《漢學研究》0254-4466
第 43 卷第 2 期 民國 114 年 6 月（2025.6）頁211-224 漢學研究中心

Book Review

Marian Olech*

Edward L. Shaughnessy
***The Origin and Early Development of the* Zhou Changes**
Leiden: Brill, 2022, 552 pages. ISBN 9789004503670

To any anglophone reader with even a superficial interest in the scholarship of the *Zhou Changes* (hereafter referred to also as *Zhouyi* 周易) the name of Edward L. Shaughnessy, the current Lorraine J. and Herrlee G. Creel Distinguished Service Professor in Early Chinese Studies and director of Graduate Studies of East Asian Languages and Civilizations at the University of Chicago, requires no introduction. To the ones completely unfamiliar with the subject, *The Origin and Early Development of the Zhou Changes* (hereafter referred to as *The Origin*) is likely the soundest, and certainly the most up-to-date, gateway into related scholarship available in the English language. I am convinced that both kinds of readers will find the book—largely an updated version of the author's doctoral dissertation from 1981—to be an excellent

Manuscript received: December 16, 2024; completed: February 4, 2025; approved: April 30, 2025.
2024 年 12 月 16 日收稿，2025 年 2 月 4 日修訂完成，2025 年 4 月 30 日通過刊登。
* Marian Olech, PhD, Department of Chinese Literature, National Chengchi University.
作者係國立政治大學中國文學系博士。

and fulfilling read, as it offers both an overview of the cultural context, indispensable to grasp the principles of creation and early development of *Zhouyi*, and an insightful philological analysis of its textual content and structure.

In the introduction to the book, Shaughnessy presents a reconstructed plan of a Western Zhou temple structure, inviting the reader to approach the *Zhou Changes*—a "temple" of the Western Zhou in its own right—through a similar pathway of textual archaeology. Indeed, the author conducts his philological excavation with the systematic precision of archaeological fieldwork. *The Origin* is evenly divided into two parts, "The Context" and "The Text," six chapters each. In the first chapter, Shaughnessy outlines the general structure of the received text of *Zhouyi*, emphasizing at the outset its most prominent characteristic: the multilayered or "bilevel"—if we wish to follow the temple metaphor—instability. On the macrostructural level, such instability is evident in the non-linear use of the *Zhou Changes*, stemming from its original identity as a divination manual. In the microscale of language, the words—or, perhaps more accurately, the characters—of the text were traditionally subject to different readings and interpretations. It is the second level of semantic instability that I would like to return to later in this review.

The author proceeds with a critical evaluation of the existing scholarship regarding the date of the composition of *Zhouyi* and introduces recently unearthed early versions of the text, namely the manuscript from the Warring States period in the possession of the Shanghai Museum, as well as those recovered from the Western Han tombs in Fuyang 阜陽 and Mawangdui 馬王堆. Faithful readers of Shaughnessy will already be familiar with the latter part from *Unearthing the* Changes (2014); however, the comparison between the corresponding graphs in unearthed and received texts is instrumental in the discussion of the polysemy inherent in *Zhouyi*, an enlightening thread interwoven throughout *The Origin*.

