



Narrative Section of a Successful Application

The attached document contains the grant narrative of a previously funded grant application, which conforms to a past set of grant guidelines. It is not intended to serve as a model, but to give you a sense of how a successful application may be crafted. Every successful application is different, and each applicant is urged to prepare a proposal that reflects its unique project and aspirations. Prospective applicants should consult the application guidelines for instructions. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to consult with the NEH Division of Research Programs staff well before a grant deadline.

Note: The attachment only contains the grant narrative, not the entire funded application. In addition, certain portions may have been redacted to protect the privacy interests of an individual and/or to protect confidential commercial and financial information and/or to protect copyrighted materials.

Project Title:	Translation of the Gongyang and Guliang Commentaries to Spring and Autumn Annals: An Early Chinese Text
Institution:	Connecticut College
Project Director:	Sarah Ann Queen
Grant Program:	Scholarly Editions and Translations Program

Proposal Narrative

Historiography and Hermeneutics in Early China: A Translation of the *Gongyang* and *Guliang*
Commentaries to *Spring and Autumn Annals*
Sarah Queen and Joachim Gentz

Significance and Impact

The *Gongyang* 公羊 (*GY*) and *Guliang* 穀梁 (*GL*) commentaries, the two texts proposed for translation here, are foundational texts in Chinese intellectual history. They are the first known systematic commentaries in Chinese history to have established a tradition of hermeneutics and have exercised a profound influence upon Chinese intellectual, legal, political and institutional history, particularly, although not exclusively, during the Han dynasty (206 BCE-221 CE), the late Qing period (19th and early 20th centuries), and on into the 21st century as an influential political perspective within the recent Confucian Revival. The *GY* commentary achieved the status of the leading classic in the early Han (2nd-1st century BCE) at a time when the foundations of Chinese imperial institutions were established. Its political vision of a unified empire with a strong ruler, based on a system of ritual and ethical rules had a lasting impact on the formation of the Chinese state. The *GL* commentary, although having somewhat lesser impact than *GY* on Chinese intellectual and political life, was favored by imperial rulers at certain periods during the Han, even generating formal debates with *GY* advocates, and was often honored for its putative close relationship to the earlier state of Lu, the homeland of Confucius. The inter-subjective, rule-based rationality of the two commentaries has influenced, and set new standards for, Chinese legal, historical, and political argumentation. At the same time *GY* and *GL* also provided the foundations for the possibilities to use Confucianism as a state ideology from the 2nd century BCE onward, a role that Confucianism held in most periods throughout China's imperial history, because they are commentaries on one of the five Confucian classics, *Chunqiu* 春秋 (most often translated as "Spring and Autumn Annals," but which we shall herein simply call "*Annals*").

Annals, which will also be newly translated as a third text along with the two commentaries because of its inextricable relationship to them, is an ostensibly straightforward record consisting of just over 1800 entries registering events that took place between 722 and 481 BCE as seen from the perspective of the state of Lu (Shandong peninsula), the home of Confucius. These entries, which compose the earliest Chinese historical record that we possess, average less than ten written Chinese characters each and were probably compiled by a sequence of official scribes working at the Lu court. Whether this compilation was produced to maintain a memory of past events or as ritual announcements at state shrines to deceased ancestors, or for both purposes simultaneously, is a matter of on-going scholarly discussion. Since the *Annals* entries are contemporary to the events registered, they are valuable to historians of early China. However, the next step in the history of *Annals* concerns us here. It ultimately resulted in the production of the *GY* and *GL* commentaries and their noteworthy hermeneutic tradition, which are so highly significant for Chinese intellectual history. The philosopher Mencius (372-289 BCE) claimed that Confucius himself put *Annals* into its final form and that it emerged from the master's hand as a text of astounding power: "Confucius completed the *Annals* and struck terror into the hearts of rebellious subjects and undutiful sons" (*Mencius*, IIIB.9). Moreover, Mencius quotes Confucius as saying, "Those who understand me will do so through the *Annals*." The assumption that Confucius had composed the *Annals* linked this text directly to Confucius himself, bestowing upon this classic an unrivaled authority and prestige enjoyed throughout the ages. Though he might be best known, at least in the West, for *Lunyu* 論語 (*Analects*), that is a collection of the recollections and notes of later disciples and is consequently only indirectly connected to the master. Combined with the idea that Confucius was the last of the true sages, all of this makes *Annals* a document of highest importance, and it exerted decisive normative power in intellectual debates on the founding institutions of the Chinese empire. The further claim that the *GY* and *GL* commentaries were handed down by Confucius's family members and

disciples and transmit Confucius's explanations of the short annalistic records of the *Annals* made these commentaries keys to the deep and hidden wisdom, which could not otherwise be accessed from the ostensibly dry and straightforward records themselves. The search for meaningful messages in *Annals* started early, perhaps earlier than Mencius's claims above, and it was intense. Since no cursory, disinterested reading of *Annals* is likely to uncover any such messages, the search for meaning in the terse entries focused upon every word, every implication, and, yes, every instance of silence. Somewhere in those entries, the exegete believes, he might uncover an authorial intention or editorial intention that will lead him to the very core of Confucian understanding of human morality and of the perfect state.

