regents and Sorqoqtani, the mother of Möngke (the fourth khan) and Khubilai Khan, proved to be a "protagonist of dynastic change" (p. 72), an accurate assessment. His account of these three is standard, although he then links a significant tax change to Sorqoqtani. According to De Nicola, the Toluids, led by Sorqoqtani, supported lighter and less exploitative taxation, unlike the Ogodeids. In this chapter, De Nicola also includes Orghina Khatun, who ruled Central Asia from 1251 to 1260, is a detailed study demonstrating that female rulers could exist within the Mongol Empire and rule beyond the capacity of regents.

Chapter Three shifts attention to the Ilkhanate, which dominates the remainder of the book. Here De Nicola explores not only the *khatun*s, but the author makes a significant contribution to our understanding of the *ordo* or camp in terms of an institution and the ownership of property. In the course of linking these themes, De Nicola makes a convincing case that the selection of the next ruler boiled down to factions centered around particularly *khatun*s (usually the candidates' mothers), and that their *ordos* provided them with the economic means to secure support. As each *khatun* had her own *ordo,* complete with the requisite personnel to manage and sustain it, it was a significant economic unit in its own right. As the *khatun*s were also engaged in commerce, particularly by funding merchants, the *khatun*s could amass a significant amount of wealth. Control of this wealth then influenced the politics and struggle for the throne. De Nicola's analysis of the economic importance of the *khatun* and her *ordo* makes his work highly significant, not only in gender and economic history, but also in terms of influencing the politics of the Ilkhanate.

Women in Mongol Iran concludes with a chapter discussing the queens and religion. Here the author investigates not only the origins and roots of Mongol conversion, but also how the *khatun*s patronised religion and how they used it to further their own goals. De Nicola demonstrates that the *khatun*s involvement was due to not only personal piety, but also political and economic interests as well.

Women in Mongol Iran is a welcome addition to the study of the Mongol Empire. There should be little doubt that gender history will be an important frontier for historians of the Mongol Empire. Our author De Nicola also sets forth an excellent model which moves beyond political history without studying other aspects in isolation. Timothy.May@ung.edu

Timothy May
University of North Georgia

Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy: Studies in the Composition and Thought of the *Shangshu* (Classic of Documents). Edited by Martin Kern and Dirk Meyer (Studies in the History of Chinese Texts 8). pp. vi, 508. Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2017.
doi:10.1017/S135618631700058X

This collaborative volume on the classical Chinese text called *Shangshu* 尚書 (usually translated as *Documents*)[1] is the fruit of two related conferences, held at Princeton and Oxford in 2013 and 2014, respectively, with chapters by contributors ranging from current graduate students to full professors. As Martin Kern and Dirk Meyer note in their introduction (p. 1f.), it stands as one of the few extensive treatments of the text in contemporary Western scholarship. The reasons for this neglect are straightforward and embarrassing: *Shangshu* is difficult because of its language, and sadly also tedious

[1] David Schaberg (p. 354) offers some theories regarding the title.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S135618631700058X Published online by Cambridge University Press

because of its content.[2] *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy* opened my eyes to several features of the text that I had never noticed, but I think most readers hoping to find philosophically engaging material in *Shangshu* will still be disappointed. Those who need to study it (whether out of genuine interest or the historicist recognition that the text is simply too important to ignore) will want to begin with this book, which represents the best of current scholarship.

Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy is unusually coherent for a collaborative volume (and lucidly written, it should be added). Constraints of space preclude a detailed consideration of each chapter; in addition, some contributors refer in detail to looted manuscripts, which I shall not cite out of principle.[3] But the book can readily be discussed as a whole because the methodological orientation varies little from chapter to chapter. While most twentieth-century scholarship (both Asian and Western) was devoted to determining plausible dates of composition for all the sections of *Shangshu*—and accordingly whether they should be designated as "genuine" (*zhen* 真) or "forged" (*wei* 僞)—Kern and Meyer (p. 6, n.20) revive an important insight by Jiang Shanguo蔣善國: the relevant question is not when each chapter of the text was composed, but when it was redacted.[4] *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy* demonstrates impressively why Jiang's observation was correct.

