judging from the wording, the text at the beginning of slip 116 without doubt directly connects to the last part of text on slip 115. The Yuelu Academy editors have observed traces of scraping (Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian [wu]*, 153n45), so it seems possible that a superfluous or redundant part of text on slip 115 was erased, instead of completely replacing the slip. The reason for this may have been that the mistake was only discovered after a replacement had become too inefficient or impractical, for example, because writing had already been applied to the following slips as well.

86. According to the Liye excavation report, most of the more than 37,000 pieces of wood from well no. 1 measure between 1.4 and 5 cm in width. See Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye fajue baogao*, 179. A future investigation will have to show in how far the Liye pieces accord with the column-to-width ratios stipulated in this Qin ordinance.

87. The word *huan* 讙 “shout; joyous” would not make any sense in the present context. However, the form of the character closely resembles the character with which the word *hu* 護 is written in another Qin ordinance from the Yuelu Academy collection. See *Yuelu Lüling* 1449 (unpublished). The only difference is an additional 又 component at the bottom of the latter. The form 讙 then might be a graphic variant or a scribal mistake. Moreover, *hu* 護 in that other ordinance is likewise preceded by *tiao* 調. The formulation *tiao hu* 調護 occurs in received literature in the meaning “to take care of/protect somebody” (*Shi ji*, 55.2047, 122.3139), which could also fit the two passages in the Yuelu Academy ordinances, if *tiao hu* is understood in the sense “to take care of something” instead of referring to a person. The Yuelu Academy editors interpret *tiao hu* as “to handle appropriately.” See Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 154n46.

88. The translation of *hao fu* 好浮 largely depends on how *fu* is understood. From a more general interpretation of its usual meaning “to float” as “to move on a surface” one might arrive at the tentative translation “movement of the brush on the surface of the writing support,” which could in the present context refer to a pleasant (*hao* 好) appearance of the writing. The Yuelu Academy editors consider the possibility of reading the character as *fu* 桴 with the meaning “to tie together,” which they probably derived from an interpretation of its basic meaning “raft, small boat,” as “tied together pieces of wood.” See Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 154n47. However, considering the fact that there are two other common words for “tying together” that are used in the context of manuscripts (i.e., *bian* 編 and *chan* 纏), as well as the fact that the preceding and following sections of the text discuss layout features, this interpretation seems less than convincing.

89. Following prescriptions for the number of columns in relation to the width of the *du*, the text here apparently contains further details on the way in which writing should be applied. Depending on whether the object pronoun *zhi* 之 in *shu zhi* 書之 refers to *du* 牘 or *hang* 行 one may expect further details on the layout in general or the columns as such. The proposed translation, which understands the described way of

footnote continued on next page

(c. 27.5 cm), one column shall not exceed 26 characters; on *du* [with a length] of one foot (c. 23 cm), one column shall not exceed 22 characters.⁹⁰ If the [text of the] document [consists of] more than one section, it is to be [visually marked/separated(?)]⁹¹ according to the sections; wherever there is a caesura in the wording/text, there is in every case to be put a mark(?)⁹² for this, in order to distinguish [separate parts of the text] and make them easy to recognize.⁹³

writing as “diligently taking care of a pleasant appearance of the characters,” is highly tentative. In general, scribes were probably expected not to write sloppily, for the sake of readability, but at the same time to write adequately swiftly, so as not to waste time or get caught up in calligraphic details. It seems also possible that the passage in question refers to spacing—between the characters of one column and/or between columns—or the alignment/orientation of the columns (exactly vertical, not slanted).

90. From the preceding sentences it is possible to calculate the maximum number of characters that was intended to be written on (one side of) a *du* with the specified width (or three, four, or five columns, respectively) and length. *Du* with a length of one foot would carry between 66 (with 3 columns and a width of c. 3.5 cm) and 110 characters (with 5 columns and a width of c. 4.4 cm); *du* with a length of one foot and two inches would carry between 78 and 130 characters, respectively. This roughly accords with the maximum number of 100 characters per *fang* stipulated in the *Yi li* (see above). Following these prescriptions, the maximum space per character was roughly 1 cm². The maximum height of an individual character varies slightly between 1.05 and 1.07 cm for *du* of 23 and 27.5 cm length. With regard to width (per character), the variance is more substantial with 1.16, 0.96, and 0.87 cm for *du* carrying 3, 4, and 5 columns, respectively.

91. This character is only partly visible. It appears between *zhang* 章 and *zhi* 之 in exactly the same way as the fragmented character on slip 114 (see n. 81 above). Although it is certainly possible from the context that the two characters stood for the same word with a meaning such as “to separate” or “to mark,” the character forms are quite different and the identification of each of the two character forms is problematic. The Yuelu Academy editors tentatively identify it as 次. See Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 154n48.

92. The right part of this character looks remarkably similar to the component 壘 in forms of the character 陸 found in pottery, seal, and bronze inscriptions. See He Linyi 何琳儀, *Zhanguo guwen zidian: Zhanguo wenzi shengxi* 戰國古文字典——戰國文字聲系, 2 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1998), 225–26. Furthermore, there is a Chu 楚-form of 陸 (occurring as part of the place name Anlu 安陸), which resembles the whole character including the 月/肉 component on the left. See Teng Rensheng 滕壬生, *Chuxi jianbo wenzhibian (zengding ben)* 楚系簡帛文字編 (增訂本) (Wuhan: Hubei jiaoyu, 2008), 1191; cf. He Linyi, *Zhanguo guwen zidian*, 225. If the character can indeed be identified as 陸, the respective word *lu* 陸 with the basic meaning “spot/piece of land” possibly refers to applying a spot or blot (German “Klecks”) of ink, i.e., some kind of mark, for example, dots or hooks. Another possibility is that the word refers to the ancient equivalent of a “paragraph break.” The Yuelu Academy editors identify the character as 綴 and consider it to stand for either *zhui* 綴 “mark” or *chuo* 輟 “stop, suspend, interrupt.” See Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 154n49.

93. It may be possible to assign the following *wei gu* 爲故 to the end of this sentence instead of the beginning of the next, as done by the Yuelu Academy editors. See Chen

footnote continued on next page

爲故書卻上對而復與卻書及¹¹⁷事俱上者，繫編之。過廿牒，階其方，江其上而署之曰：「此以右若左若干牒前對、請若前奏。」用疏者，如故。¹¹⁸不從令及牘廣不中過十分寸一，皆貲二甲。¹¹⁹

If, for the purpose of submitting an answer [in response] to the rejection of a former document, [that document] is again submitted together with the letter of rejection and the [new/current] official matter (i.e., the answer), tie [all these documents] together accumulatively; if [the resulting multi-piece manuscript] exceeds 20 *die*, insert⁹⁴ a “section-piece” [for a subheading],⁹⁵ fill the top [of that piece] with

Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 106. This would lead to the subclause *yi bie yi zhi wei gu* 以別易（易）智（知）爲故 “for the reason of distinguishing [separate parts of the text] and making them easy to understand/recognize.” However, the meaning of the sentence would not be significantly different without the final *wei gu*. Furthermore, *yi zhi* 易（易）智（知） occurs at the very end of a sentence in two other passages on slips 112 and 113 as well, which is why *wei gu* is considered to be the beginning of the next sentence.

94. *Jie* 階 may either be understood as *jie* 界 “to draw/set a boundary; demarcate” (Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian [wu]*, 107) or *jie* 介 “to insert.” The choice depends on how the following *fang* 方 is interpreted, and the resulting translation would be either “to demarcate the sections” or “to insert a ‘section-piece.’” See also n. 95 below.

95. From several Han manuscripts containing lists of grave goods, we know that different categories of grave goods are separated in these lists by subheadings. A subheading is usually written on a separate piece following after (i.e., to the left of) the pieces describing grave goods of the category to which the subheading refers. Frequently found formulations for subheadings closely match the formulation *ci yi you ruo zuo ruogan die* 此以右若左若干牒 “to the right or left of this [piece] so and so many *die*” in the present Qin ordinance. See, for example, *you fang si die zhu qi* 右方四牒竹器 “to the right: four *die* with bamboo utensils/containers” or *you fang qi hua mu qi ba die* 右方漆畫木器八牒 “to the right: lacquer-painted wood utensils/containers, eight *die*” on *Mawangdui yi hao mu zhujian qiance* 馬王堆一號墓竹簡遣策 283 and 219, respectively. All references to the lists of grave goods from Mawangdui are according to Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, Hunan sheng bowuguan, and Fudan daxue chutu wenxian yu gu wenzi yanjiu zhongxin, eds., *Changsha Mawangdui Han mu jianbo jicheng* 長沙馬王堆漢墓簡帛集成 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2014), vols. 2 (photographs) and 6 (transcriptions). On first sight, one might tend to understand *fang* in the cited subheadings as “direction.” However, in the light of the present Qin ordinance it appears more likely that *fang* refers to a part of text between two subheadings. This also makes more sense than merely “to the right” because in the cited examples *you fang* does definitely not mean *all* the *die* that may be situated to the right of the piece with a certain subheading (including *die* with grave goods of other categories). However, if *fang* means “section of a text,” what is the difference to *zhang* 章? If the preceding character is read as *jie* 介 “to insert,” *fang* could also refer to the piece carrying the subheading itself. The lists of grave goods found in Mawangdui tombs no. 1 and 3 show that wider pieces with several columns of writing were also used for the subheadings. Apparently, the use of either a narrow or a wide piece depended on the number of characters to be written. For example, the list from

footnote continued on next page

ink⁹⁶ and make a record on it stating: “To the right or left of this [piece] so and so many *die* with the earlier⁹⁷ answer or request or the earlier memorial.” If the list form⁹⁸ is used [the same rules] as before [apply]. If this ordinance is not followed or if the width of the *du* deviates [from the norm] by more than one tenth of an inch (c. 2.3 mm), this is in every case fined with two suits of armor.