We know the names of several other *Annals* commentaries that have been lost, but in addition to the *GY* and *GL* commentaries, a third commentary known as the *Zuozhuan* 左傳 (*ZZ*) has been transmitted down to the present day and has also, in its own way, exerted great influence upon Chinese civilization. These three surviving commentaries were incorporated into the Tang dynasty (618-907) collection of the "Twelve Confucian Classics" and were inscribed on stelae in the capital at Chang'an, a fitting testimony to their centrality in the life of the traditional Confucian polity of the Chinese empire. Despite being regularly described as an "*Annals* commentary," *ZZ* may not originally have been tightly linked to *Annals* at all and is largely comprised of historical and pseudo-historical narratives with *some* direct *Annals* commentary added at an early stage of its compilation. However, *GY* and *GL*, in contrast to *ZZ*, always use *Annals* entries as a point of departure and are very much commentaries, albeit commentaries of a rather strange and, we think, intriguing sort. *GY* scholars dominated *Annals* studies throughout the revival of book culture during the time of Emperor Wu (r. 141-87 BCE) and exerted considerable political impact as well as holding positions in the Imperial Academy. This changed during the reign of the Han Emperor Xuan (r. 74-48 BCE), who favored *GL* and established a chair for *GL* studies in the Imperial Academy, after considerable dispute. There is much more to this story to tell, but the critical fact is that throughout the Han, *Annals* was regarded, in the words of Sarah Queen, "as a blueprint of the Way of Heaven, the perfect model for ordering the human world" (1996:122) and exegetes in the *GY* and *GL* traditions strove mightily to find the sinews of that "perfect model." The exegetical hermeneutic found in these two commentaries does not display the type of "over-interpretation" Umberto Eco describes for late Medieval and Renaissance Europe, where "if books tell the truth . . . then their each and every word must be an allusion or allegory" (1992:30), a process which takes us whirling outwards into realms quite different from where the reading began. While equally concerned with words, and almost as often, with the presumed elision of a word, *GY* and *GL* lead us on a search for "profound meaning captured in its subtle terminology" 微言大義, to quote the most common early Chinese characterization. The significance is not so much "out there" as "in here" and resembles in some ways a Jewish Rabbinic tradition that involves "the isolation of a word, phrase, or clause from its surrounding Scriptural text" and makes it a subject of intense scrutiny (Samely 2002: 33). In sum, these texts were a critical center of intellectual life during the Han and were even revived as subjects of sharp controversy at the end of the Qing period and on into the early years of the Republic. In Taiwan, *GY* was still taught as the most profound of all Confucian classics by scholars like Aisin-Gioro Yuyun 愛新覺羅毓鋆 (1908–2011, great-great grandson of the Daoguang Emperor) until the 1980s and is propagated as the most authoritative Confucian source for the conception of a New Confucian state by at least one PRC scholar (Jiang Qing) in recent years.

The translations for which we seek NEH support will be of interest to scholars and students in a wide range of fields. From a comparative perspective, these two commentaries occupy a unique position in world history in several respects. They are the earliest extant commentaries that attempt to fully explain an entire earlier text systematically by defining exegetical rules down to the level of word meaning and syntax. Furthermore, in their interpretation of *Annals*, their exegetical rules established what may well be the earliest systematic attempt in world history to define the historiographical principles, literary patterns, and meaning of a previous historical text. The commentaries contain sophisticated reflections on the reliability of sources and on the putative historical viewpoint of the author, and they offer an overall theory of history in a consensus-oriented, argumentative, rule-governed and terminologically articulated

