On 6 December 2007, Hsin-hua news agency reported that the owner of tomb 1 at Hsieh-chia-ch'iao 謝家橋 (HCC) had been identified as a noble lady named Hui 惱. The tomb is situated in the south-eastern part of today’s city of Ching-chou 荊州 in Hupei and had been unearthed during a rescue excavation conducted from 20 November to 29 November 2007. In its eastern chamber, a silk bag was found containing a bundle of 208 bamboo strips and 3 bamboo tablets held together by silk threads. According to Hsin-hua, the contents of the documents mainly consist of the tomb inventory (ch’ien-ts’e 遣策) and an ‘announcement to the world below’ (kao-ti shu 告地書).\(^1\)

Other examples of this genre, which is unknown to transmitted literature, had previously been found in seven other tombs of early imperial China. They are believed to be communications to the bureaucracy of the world below, announcing the passage of the deceased from one world to the other. Chinese scholars have called them, amongst other things, i-wu ch’üan 衣物券, wen-kao tu 文告牘, kao-mu shu 告墓書, kao-ti-hsia shu 告地下書, kao-ti ts’e 告地策, or kao-ti shu, the latter two apparently having established themselves in the evolving terminology for the study of ancient manuscripts. These texts have been utilised to draw sometimes far-reaching conclusions on Chinese ideas of afterlife, even though in more than one case their exact meaning and function are far from clear. The most prominent of these ‘announcements’ is written on a wooden tablet unearthed from the eastern chamber of the outer coffin of tomb 3 of Ma-wang-tui 馬王堆 (MWT) (Fig. 1).

In 1981, Yü Ying-shih translated the 30 characters as transcribed and normalised in Wen-wu 1974.7, 43:

十二年乙巳朔戊辰家丞奮移主藏郎中移藏物一編書到先撰具奏主藏君

On 24th day, second month, the twelfth year [of Emperor Wen’s reign, 168 BC] Household Assistant named Fen to Lang-chung in Charge of the Dead: A list of mortu-

ary objects is herewith forwarded to you. Upon receiving this document please memorialize without delay to the Lord of the Dead.

For Yü, the meaning is unambiguous:

Clearly, here Household Assistant Fen is notifying his counterpart in the underworld bureaucracy of the arrival of the newly deceased.\(^2\)

This interpretation is based on Chinese scholarship and has been adopted by Anna Seidel and others in the West as opinio communis.\(^3\) But as Ch’en Song-ch’ang 陳松長 has shown in two articles from 1994 and 1997, there is evidence which casts doubt on this classification as a message to the world below.\(^4\) In what follows, I will summarise the arguments of Ch’en, then consider other so-called announcements and, finally, compare them with the specimen of MWT 3. A reference list of the materials is given in an appendix.

MWT 3

Contrary to Yü and others, Ch’en tries to show that the message was not addressed to some Chinese Hades, but to persons involved in the funeral rites. His main argument is based on a ritual text and a different reading of the text of the ‘announcement’:

According to the Chi-hsi li 既夕禮 (Obsequies of an ordinary officer = I-li 13), where the transport of coffin, gifts and funeral goods to the burial ground is outlined in some detail, all presents are noted down (書遣於策) and put on display. After the farewell offering, the scribe of the master of ceremony (主人之史) then reads out the list with a tallyman checking the presents. When the procession has reached

\(^{3}\) Seidel 1985, 163; Seidel 1987, 25; for a recent contribution see Rölliche 2006.  
\(^{4}\) Ch’en Sung-ch’ang 1994 and again 1997. –These articles seem to have escaped the attention of most Western scholars; Harper 1994 mentions the first one on page 17, n. 13.
the burial pit and the coffin has been lowered into the grave, vessels and offerings are 'stored' at the side of it (藏器於旁; 藏苞筲於旁).\(^5\)

Ch’en normalises character 25 of the ‘announcement’ as質\(^5\)

Ch’en Sung-ch’ang normalises differently in his two articles (1994 and 1997), but with the same result; for the glosses see HS 40/2048; 50/2318.