請：自今以來，諸縣官上對、請書者，牘厚毋下十分寸一，二行牘厚毋下十五分寸一。厚過程者，毋得各過₁₂₀其厚之半。為程，牘牒各一，不從令者，貲一甲。

tomb no. 3 contains both narrow and wide pieces (see, for example, *Mawangdui san hao mu zhujian qiance* 馬王堆三號墓竹簡遺策 396/154, 397/168). One may speculate that pieces with subheadings originally were comparatively wide, which could explain the use of the term *fang* (cf. the Yuelu Academy editors' interpretation as *ban* 板 “board,” see Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian [wu]*, 154n52). As has been argued above, this term likely referred to pieces of writing support that were used as single-piece manuscripts, which were usually wider than the pieces used for multi-piece manuscripts. It is possible that *du* replaced *fang* at some point, because *fang* came to acquire a new meaning in the context of manuscript production. The meaning of *fang* may have shifted further between Qin and Han times from “piece with a subheading” to “section of text demarcated by a piece with a subheading.” This would at least explain the slightly different use of *fang* in very similar contexts in Qin administrative documents and Han lists of grave goods.

96. Although it is unclear exactly which word 江 is supposed to write in the present context, it is possible to make an educated guess on the basis of extant Qin and Han manuscripts. The most likely possibility is that the respective word refers to the process of filling the top of a piece of writing support with ink, resulting in a black rectangle or square or in a thin black line that might be seen as vaguely resembling a *jiang* 江, or “river.” In any case, this feature probably served as an orientation aid, and there are many examples of it on the previously mentioned pieces with subheadings in Han lists of grave goods. See, for example, *Fenghuangshan ba hao mu qiance* 鳳凰山八號墓遺策 88, 115, 125, 170 (Hubei sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, ed., *Jiangling Fenghuangshan Xi-Han jiandu* 江陵鳳凰山西漢簡牘 [Beijing: Zhonghua, 2012]); *Mawangdui yi hao mu zhujian qiance* 10, 18, 22, etc. For examples of this layout feature in the Liye documents see Momiyama, “‘Taba’ to hyōdai kan no kankei ni tsuite”; Zhang Jin 張今, “Liye Qin jian zhong de jie” 里耶秦簡中的揭, August 21, 2016 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=2609), accessed November 21, 2017. If the character 江 is read as *kong* 空, “leave empty” (Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian [wu]*, 107), the word would simply mean that no characters are to be written at the very top of the respective piece of writing support. This of course likewise implies the possibility that this blank space may have been filled with ink.

97. The difference between *qian* 前 and *gu* 故, “former, original” (cf. preceding slip 117 of this regulation), is as yet unclear. Both seem to refer to earlier submissions that were apparently re-submitted as part of a new submission. Possibly, *gu* was the “first,” *qian* the “previous” in a series of submissions related to the same official matter.

98. See n. 34 above. *Shu* 疏 probably implies the use of *du* rather than *die*, at least in the present context. Cf. the view of the Yuelu Academy editors, who suspect it to be a “type of document.” See Chen Songchang, *Yuelu shuyuan cang Qin jian (wu)*, 154n55.

御史上議：御牘尺二寸，官券牒尺六寸。

制曰：更尺一寸牘。¹²¹

Request: From now on, whenever government offices submit documents with answers or requests to superiors, the thickness of *du* shall not fall below one tenth of an inch (c. 2.3 mm); the thickness of two-column *die* shall not fall below one fifteenth of an inch (c. 1.5 mm).⁹⁹ In case the thickness exceeds the norm, it is not allowed that either of them (i.e., *du* and *die*, respectively) exceed [the norm] by [more than] half of the [prescribed] thickness. A standard piece¹⁰⁰ is to be created, one each for *du* and *die*. Whoever does not follow this ordinance is fined one suit of armor.

The Imperial Secretary submits the following proposal [as an addendum to the requested revision/supplementation of the existing regulations]: Imperial *du* shall have a length of one foot and two inches (c. 27.5 cm); official tally-*die* shall have a length of one foot and six inches (c. 37 cm).

The decision [of the emperor] stated: Change [the standard length of imperial] *du* to one foot and one inch (c. 25 cm).¹⁰¹ ...¹⁰²

99. This means that the minimum thickness of *die* is exactly two-thirds of the minimum thickness of *du*. Note that the *Shuowen jiezi* commentary by Duan Yucai also suggests that *die* are thinner than *du*. See *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 7.318: 厚者爲牘，薄者爲牒。 “Thick [pieces of wood] become *du*, thin ones become *die*.”

100. This maybe refers to concrete standard pieces or models to be created locally, because the abstract norm itself must have been created by the central government. Cf. the local production of standard weights during the Qin period; on this see Kin Sum (Sammy) Li, “To Rule by Manufacture: Measurement Regulation and Metal Weight Production in the Qin Empire,” *T’oung Pao* 103.1–3 (2017), 24.

101. With regard to the fact that “imperial *du*”—probably *du* that were sent by and/or to the Qin emperor—were supposed to have a length of one foot and one inch, it seems very likely that “normal” *du* had a shorter standard length of only one foot (c. 23 cm), cf. the examples of *du* from Liye well no. 1 in Table 1. In fact, this would correspond to the standard lengths for pieces of writing support used for normal official documents vs. imperial documents (more precisely imperial decrees) in the Han period. See Tomiya Itaru 富谷至, ed., *Kan kan goi kōshō* 漢簡語彙考証 (Tōkyō: Iwanami, 2015), 17.

102. The Yuelu Academy editors placed *Yuelu Lüling* 122 at the very end of this ordinance, which would add a final *die* 牒 to the last sentence. The whole sentence would read *geng chi yi cun du die* 更尺一寸牘牒 “Change [the standard length of imperial] *du* and *die* to one foot and one inch.” This has not been accepted here for the following reason: The title on *Yuelu Lüling* 122 reads *zuling bing si* 卒令丙四 “Distributed ordinances, C4.” In fact the exact same title also occurs on *Yuelu Lüling* 1160, where, however, it follows an ordinance with an entirely different content. See the transcription published in Zhou Haifeng 周海鋒, “Qin lüling zhi liubu ji suizang lüling xingzhi wenti” 秦律令之流布及隨葬律令性質問題, *Huadong zhengfa daxue xuebao* 華東政法大學學報

footnote continued on next page

These Qin regulations are important for several reasons. First, they provide many valuable details on the norms to which the Qin government tried to hold the production of administrative documents. Second, from an analysis of these prescriptions—and the requested supplements—one can also gather some hints on the circumstances and/or motives behind their promulgation. For example, the proposal of minimum thicknesses for different pieces of writing support might be due to frequent breakage experienced while using comparatively thin pieces. Originally, economic considerations may have motivated attempts to save raw materials to the disadvantage of the stability of writing support. Third, and most important for the present study, the above regulations shed further light on the terminology the Qin used to describe certain codicological or textual features related to manuscripts, including binding techniques, layout, and punctuation. Although the precise meaning of certain terms is still unclear, their diversity testifies to a sophisticated codicological vocabulary. Moreover, the two terms *die* and *du* not only frequently occur but are also clearly distinguished with respect to certain aspects of both form and function. These distinctive features can be summarized as follows:

1. *Die* carry no more than two columns of writing, while *du* carry three, four, or five columns of writing.
2. Only *die* are mentioned in connection with the “binding” of multi-piece manuscripts (*bian* 編).
3. *Die* have a minimum thickness of about 1.5 mm, while *du* have a minimum thickness of about 2.3 mm.