communication. All this makes them important contributions to global intellectual history and highly significant for historians. The explicit formulation of complex interpretative principles in these commentaries created a rich hermeneutical methodology, as noted earlier, and these principles were additionally applied in the field of precedent law to create a whole new abstract legislative methodology, which makes them and their subsequent use especially relevant to historians of law. In terms of ideology, the commentaries hold a unique position within early Chinese discussions on political philosophy, especially in their attempt to determine the relationship between ritual and morality. Their ideological stance places them somewhere between a traditional person-centered monarchy, in which the concepts of virtue, loyalty, and filial piety are central, and a new, impersonal system operating on the basis of an abstract set of highly efficient ruling techniques and bureaucratic rules. They are therefore also relevant to philosophers and historians of thought. With their foci on ritual laws, they bridge the conceptual spheres of religion, morality, and law. Because ritual rules, their functions and meanings, are discussed in some detail in both *GY* and *GL*, they should be of great interest both to scholars of Ritual Studies in general and also, more particularly, to scholars seeking to understand early Chinese ritual. In addition, *GY* develops a political vision of an empire without political borders that is defined on cultural grounds, which is quite unique in world history. Due to its distinctive vision of the Central States as part of a conglomerate of other states, it has been one of the major reference texts for Chinese modernizers and reformers since the late 19th century and for Chinese intellectuals up to the present day, which should make it of considerable interest to Political Studies scholars interested in international relations. Indeed, the stunning number of extraordinary features of these commentaries presented here in a concise form should engage and stimulate not only students and specialists of the Chinese past but also scholars and readers beyond the sinological world. In summary, a translation which makes the nuances and intricate subtleties of these commentaries accessible through an annotated, precise scholarly translation will enable students and scholars of all disciplines to access the high intellectual standards set by these Chinese commentaries from the 3rd century BCE and use this knowledge to enrich their own studies.

A full translation of the *Guliang Commentary* by Gen Liang 耿亮 (2011), was published by the translator's children in a bilingual edition 42 years after his death. It still has the characteristics of a manuscript, is imprecise, full of grammatical and conceptual mistakes, not annotated, and uses the unreliable Chinese text versions from the websites ctext.org and wikisource.org. The translation is far from being an academic translation and is often misleading. A complete translation of the *Gongyang Commentary* was published several years ago by Harry Miller (2015). It is a rather imprecise translation (see the review by Van Auken 2018) that is based, as the translator acknowledges, almost entirely on the vernacular Chinese translation of Xue Ke 雪克 and Zhou Fengwu 周鳳五 (2008) and is in format and style quite different from our own translation, most notably in including no written Chinese characters. The distinguished Swedish linguist and sinologist Göran Malmqvist (1924-2019) has fully translated the first three chapters of *Gongyang* and *Guliang* and has provided excerpted translations from the final nine chapters, so that, overall, his translation includes approximately one-half of both texts (see 1971, 1975, and 1977). Any new English translator must consult Malmqvist and his few but useful notes. Indeed, Malmqvist sets a very high bar for subsequent translators, at least for those portions of the text he completed. Nevertheless, his work is not easily accessed, particularly in this era when so many university libraries no longer value the collection and maintenance of journals (although the Thesaurus Linguae Sericae webpage does include all of Malmqvist's *Guliang* translation online). There are two readily available English translations of *Annals*: James Legge (1872/1895) and Stephen Durrant, Wai-ye Li, and David Schaberg (2016). Our translation will remedy the deficiencies noted in these earlier English translations by increased rigor and consistency, a strong supporting apparatus (discussed below), and, perhaps mostly importantly, by treating both the *GY* and *GL* commentaries as part of a single hermeneutic tradition, a tradition that also includes the *Zuo* commentary, to which our explanatory notes will regularly refer.

Chinese and Japanese *Annals* scholarship (including commentarial traditions) has flourished for centuries, no doubt due to the prestige and reverence this text has garnered since its early incorporation

into the Confucian Canon in the 2nd century C.E.. In contrast, English language scholarship on *Annals* and its commentarial traditions (*Zuo*, *Gongyang*, and *Guliang*) is quite limited. Studies of the *Zuo Commentary* have focused on the early history or historiography of Warring States China and shall not concern us here. Van Auken's monograph (2016) remains one of the few works that analyze in detail the exegetical methodology found in different textual layers of the *Zuo* commentary. In recent decades Joachim Gentz and Sarah Queen have worked to expand early readings of the *Annals*, hitherto largely limited to the *Zuo* Commentary, through their research and publications on the *Gongyang* commentary. While Gentz has discussed questions of dating and exegetical methodology, Queen has focused on the function of the historical narratives and the historical context of the *Gongyang* tradition up to Dong Zhongshu. Almost no research on the *GY* has been published in the West beyond Queen's and Gentz's works. The *Guliang* Commentary, in contrast, has received little attention in Western scholarship beyond scattered observations in Tjan (1949), Malmqvist (1975), and Cheng (1985), and a recent article by Van Auken focusing upon a small, albeit important, grammatical issue (2014).