One reason is that chapters in the received text often turn out to comprise two or more strands. In the first study in the book ("Language and the Ideology of Kingship in the 'Canon of Yao,'" pp. 23–61),[5] Kern shows that "Yao dian" 堯典, the opening chapter of *Shangshu*, contains divergent narratives of the Sage Kings Yao and Shun 舜, which not only are marked by distinct rhetoric, but also present the two sovereigns in contrasting modes: Yao as a dynamic and charismatic figure, Shun as an invisible force operating behind the impersonal machinery of state.[6] Kern identifies the second half as later than the first, and associates it with the ideology of the Qin 秦 and Western Han 西漢 empires. If he is correct, then asking when "Yao dian" was written would qualify as a category mistake, because different parts were written at different times (and probably for different purposes). Once again, the relevant question is when the text was *redacted*: in this case, sometime during the early empire, in order to provide doctrinal cover for a revolutionary ideology that emphasized efficient bureaucratic administration rather than the unique powers of the king. Immediately after Kern, Kai Vogelsang ("Competing Voices in the *Shangshu*," pp. 62–105) shows that two other chapters, "Gao Yao mo" 皋陶謨 and "Lü xing" 呂刑, can similarly be divided into "A" and "B" sections, the first portraying the emperor as the virtuous head of his lineage, the second as a figurehead surrounded by meritorious and genetically unrelated ministers (e.g., p. 71).[7]

In a later chapter ("The 'Harangues' [*shi* 誓] in the *Shangshu*," pp. 281–319), Kern again relies on structural and rhetorical features (pp. 289–303) to show that three "rousing battle speeches" (p. 282), namely "Gan shi" 甘誓, "Tang shi" 湯誓, and "Mu shi" 牧誓, belong to a discernible genre that he calls "harangue".[8] Building on Jan Assmann's notion of cultural memory (*kulturelles Gedächtnis*), Kern

[2]In the interest of full disclosure, I should state that this is why I dropped out of the project after attending the first conference at Princeton.

[3]For my reasons, see "*Heng xian* and the Problem of Studying Looted Artifacts," *Dao* 12.2 (2013), pp. 153-160.

[4]*Shangshu zongshu* 尚書綜述 (Shanghai, 1988), p. 133.

[5]A previous version was published in *Ideology of Power and Power of Ideology in Early China*, (ed.) Y. Pines *et al.* (Leiden, 2015), pp. 118-151.

[6]In the so-called *guwen* 古文 edition of the text, the two parts are divided into separate chapters: "Yao dian" and "Shun dian" 舜典.

[7]One distinction: whereas Kern explains the differences between the two sections as a matter of chronology—a new model of kingship against the backdrop of an older one—Vogelsang entertains the possibility they derive from different parts of China (Chu 楚 and Qin) before conceding that the evidence is inconclusive (pp. 100-103).

[8]My one misgiving is that *shi* does not ordinarily bear this sense, and in any case "harangue" has varying connotations in English, many of which are pejorative. The normal meaning of *shi* is "oath," as Maria Khayutina points out later in the book, adding: "It is possible, though not yet supported by Western Zhou epigraphic evidence, that legally binding oaths were taken in military contexts" ("'Bi shi' 費誓, Western Zhou Oath Texts, and the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S135618631700058X Published online by Cambridge University Press

argues that these speeches, though placed in the mouths of kings of high antiquity, "were created as idealized artifacts to literally overwrite the actual historical events and to make history conform to the moral norms of a later age".[9] (p. 284) Toward the end of this study, Kern makes another important point: "harangues" cannot be dated by linguistic features because they were not composed at a single historical moment. Rather, drawing on an old suggestion by Nomura Shigeo 野村茂夫, Kern contends that they are best understood as repertoires of constantly revised and renegotiated material, hypertexts "of a common underlying hypotext".[10](p. 307) Here too, the simplistic "genuine-or-forged" discourse of earlier textual criticism proves inadequate. The "harangues" are not plausible as contemporaneous accounts (p. 288), but this does not mean that they were simply forged.