So how can this new evidence from a Qin ordinance be brought together with what has earlier been gathered on the four terms *fang*, *ban*, *du*, and *die*? To begin with, neither *fang* nor *ban* seem to play any role as general terms for pieces of writing support. Although the word *fang* occurs in the regulations once, in this context it must either refer to a piece with a

2016.4, 51–52. Furthermore, there is a duplicate of that ordinance, which is included in volume 5 of the Yuelu Academy manuscripts (see *Yuelu Lüling* 111). Interestingly, only the beginning of that duplicate is found on a fragmented slip, while the rest is missing. I suspect that *Yuelu Lüling* 122 carries the end of the duplicate that begins on *Yuelu Lüling* 111. As to the *die* 牒, it does admittedly not occur on *Yuelu Lüling* 1160, which likewise carries the title *zuling bing si* 卒令丙四. However, there are a few examples, where the main text of an ordinance is followed by a note on the number of *die* on which it was written. See, for example, *Yuelu Lüling* 145 as well as its duplicate *Yuelu Lüling* 0476 (unpublished). With this in mind, the text before *Yuelu Lüling* 122 might be tentatively emended as *ling yi* 令一, leading to the note *ling yi die* 令一牒 “ordinance on one die” at the end of the ordinance presumably consisting of *Yuelu Lüling* 111 and 122.

subheading that is part of a multi-piece manuscript, or to a part of text between two subheadings.¹⁰³ It seems very unlikely that it refers to a piece of writing support that is used individually, as in the Shuihudi statutes and the *Yi li*.

As far as *die* and *du* are concerned, all three above-mentioned features suggest that *die* was mainly used to refer to comparatively narrow pieces that were tied together in multi-piece manuscripts. Direct evidence for this is the use of *die* together with *bian* 編, “to tie together/a manuscript produced by tying multiple pieces together.” The comparatively narrow format—suggested by the application of two or less columns of writing¹⁰⁴—and the lower minimum thickness also hint towards the use of *die* as part of multi-piece manuscripts. Thinner pieces with less volume and weight were probably beneficial for the handling and storage of these manuscripts. At the same time, a manuscript consisting of several layers of thin pieces rolled up together would likely be at least as robust as a slightly thicker individual piece used as a single-piece manuscript. The latter are obviously referred to as *du* in the Qin regulations under discussion. In sum, this means that *die* and *du* are distinguishable with respect to both form and function and appear to be connected to two conceptually different types of manuscripts: the multi- and the single-piece manuscript, respectively.

However, the expression *guan quan die* 官券牒 (“official tally-*die*”) on slip 121 of the Qin ordinance confirms an observation, already made on the basis of other Qin manuscripts above, which somewhat contradicts this clear-cut distinction between *die* and *du*. As has been shown, there is evidence in both the Shuihudi as well as the Liye manuscripts that *die* was sometimes used to refer to pieces of writing support that were used as single-piece manuscripts. The function of *quan*, bi- or tripartite tallies with corresponding notches that were used as certificates of transactions, suggests that every part of a *quan* constituted a single-piece manuscript in its own right. To tie such a document into a multi-piece manuscript would have made it difficult to verify the validity of a transaction by putting together parts kept by different parties. Still, the Qin regulations under discussion suggest that the pieces used as *quan* were

103. See n. 95 above.

104. Most single-piece manuscripts found at Liye well no. 1 have at least three columns of writing. See Sumiya, “Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite,” 115. In fact, Sumiya noted cases in which the writing seems to have been deliberately stretched into three columns although it would easily have fit into two columns (e.g., *Liye* 8-1559). This also points towards the possibility that single-piece manuscripts were supposed to have at least three columns of writing—which would match the description of *du* in the Qin ordinance.

referred to as *die* rather than *du*.¹⁰⁵ The reason for this might be that, as far as their format or more precisely their length to width ratio is concerned, *quan* are more similar to the narrow *die* that were used in multi-piece manuscripts than to the wider (and relatively short) *du* used for single-piece manuscripts.¹⁰⁶ According to the preface of volume 1 of the Liye manuscripts, the *quan* excavated at Liye have a length of 37 cm, or “one foot and six inches” (*yi chi liu cun* 一尺六寸).¹⁰⁷ A cursory glance at a compilation of all pieces bearing notches¹⁰⁸ in conjunction with the respective photographs¹⁰⁹ shows that there are at least 29 examples of complete—or already completely reconstructed—*quan*, the length of which can therefore be determined (see Appendix B). As can be seen, all *quan* are made of comparatively long and narrow pieces of wood. Their length varies between 34.6 and 38.2 cm, while they are

105. Further evidence for this is the occurrence of expressions such as *jiao quan yi die* 校券一牒, “checking tally, one *die*,” on *Liye* 8-135 and 8-677.

106. An analysis of the length to width ratio of pieces referred to as *du* or *die* is indeed revealing. With regard to the pieces collected in Table 1, the ratio for pieces named *du* (all values rounded to whole numbers) is between 6 (*Liye* 8-1517) and 13 (*Liye* 8-1566). If we calculate the ratio for the standard measurements stipulated in the Qin ordinance discussed above, the numbers are even lower, between 5 (length of c. 23 cm/width of c. 4.4 cm) and 8 (length of c. 27.5 cm/width of c. 3.5 cm). The situation is much different for pieces named *die*. The measurements in Table 1 give ratios around 15 for the two complete/completely reconstructed pieces (*Liye* 8-1069+8-1434+8-1520, 9-2352). If the tallies (*quan*)—also referred to as *die* and collected in Appendix B—are considered, the numbers are even higher. The lowest ratio is 17 (*Liye* 8-900+8-1583), the highest even 34 (*Liye* 8-2246), with the length to width ratio of most pieces ranging between 20 and 26. Although no width is stipulated for *die* in the cited Qin ordinance, it is possible to infer the intended width of pieces with only one or two columns of writing from the measurements prescribed for pieces with three, four, or five columns. The latter would correspond to widths of 1.16, 0.96 and 0.87 cm per column. This would mean that pieces for one column of writing were probably supposed to have a width between 0.87 and 1.16 cm (roughly 1 cm), while pieces for two columns were probably supposed to have a width between 1.74 and 2.32 cm (roughly 2 cm). This would suggest length to width ratios between 12 (length of c. 23 cm/width of c. 2 cm) and 28 (length of c. 27.5 cm/width of c. 1 cm). To sum up, the length to width ratio of pieces designated as *du* appears to range between 5 and 8 (stipulated) or 6 and 13 (actual examples); the ratio of pieces designated as *die* ranges between 12 and 28 (stipulated, hypothetical) or 15 and 34 (actual examples). Depending on whether one takes a normative or descriptive approach, the threshold between *du* and *die*—based on length to width ratio—was roughly at 10 or 14, respectively.

107. Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye Qin jian* (*yi*), preface, 2.

108. See Table 1 in Zhang Chunlong 張春龍, Ōkawa Toshitaka 大川俊隆, and Momiyama Akira 糀山明, “*Liye Qin jian kechi jian yanjiu: jian lun Yuelu Qin jian Shu zhong de wei jiedu jian*” 里耶秦簡刻齒簡研究——兼論嶽麓秦簡《數》中的未解讀簡, *Wenwu* 文物 2015.3, 53–69+96.

109. For these see Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye Qin jian* (*yi*) (layer 8) as well as *Liye Qin jian bowuguan* et al., *Liye Qin jian bowuguan cang Qin jian* (layers 9 and 10).

only between 1.1 and 2.2 cm wide. Furthermore, none of them bears more than two columns of writing or has writing on both sides. All these features closely resemble pieces commonly used for multi-piece manuscripts. And exactly this may be the reason why these pieces, even if used for a special type of single-piece manuscript, were still referred to as *die*. In fact, the four pieces with the self-reference *die* discussed above (see Table 1) are comparatively long and narrow too, measuring more than 15.1×1.7 cm (*Liye* 8-651), more than 32.3×1.9 cm (*Liye* 8-686+8-973), 46×3 cm (*Liye* 8-1069+8-1434+8-1520) and 47.1×3.1 cm (*Liye* 9-2352), respectively. In these cases, not even the fact that they carry writing on both sides in up to four columns seems to have dissuaded the person who drew up the document from referring to the pieces as *die*. The form criterion (long and comparatively narrow) apparently outweighed the function criterion (single-piece manuscript) in case the two conflicted with regard to the choice of designation.¹¹⁰

The Emergence of the Distinction Between *die* and *du* in the Qin Period

It is possible that the Qin at some point newly introduced the term *du*, because it does not seem to occur in either excavated or received sources from before the imperial Qin period. The earliest occurrences can be found in two passages of the *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策 and the *Zhuangzi* 莊子.¹¹¹

110. In the above ordinance the length of “imperial *du*” was set to about 25 cm. As pointed out to me by Tang Junfeng, if this length was in fact reserved for certain *du* supposed to exhibit the emperor’s authority and status, it would seem unlikely that longer pieces—even if they would theoretically have to be classified as *du*—were actually referred to as *du*. See also n. 101 above. It is actually possible that all pieces that exceeded the standard (or “imperial”) length of *du*, probably 23 up to 25 cm, were referred to as *die*.