In China research on the two commentaries has mainly developed in five fields: First, new critical text editions as well as traditional commentarial works (Li 2005, Liao 2012, Zhang/Xi 2013, Liu 2017); Second, histories of traditional *GY/GL* scholarship which mainly focus on the late 19th century early 20th century discussions (Chen 1997, Ding 2002, Duan 2002); Third, books on the thought of *GY/GL* (Jiang 1995, Wu 2000, Lin 2003, Qin 2012) that are mainly informed by the interpretations of the commentator He Xiu (129-182 C.E.) and continue to focus on the themes already discussed by reformist thinkers in the late 19th century; Fourth, works on the editorial history of the *GL* (Zhou 2002, Wang 2014); and fifth, numerous translations into modern vernacular Chinese (*baihua*) (see bibliography). The updated editions are of high academic quality and particularly valuable for our own translation work which will build on them.

Japanese research mainly focuses on *GY*. In the 1990s a research group was organized in Tokyo to work through the *GY* and He Xiu's commentary with a strong philological interest that mainly replicated within the Japanese context the Chinese traditional approach of reading *GY* through He Xiu (Iwamoto 1994). But all in all, very little substantial original new research has been published on *GY* and *GL* in China and Japan since the 1980s, and, apart from Queen's and Gentz's works, scholarly analyses of *GY/GL* that engage with these commentaries in a transdisciplinary way, are lacking. It is precisely this void in the literature that we anticipate our translation will fill by promoting a wider readership of these two historically significant commentaries.

History of the Project and Productivity

The three participants in this project have been familiar with one another's work for many years. Two of them, Project Director Sarah Queen and Joachim Gentz, have planned for some time to engage in a full translation of the *Gongyang* commentary. Stephen Durrant, in collaboration with two other early China scholars, has just completed and published a translation of the *Zuo* commentary. As we have noted above, the latter work is somewhat different in style from *GY* and *GL* but is closely related in terms of being organized at an early stage of its transmission around *Annals*, and, moreover, contains certain passages which significantly overlap with *GY* and/or *GL*. Durrant is particularly interested in *GL*, which has been the most overlooked of the commentaries, at least in Western scholarship. It seemed to us a natural collaboration and coalesced around a request from Oxford University Press for us to submit a proposal for their recently launched Hsu-T'ang Library of Classical Chinese Literature, edited by Stefan Vranka. The Hsu-Tang Library of Classical Chinese Literature takes as its model the Loeb Classical Library of Greek and Latin literature. It will publish new translations that are both reliable and eminently readable for scholars, students, and the wider public. Detailed introductions and explanatory notes will accompany each volume, providing readers with rich historical and cultural context. In addition to handsome print volumes, the series will host digital versions of the texts on an online platform, available for institutional and individual subscription. The purpose of this new series is "to give a voice to three millennia of China's classical literary tradition" and "to feature classical Chinese literature in its broadest

incarnation, ranging from philosophical and religious literature to poetry, fiction, drama, and other literary genres.”

After discussion with the academic editors of the Hsu-T’ang series, we decided to submit a proposal to translate both *GY* and *GL* and to present these commentaries in a unified form with the parallel commentaries from each text presented one after another under each *Annals* entry (see more on this below). Our proposal was accepted after a process of extensive review. A contract has been issued, preliminary work on the project has begun, and we expect to complete the project by the end of summer 2023. The very fact that our proposed volume has already been selected to be among the first works planned for publication in this series, a series that is destined to become the most prestigious series of its sort in English, indicates the confidence Oxford University Press has in our collaboration. These works will be sold and promoted in English- and Chinese-speaking markets throughout the world. In short, the series aims to introduce contemporary readers to the literary heritage of one of the world’s great civilizations. With the support of this press, we are confident that our translation will be widely disseminated.