Ch’en Sung-ch’ang 2001 interprets strokes and hooks in the inventory on a wooden board from Yin-wan 6 as marks from the checker.

Who was ‘in charge of the burial’?

I-li 13 mentions a ‘scribe of the duke’ (kung-shih 公史) reading out the list of presents for a second time and an ‘assistant minister of state’ (tsai-fu 宰夫; Hucker No. 6816) sent by the duke with a parting gift. In the notes (chi 記) transmitted with this text, there is given the alternative for either ‘the ruler being present at the major dressing’ of the corpse (chün shih lien 君視斂), or if ‘he does not wish to view the dressing, he comes after the lid has been put on and stays to the end’.\(^9\)

The requirement for the ruler to be present at the funeral rites for his ministers and officers, or at least be represented by a high-ranking official, seems to have survived into early imperial times. An ordinance from 199 BC provides for soldiers having died in service to be brought back to their home district and

\(^{6}\) Text in ICS edition, 13/84/5, 20–22; 85/1–2; translation in Steele 1917, 2, 86, 89, 91; see also de Groot 1894, 390-394.

\(^{7}\) Ch’en Sung-ch’ang 2001 interprets strokes and hooks in the inventory on a wooden board from Yin-wan 6 as marks from the checker.

\(^{8}\) The excavation report has 葬 and mentions the other reading only en passant, see Ho 2004, 43.

\(^{9}\) Text in ICS edition 13/84/22, 25, 87/18; translation in Steele 1917, 89, 90, 104.
provided with a burial and offerings, supervised (shih-tsang 視葬) by the senior official (chung-li 長史).\textsuperscript{10} If ordinary soldiers were thus rewarded, this must hold true even more so for members of the nobility. An ordinance from 148 bc gives detailed regulations for the funeral of kings and the lower nobility. Members of the latter were to be honoured by the presence of a representative of the imperial court overseeing the funeral (shih sang-shih 視喪事) and investing the heir. This ordinance also restricts expenditure at funerals which, together with a desire to control these important ritual events, might have been the original intention.\textsuperscript{11} It surely does not mean that before this date funeral rites for noblemen were never performed with the participation of the imperial court.

An exceptional case from the time of empress Lü (reigned 187–180 bc) shows how even the funeral of the mother of the bearer of only an honorary title could become an important event: her son was poor and after a marquis had been persuaded to donate 100 pieces of gold for the funeral clothing, ‘nobles and men of high position’ (lieh-hou kuei-ren 列侯貴 人) went and donated another 500 pieces of gold.\textsuperscript{12} Funerals must have been important occasions for all participants to publicly display wealth and status (or the lack of either one).

We still do not know who the tomb owner of MWT 3 was, neither do we know the customs followed at the kingly courts during early Han; we cannot even exclude the possibility that some marquises tried to hold court in a manner resembling kings and emperors. But since the inventory of MWT 3 (which had not been disturbed!) mentions items ‘received from the centre’ (shou-chung 受中) as well as such ‘received from the family in Lin-hsiang’ (臨湘家), a relation of the deceased to the court in Ch’ang-sha or Ch’ang-an has to be presumed.\textsuperscript{13} The title ‘lord in charge of the burial’, therefore, probably refers to a representative of either one.\textsuperscript{14}

Formulaic language in official documents

Ch’en has tried to explain the somewhat irritating double occurrence of 移 by referring to a formula found in a Han document from Chü-yen 居延. He thinks the second 移 should be understood as an ellipsis for 所移, but as the context of the quoted document shows, this case is not comparable.\textsuperscript{15} Even though his argument is not convincing in this regard, the formula has some bearing on the problem under discussion. It seemingly was part of the official cover note for documents dispatched to some higher authority, and may be presented in the following way:

\begin{verbatim}
[date]
[sender]
kan yen chih 敢言之
[optional: content]
[adverbial modification of the following, in most cases chin 謹, sometimes su 速, 寫 or other]
i 移
[different types of lists, registers or files: ho-chuang 務狀, ming-chi名籍, pu簿, ying-shu應書, yuán-shu愛書]
i-pien 一編
kan yen chih 敢言之
\end{verbatim}

Leafing through the edition of documents from Chü-yen by Hsieh Kuei-hua 謝桂華 and others, I have counted 28 occurrences of the complete form and 28 fragments which most probably also belong to this type.\textsuperscript{16} The phrase 一編 is clearly used in the sense of ‘batch [of documents]’, since in some cases not only one list, but two or more are mentioned.