A final strength of the book is that it sheds considerable light on the processes by which *Shangshu* was closed and canonised, but the evidence is spread over several chapters. Yegor Grebnev ("The *Yi Zhoushu* and the *Shangshu*: The Case of Texts with Speeches," pp. 249–280) compares chapters from *Shangshu* with those from a similar collection, *Yi Zhoushu* 逸周書 (which he translates as *Remnant Zhou Documents*). Although one would have liked to see an account of the *latter* text's history,[11] it is clear that Grebnev has hit on an important criterion when he observes that "dramatic" speeches are more typical of *Shangshu*, "non-dramatic" speeches more typical of *Yi Zhoushu* (pp. 266–270). As Grebnev explains, "the former are emotionally laden and personalized and have a richer repertoire of emphatic devices, while the latter appear as treatises superficially furnished [with] emphatic devices reminiscent of dramatic speeches" (p. 255); "dramatic" speeches, similarly, contain an even distribution of "first- and second-person pronouns, vocatives, and exclamations" (p. 256). Thus if the material in the two collections derives from the same fund of lore, someone (or some committee) used certain selection criteria when deciding which to include in *Shangshu* (p. 276f.). Grebnev also reminds us that each chapter of the received *Shangshu* includes a preface purporting to explain the circumstances of its composition (p. 271), another obvious sign of canonisation.[12]

Joachim Gentz ("One Heaven, One History, One People: Repositioning the Zhou in Royal Addresses to Subdued Enemies in the 'Duo shi' 多士 and 'Duo fang' 多方 Chapters of the *Shangshu* and in the 'Shang shi' 商誓 Chapter of the *Yi Zhoushu*," pp. 146–192) observes that *Shangshu* chapters are more similar to one another than to any other genre (pp. 176–177), and David Schaberg ("Speaking of Documents: *Shu* Citations in Warring States Texts," pp. 320–359) draws attention to the number 28, which appears in too many places to be coincidental (p. 350f.). (I never would have noticed this.)

Legal Culture of Early China," p. 426). She also notes, provocatively, that *shi* "could be enforced in response to an overlord's command (*ming* 命)" (p. 427). My theory would be that if the operative "command" in the *Shangshu* was construed as "Heaven's command" (*tianming* 天命, i.e. the divine right to rule), then the kings' famous battlefield speeches were to be understood as their "oaths" to carry out this formidable charge.

[9]Presumably Dirk Meyer means something similar when he characterizes "Gu ming" 顧命 as "*lieu de mémoire*" ("Recontextualization and Memory Production: Debates on Rulership as Reconstructed from 'Gu ming' 顧命," p. 127), but he does not elaborate on his understanding of this concept (which is borrowed from Pierre Nora).

[10]Kern expects his learned readers to know that the terminology is from Gérard Genette, e.g., *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, translated by C. Newman and C. Doubinsky (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1997), p. 5. I would add that the antecedent of a "harangue" need not have been textual at all: it might simply have been a shared notion that venerable kings exhorted their troops before winning an epoch-making battle.

[11]For a recent study in English, see R. McNeal, *Conquer and Govern: Early Chinese Military Texts from the* Yi Zhou shu (Honolulu, 2012), pp. 73–96; also E. L. Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (Albany, N.Y., 2006), pp. 178ff.