111. In the *Zhuangzi*, *du* occurs in one of the so-called miscellaneous or mixed chapters, which includes some material said to be authored by Zhuang Zhou 莊周 (4th c. B.C.E.). See *Zhuangzi jijie* 莊子集解, ed. Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1987), 8.281; Burton Watson, *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), 356. However, it is difficult to precisely date the passage in question as the extant recension is that of Guo Xiang 郭象 (d. 312 C.E.). See Harold D. Roth, “Chuang tzu,” in *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*, ed. Michael Loewe (Berkeley: Society for the Study of Early China, Institute of East Asian Studies, 1993), 56–57. As to the *Zhanguo ce*, the alleged compiler Liu Xiang (first century B.C.E.) stated that it is based on sources that existed already during the Warring States period. See Tsien Tsuen-Hsueh, “*Chan kuo ts’ue*,” in *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*, ed. Michael Loewe (Berkeley: Society for the Study of Early China, Institute of East Asian Studies, 1993), 5. If this is true for the passage in question (*Zhanguo ce* 13.473)—and provided it remained unaltered by Liu—then it would prove that *du* was already used to refer to writing support in pre-imperial China. At least the events narrated in the

footnote continued on next page

If *du* really refers to the same thing as *fang*, as hypothesized above, then *du* may have replaced the latter term in specific contexts. *Fang* certainly continued to be used as a codicological term but apparently referred specifically to pieces of multi-piece manuscripts carrying a subheading or to a part of text delimited by such a subheading, as shown by the Yuelu Academy regulations. The earliest Liye document on which *du* occurs can be dated to July 26, 217 B.C.E. (*Liye* 8-1566).¹¹² This is—at least according to my own research—the earliest precisely datable occurrence of *du* in either received or excavated sources. Could the term *du* have been introduced as one of various terminological changes in the course of the Qin unification in 221 B.C.E.? The most prominent piece of evidence for such lexical changes from among the Liye manuscripts is 8-461, a wooden board measuring roughly 28×13 cm, which originally must have described more than 50 changes of certain terms (or character forms).¹¹³ The board is fragmented, and the writing is not entirely decipherable, but at least in the legible part no mention is made of *du*. However, there likely were additional lexical changes.

Xing Yitian has observed a peculiarity regarding the use of the terms *ban* 半 and *fa* 發 in the Liye documents, which according to context must both mean “to open”¹¹⁴—to break the seal of a document. He noted that *ban* only occurs in documents dated to between the twenty-sixth and the thirty-first year of the First Emperor of Qin (i.e., 221 to 216 B.C.E.), whereas *fa* only occurs in those of the thirty-first year or later. Accordingly, he hypothesized that there might have been another major lexical reform around the year 216 B.C.E.¹¹⁵ Checking Xing’s data, I could not find any documents from the thirty-first year in which *ban* occurs in the sense “to open.” Instead, the latest example seems to be *Liye* 8-1566 (thirtieth year, July 26, 217 B.C.E.), which happens to be the same tablet that bears the

passage took place in the early second half of the third century B.C.E., as they focus on the death of Queen (Mother) Junwang of Qi 齊君王后 in 249 B.C.E. (*Shi ji*, 46.1902).

112. Xu Xiqi, *Xi-Zhou (Gonghe) zhi Xi-Han lipu*, 1250.

113. 8-461 is the number according to the edition in Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye Qin jian (yi)*. In earlier articles the board was usually referred to by its excavation number (8-455). The piece has received considerable scholarly attention. For two of the earliest works see Zhang Chunlong 張春龍 and Zhang Jingsha 張京沙, “Xiangxi Liye Qin jian 8-455 hao” 湘西里耶秦簡8-455號, *Jianbo* 簡帛 4 (2009), 11–15; Hu Pingsheng 胡平生, “Liye Qin jian 8-455 hao mufang xingzhi chuyi” 里耶秦簡8-455號木方性質芻議, *Jianbo* 簡帛 4 (2009), 17–25.

114. Chen Jian 陳劍, “Du Qin Han jian zhaji san pian” 讀秦漢簡札記三篇, *Chutu wenxian yu gu wenzi yanjiu* 出土文獻與古文字研究 4 (2011), 370–75.

115. Xing Yitian 邢義田, “‘Shou,’ ‘ban,’ ‘yue Wu yue Jing’ yu ‘Qianling gong’: Liye Qin jian chudu zhi yi” “手”、“半”、“曰梧曰荆”與“遷陵公”——里耶秦簡初讀之一, May 7, 2012 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=1685), accessed November 21, 2017.

earliest occurrence of *du*. The earliest example of *fa* can actually be found on *Liye* 9-981, which likewise dates to the thirtieth year, more precisely October 20, 217 B.C.E.¹¹⁶ Therefore, it seems probable that the standard term to refer to the opening of a document was changed from *ban* to *fa* sometime between July and October 217 B.C.E.¹¹⁷ The motive behind this change may have been the graphical similarity between the character forms used to write *ban* 半 “opened by” and *shou* 手 “handled by,” another expression frequently occurring in the *Liye* documents.¹¹⁸

Du may have been introduced at roughly the same time, because no mention of the term is made in *Liye* documents dated to before 217 B.C.E. Unfortunately, the Qin ordinance on documents discussed above bears no date. However, the prescriptions regarding the “official tally-*die*” (*guan quan die*) contained in them may be used to narrow down the possible date of its enactment. The ordinance text notes that the Imperial Secretary proposed to fix the length of official tally-*die* at “one foot and six inches” (*yi chi liu cun*, or about 37 cm) in addition to changes “requested” (*qing* 請) by an unnamed person—probably a Chancellor (*chengxiang* 丞相). A glance at the table in Appendix B shows that nearly all examples of *quan* excavated from *Liye* match this 37 cm standard. However, a closer look reveals that this is only the case for tallies from the first day of the thirty-first year of the First Emperor (November 4, 217 B.C.E.) onward.¹¹⁹ Of these, nearly 80 percent (22 out of 28) have a length between 36.5 and 37.5 cm, while only 6 are slightly longer (37.6 to 38.2 cm). The maximum deviation from the standard of 37 cm is 1.2 cm. There is only one complete tally from before the thirty-first year, which is *Liye* 8-1551 from the twenty-seventh year (exactly February 5,

116. Xu Xiqi, *Xi-Zhou (Gonghe) zhi Xi-Han lipu*, 1250.

117. Chen Wei 陳偉 et al., *Qin jiandu zhengli yu yanjiu* 秦簡牘整理與研究 (Beijing: Jingji kexue, 2017), 10–11. Chen Wei has pointed out additional roughly contemporary lexical changes, for example, the change from the standard reference to the first month (in administrative documents) from *duan yue* 端月 to *zheng yue* 正月 between 220 and 218 B.C.E. and the change of the terms *chen qie* 臣妾 or *nu qie* 奴妾 for private slaves to *nu bi* 奴婢 between 219 and 215 B.C.E. See his “Qin bihui ‘zheng’ zi wenti zai kaocha” 秦避諱 “正”字問題再考察, August 27, 2014 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=2062), accessed November 21, 2017; “Qin bihui ‘zheng’ zi wenti zai kaocha buzheng” 秦避諱 “正”字問題再考察補證, September 1, 2014 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=2067), accessed November 21, 2017; as well as “Cong ‘chenqie,’ ‘nuqie’ dao ‘nubi’” 從“臣妾”、“奴妾”到“奴婢”, January 27, 2017 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=2715), accessed November 21, 2017.

118. The graphical similarity of the two forms in fact led to misidentification of *ban* 半 as *shou* 手 by the *Liye* editors in certain cases. See Chen Jian, “Du Qin Han jian zhaji san pian,” 370–75.

119. The earliest such tally, dating exactly to the first day of the thirty-first year, is *Liye* 8-1545.

220 B.C.E.). In fact, that piece is significantly shorter than all the other tallies. Measuring only 34.6 cm, it corresponds to “one foot and five inches” (*yi chi wu cun* 一尺五寸, or 34.65 cm) rather than the “one foot and six inches” stipulated in the Yuelu Academy ordinance.¹²⁰ Unfortunately, the only other two tallies predating the thirty-first year, *viz.* *Liye* 8-1690 (twenty-ninth year) and *Liye* 8-1647 (thirtieth year), are only fragments, of which the other parts have not been identified yet. Accordingly, their original length is unclear. However, for the time being one might tentatively date the enactment of the supplemented version of the above Yuelu Academy ordinance to the period between February 220 B.C.E. and November 217 B.C.E. As the original regulations that were to be supplemented already contain the term *du*, that term must have been introduced at some point before. Whether that was shortly before the enactment of the supplemented version—at the latest in November 217 B.C.E.—or even before 220 B.C.E. cannot be determined at this point. However, both suggestions seem generally possible, as the former would roughly coincide with the lexical change from *ban* to *fa*, while the latter would link the introduction of *du* to other lexical changes directly following the Qin unification in 221 B.C.E.