Returning to the ‘announcement’ of MWT 3, there are more discrepancies besides the second 移: the opening and closing formula 敢言之 (‘presume to report’) is missing; the phrase 一編 is not preceded by the title of document(s) dispatched, but by the words 藏物; the recipient never seems to be mentioned in official documents of this type (probably because the cover note and documents never came alone); lastly, and perhaps, most importantly: the attached documents are missing—the inventory had been placed in the western chamber. And yet, there were writings found in the eastern chamber, namely the contents of the library chest.

\textit{i pien 一編 or i pien shu 一編書?}
The phrase 一編 does not seem to occur in transmitted literature of pre-imperial or early imperial times. There is one

\textsuperscript{10} HS 1A/65.
\textsuperscript{11} HS 5/145.
\textsuperscript{12} HS 43/2117
\textsuperscript{13} Ho 2004, 63, No. 236; the editors assume that ‘centre’ refers to the court of the king of Ch’ang-sha. The same wooden board mentions a ‘family in Lin-hsiang’ (臨湘家) which is usually understood to mean the seat of the Li family in the capital of Ch’ang-sha.
\textsuperscript{14} Ch’en Sung-ch’ang 1997; his article from 1994 mentions the possibility that the latter refers to the king of Ch’ang-sha.
\textsuperscript{15} 所移 seems to introduce and quote a document issued by a higher authority. Ch’en quotes an early reference to the Chü-yen materials concerning FHS 168 by Ch’en Chih 1977, 76.
\textsuperscript{16} A typical example is A33–10.34A–B, discussed in Giele 2005, 375.
\textsuperscript{17} Hsieh 1987; it is a pity that in quite a few cases the photographs in Chung-kuo 1980 are illegible or even completely black.
\textsuperscript{18} I am grateful to Enno Giele (Tucson) who first drew my attention to the fact that 一編 must be a set phrase, since there are no occurrences with other numerals than one.
exception, though, to be found in the famous encounter of Chang Liang 張良 with the sage. The narrative reaches its climax with Chang Liang finally having got up early enough to receive 一編書 (a batch of writings), only later finding out that these were the T'ai-kung ping-fa 太公兵法.

Since four-word-phrases beginning with shu tao 書到 are quite frequent in Han documents, it is unlikely that one should read 移藏物一編書, to 先質. However, there still remains the possibility that a reduplication mark following 書 was forgotten or has disappeared. Then the phrase 移藏物一編書 might be translated as ‘sends funeral goods and a batch of writings’ or ‘sends a batch of writings as funeral goods’.

The formula kan yen chih 敢言之 in ‘announcements’
In the ‘announcement’ on a wooden board unearthed from tomb 18 of Kao-t'ai 高台 (KT) situated about 100 m east of the wall of Chi-nan 纪南, the capital Ying 鄂 of ancient Ch’u, the formula kan yen chih 敢言之 occurs where it might be expected (Fig. 3):

recto: [date]
  [sender]
  敢言之
  [content]
  書到為報
  敢言之
  [date]
  [sender]
  敢移
  [recipient]
  亭手

verso, bottom left: 亭手

This arrangement corresponds in all respects to the format of Han official documents before the middle of the second century BC as analysed by Enno Giele: a message written by one official who ‘signs’ verso, bottom (‘so-and-so handled [this]’), with notes or decisions added by other officials in between. Even the toponym An-tu 安都 (City of peace), which is resonant with otherworldly associations, has been identified with a short-lived marquisate established in 176 BC. In other words: the ‘announcement’ of KT 18 appears just like (the copy of) an ordinary document issued in