[12]Grebnev was not aware of a relevant publication that has appeared in the interim: R. He and M. Nylan, "On a Han-Era Postface (*xu* 序) to the *Documents*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 75.2 (2016), pp. 377–426. Moreover, he might have commented on the similarity of the programme of systematically historicising the chapters of *Shangshu* to the so-called "minor prefaces" (*xiaoxu* 小序) attached to each item in the *Mao Shi* 毛詩 (*Mao Odes*), which do nearly the same thing. See, e.g., Mao Xuanguo 毛宣國, "Handai *Shijing* lishihua jiedu de shixue yiyi" 漢代《詩經》歷史化解讀的詩學意義, *Wenxue pinglun* 文學評論 2007.3, pp. 169-174.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S135618631700058X Published online by Cambridge University Press

For example, the sky is divided into twenty-eight "lodges" (*xiu* 宿).[13] Thus it is striking that the *jinwen* 今文 edition of *Shangshu* contains precisely twenty-eight chapters. Someone governing the final form of the text chose a numerologically significant length.

I did detect one latent contradiction throughout the book—at any rate, an assumption that might have been examined explicitly. If scholars such as Kern, Vogelsang, Meyer, and Gentz are right that *Shangshu* chapters exemplify repertoires based on a shared hypo-text (Kern) or are constructed out of "modules" that can be combined and recombined in a variety of permutations (Gentz, pp. 160–163), then—as they themselves emphasize—one has to be careful about appealing to such material as proof of particular beliefs or practices in the Bronze Age. But occasionally they make what seems like the same mistake that they criticise in others. For example, at one point Meyer writes:

> Not long after the decisive campaign against the Shang, King Wu died too, throwing the young [Zhou] dynasty into a major crisis. The Duke of Zhou stepped in for King Cheng to oversee government on his behalf. Ancient sources make it plain that the legitimacy of this move was doubted. (p. 109)

Which "ancient sources"? He does not say, but I can only suspect that he is referring to Edward L. Shaughnessy's analysis of "Shao gao" 召誥 (a very famous chapter of *Shangshu* that is scarcely mentioned in this book).[14] One has to ask why "Shao gao" should be accepted unproblematically as an "ancient source" if the other chapters, as we have been learning, are to be construed as late reconceptualisations of earlier traditions. Or is there a deeper problem: is it the case that *some* chapters are truly "ancient sources" but *others* are more complicated?

Several contributors rely on one text in particular as representative of Bronze-Age values: "Shi fu" 世俘, a notoriously bloody narration of the Zhou conquest currently found in *Yi Zhoushu*.[15] I counted no fewer than five instances in this book (pp. 152, 181, 285, 297, and 308) when a contributor contrasted material in *Shangshu* with the supposedly unvarnished account in "Shi fu". The suitability of "Shi fu" for this purpose is never challenged—yet one can imagine how "Shi fu" would also have to be reinterpreted if it were subjected to the same sort of textual destabilisation that is performed on other texts in this book. After all, nobody has given us more reason to be wary of reading them at face value than the contributors themselves.

Lastly, some readers may wonder about the title: *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*. On the one hand, the contributors are not to blame for the fact that *Shangshu* is less than thrilling as philosophy; on the other hand, while they are thoughtful and persuasive when they show how to read the text (and how not to read the text), they do not make it sound any less preachy. One telling detail is that "Kang gao" 康誥 is mentioned more than once as part of "the earliest layer" (e.g., pp. 173 and 370), but no one was inspired to devote a chapter to it. I cannot help thinking that the reason is all too disheartening: "Kang gao" is an infernal bore. It contains tireless exhortations to treat widows and widowers kindly, to revere the people who ought to be revered, to be ever mindful of Heaven's awesome mandate—but never any doubt as to what these injunctions mean (or why we should act on them). That, in my view, is necessary for philosophy: the awareness that there can be other perspectives, that a moral life requires thinking for oneself and not simply living up to the expectations of some unquestioned authority. If there were people in the Bronze Age who ruminated along such lines, we do not have any record of their ideas.