The next three chapters comprise the overview of turtle-shell and milfoil

divinatory practices of Western Zhou China, insofar as such practices can be seen as relevant to the formation of *Zhouyi*. Particularly noteworthy is Shaughnessy's assiduousness in the collection and translation of the analyzed textual material. The reader is provided with no fewer than eighteen accounts of turtle-shell divination and nineteen accounts of milfoil divination from the Zhou period, beginning with selected Zhouyuan 周原 and Qijia 齊家 site oracle-bone inscriptions, and progressing chronologically through relevant fragments from both transmitted and unearthed corpora, such as *Shangshu* 尚書, *Zuozhuan* 左傳, and the Baoshan 包山 Chu 楚 bamboo slips. The author then isolates and examines the distinct stages of divination, such as the command, prognostication, and oracle. The conclusion drawn from these analyses is that while differing in specific steps, both the turtle-shell and milfoil divination essentially involved "a two-step procedure, in which a preliminary prognostication required some further refinement, producing a second, definitive prognostication" (p. 213). Subsequently, Shaughnessy inspects the accounts about the milfoil divination specifically involving the *Zhou Changes*. Many such accounts were recorded in the Fuyang manuscript and are supplemented in *The Origin* with the fragments from *Zuozhuan*, which explicitly mention the use of *Zhouyi* in particular instances of yarrow-stalk sortilege. With the newly available material from the Fuyang slips, Shaughnessy reiterates his proposition, already made in his doctoral dissertation, that in the case of *Zhou Changes* divination, the aforementioned two-step procedure amounted to first determining one of the sixty-four hexagrams and then determining which one of the hexagram's six line statements was to be used as the basis for the oracle (p. 263).

The last chapter of the first part of the book, "The Poetic Imagination," discusses the motives, imagery, and symbolism shared by *Zhouyi* with other texts from the Zhou period, primarily folk songs exemplified most famously—though not exclusively—in the *Guofeng* 國風 (*Airs of the States*) section of *Shijing* 詩經. Considerably shorter than other sections of *The Origin*, the

chapter in question nevertheless contributes much to the reader's understanding of the *Zhouyi* language and the scope of its possible interpretations. As an example of the author's exploration of new exegetical avenues, one may cite the sexual symbolism that he sees embedded in *guanguan* 關關, the onomatopoeia imitative of a water fowl's cry which opens the first ode of *Guanju* 關雎 in *Shijing* (pp. 281-86). Such a reading is indirectly supported by other examples of sexually charged imagery in *Shijing* cited by Shaughnessy and undoubtedly conforms to the erotic undertone of the ode. That being said, one might also point out that according to the logic of Shaughnessy's argument, the actuality of the coital connotations of *guanguan* hinges, at least partially, on the identification of *jujiu* 雎鳩 with an osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*), whose cry is "nothing like guan-guan" (p. 285). Such identification, established as it is in recent scholarship, has not been entirely unchallenged.[1]

Equipped with such contextual information, in the second part of the book the reader is invited on a deep dive into the structural and linguistic intricacies of the *Zhou Changes*. The focus is first set on its most distinguishing characteristic: the eight trigrams and sixty-four hexagrams, the fundamental symbols around which the text of *Zhouyi* is organized. Shaughnessy relates the foremost tenets of the tradition that links the origin of the eight trigrams to the pictographic roots of the respective Chinese characters. While the actual nature and the extent of the relationship between trigrams and script is generally difficult to establish, *The Origin* makes compelling use of the most recent discoveries, such as the human body diagram in the Warring States manuscript entitled *Shifa* 筮法 (*Method of Milfoil Divination*) from the fourth volume of the Tsinghua University corpus (published in December 2013), in illustrating at

1 See, for example, Chu Binjie 褚斌杰, *Shijing quanzhu* 詩經全注 [Complete annotations of *Shijing*] (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1999), 11. If we put aside for a moment the whole commentarial tradition of *Shijing*, we will note that the only information about a water fowl present in the original text of *Guanju*, besides its affinity to river islets, is exactly the sound that it makes. To reject that based on a later, inevitably speculative identification with a particular species does not seem to me entirely persuasive.

least some pictorial motivation behind the usage, if not creation, of the trigrams. The sixty-four hexagrams have also been traditionally seen as iconic representations of objects, actions, or emotions, as reflected in the hexagram names. Such motivation may be pictorial, as in the case of Ding 鼎 (Cauldron)䷱, or conceptual, as in the cases of Lin 臨 (Looking Down) ䷒ and Guan 觀 (Looking Up) ䷓. Brief discussion is then devoted to the hexagram names and their connection with the content of the line statements. Shaughnessy points out that such connection is easily demonstrable, and at the same time prudently refrains from siding with either side of the long-standing debate concerning the chronological priority of either a hexagram name or line statements, considering it an ultimately unanswerable "chicken and egg" question (p. 309).