---

19 HS 40/2024; SC 55/2035.
20 Giele 2005, 364, n. 33 on the ‘announcement’ from KT 18: ‘here it is much more difficult to decide whether different hands were involved or not’.
21 SC 19/1000; HS 15A/432; Wang 1995 vol. 1, 148 quotes Ch’ien Ta-chao 錢大昭 who identifies An-tu with ruins 39 miles south-east from Kao-yang, then Chihli, today Hopei; for An-tu as home of the deceased see Huang 2000, 224.
173 BC forwarding the request to change the place of registration (*shou ming-shu* 受名數) to the office responsible.

The ‘announcement’ from tomb 8 of K‘ung-chia-p‘o 孔家坡 (KCP) (Fig. 4) is similar in form to that of KT 18. It has the opening *kan yen chih*, asks the recipient to register the deceased (*shou shu* 受數) and also has a ‘signature’ verso. In comparison with other ‘announcements’, however, the text seems to be incomplete, since the list of persons and goods accompanying the deceased is neither followed by a verb, nor is the formula *kan yen chih* repeated. Furthermore, in the second entry (probably by a different hand) a *ti-hsia ch‘eng* 地下丞 (deputy of the world below) is mentioned as the recipient. This seems to be the only exception, thus far, to the rule that the world below is addressed by the verb *kao* 告 (‘announce’).22

Since only the first part of the ‘announcement’ of HCC 1 has been published, it is not possible to draw any conclusions on its usage of the formula *kan yen chih*.

References to the world below in ‘announcements’

There are more ‘announcements’ explicitly addressed to the world below. They also make use of formulaic language, namely of *kan kao* 敢告 (‘presume to announce’) or *ching kao* 敬告 (‘respectfully announce’) addressing some authority *ti-hsia* 地下 (‘below the ground’) or, once, a *t‘u-chu* 土主 (‘master of land’).

Three or, if an emendation of Ch‘en is accepted, four ‘announcements’ belong to this type: those from tomb 1 Mao-chia-yüan 毛家園 (MCY), tombs 168 and 10 at Fenghuang-shan 鳳凰山 (FHS), all in the southern part of the ancient Ch‘u capital and lastly, the ‘announcement’ from tomb 5 at Hu-ch‘ang 胡場 (HC) in Chiangsu. The first three all begin with the formula, only FHS 168 uses it at the end, FHS 10 does not; MCY 1 is only partially published. Just as with *kan yen chih*, they list in different wording persons and goods accompanying the deceased, with these lists sometimes being introduced by a third person.

HC 5 is peculiar, not only because of its late date (70 BC) and its remoteness from the centre of ancient Ch‘u, but also because it reports a legal case, thus in some sense resembling KT 18. The tomb owners have died prematurely, the man at the age of about 30 years and, the woman probably before reaching her twenties, which has led the editors of the preliminary excavation report to speculate that their death was caused by punishment or poor treatment. Furthermore, a

---

Another problem is posed by the sender in the second entry, the major-domus of a marquisate of T‘ao (桃侯國丞), since there must have existed two fiefs with the same title; Wu 2007, 7 has tried to bring light into this matter.

---

22 See Giele 2005 for terminology.
formula is usually reserved for higher authorities to instruct the lower echelons. HC 5 is clearly not listing any funeral goods at all, but giving notice of a legal case and, perhaps, filing a suit in the pit (戻詣穴).

The term *tzu-yen* 自言
Both formulas, *kan yen chih* as well as *kan kao/ching kao*, are found in conjunction with the legal term *tzu-yen* 自言 (*‘to report in person’*)\(^{24}\), the former in HCC 1 and KT 18, the latter in MCY 1 and FHS 168. In all instances, the sequence is as follows:

```
[date]
[sender]
*kan yen chih* or *kan kao* or *ching kao*
[another person as subject of]
*tzu-yen*
[accompanying persons and / or funeral goods]
```

For KT 18 and FHS 168, the funeral goods prove that the person named as the subject of *tzu-yen* is the tomb owner. In the case of MCY 1, this is at least possible (and indeed proposed by the preliminary report); for HCC 1, it is a son of the deceased. This means that these ‘announcements’ are intimately related to the funeral goods and to the burial.