It seems that the Qin distinguished between *du* and *die* at the latest by 217 B.C.E. Pieces of writing support referred to as *du* were usually used for single-piece manuscripts and often carried writing on both sides in three or more columns. Pieces referred to as *die* were normally used for multi-piece manuscripts and often carried writing on only one side in no more than two columns. As has been shown, pieces used for single-piece manuscripts were occasionally referred to as *die* on the basis of their form. However, form was not necessarily the primary criterion for the choice of designation. The different ways in which the two types of manuscripts were kept for storage and transport suggest that function (single- vs. multi-piece manuscript) figured prominently as well. Possible etymological relations of the terms *die* and *du* with other words provide further clues on this. For example, Schuessler suggested a relation

120. Hand measurements of the photographic reproduction of *Liye* 8-1551 (in Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye Qin jian [yi]*) rather suggest a length of c. 35.2 cm. However, even this would be closer to “one foot and five inches” than to “one foot and six inches.” On an interesting side note, a manuscript excavated from Zhangjiashan tomb no. 247 describes a mathematical problem that might speak in favor of this hypothetic change of standard length. It asks how many slips (*jian* 簡) with a length of one foot and six inches could be produced from a bamboo culm segment that would yield exactly 366 slips with a length of one foot and five inches. See *Suanshu shu* 71. Admittedly, *quan* seem to have been produced from wood rather than bamboo, but the occurrence of exactly these two measures of length in a mathematical problem related to the production of writing support is still noteworthy.

between *die* 牒 and *die* 褶, “double, lined garment,” as well as *die* 疊, “double, accumulate.”¹²¹ This would fit the previous observation that *die* 牒 are normally “accumulated” (i.e., tied together) in multi-piece manuscripts. With this in mind one can hypothesize that *du* 牘 *l'ok¹²² may be a cognate of *du* 獨 *[d]’ok “alone; self-contained, independent.”¹²³ If this is actually the case, then the basic meanings of *die* and *du* as codicological terms could be “pieces tied together in multi-piece manuscripts” (or other pieces closely resembling them) and “pieces used as single-piece manuscripts,” respectively. For pragmatic reasons the translations “slip” or “strip” for *die* and “tablet” for *du* may be more suitable, but care should be taken not to confuse this terminological use with non-terminological uses in which the English terms are not necessarily the exact equivalents of *die* and *du*.

It is remarkable that—at least based on the cited Qin regulations—there does not seem to have been a preference for either multi- or single-piece manuscripts in the production of official documents.¹²⁴ Although multi-piece manuscripts were of course widely used during

121. He in fact considers the three as representing the same word, which he reconstructs as *l'ep. See Schuessler, *ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese*, 213.

122. If not otherwise noted, Old Chinese reconstructions follow William H. Baxter and Laurent Sagart, “BaxterSagart Old Chinese reconstruction, version 1.1 (20 September 2014),” (<http://ocbaxtersagart.lsa.it.lsa.umich.edu/BaxterSagartOCbyMandarinMC2014-09-20.pdf>), accessed November 21, 2017.

123. As of now, the evidence for the claim that *du* 牘 and *du* 獨 are definitely etymologically related is not sufficient. Therefore, this is no more than a hypothesis based on phonological similarity between two words. And even the seemingly most up-to-date Old Chinese reconstruction by Baxter and Sagart, on which I base this, is not uncontested. See, for example, the critique in Christoph Harbsmeier, “Irrefutable Conjectures: A Review of William H. Baxter and Laurent Sagart, *Old Chinese. A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014),” *Monumenta Serica* 64.2 (2016), 445–504. Still, at least according to the reconstruction, the phonological similarity between the two words is rather striking. Among the nearly 5,000 words for which Baxter and Sagart offer Old Chinese reconstructions, there are overall 27 words ending in OC *’ok. As far as the initials are concerned, there is of course quite a variety. The two words under discussion also seem to have different initials, “*l’” in the case of *du* 牘 vs. “*[d]’” in the case of *du* 獨, although the square brackets show that the latter reconstruction is less secure. However, apart from *du* 牘 and some other words written with a character indeed sharing the same phonophoric (such as *du* 讀 “to read,” *du* 積 “coffer; box,” and *du* 犢 “calf”), *du* 獨 is the only one among said 5,000 words that evolved to Middle Chinese *duwk*. Phonological similarity between *du* 獨 and words written with the phonophoric 賣 may also be gleaned from the fact that there is at least one example where the character 獨 was used to write *du* 犢 “calf.” See Feng Qiyong and Deng Ansheng, *Tongjia zi huishi*, 382.

124. At least this is true with regard to all submissions to superior authorities that fall into the categories “request” (*qing*), “answer” (*dui*) or “memorial” (*zou*)—without doubt at least a significant part of all official correspondence.

the Qin period, as the many bamboo manuscripts from tombs show, single-piece manuscripts seem to have been very common in administrative practice—at least if the Liye manuscripts published so far can be considered representative.

Further Developments in the Han Period and Possible Reasons

In received literature from the Han period, both *die* and *du* are frequently mentioned. Occasionally, the two occur together, which might suggest that the terms continued to be used to refer to single- vs. multi-piece manuscripts as two basic types.¹²⁵ However, whereas the term *du* appears in Han received literature, it is all but absent from actual administrative documents of the time.¹²⁶ This presents a stark contrast to the term *die*, which occurs more than 250 times in the documents from Juyan 居延 and Jianshui Jinguan 肩水金關 alone. In more than 70 percent of these cases *die* appears as part of the phrase *ru die* 如牒, literally “as [written] on the *die*.” It has been shown that *die* in these cases means the pieces of writing support that are—or rather *were*, originally—attached to the ones on which the text including *ru die* is written: cover letters. Furthermore, *die* could refer to pieces carrying either one or two columns of writing. These were named *zha* 札 and *liang hang* 兩行, respectively, before they became part of a multi-piece manuscript.¹²⁷

125. However, the expression *die du* 牒牘 may also serve as a generic term for manuscripts made of wood (or possibly bamboo). See, for example, *Lun heng jiaoshi*, 13.613: 豈徒用其才力·游文於牒牘哉? “How could [governors, ministers, and high functionaries] merely use their intellectual faculties for scribbling on *die* and *du*?” The translation was adapted from Alfred Forke, *Lun-Hêng*, vol. 2 (New York: Paragon Book Gallery, 1962 [1911]), 301.

126. The word occurs only once on *Jianshui Jinguan* 肩水金關 73EJT21:213 with only rudimentary context. For the manuscripts excavated at Jianshui Jinguan see Gansu sheng jiandu baohu yanjiu zhongxin, Gansu sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, Gansu sheng bowuguan, Zhongguo wenhua yichan yanjiuyuan gu wenxian yanjiushi, and Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jianbo yanjiu zhongxin, eds., *Jianshui Jinguan Han jian (yi-wu)* 肩水金關漢簡(壹一伍), 5 vols. (Shanghai: Zhongxi, 2011–16). Nor can it be found in the “old” or “new” Juyan manuscripts, nor the manuscripts from Dunhuang 敦煌 or Changsha Wuyi guangchang 長沙五一廣場 published so far.

127. Tomiya, *Kan kan goi kōshō*, 361–67 (including a discussion of the two multi-piece manuscripts *Juyan xinjian* E.P.F22:56–60 and E.P.F22:80–82); cf. Kyōto daigaku jinbun kagaku kenkyūjo kantoku kenkyūhan 京都大学人文科学研究所簡牘研究班, ed., *Kan kan goi: Chūgoku kodai mokkan jiten* 漢簡語彙—中国古代木簡辭典 (Tōkyō: Iwanami, 2015), 260. In Han documents, the piece with the cover letter normally followed the attached pieces, at least in case these contained a kind of register (*buji* 簿籍). See Hou Xudong 侯旭東, “Xibei suo chu Handai buji ceshu jian de pailie yu fuyuan: cong Dong-Han Yongyuan bingwu bu shuoqi” 西北所出漢代簿籍冊書簡的排列與復原——從東漢永元兵物簿說起, *Shixue jikan* 史學集刊 2014.1, 58–73.

Therefore, a suitable English translation for the expression *ru die* would be “as [written] on the [attached] *die*” or simply “as in the attachment.”¹²⁸ Similar cases where attached pieces are referred to as *die* in a cover letter can also be found in the Qin documents from Liye (see Appendix A).