The eighth chapter of *The Origin* is dedicated to the hexagram statements. The author concentrates on the emblematic statement of the first hexagram, Qian 乾 (Vigorous). The phrase in question, read as *yuan heng li zhen* 元亨利貞 in modern Mandarin, has been subject to many vastly differing interpretations. The reader is presented with a thorough analysis of all these four lexemes, most illuminatingly so in the case of *heng* 亨. Shaughnessy points to the etymological relationship between *heng* and *xiang* 饗 (to feast, enjoy), and to the usage of the latter in early received literature in the sacrificial context of spirits "receiving" an offering, notably also in the formulaic endings of divinatory prayers such as *shang xiang* 尙饗 (would that it be received) seen in *Yili* 儀禮 (pp. 326-77). This is in turn augmented by the evidence from the He 何 Diviner Group of Shang oracle bone inscriptions, where  , an early form of *qing* 卿 and a protograph of *xiang*, is used as a prognostication about the offering being "received." Supported also by equally persuasive, if less extensive, examinations of the remaining words in the phrase, Shaughnessy's translation of *yuan heng li zhen* as "prime receipt, beneficial to affirm" is certainly convincing. While an ardent reader might hope for a wider take on other hexagram statements, the author's restraint is well justified by the sheer physical limitations of an already five-hundred-page volume.

The ninth chapter is devoted to the line statements and includes detailed discussion of both of their constituent parts: the oracle and the prognostication. As for the former, Shaughnessy examines the formal aspects of an oracular text, the possible circumstances of its derivation from actual divinations, as well as its symbolic imagery.

He then proceeds to describe the prognostication expressed by divinatory technical terms at the end of line statements, such as *ji* 吉 (auspicious), *xiong* 凶 (ominous), *wu jiu* 無咎 (without trouble), and *fu* 孚 (trustworthy, reliable [of the divination result]), discussing their occurrences across the received text and the Fuyang manuscript. The author relates important scholarly developments in the understanding of the aforementioned *fu*, whose meaning has been conclusively determined only through the recent insights into the Shang oracle bone inscriptions and Warring States manuscripts.[2]

In the tenth chapter, attention is given first to the intra-hexagram structure of the *Zhouyi* text. "The bottom-to-top organization of line statements is the fundamental organizing principle within a single hexagram text" (p. 397), which is instantiated by references to parts of objects (cauldron, human body) arranged in the general bottom-to-top sequence. This paradigm is also semantically expressed in the descriptions of motion, perhaps most spectacularly so in the case of the dragon "moving through the fields," "jumping through the depths," or "flying in the heavens" in the line statements of Qian, the first hexagram. Shaughnessy compellingly explains these passages as the Dragon constellation's annual progression through the night sky. In the second part of the chapter, *The Origin* discusses the inter-hexagrammatic relationships within inverse pairs of hexagrams, exemplified by shared imagery

2 It is perhaps interesting to note here that the exact etymology of *fu* is still subject to academic debate. In a recent article, Wu Kejing 鄔可晶 argues at considerable length that *fu* is etymologically identical with the verb *fu* 覆 (to cover, overlay), metaphorically extended to the meaning "fulfill" in Shang and Zhou divinatory contexts. See Wu Kejing, "Shuo 'Fu'" 說"𠂤" [On "fu"], in *Zhanguo wenzi yanjiu* 戰國文字研究 [Studies on Warring States script], ed. Xu Zaiguo 徐在國 (Hefei: Anhui daxue chubanshe, 2022), 6:22-78.

and corresponding names.