Inventory and ‘announcement’
It may not be mere accident that in three of the tombs inventory and ‘announcement’ were physically joined, the one from FHS 10 on the same wooden board; the one from HCC 1 in the same silk bag; the one from KT 18 was bound together with three wooden boards consisting of an address label, a list of persons identical with those of the ‘announcement’, and the inventory. The one from FHS 168 was placed in the side chamber together with the strips of the inventory originally perhaps joined to them in some way; the position of inventory and ‘announcement’ of MCY 1 is still unknown. No inventory was found in KCP 8, but there are images of six slaves, a carriage baldachin and three horses perfectly matching the figures given for the entourage in the ‘announcement’.

Only the ‘announcements’ from HC 5 and MWT 3 are not immediately related to an inventory; the first one lacking it, the second one spatially separated from it.

Synopsis of some features of ‘announcements’ (see Table 1)
The table allows for some tentative conclusions, even if the number of ‘announcements’ is far from being significant:

The evidence suggests the existence of two sets of formulae, one more or less faithfully copying the style of contemporary administrative documents (*kan yen chih*), one perhaps resorting to more archaic language and directly, albeit politely, addressing the authorities below (*kan or ching kao ti-hsia*)\(^{25}\). There are hybrid ‘announcements’ (KCP 8) and there is one concerned with a legal case (HC 5), but almost all are in some way or another related to the funeral goods and, if present, the inventory, which supports Giele’s assumption that they originated as cover notes for the tomb inventory. Distribution in space (5 from the capital region of ancient Ch’u in southern Hupei; 1 from central Hupei; 1 from Hunan; 1 from Chiangsu) as well as in time (7 between 183 and 142 BC, 1 from 70 BC) may be responsible for this remarkable variety up to a certain degree, but KT 18 (174 BC) is only seven years earlier than FHS 168 (167 BC) and separated by the city wall of Chi-nan and perhaps 500 m, and yet each represents a different type. This probably reflects differences in background, status and observances.

The table also shows that the ‘announcement’ of MWT 3 is completely different from all others. It is most probably unique—just like the MWT complex in toto. With the exception of *i* 送 (send), not even one term agrees with the language of the other specimen of this ‘genre’. It should, therefore, be deleted from the list of ‘announcements’. Of course, if it was intentionally placed in the eastern chamber, it is part of the tomb ensemble and has to be interpreted in this context. But this holds true for other objects as well which were originally produced for different purposes.

Post scriptum
After having prepared the above text for publication, Professor Ch’en sent me a recent publication of his discussing more or less the same topic.\(^{26}\) He quotes from Ch’in administrative documents found in Li-yeh 里耶 to show that the form of the ‘announcements’ is adopted from official letters, which nicely fits the evidence given by Giele. He does not only delete MWT 3 from the list of announcements, but also HC 5, because he thinks the latter was written at a time when the person mentioned in the text was still alive.

---

\(^{24}\) I am grateful to Ulrich Lau (Berlin) who drew my attention to Lien 1987, 60 who quotes HS 97A/3962.10 and the commentary of Yen Shih-ku HS 97A/3963 glossing as: 自言理。--Lau defines the meaning of *tzu-yen* based on his corpus of legal texts: ‘persönlich (der Behörde) melden’ (personal communication 5.10.08).

\(^{25}\) For administrative usage see Giele 2006, 113: ‘in Han times gǎn gào must have already been an archaic expression that perhaps only the well educated knew how to use appropriately’.