Collaborators

This translation is a collaborative work of three scholars of quite different perspectives and backgrounds: Project Director Sarah Queen is a historian of the Han period, Joachim Gentz is steeped in philosophy and hermeneutics, and Stephen Durrant is a specialist in early Chinese literature. Queen and Gentz have already published extensively on these texts and the world from which they emerged, and Queen and Durrant have been part of other teams that have translated two related texts, the *Zuo Tradition* (2016) and *Luxuriant Gems of Spring and Autumn Annals* (2015). Queen has not only been the Lead Principal Investigator of this latter translation (618pp) which was initially funded by NEH is 2009-10, but she has also completed a full team translation (986pp) of the important Han philosophical compendium, the *Huainanzi* (2010) funded through the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation. She is thus an experienced team translator of early Chinese texts and well qualified to act as project director for this team translation. Her deep knowledge of and extensive work on the *Luxuriant Gems of Spring and Autumn Annals*, a text that further systematically discusses and develops the hermeneutics of the *GY* tradition, will be a great asset to this collaboration. Furthermore, she has written a monograph and articles on this text and has also published on the *GY* commentary with which she is deeply familiar. Joachim Gentz has written a monograph (634pp) on the *GY* commentary (2001), the most significant study yet to appear in a Western language on this work, and has continued to do research and to publish on the *GY* commentary over the last twenty years. He is an expert on early Chinese thought and hermeneutics and has published numerous articles on early Chinese commentaries, argumentation and conceptual terminology. Stephen Durrant has been part of a team that produced the award-winning translation in 3 vols. (2147pp) of the *Zuo* commentary (2016) and has published extensively on early Chinese literature and historiography. He is thus not only familiar with the historical contents of the *Annals*, with one of its canonical commentaries, and with all the methodological and presentational issues involved in translating *Annals* with commentary, but he is also experienced in a long-term team translation project.

As laid out in more detail below, our goal is to begin full time work on this translation October 2021 and to work continuously and collectively over the two ensuing years. Queen and Gentz will be taking sabbaticals to coordinate with Durrant who has retired from teaching responsibilities and is consequently able to work full time as well. Each of us will contribute equally to this translation. We plan to commit approximately thirty to forty hours per week to this project, depending on the varied funding we receive each semester, for the duration of the two years, distributing our time between individual work and collaborative work. The collaborative work will take the form of reviewing each other’s translations as well as regular meetings, virtual and in person, to discuss and further refine principles of our translations, individual terms and concepts, interpretations of specific text passages and translation style. This will enable us to contribute our respective strengths while building on individual strengths in our collaborative work. The strength of this team, we believe, is that our expertise complements one another

and spans the disciplines of history, philosophy, religious studies, and literature. Not only are our fields of expertise different but so are our approaches to the texts we are translating. In short, we expect plenty of lively give and take as our work proceeds in the years ahead, but we know one another well enough to give assurance that this ongoing discussion will be productive and mutually educational.

Methods and Execution

Beyond the MLA standard guidelines for annotations, introductions, indexes and other scholarly apparatus that we will follow in our translation, our approach to the translation of these texts is to some extent informed by certain theoretical considerations. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1993) has argued that a translator should labor to preserve the stylistic features of the original, even at the expense of English. To do otherwise, she says, is an act of appropriation and a distortion of the original. While we can agree with this, it leaves translators of these particular texts in something of a quandary. A fairly literal and responsible translation of the *GY* and *GL* commentaries, such as we intend to produce, is sure to result at times in strange English, although we do hope that our English translation will be grammatical, reasonably colloquial, and clear. But when we attempt to follow Spivak's subsequent advice and fully immerse ourselves and our eventual readers in the cultural and linguistic details of these particular texts, we find ourselves entering into a challenging, indeed somewhat hermetic, world. Which is to say that even within their original Chinese context these particular texts must have seemed singular, perhaps for some readers virtually inaccessible. Why? First, they are constructed in a relentlessly catechistic style that reflects the pedagogical milieu from which they originally emerged. Second, they are stylistically formulaic, with the same grammatical patterns and vocabulary repeating frequently, leaving translators to struggle with the question of how much of this to replicate strictly and how much to alter, however slightly. And third, and perhaps most problematic of all, they beg for contextualization and supportive explanation not only for today's culturally distant English readers, but, we suspect, for those early Chinese readers who were not an immediate part of the communities in which these texts took form. While these communities were not religious communities, at least in the sense we usually employ this term, the texts themselves seem constructed more around a hermeneutic of faith than a hermeneutic of reason. That is, one must begin by accepting certain premises about *Annals*, especially that Confucius put that text into its final form and that the *GY* and *GL* authors transmitted his true hidden intentions so that, as the great Qing dynasty classical scholar Pi Xirui 皮希瑞 (1850-1908) said, "*Annals* great principles, conveyed through subtle words, would become a standard for ten-thousand generations." Such principles, however, can only be extracted through disciplined reading, which reveals certain rules from the text, with a teacher-master sitting at one's side.