Having covered the internal structure of hexagram texts and the interrelations within the hexagram pairs, Shaughnessy moves on to a presentation and discussion of the hexagram sequence of the received *Zhou Changes* and the problems posed by both the incomplete physical state of the bamboo slips and the set of unique symbols (black and red squares) of the Shanghai Museum manuscript. *The Origin* concurs with the hypothetical reconstruction carried out by He Zeheng 何澤恒 , which has resulted in the consistency of the hexagram sequence between the manuscript and the received text. This, combined with the evidence of numerical hexagrams from the Western Zhou pottery shards, leads Shaughnessy to conclude that the hexagrammatic sequence seen in the transmitted version of the *Zhouyi* text, "which is to say beginning with Qian 乾 ䷀ 'Vigorous' and Kun 坤 ䷁ 'Compliant' hexagrams and continuing through Jiji 既濟 ䷾ 'Already Across' and Weiji 未濟 ䷿ 'Not Yet Across' as the final two hexagrams, was already more or less standard as early as the Warring States period, and perhaps even as early as the late Western Zhou dynasty" (p. 451).

The twelfth and final chapter is concerned with a topic marginal to the eponymous focus of *The Origin*: the transition in understanding and usage of *Zhouyi* from a divination manual to a philosophical text. The author turns to the so-called "Ten Wings," namely seven commentaries on the *Zhou Changes* that have constituted an integral part of the classic at least since the Eastern Han period, and examines the selected fragments from four of these "Wings": *Tuan zhuan* 彖傳 (*Commentary on the Judgments*), *Wenyan zhuan* 文言傳 (*Commentary on the Words and Sayings*), *Xici zhuan* 繫辭傳 (*Judgment on the Appended Statements*), and *Shuo gua zhuan* 說卦傳 (*Commentary Discussing the Trigrams*). Deserving of special attention is Shaughnessy's spirited reading of *Qiankun lun* 乾坤論 (*Treatise on Qian and Kun*) from *Xici zhuan* (pp. 482-84); its complex symbolism, that according to the author ultimately refers to the

sexual union and the procreation of life, reverberates with the aforementioned interpretation of the *Shijing* imagery. It is also from *Xici zhuan* that the author derives the final discussion about the interrelationship of thought, speech, and script, as debated already towards the end of the Warring States period in China.

As I have already claimed at the beginning, Shaughnessy's book is an excellent, fulfilling, and compelling account of the origin and early development of the *Zhou Changes*, doubtless the most cryptic and tortuous of ancient Chinese classics. Indeed, the book can be regarded as an exemplary philological exercise in the "double evidence method" 二重證據法 (the central methodological tenet of Chinese historiography formulated by Wang Guowei 王國維 [1877-1927] in the first half of the twentieth century), as the author utilizes a wide array of received and unearthed materials, scrutinizing the *Zhouyi* text under the integrated lens of literature and philosophy, archaeology and history, as well as language and script. It is only from this last perspective that I would now like to engage with *The Origin* in a more critical fashion. However, I should hasten to emphasize that while Shaughnessy's recourse to a linguistic and paleographic analysis is frequent enough for me to feel justified in taking up several issues on this particular front, these thoughts have little to no bearing on the broad considerations and conclusions presented in the book, and are perhaps better viewed as potential points for further discussion.

First of all, in his enlightening inquiry into the semantic instability in the early development and functioning, if not the very creation, of the *Zhouyi* text, Shaughnessy's terminological choices at times tend to obscure the distinctions between lexical derivation, polysemy, and homonymy. The instability in question is splendidly illustrated by the author through a comparison between the received text and the Shanghai manuscript, where in the text of the hexagram Meng 蒙 (Shrouded), the title noun, also *meng* 蒙 (youthful ignorance), is written as *mang* 尨 (shaggy dog). While the precedence is usually given to the received version, namely the graph *mang* is treated as a