The difference in usage of the term *die* in the Qin vs. the Han period seems to be that, as has been demonstrated, form still had an influence on the choice of designation as *du* or *die* in the Qin period, whereas the distinction seems to have evolved into a clear-cut functional one in the following Han period.¹²⁹ This means that *die* occasionally referred to pieces used as single-piece manuscripts in the former, whereas it is exclusively used to refer to the individual pieces of multi-piece manuscripts in the latter. Sumiya pointed out that, although the second usage of the term *die* is indeed suggested by the Juyan manuscripts, a passage in the Han “Statutes and Ordinances of the Second Year” (*Ernian lüling* 二年律令) from Zhangjiashan 張家山 tomb no. 247 shows strong parallels to the Qin usage of *die*. The passage, from the “Statutes on Agriculture” (*Tianlü* 田律), reads:

官各以二尺牒疏書一歲馬、牛它物用稟數，餘見芻稟數，上內史，恒會八月望。¹³⁰

Each office is to write down in separate entries on *die* of two feet (i.e., around 46 cm) [in length] the amount of straw used in one year by its horses, cattle, and other animals, [as well as] the remaining amount of hay and straw, and submit it to the Scribe of the Capital Area. The deadline [for submissions] is always the full moon of the eighth month.

A “*die* of two feet in length” with a report “in separate entries” would in fact precisely describe the Liye piece 8-1069+8-1434+8-1520 discussed above, which actually constitutes a single-piece manuscript.¹³¹ Because in Han administrative documents *die* usually refers to narrow pieces with only one or two columns that are tied together as multi-piece manuscripts, Sumiya suggests that this Han stipulation might be based on

128. Enno Giele originally suggested this interpretation of *die* in Han documents to me and also proposed the English translation “attachment.”

129. I am grateful to Tang Junfeng for the proposal that the creation of the terms *zha* and *liang hang* itself might point to certain changes in the way the term *die* was understood in the Han period.

130. *Ernian lüling* 256. For this manuscript see Zhangjiashan ersiqi hao Han mu zhujian zhengli xiaozu, *Zhangjiashan Han mu zhujian [ersiqi hao mu]*. Translation adapted from Barbieri-Low and Yates, *Law, State, and Society in Early Imperial China*, 703.

131. The expression *shu shu* also occurs in connection with other single-piece manuscripts; see n. 34 above.

earlier Qin regulations.¹³² This definitely seems possible in light of the substantial textual similarity between certain Qin and Han statutes.¹³³ Another possibility is that the obvious changes with regard to the use of the term *die* did not occur at the beginning of the Han period, but instead postdate the time of the *Ernian liling*—generally dated to 186 B.C.E.¹³⁴

Although single-piece manuscripts continued to be used in administrative practice throughout the Han (206 B.C.E.–220 C.E.) and into the Three Kingdoms period (220–80 C.E.), multi-piece manuscripts seem to have figured far more prominently. Finds of administrative documents from these periods that were all excavated in the same area in present-day downtown Changsha (Hunan province) provide a suitable set of data for comparison. Sorted according to period they can be summarized as follows: (1) Zoumalou 走馬樓 well no. 8: The manuscripts were roughly dated to the early reign of Emperor Wu of Han 漢武帝 (r. 141–87 B.C.E.). While the excavation report of 2005 mentions only pieces with one or two columns of writing, Song Shaohua 宋少華 describes four basic types. Three of these have one or two columns of writing, and one has three columns. Still this suggests that the former three types of pieces, which were likely once part of multi-piece manuscripts, represent the majority, as the latter type was not even mentioned in the original excavation report.¹³⁵ (2) Wuyi guangchang pit no. 1: The manuscripts date to around 100 C.E. and mostly consist of pieces with two columns, probably once part of multi-piece manuscripts. A few examples of single-piece manuscripts were also found, e.g., CWJ1③:291, CWJ1③:169. The exact ratio of single- vs. multi-piece manuscripts is as yet unclear, as only a selection of the manuscripts has been published to date.¹³⁶ (3) Dongpailou 東牌樓 well no.

132. Sumiya, “Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite,” 121–22.

133. See in detail Barbieri-Low and Yates, *Law, State, and Society in Early Imperial China*, 70–72, 698–99 (on *Ernian liling* 246–48 and a textual parallel on a wood tablet dated to 309 B.C.E.).

134. On the dating of the *Ernian liling* see Barbieri-Low and Yates, *Law, State, and Society in Early Imperial China*, 62–64.

135. See Changsha jiandu bowuguan, Changsha shi wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo lianhe fajuezu, “2003 nian Changsha Zoumalou Xi-Han jiandu zhongda kaogu faxian” 2003年長沙走馬樓西漢簡牘重大考古發現, *Chutu wenxian yanjiu* 出土文獻研究 7 (2005), 57–64; cf. Song Shaohua, “Changsha chutu de jiandu ji xiangguan kaocha” 長沙出土的簡牘及相關考察, *Jianbo yanjiu* 簡帛研究 2006 (2008), 249–62.

136. See Changsha shi wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, “Hunan Changsha Wuyi guangchang Dong-Han jiandu fajue jianbao”; Changsha shi wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, Qinghua daxue chutu wenxian yanjiu yu baohu zhongxin, Zhongguo wenhua yichan yanjiuyuan, and Hunan daxue Yuelu shuyuan, eds., *Changsha Wuyi guangchang Dong-Han jiandu xuanshi* 長沙五一廣場東漢簡牘選釋 (Shanghai: Zhongxi, 2015).

7: The manuscripts date to the reign of Emperor Ling of Han 漢靈帝 (r. 168–89 C.E.). Among the overall 205 inscribed pieces there are various single-piece manuscripts. However, these seem to be mostly private letters or official letters with an informal nature.¹³⁷ (4) Zoumalou well no. 22: The manuscripts date to 220–37 C.E. and most pieces were originally part of multi-piece manuscripts. A few examples of single-piece manuscripts can be found, e.g., J22-2695.¹³⁸

Based on an analysis of documents excavated from the northwestern border regions of the Han Empire, Sumiya has pointed out that the use of single-piece manuscripts, which she refers to as *tandoku shiyō* 単独使用, was largely restricted to private letters or official letters with an informal nature, or the so-called “notes” (*ji* 記).¹³⁹ Taking the “register/account” (*bu* 簿) as an example, she furthermore demonstrated that this type of document was often drawn up as single-piece manuscript during the Qin period, whereas in the following Han period it usually constituted a multi-piece manuscript.¹⁴⁰ Takamura Takeyuki 高村武幸 delivered additional evidence for this tendency and argued that the reign of Emperor Wu of Han may be seen as a transitional period during which the use of single-piece manuscripts became largely restricted to a few special circumstances. For most types of documents, single-piece manuscripts seem to have been replaced by multi-piece manuscripts. This is why the former do not figure prominently among the Juyan and Dunhuang manuscripts, most of which

137. See Changsha shi wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, and Zhongguo wenwu yanjiusuo, eds., *Changsha Dongpailou Dong-Han jiandu* 長沙東牌樓東漢簡牘 (Beijing: Wenwu, 2006).

138. See Changsha shi wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, Zhongguo wenwu yanjiusuo, Beijing daxue lishixue xi, and Zoumalou jiandu zhengli zu, eds., *Changsha Zoumalou Sanguo Wu jian: Jiahe limin tianjia bie* 長沙走馬樓三國吳簡——嘉禾吏民田家簡, vol. 1 (Beijing: Wenwu, 1999), 30–35 as well as Figure 41 (for J22-2695).

139. Sumiya Tsuneko 角谷常子, “Kantoku no keijō ni okeru imi” 簡牘の形状における意味, in *Henkyō shutsudo mokkan no kenkyū* 邊境出土木簡の研究, ed. Tomiya Itaru 富谷至 (Kyōto: Hōyū, 2003), 89–118; cf. Takamura, “Shin Kan jidai no toku ni tsuite,” 59, 63–66. On private letters from early imperial China see Enno Giele, “Private Letter Manuscripts from Early Imperial China,” in *A History of Chinese Letters and Epistolary Culture*, ed. Antje Richter (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 403–74. The so-called “greeting tablets” (*ci* 刺 or *ye* 謁) that have been found in ancient wells and tombs in central China would have to be added to the common types of single-piece manuscripts during the Han period. For an in-depth study of the greeting tablets see Maxim Korolkov, “‘Greeting Tablets’ in Early China: Some Traits of the Communicative Etiquette of Officialdom in Light of Newly Excavated Inscriptions,” *T’oung Pao* 98 (2012), 295–348.

140. Sumiya, “Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite,” 109–13.

can be dated to a later period.¹⁴¹ This would also explain the absence of the term *du* in administrative documents.