\(^{26}\) Ch’en Sung-ch’ang 2008.
The following list is meant for quick reference only. The ‘announcements’ are given in chronological order of their first date of publication with the texts taken from the cited sources, transcribed into non-simplified and normalised characters with punctuation and, in a few instances, commented upon and corrected. In those cases where no photographs have been published, the transcriptions should be treated with even greater caution. Western dates are given according to Hsü 1997.

No. 1. FHS 10: Feng-huang-shan 鳳凰山
四年後九月辛亥, 平里五大夫張偃敢告地下主：偃衣器物所以祭具器物, 可令吏以律令從事

Site: in south-eastern corner of ancient Ch’u capital Ying郢, today Chi-nan 紀南, to the north of Ching-chou 荊州, Hubei.

Date: year 4 of emperor Ching, additional month 9, day 8 (25.10.153 BC).


The text follows an inventory beginning recto and continuing for one column verso.

No. 2. MWT 3: Ma-wang-tui 馬王堆
十二年乙巳朔戊辰, 家丞奮移主藏郎中, 移藏物一編, 書到先質, 具奏主藏君

Site: in the eastern part of Ch’ang-sha 長沙, Hunan; the wooden board was found in the eastern chamber where also the lacquer chest containing the tomb library had been deposited, whereas the inventory had been stored in the western chamber.

Date: year 12 of emperor Wen, month 2, day 24 (4.4.168 BC).

Source: Ch’en Sung-ch’ang 1994; first report in Hu-nan and Chung-kuo 1974; photographs in many volumes on MWT, of fairly good quality are those in Ho 2004, colour plate XVII.1, plate XX. 1.

No. 3. FHS 168: Feng-huang-shan 鳳凰山
十三年五月庚辰, 江陵丞敢告地下丞：市陽五大夫遂自言：與大奴良等廿八人、大婢益等十八人、軺車二乘、牛車一兩、口馬四匹、駁馬二匹、騎馬四匹, 可令吏以從事, 敢告主

Site: see No. 1 (FHS 10); bamboo board with five flattened surfaces used as columns for writing; together with inventory at the bottom of the middle of the side chamber.

Date: year 13 of emperor Wen, month 5, day 13 (10.6.167 BC).


Name Sui 遂 written as on a seal found in the tomb. Images and funeral goods do not only match the short list in the ‘announcement’, but also most of the inventory.
No. 5. MCY 1: Mao-chia-yüan 毛家園

Site: 7 km west of Yang-chou 揚州, Chiangsu, the two wooden boards with the ‘announcement’ were found in the side chamber.

Date: year 47 of the first king of Kuang-ling, month 12, day 16 (23.1.70 BC).

Source: Yang-chou and Han-chiang 1981, 17 (here, the duplication mark following 事 has not been taken into account for the transcription); plates.

No. 6. KT 18: Kao-t’ai 高台

Site: in south-east corner of Chi-nan, 110 m from Feng-huang-shan to the west, 190 m from south wall of Chi-nan.; no location is given for the ‘announcement’, neither for the inventory mentioned.

Date: year 12 of emperor Wen, month 8, day 18 (22.9.168 BC).

Source: Yang 1987, 204; no photograph; incomplete.

No. 7. KCP 8: K’ung-chia-p’o 孔家坡

Site: about 100 m outside of east wall of Chi-nan; the boards were placed in the head chamber.

Date: year 7 of emperor Wen, month 10, day 25 (4.12.174 BC).


[B punctuation added by Michael Friedrich].

Originally probably bound with three wooden boards: one with address (An-tu 安都) and sender (Chiang-ling ch’eng yin 江陵丞印), one with a list of persons and the status of the family corresponding to the ‘announcement’; one with inventory.

No. 8. HCC 1: Hsieh-chia-ch’iao 謝家橋

Site: Sha-shih-ch’ü 沙市區 in south-eastern part of Ching-chou.

Date: year 5 of empress Lü, month 11, day 28 (26.12.184 BC).

Source: http://news.xinhuanet.com/newscenter/2007-12/content_7211907.htm (July 5, 2008); no photograph; incomplete.
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