phonetic loan for *meng*, Shaughnessy points to the fact that both readings, vastly different as they are, can be grammatically and semantically accommodated into the context (pp. 52-54). Similarly, the author translates the name of the hexagram Jing 井 as "Well-Trap," to account for the two alternative readings of 井 as either "well" (*jing* 井) or as "trap" (*jing* 阱). We could clarify at this point that the two words, obviously cognate, in Old Chinese were pronounced with unvoiced and voiced onset—*tseŋʔ and *dzeŋʔ respectively, in Axel Schuessler's reconstruction.[3] Shaughnessy points out that in the Shanghai manuscript, the hexagram name is written as 荂, a character listed as the *guwen* 古文 form of 阱 *jing* "trap" in *Shuowen jiezì* 說文解字. The two alternative readings of the graph 井 as either "well" or "trap" project directly into the interpretation of the Nine in the Second line statement as either "shooting sardines at the bottom of the well" 井谷射鮒, as seen in the received text, or "shooting a pig in a pitfall trap" 荂浴豕豝, recorded in the Shanghai manuscript (pp. 57-59). However, Shaughnessy recapitulates these findings by saying that "(t)he diviners who created the hexagram and line statements seem to have very much appreciated the different senses of individual words, in the different line statements of a single hexagram often emphasizing different aspects of a single word." He echoes Richard Kunst in stating that "(i)n the Western Zhou or Spring and Autumn periods, when the *Zhou Changes* was being composed, the words of these word families were often written with a single character. I suspect the ancient diviners were already well aware that words are variable, changeable, and that in creating the *Yi*, the *Changes*, they sought to exploit this feature of their language" (p. 62). There is certain degree of confusion here between different senses of a single word and cognate words, a distinction admittedly often clouded by the Chinese script. For the sake of clarity, I would insist that what is "variable" and "changeable" here is

3 Axel Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to* Grammata Serica Recensa (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), 140-41.

the potential reading of the characters, regardless of whether the lexemes they may record are cognate, such as *tseŋʔ 井 and *dzeŋʔ 阱, or only phonetically similar but etymologically unrelated, like *meng* and *mang*. It follows that the feature exploited here is as much the faculty of the writing system, as it is the homophony and polysemy on the level of language.

By the same token, when Shaughnessy seeks to illustrate his convincing analysis of *heng* in the *Zhou Changes* as etymologically identical with *xiang*, he frames it as an instantiation of a "special feature of the Chinese language," which is that "many words involving the give and take of communications between two persons or two parties were originally expressed with a single word" (pp. 325-26). He then provides four specific examples, out of which only two are strictly applicable: *jie* 借 can indeed mean both "to lend" and "to borrow," and *ming* 明 can mean both "to explain" and "to understand." The other two cases, *shou* 授 (to give) and *shou* 受 (to receive) as well as *mai* 買 (to buy) and *mai* 賣 (to sell), are better characterized as pairs of cognates rather than single words. Obviously so in the case of 買 and 賣, still pronounced differently in modern Mandarin, it is also historically true for 授 and 受, pronounced differently up to Middle Chinese (despite having been indiscriminately written as 受 in the pre-Qin script).[4] Pedantic as such remarks may very well seem, I believe these distinctions are substantially meaningful and relate directly to our understanding of the changeability or instability of the *Zhouyi* text.

In a similarly captious spirit, one might point to other minor inconsistencies, few and far between as they are. For example, Shaughnessy explains the verb *zhen* 貞, one of the key technical terms in *Zhouyi*, as "to

4 This difference in pronunciation was tonal in Middle Chinese; however, what kind of morphological distinction in Old Chinese it reflects is the subject of an ongoing debate, far outside the scope of this review. See William H. Baxter and Laurent Sagart, *Old Chinese: A New Reconstuction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 59; Sun Yuwen 孫玉文, *Hanyu biandiao gouci kaobian* 漢語變調構詞考辨 [Textual research on word formation caused by tone change in Mandarin Chinese] (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2015), 180.

affirm." While this translation is generally convincing and well-grounded, among the arguments cited in its support the author includes the interpretation of the graph *ding* 丁 as the protograph of *ding* 釘 (nail) (pp. 68, 339-40). Plausible as the etymological relationship between the lexemes *zhen* and 釘 might be, it should be indicated that the paleographical association of the form 丁 with 釘 is rather outdated. One of the more current theories about the origin of 丁 (written as  in the oracle bone inscriptions) is that it represents the circular shape of a human head, being a protograph of the word family *ding* 頂 and *dian* 顛 (top of the head), as well as featuring in the early form of the character *tian* 天 (sky):  (天 also being cognate with 頂 and 顛).[5] It is somewhat puzzling to note that Shaughnessy himself seems inclined towards the latter explanation elsewhere.[6] Of course, as far as *The Origin* is concerned, it goes without saying that the author is in his full right to subscribe to the

---

5 Identification of the character 丁 with 釘 was proposed by Qing dynasty and Republican era scholars such as Liu Xinyuan 劉心源 (1848-1915), Lin Yiguang 林義光 (?-1932), and Wu Qichang 吳其昌 (1904-1944).