This demise of single-piece manuscripts from the Qin period onwards—at least in an administrative context—inevitably raises the question of the reason for this development.¹⁴² Scholars have advanced several hypotheses. For Sumiya, the main reasons behind the choice of certain types of writing support—with regard to both form and material—are regulations such as those found in the statutes excavated from Shuihudi tomb no. 11 and Zhangjiashan tomb no. 247. At least for the Qin period, these seem to suggest that wood was normally used to produce writing support for administrative documents and that single-piece manuscripts were the most common type. The Liye documents in fact seem to confirm this.¹⁴³ Sumiya further argues that this preference might result from considerations regarding the integrity of administrative documents. Single-piece manuscripts do not come with the danger of binding strings dissolving and parts of a document getting lost, which may be seen as a major advantage of single- over multi-piece manuscripts.¹⁴⁴ However, considering the Qin ordinance discussed above, there does not seem to have been a prescribed preference for either single- or multi-piece manuscripts. Takamura argues that the degree to which single- vs. multi-piece manuscripts were used in the northwest of the Han Empire (Juyan and Dunhuang) may not have institutional causes. He suggests that the availability of raw materials, individual or group habits, different production techniques, and/or the amount of text to be recorded probably had a strong influence on the choice of writing support (and accordingly

141. Takamura, “Shin Kan jidai no toku ni tsuite,” 62, 66–68. It has to be noted that the distinction made by Takamura is between *toku* 牘 and *sakusho* 冊書. He defines the former as “pieces that were planned to act as writing support and which carry at least three columns of writing” (Takamura, “Shin Kan jidai no toku ni tsuite,” 58). This definition alone would not equate the respective pieces with single-piece manuscripts. However, the fact that *toku* are contrasted with multi-piece manuscripts (*sakusho*) and that Takamura considers cases in which the former became pieces of multi-piece manuscripts as exceptional (Takamura, “Shin Kan jidai no toku ni tsuite,” 62) suggests that he also generally understands *toku* as pieces used for what have been termed “single-piece manuscripts” in the present paper.

142. One of course has to consider that to date the only actual examples of Qin administrative documents are the finds from Liye. Whether the widespread use of single-piece manuscripts may to some extent reflect a regional peculiarity will only become clear as soon as additional Qin documents from other regions are discovered.

143. Sumiya, “Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite,” 121–24.

144. Sumiya, “Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite,” 126–27.

the type of manuscript).¹⁴⁵ Sumiya's hypothesis is apparently the only explanation yet proposed as to why the Qin administration seems to have made use of single-piece manuscripts so frequently. The possible reasons for the later preference of multi-piece manuscripts, however, are numerous:

First, multi-piece manuscripts are structurally more flexible. They enable the separation of one manuscript into several smaller units. At the same time, they facilitate compiling formerly separate manuscripts and also allow expansion if need be.¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, it is possible to replace individual pieces of multi-piece manuscripts if, for example, extensive corrections or changes are necessary. All this would be impossible or at least impractical with single-piece manuscripts—usually consisting of a wide piece of writing support with writing on both sides—and would probably have made an additional copying process necessary.¹⁴⁷

Second, multi-piece manuscripts require smaller pieces of writing support. Although it is theoretically possible that a whole tree trunk would have been used solely to produce writing support, it seems more likely that the most valuable parts of a tree were used for other purposes, first and foremost the construction of buildings. Therefore, writing support was likely produced from the remaining pieces, which would be considerably smaller. Pieces of writing support designed for only one or two columns of writing could even be produced from very thin raw materials the size of a branch—with few other possible

145. Takamura, "Shin Kan jidai no toku ni tsuite," 60. Cf. Sumiya's contrary view that the amount of characters to be written does not seem to have been the reason for the choice of single- or multi-piece manuscripts. See Sumiya, "Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite," 123.

146. For a multi-piece manuscript consisting of several formerly independent multi-piece manuscripts see, for example, *Juyan* 128.1. In principle, there is no limit to the length of a text that can be written on one multi-piece manuscript. In actual practice, multi-piece manuscripts of course get too unwieldy at a certain point. It was proposed years ago that the maximum number of pieces in administrative multi-piece manuscripts might have been around 100. See Xing Yitian 邢義田, "Handai jiandu de tiji, zhongliang he shiyong: yi Zhongyanyuan shiyusuo cang Juyan Han jian wei li" 漢代簡牘的體積、重量和使用——以中研院史語所藏居延漢簡為例, in *Di bu ai bao: Handai de jiandu* 地不愛寶——漢代的簡牘 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2011), 22–23. This assumption has now received excellent backup from the Qin ordinance discussed above, which stipulates exactly 100 *die* as the maximum.

147. Possible drawbacks concerning revision, (re-)organization and storage with regard to single-piece manuscripts were also suggested by Sumiya and Takamura. See Sumiya, "Riya Shin kan ni okeru tandoku kan ni tsuite," 126–27; Takamura, "Shin Kan jidai no toku ni tsuite," 60n15.

uses apart from as firewood. This would be especially advantageous in areas with very limited supplies of raw materials.¹⁴⁸ Wider pieces would require raw material of a size that might also be suitable as timber. In addition, bamboo might even have an inexpensive alternative to wood for the production of writing support suitable for multi-piece manuscripts.¹⁴⁹

Third, multi-piece manuscripts facilitate mass production. One factor informing this is the smaller format of the required pieces of writing support, which enables a wider selection of raw materials to be used. Another is the lower variety of formats. To produce only two basic types of writing support used for multi-piece manuscripts—*zha* and *liang hang*—is probably easier and therefore economically much more favorable than to produce six additional types of wider pieces, that is, *du* used as single-piece manuscripts with three different widths and two different lengths.¹⁵⁰ Of course, *zha* and *liang hang* used in administrative documents were also produced in different lengths, but by far the most common length was one Han foot (or roughly 23 cm).¹⁵¹ The lower variety in width must have greatly facilitated the production of standardized writing support.

148. The lack of sufficiently large pieces of wood may indeed have prevented the frequent use of single-piece manuscripts in Juyan and Dunhuang. See Takamura, “Shin Kan jidai no toku ni tsuite,” 61. The frequent reuse of writing support, which can be observed in the northwestern border regions of the Han Empire, also hints at the relative scarcity of raw materials. On reuse see in detail Takamura Takeyuki 高村武幸, “Kantoku no sai riyō: Kyoen Kan kan wo chūshin ni” 簡牘の再利用—居延漢簡を中心に, in *Bunken to ibutsu no kyōkai: Chūgoku shutsudo kantoku shiryō no seitaiteki kenkyū* 文献と遺物の境界—中国出土簡牘史料の生態的研究, eds. Momiyama Akira 初山明 and Satō Makoto 佐藤信 (Tōkyō: Rokuichi, 2011), 163–84.

149. Although wider pieces were sometimes made from bamboo as well, it was much more suitable for the production of comparatively narrow pieces, convenient to apply only one column of writing. Enno Giele also pointed out that pieces of bamboo are much less suitable for two-sided use. See Giele, “Private Letter Manuscripts from Early Imperial China,” 411n16.

150. See the Qin ordinance discussed above. In Han documents recording the transfer and disbursal of materials used for manuscript production, *zha* and *liang hang* occur frequently but are only exceptionally described in further detail. See the examples in Ji Anuo 紀安諾 (Enno Giele), “Handai biansai beiyong shuxie cailiao ji qi shehui shi yiyi” 漢代邊塞備用書寫材料及其社會史意義, *Jianbo* 簡帛 2 (2007), 475–500. This also suggests that *zha* and *liang hang* were normally produced in standard formats.

151. Tomiya, *Kan kan goi kōshō*, 15–19.

Concluding Remarks

An analysis of the usage of the terms *die* and *du* in excavated and received sources from early imperial China has shown that the two terms are connected to conceptually different types of manuscripts, namely single- and multi-piece manuscripts, which also entail differences in the way they are kept for storage and transport. This functional distinction may be reflected in etymological relations of the two words with other words of the semantic fields “duplication, accumulation” (*die*) and “alone; self-contained, independent” (*du*), respectively. Furthermore, there apparently was a distinction with regard to form, which seems to have outweighed the functional distinction in certain conflicting cases—for example, when comparatively long and narrow pieces were used as single-piece manuscripts (e.g., tallies referred to as *die*). It is possible that this partial overlap of the meanings of *die* and *du* in Qin usage resulted from the introduction of *du* as a novel term sometime after the Qin unification. In the following Han period, multi-piece manuscripts prevailed over single-piece manuscripts. This is also suggested by the frequent occurrence of the term *die*, which, at least by the time of Emperor Wu, referred exclusively to pieces of writing support that were part of multi-piece manuscripts. It has been argued that there are numerous pragmatic and economic reasons that could explain the preference of multi- over single-piece manuscripts and that would moreover fit well into the setting of a gradually consolidating empire with an ever-growing volume of bureaucratic record keeping.