Given these challenges, how do we as translators of these daunting texts proceed? "Thick translation," to apply Kwame Anthony Appiah's useful term (1993), will provide the solution. In this regard, earlier translators of these texts, few though there have been, failed. How do we proceed to correct this circumstance and develop the sort of "thickness" that might enable us to translate *GY* and *GL* within an appropriately rich historical and cultural context? First, our introduction will be a fairly lengthy and detailed one. As currently conceived, it will include: (A) a historical introduction to the genre of *Annals* commentaries which will be crucial to explain and introduce some of their basic exegetical assumptions and their rationale in the light of early Chinese historiographical practice; (B) the social and intellectual setting in which the commentaries were created, which will help us to explain their basic function and purpose; (C) the reception history which has determined the understanding and use of these commentaries from Han times until today. This is relevant because it differs quite considerably from our understanding of the original texts and is therefore needed to explain our own approach to the texts stripped from their commentaries; (D) an introduction to our own comparative perspective of these two texts which defines our interest, approach and methodology as well as providing a reflection on the historical contribution that these commentaries have made to Chinese/global hermeneutics; (E) more technical explanations of our principles and methods of translation to make our work as transparent as possible for our readers.

Second, we have earlier made the decision, with the enthusiastic approval of our Oxford University Press academic editors, to emphasize that *GY* and *GL* commentaries are part of a single hermeneutic and historiographic tradition and that we would consequently present them not as separate texts but in an interlocked form. Some of the short and technical *GY* and *GL* comments are so elliptic and nuances in the diverging presentations of historical narratives so minute that they can only be understood in the light of each other, and such presentation reveals the interpretative counter text against which they were written. Much of the competitive tension and many of the implicit counter-arguments in the commentaries can only be fully explored when read side by side. This comparative approach will also have an impact on our translation strategy which will aim to make these comparative nuances explicit and visible.

Third, deciding what to footnote and how to strike the proper balance between information in footnotes and information in explanatory headers and footers will be an ongoing challenge. We cannot ignore the important early *Annals* exegetical chapters of the *Chunqiu fanlu*, which often provide excellent interpretations of both *GY* and *GL*. Fortunately, two of our team (Queen and Gentz) have worked on these and Queen has recently published a full translation of them. We also will include occasional comments from two additional early and most influential commentators on these commentaries: He Xiu 何休 (129-182 CE) for *GY* and Fan Ning 范甯 (339?-401?) for *GL*. Both of these, especially the former, are important less for helping us understand the original text than demonstrating the direction study of these two texts took in the earliest centuries after they were written down and subsequently also in later times which mostly followed these early readings. Beyond that, footnotes should elucidate the text without becoming superfluous or overwhelming.

Fourth, our translation will not only include the ample footnotes explaining features and problems of the text that might make them difficult or even incomprehensible for a non-sinologist reader, but, in addition, after major commentarial units, we will provide explanations in a different font (italics in our on-going manuscript). These will compare the *GY* and *GL* exegesis of the *Annals* entry in question, provide certain background information, and adduce relevant material from other closely related texts, particularly the *Zuo* commentary, which Durrant has previously translated, and *Luxuriant Gems of Spring and Autumn Annals*, which Queen has previously translated, and, on a somewhat more limited basis, other early Chinese texts, such as *Lunyu* and the ritual texts, which might have influenced and/or been “in dialogue” with portions of these commentaries.

Fifth, we envision two appendices: one a glossary of technical terms employed in these two commentaries; and one a list of the primary “rules” that these texts propose for reading *Annals* correctly. This material will not only be helpful in reading and understanding our translation but will also be a valuable resource for scholars who wish to pursue further research on the contribution that these two texts made to hermeneutics, historiography and ritual studies in Chinese and in world history.

In the course of our work, we intend to enhance the expertise reflected in our translation and notes by drawing upon our wide range of contacts within the field of early China studies and consulting with experts from Asia, Europe, and North America as need arises. Such experts might include, among other possibilities, Zhang Suqing 張素卿 and Newell Ann Van Auken on *Annals* exegesis, Li Longxian 李隆獻 on general “classics study” [經學], Leonard Hung-Shing Cheung on *Guliang*, Hans van Ess and Yuri Pines on historical context, and Christoph Harbsmeier and Wolfgang Behr on issues of language, grammar and phonology.

We will not only consult, as necessary, living experts on these texts but also the voices of experts transmitted in the many works that have discussed and analyzed these two commentaries in the past. We have tried to honor traditional Chinese commentaries and studies of *GY* and *GL*, beginning with the early “canonical” commentators mentioned above, He Xiu and Fan Ning, and continuing on up through the millennia to current scholars working in classical and modern Chinese, Japanese, Manchu, German, French, and English. Finally, in addition to consulting these English translations, we shall also consult from time to time, several available Modern Chinese and Japanese translations, as well as a 1737 Manchu translation of *Annals* and both commentaries (Bauer 1959). A good idea of the number of primary and

secondary sources we plan to utilize in producing this translation can be gained from our bibliography (attached). The very vastness and multilingual composition of that bibliography make collaboration essential. In selecting these sources.