6 Shaughnessy credits Lionel C. Hopkins with pointing out that in the early forms of 天 "the round head is actually the character *ding* 丁, which simultaneously depicts the human head and also serves as the phonetic component for the character." Edward L. Shaughnessy, *Chinese Annals in the Western Observatory: An Outline of Western Studies of Chinese Unearthed Documents* (Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2019), 25. But in fact, Hopkins only remarked that in the early forms of 天, namely , , and , the components and represent the head of an anthropomorphic figure, and that 二 seen in the third form is a contraction of . He did not say anything about the connection of either component with 丁, phonetic or otherwise. See Lionel C. Hopkins, "Pictographic Reconnaissances: Being Discoveries, Recoveries, and Conjectural Raids in Archaic Chinese Writing," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (October 1917): 774-75. The connection between 丁, 頂, 顛, and 天 was drawn independently by Wen Yiduo 聞一多 (1899-1946) and Peter A. Boodberg (1903-1972), and later elaborated upon by more recent scholars. See Zheng Huisheng 鄭慧生, "Shi 'Ding'" 釋 '丁' [Interpreting "ding"], in *Jiaguwen yu Yinshang shi* 甲骨文與殷商史 [Oracle bone inscriptions and Shang history], ed. Song Zhenhao 宋鎮豪 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2013), 222-26; Peter A. Boodberg, "Some Proleptical Remarks on the Evolution of Archaic Chinese," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 2, no. 3/4 (December 1937): 369.

older theory. However, I do believe it would benefit more inquisitive readers to also learn about the newer one(s), even at the expense of the semantographic association of "nail" with "to affirm."

At the beginning of the seventh chapter, Shaughnessy writes that "(t)he *Xici zhuan* 繫辭傳 *Commentary on the Appended Statements* describes the creation of the eight trigrams, and presumably all things, including the sixty-four hexagrams, as a quasi mathematical process of division, deriving originally from a Great Ultimate (*taiji* 太極) or, probably more properly, a Great Constant (*da heng* 大恆) [...]" (p. 290). In the footnote, the author explains that the substitution of *ji* 極 by *heng* 恆 may have been due to either the taboo of the given name of Emperor Wen of Han, namely Liu Heng 劉恆, or motivated by the graphical similarity between the Small Seal forms of 亟 (*ji* 亟, a protograph of 極) and 𢆶 (*heng* 恆). I fear that the entire passage, along with the footnote, will be rather bewildering to uninitiated readers, as Shaughnessy altogether fails to mention the very reason behind the connection between 極 (ultimate) and 恆 (constant); that is, the fact that the Mawangdui manuscript of *Xici zhuan* has *da-heng* vis-à-vis *taiji* seen in the received version. This variation has been discussed at length by several scholars and indeed attributed to the graphical similarity between 亟 and 恆, though not in the Small Seal script, but across the Chu and Han (clerical) script forms. The Mawangdui manuscript was in all likelihood transcribed from a pre-existing Chu version, in which 極 had most probably been written as 𣐈 —an otherwise well-known practice of Chu scribes; the form 𣐈 was later mistaken by Western Han copyists for 恆.[7]

---

7 See Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, "Shi 'hengxian' haishi 'jixian'?" 是 " 恆先 " 還是 " 極先 " ？ [Is it "heng xian" or "ji xian"?], in *Qiu Xigui xueshu wenji: gudai lishi sixiang minsu juan* 裘錫圭學術文集・古代歷史思想民俗卷 [Anthology of Qiu Xigui's academic works: Volume on ancient historical thought and custom] (Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2012), 331; Xuan Jiancong 禤健聰, *Zhanguo Chuxi jianbo yongzi xiguan yanjiu* 戰國楚系簡帛用字習慣研究 [Research on character use in Chu wooden slips and silk manuscripts from the Warring States period] (Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 2017), 149-51.