Considering the economic value of the pieces of writing support from which the two types of manuscripts were produced, the comparatively wide pieces usually used for single-piece manuscripts must have been more expensive than the narrower pieces used for multi-piece manuscripts.¹⁵² Exactly this may be one of the reasons why single-piece manuscripts did not vanish entirely. It probably is no coincidence that they continued to be used in contexts where courtesy and respect must have been much more important than the pragmatic and economic considerations governing the production of administrative documents: the exchange of private (or at least informal) letters and greeting tablets.¹⁵³

152. It has also been argued that during the Han period pieces for only one column of writing (*zha*) were mostly used for drafts, whereas clean copies were usually written on wider pieces for two columns (*liang hang*). See Sumiya, “Kantoku no keijō ni okeru imi,” 98. This would support the assumption that the latter were generally considered more valuable.

153. See n. 139 above. Of course, the comparatively low amount of text usually written in private letters or on greeting tablets probably was another reason for the use of single-piece manuscripts.

Appendix A: Overview of pieces from Liye Well no. 1 mentioning *die*¹⁵⁴

Item no.	Measurements (cm)	Columns (r/v)	Die + immediate context	Referring to
8-42+8-55	>17.5×1.4	1	☐事志一牒	Attached piece(?)
8-164+8-1475	23×4.2	3/1	獄校廿一牒	Attached pieces
8-170	>17.2×2.3	3/1	當復者六人，人一牒	Attached pieces(?)
8-175	>14.7×2.2	2/2	今上當令者一牒	Attached piece
8-183+8-290+8-530	22.9×2	2	上卅三年黔首息秬八牒	Attached pieces
8-317	>8.8×1.6	2	今牒書當令☐	Attached piece(s)
8-369+8-726	>17.6×2.8	2	今上當令者三牒	Attached pieces
8-551	>12.6×0.9	1	☐留簿（簿）牒上	Attached piece(s)
8-602+8-1717+8-1892+8-1922	>20.7×>2.6	2	☐志四牒	Attached pieces
8-645	23×2.5	2/1	牒書水火敗亡課一牒上	Attached piece
8-651	>15.1×1.7	3/1	上劾一牒☐	Same piece
8-677	23×>1	2/1	寫校券一牒... 上	Attached piece
8-686+8-973	>32.3×1.9	4/2	疏書作徒簿（簿）牒北（背）上	Same piece
8-768	23.2×3.2	3/1	今牒書應（應）書者一牒上	Attached piece
8-1069+8-1434+8-1520	46×3	4/2	疏書作徒日簿（簿）一牒	Same piece
8-1511	23.1×2.1	2/2	令令史感上水火敗亡者課一牒	Attached piece

Appendix A: (Continued)

Item no.	Measurements (cm)	Columns (r/v)	Die + immediate context	Referring to
8-1514	>20.3×3	3/1	今牒書當令者三牒	Attached pieces
8-1539	22.9×3.4	2	上不更以下餘(徭)計二牒	Attached pieces
8-1559	23.5×3.5	3/1	上五月作徒簿(簿)及取(最)卅牒	Attached pieces
8-1565	23×1.9	3/1	今上其校一牒	Attached piece
9-1869	23.1×1.6	2/1	上豸田課一牒	Attached piece
9-2352	47.1×3.1	4/2	上診一牒	Same piece

154. The decision on the most probable reference object of *die* of course depends on the question of whether *die* occurs in an “original document” or whether the respective part of text was merely copied into a subsequent document (e.g., an answer to the original document). In the former case, the interpretation “same piece” or “attached piece(s)” is most likely, whereas in the latter *die* most probably refers to some other document. See also n. 32 above. The table only includes *die*-references that are likely to be part of “original documents.” A piece is assumed to represent an original document if there was no evidence suggesting that it might be a copy (as, for example, in *Liye* 8-135 or 8-653, where additional parts of text with more recent dates written by the same hand can be found on the same piece of writing support). In case a piece is so fragmentary that it provides too little evidence to make any judgement on whether *die* most likely refers to the same piece, an attached piece or to an entirely different document, it has not been included in the table. This is the case for the following ten pieces: *Liye* 8-5, 8-225, 8-234, 8-235, 8-528+8-532+8-674, 8-804, 8-1715, 8-2003, 8-2035, and 8-2543. Furthermore, *Liye* 8-1041+8-1043 was likewise not included, as it constitutes an unfinished or partly deleted document used for writing exercises. The measurements of *Liye* 9-1869 and 9-2352 were taken from *Liye Qin jian bowuguan* et al., *Liye Qin jian bowuguan cang Qin jian*, Appendix 2. All other measurements provided in the table are based on hand measurement of the photographs in Hunan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, *Liye Qin jian (yi)*.

Appendix B: Overview of complete *quan* from Liye Well no. 1¹⁵⁵

Item no.	Measurements (cm)	Columns	Year
8-212+8-426+8-1632	36.8×1.7 (length hand measured)	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-217	37×1.4	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-760	36.7×1.3	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-761	36.7×1.4	2	33rd (214 B.C.E.)
8-762	37.4×1.8	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-763	37.2×1.6	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-764	37.8×1.4	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-766	36.7×1.5	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-811+8-1572	36.7×1.2 (length hand measured)	2	35th (212 B.C.E.)
8-886+8-1220	37.6×1.4 (length hand measured)	1	34th (213 B.C.E.)
8-890+8-1583	37.2×2.2 (length hand measured)	2	35th (212 B.C.E.)
8-1002+8-1091	36.7×1.7 (length hand measured)	2	35th (212 B.C.E.)
8-1055+8-1579	36.9×1.7 (length hand measured)	2	35th (212 B.C.E.)
8-1239+8-1334	37.3×1.9 (length hand measured)	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-1345+8-2245	36.5×1.5 (length hand measured)	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-1540	36.5×1.8	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-1544	36.8×1.7	1	35th (212 B.C.E.)
8-1545	36.6×1.4	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-1549	38.2×1.6	2	34th (213 B.C.E.)
8-1550	36.5×1.5	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)

155. The measurements of *Liye* 8-762, 8-763, 9-762, and 10-1157 were taken from Liye Qin jian bowuguan et al., *Liye Qin jian bowuguan cang Qin jian*, Appendix 2. Note that *Liye* 8-762 and 8-763 must be sought under their excavation numbers (8-763 and 8-764) in that volume. The other measurements, if not noted otherwise, follow Zhang Chunlong et al., “*Liye Qin jian kechi jian yanjiu*,” Table 1. For the reconstruction of *Liye*

footnote continued on next page

Appendix B: (Continued)

Item no.	Measurements (cm)	Columns	Year
8-1551	34.6×1.7	2	27th (220 B.C.E.)
8-1557	36.9×1.8	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-1574+8-1787	38.1×1.5 (length hand measured)	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-1590+8-1839	37.9×1.3 (length hand measured)	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-2246	37.2×1.1	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
8-2247	37×1.4	1	32nd (215 B.C.E.)
8-2249	37×1.8	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
9-762	37.6×1.6	2	31st (216 B.C.E.)
10-1157	37.1×1.8	2	33rd (214 B.C.E.)

秦漢時代的單獨簡與編冊簡：兩者採用術語區別的背景與意義

史達

提要

秦漢時期的傳世和出土資料，記載了不少與用作書寫載體的竹或木片相關的術語。很多時候，它們用法上的確切含義以及歷時性差異，皆未得到充分了解。究竟這些術語在特定時間內，指涉哪些具體事物，成為一個複雜的問題。本文聚焦於「牘」與「牒」，不但由於這兩個詞在資料裏最常出現，還因為它們可被視作互補的一對。爬梳行政文書和法律規範（包括一條新見的秦令）中「牘」和「牒」在形制和功能方面的差異後，本文認為「牘」和「牒」實際上連繫着兩種不同概念的寫本，即單獨簡和編冊簡。本文的分析又顯示，這兩種寫本也意味着儲藏方式的區別，其同樣反映在特殊的術語上。最後，本文提出漢代（特別從漢武帝時起）編冊簡使用之所以日益增加，可能出於實用和經濟原因，這也符合當時漢帝國日漸穩固、官僚系統簿記數量不斷增加的情況。

Keywords: bamboo and wood manuscripts, codicology, terminology, Qin ordinances

簡牘, 寫本學, 術語, 秦令

8-886+8-1220 see Zhang Chi 張馳, "Liye Qin jian quan lei wenshu zhuihe san ze" 里耶秦簡券類文書綴合三則, July 31, 2015 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=2276), accessed November 21, 2017. For *Liye* 8-1590+8-1839 see Yao Lei 姚磊, "Liye Qin jian du zhuihe zhaji (er)" 里耶秦簡牘綴合札記(二), June 7, 2015 (http://www.bsm.org.cn/show_article.php?id=2254), accessed November 21, 2017.