For over two centuries, the most authoritative text edition of the Confucian classics which is used as the standard text edition for all the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* translations in any language is Ruan Yuan's 阮元 *Shisanjing zhushu fu jiaokan ji* 十三經注疏附校勘記 (*Thirteen Classics with Commentaries, Subcommentaries, and Added Notes of Critical Text Collation*) originally published in 1815–1816. Much has happened since this 19th century publication, existing sources have been re-evaluated and new sources have been discovered. New and earlier sources have been identified, further text editions from Dunhuang and Japan have been discovered, and textual studies research has progressed. We will use the most up-to-date editions that have built on Ruan Yuan's work and further refined it. For our *Gongyang* translation we will use an edition from the new Shanghai guji series *Shisanjing zhushu zhengluben* 十三經注疏整理本 (*A New Critical Edition of the Thirteen Classics with Commentaries, Subcommentaries*), a series edited by Zhang Qizhi 張其成 which revises Ruan Yuan's edition on the basis of most recent textual studies research. This publication contains the *Gongyang* edition *Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan zhushu* 春秋公羊傳注疏 (*Gongyang Commentary to the Annals with Commentary and Subcommentary*). It has been most meticulously collated by Diao Xiaolong 刁小龍 (Shanghai, 2014, 2 vols). No *Guliang* edition has been published in this series so far so we will rely on the Zhonghua edition of Liao Ping's 廖平 (1852-1932) *Guliang guyi shu* 穀梁古義疏 (*A Subcommentary on the Ancient Meanings of the Guliang Commentary*) which is the most reliable edition at hand (Beijing, 2000, 2 vols). We will, at any rate, reproduce the latest and best Chinese editions we can access, making our own editorial notes only where we select an alternative reading that makes a significant difference in our translation. Given the excellent editorial quality of the Confucian canon and our earlier experiences developing partial translations of the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* texts, we do not expect to find any significant editorial variants that would cause substantial changes in our present proposed translation. We therefore do not see the need to produce a new critical edition to accompany this proposed translation.

While we have already collected for our previous research much of the essential material for this project, it will be critical to fill out our libraries, both digital and physical, with the most recent editions and other relevant scholarly resources. Particularly important, we believe, will be to explore and work out the most effective way of exchanging files, and, in particular, working with the Chinese text, which we are required to submit to our publisher along with the final translation. In these research activities, NEH support will be helpful. In addition to the existing collections of the primary works and secondary scholarship in our libraries we will also have to purchase more specialized works and will try to get hold of as many electronic versions of these texts as possible. Where necessary we will employ OCR scans of these works to be able to search in all texts for discussions of particular terms, concepts and topics. All three translators in this project are familiar with the existing databases of early Chinese texts and how to use them in their translations and research. We will also compile a handbook of exegetical rules for these commentaries in the form of a database. Attempts to do this on which we can draw have been undertaken for the *GY* commentary by Joachim Gentz (2001: 571-595) and for the *GL* commentary by Gen Liang (2011: xv-xxvi).

Despite the complexity of this project and the large number of sources upon which we intend to draw, the success of our methodology will come down to our own scholarly discretion and our capacity to work successfully as a team. Given our positive experience with previous team translations, which resulted in some of the most widely acclaimed translations of early Chinese texts to be published in the last twenty years, we believe that the additional qualitative value in precision and depth of understanding gained by a collaborative effort in team translations undertaken by experts in the field is much higher than the sum of its parts. Textual difficulties can take different forms. They can be caused by a lack of understanding of either the historical context or the particular argument, or by linguistic and literary peculiarities of the text (genre). We expect that the combination of different expertise and experience with early Chinese texts in this team will help to identify and overcome many of these difficulties.

While our emphasis above has been upon the daunting and somewhat technical nature of our translation, our goal is to open up this commentarial tradition to readers far beyond the rather limited circle of sinologists. We believe profoundly in the importance of these texts, not just for China specialists but for those interested in global humanities and social science as well – a belief that motivates this work – and our intention is to translate, interpret, and write in a way that is accessible and, whenever possible, lively. At the same time, and here is our biggest challenge, we strongly desire to honor the cultural world from which these texts emerged by avoiding the kind of appropriation that erases or obscures that world. We believe we can achieve this, but we have no illusions about the effort that achievement will require.