[13] Schaberg says "lunar lodges", but "lodges" is more precise. See C. Cullen, "Translating 宿 *sukh/xiu and 舍 *lhah/she—'Lunar Lodges' or Just Plain 'Lodges'?" *East Asian Science, Technology and Medicine* 33 (2011), pp. 84–95.

[14] *Before Confucius: Studies in the Creation of the Chinese Classics* (Albany, N.Y., 1997), especially pp. 114-118.

[15] Not coincidentally, Shaughnessy has published prominently on this text too: *Before Confucius*, pp. 31-67.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S135618631700058X Published online by Cambridge University Press

There are occasional philosophically interesting moments. Yuri Pines ("A Toiling Monarch? The 'Wu yi' 無逸 Chapter Revisited," pp. 360–392) and Michael Hunter ("Against (Uninformed) Idleness: Situating the Didacticism of 'Wu yi' 無逸," pp. 393–415) disagree over the meaning of the word *zhi* 知 (to know, to be aware of, to understand) in the declaration that the ruler must *zhi* "the hardship of sowing and reaping" 先知稼穡之艱難 (Pines's translation, p. 363). Does this mean that the ruler must experience manual labour personally (Pines, pp. 367f. and 372) or merely that he must understand its importance (Hunter, p. 406)? The text is too underdetermined to be sure of the answer, but philosophical readers might take it as an early suggestion of the unity of knowledge and action (*zhixing heyi* 知行合一), a cardinal idea of the much later philosopher Wang Shouren 王守仁 (1472-1529).[16] Can a king be said "to know" manual labour if he does not *do* it? A student of Ming philosophy might even be motivated to check what Wang himself had to say about the "Wu yi" chapter (which he probably knew by heart).

In sum, *Origins of Chinese Political Thought* might not induce readers to drop their *Zhuangzi* 莊子 or *Xunzi* 荀子 and dust off their mouldering copy of *Shangshu* instead, but it does show how the text slowly yields its patterns under sound methodological investigation. Moreover, the interpretive techniques so effectively deployed in this volume could undoubtedly be applied to other texts as well. Several of the contributors might already be contemplating such research. (prg@sas.upenn.edu)

Paul R. Goldin
University of Pennsylvania

Ernst Boerschmann: Pagoden in China, Das unveröffentlichte Werk "Pagoden II," Edited and adapted by Hartmut Walravens. pp. 709. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2016.
doi:10.1017/S1356186317000608

Since 1931, a very few research libraries with holdings in the East Asian field had a thick volume with a rough, yellow cover entitled *Chinesische Pagoden I* among the small number of books about Chinese architecture. Those who opened the book found a detailed, descriptive text organised regionally with superb photographs and drawings of pagodas in China. The Roman Numeral I, of course, is anticipatory, but those who have used the book have assumed, certainly after the author Ernst Boerschmann's death in 1949, that a book that perhaps was held up by war in the 1930s and 1940s would never be completed. As it turns out, the text of Vol. II had been largely written and the illustrations had been chosen by Boerschmann, but due to circumstances even beyond World War, it was never published.

The last ten years has seen an extraordinary interest in the writings of this man who worked in China as an architect of the German Legation in the early years of the twentieth century. His biography and much of his unpublished, seminal research on Chinese architecture, as well as challenges to getting the work published, are the subjects of an equally long book by Eduard Kögel reviewed in *JRAS* 2018 and several of Kögel's articles. Hartmut Walravens meanwhile worked through the sequel to the volume on pagodas. The result is a careful, accurate, edited, updated version of a book written more than eighty years ago whose contents is still valuable and includes material not otherwise available.

[16] See, e.g., D.S. Nivison, *The Ways of Confucianism: Investigations in Chinese Philosophy*, (ed.) B.W. Van Norden (Chicago and LaSalle, Ill., 1996), pp. 226–228.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S135618631700058X Published online by Cambridge University Press