Lastly, Shaughnessy confidently asserts that *yao* 爻 and *yao* (or *zhou*) 繇, both referring to the hexagram lines in the *Zhouyi* text, in antiquity were pronounced identically and represent the very same word (pp. 133, 264-65, 347). Such a claim is rather indefensible on phonological and paleographic grounds. 爻 and 繇 belong to different onsets and divisions in Middle Chinese, and, as Shaughnessy concedes (pp. 264-65), their reconstructed Old Chinese phonetic values vary accordingly; for example, Schuessler reconstructs 爻 as *grâu and 繇 as *jau (for *yao*) or *druh (for *zhou*).[8] Even the respective etymological meanings seem to be ultimately rooted in different kinds of mantic practices. The noun *yao* (or *zhou*) 繇 (aptly rendered in *The Origin* as "oracle") which in the textual record occurs in both turtle-shell and milfoil divinatory contexts, has been tentatively connected by Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭 to the noun *zhao* 兆 (pyromantic crack on the bone surface) and the cognate verb *zhan* 占 (to predict, prognosticate).[9] As for 爻, Shaughnessy himself indicates that the character is "said to be a pictograph of crossed counting sticks, hearkening back to the Changes' use in sortilege" (p. 347). In fact, the word 爻 may

8 Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese*, 196, 199-200. 爻 belongs to the initial consonant *xia* 匣, second-type division 二等; 繇 belongs to the initial consonant *yi* 以, third-class division 三等. In a paleographic perspective, one of the most widely accepted theories about the component 𠂤 seen in the characters 繇, 鎎, etc. is that it derives from the protograph of *you* 鼬 (weasel); 由, the phonetic component in 鼬, likewise belongs to the third-class division of initial consonant 以 in Middle Chinese. See Zhu Fangpu 朱芳圃, *Yinzhou wenzi shicong* 殷周文字釋叢 [Interpretations of Zhou script] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 11-12; Zeng Xiantong 曾憲通, "Shuo yao" 說繇 [On *yao*], in *Guwenzi yu chutu wenxian congkao* 古文字與出土文獻叢考 [Verifications of Old Chinese and unearthed documents] (Guangzhou: Zhongshan daxue chubanshe, 2005), 23-30.

9 Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, "Cong Yinxu buci de 'wang zhan yue' shuodao gu Hanyu de xiaotan duizhuan" 從殷墟卜辭的"王占曰"說到古漢語的宵談對轉 [From "Wang zhan yue" in Shang divinations to Old Chinese], in *Qiu Xigui xueshu wenji: jiaguwen juan* 裘錫圭學術文集・甲骨文卷 [Anthology of Qiu Xigui's academic works: Volume on matters of oracle bone inscriptions] (Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2012), 489.

very well be etymologically related to *jiao* 交 (to cross, intersect).[10] In other words, 爻 and 爻 are both divinatory terms, but with quite different origins and pronunciations; their referential overlap within the *Zhouyi* tradition is hardly an evidence of lexical identity.

Such are the thoughts about Shaughnessy's book that I might venture to offer from the comfortable refuge of one's own disciplinary backyard. At the same time, I do not feel that the issues raised above are of any consequence regarding the scholarly value of *The Origin*. They certainly constitute no more than an individual outlook at just one of many theoretical toolkits with which Edward Shaughnessy excavates and reconstructs the temple of the *Zhou Changes*. That he completes this arduous endeavor with spectacular success is, to me, beyond question.

10 See Liu Junjie 劉鈞杰, *Tongyuan zidian bu* 同源字典補 [Supplement to the dictionary of cognates] (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1999), 32.