Work Plan

Since we previously submitted a book proposal to Oxford University Press, which has now been formally accepted, initial exploratory work on our translation has already begun. Our team is currently in regular contact with one another and is in the process of drafting rough translations and compiling glossaries and other materials to assist us in eventually producing a rigorous translation that reflects as best we can the essential features of the original texts. We have, for example, a rough draft translation in hand of just over one-fourth of the two commentaries (160 single-spaced pages in manuscript), which will serve as a resource for refining and organizing our work as we move forward. We will continue to push forward with this draft and supportive materials, as each of us has time over the next months. Due to the pressures of teaching and other service responsibilities for two members of the team, this initial work is not as intensive and tightly organized as what we plan for our period of full-time work on this project, which will begin in October 2021 after the conclusion of the current academic year.

We wish to stress here that while we three will fully participate in and take responsibility for the entire final product, there will be some division of responsibilities. Queen and Gentz will be the primary translators of *GY*, a text on which they are experts and have extensive experience. Meanwhile, Durrant will concentrate his efforts largely on *GL*. However, each member of the team will review and, where necessary, suggest changes in all portions of the text. Very close collaboration between the *GY* and *GL* translators is necessary precisely because these texts overlap considerably, with the latter (*GL*), at least we now believe, drawing fairly extensively on the former (*GY*). It will of course be necessary as our translation proceeds to keep in touch with our academic editors at Oxford University Press, Wiebke Denecke of MIT and Lucas Klein of the City University of Hong Kong, to make certain our work complies fully with our publisher's structural and stylistic expectations.

Our goal is to complete a semi-final draft translation by October 2022. NEH support would facilitate this effort by providing the released time which we have requested (Durrant is retired and not included in this released-time request). The second year of work, October 2022 to September 2023, will involve revision of the translation and accompanying apparatus, writing a lengthy introduction, and preparing necessary appendices and indices. The completed manuscript would then be presented to our publisher in September 2023.

We have already been in contact with one another on a fairly regular basis, and this will continue during the months immediately ahead. The three of us are separated by a considerable distance (Scotland, Massachusetts, and Oregon) and coordinate our work via regular Zoom conferences and exchanging google documents so that our individual talents and knowledge can be used in the most efficient and complementary fashion. Our experience, however, tells us that while technology has made exchanging texts and speaking to one another on Zoom or Facetime an excellent way to coordinate collaborative work, nothing substitutes for spending time sitting around a table and resolving the many issues we are sure to confront. Thus, we envision three weeklong person-to-person workshops at critical stages of our work. As currently foreseen, the first of these workshops will be held in autumn 2021 as we begin our period of most intense work. The second would follow in spring 2022, to review what we believe will be the substantial progress we have made by that point, and the third in late autumn 2022 to work out details for the final draft of the translation and introduction and to lay the groundwork for the supplementary materials our volume will include. We are requesting NEH funds to help support travel to these

workshops. It is possible we will on occasion need to draw on the expertise of other specialists in such deliberations, as we have noted earlier.

Final Product and Dissemination

We have recently secured a contract with Oxford University Press to publish our completed translation as part of the Hsu-Tang Library of Chinese Classics series. The final product will be published as a single print volume with Chinese text accompanying the English translation. It will also be available in digital format as the Oxford University Press series will host digital versions of the texts on an online platform, available for institutional and individual subscription. Advertising and distribution will be dealt with by Oxford University Press. We do not expect to encounter copyright issues in our work. We currently envisage that the final book will be organized as follows:

Table of Contents

- I. An Introduction (100 pp).
 - A. A historical introduction to the genre of *Annals* commentaries.
 - B. The social and intellectual setting in which the commentaries were created.
 - C. The reception history which has determined understanding and use of the commentaries.
 - D. An introduction to our own comparative perspective of these two texts.
 - E. More technical explanations of our principles and methods of translation.
- II. The translation with Chinese text, organized according to the reigns of the twelve Lords of Lu (currently estimated, with Chinese text, at 750 pp.).
- III. Two or three high quality maps of the Spring and Autumn world including the places mentioned in the *Annals* and the commentaries.
- IV. A bibliography of important studies of *Annals*, *Gongyang*, and *Guliang* (20 pp).
- V. Appendices (60 pp.)
 - A. Glossary of technical exegetical terms.
 - B. Glossary of exegetical and historiographical rules.
- V. Indices (30 pp).
 - A. Personal name index
 - B. Subject index

While the total size of the resulting volume remains difficult to estimate, the current plan should yield a manuscript of 300,000-350,000 words plus the Chinese characters (GY 44,000, GL 41,000, CQ 16,000—approximately 100,000 characters total). In published form, we expect the volume to be approximately 950-1000 pages. Oxford University Press has indicated that the estimated cost of the volume will be \$35.00 for the hardcover price and \$30 for the e-book. Oxford University Press has not yet determined the pricing structure for electronic publication.