> compositions were spectacular. I composed the 'Connected Traditions of the Grove of Confucians,' chapter 61 [of this category]." His narratological viewpoint obviously is connected with this gap in coverage for the sake of criticizing Emperor Wu; this conclusion is not even worth refuting. The significance of his narratology is to justify himself via the merit of great classicists of the early Han and the early period of the reign of Emperor Wu and to promote private scholarship while repressing bureaucratic scholarship; these conclusions are probably accurate and incontrovertible![117]

It is what Sima Qian leaves out as much as what he includes that allows us to reach these conclusions, thus illustrating "the use of what has no physical existence."

3.6. Conclusions

Both Dong Zhongshu and Sima Qian have become honored exemplars, even archetypes, of Confucian political philosophy and Confucian-based moral historiography. Today such reputations are well entrenched and taken as accepted articles of faith, with no need for further consideration; they are part of the ironclad assumptions that govern our worldview of ancient China. The intellectual underpinnings of Chinese imperialism are almost entirely based on the merit of Dong Zhongshu; the format, purport, and literary style of traditional Chinese historical writing are almost entirely the creation of Sima Qian. Yet both needed generations to pass before being granted such high intellectual honors. It took until the following century before Dong Zhongshu's synthesis of Confucian thought based on *Gongyang* hermeneutics was enshrined as orthodoxy. This happened formally at the White Tiger Hall concordance that was convened in 79 AD by Emperor Zhang 章帝 (r. 75–88).[118] Ban Gu took notes at the proceedings and compiled the official record of the results. For Sima Qian, the course of his great work's rise out of obscurity was slow, and it was not completed until the imperially sanctioned animus against private scholarship during the Eastern Han ran its course and the work was able to circulate more widely.[119] Despite the delay in recognition, both eminent founders set the courses of their respective disciplines on paths that would run true (with various admixtures and adjustments along the way), paths which classicists, politicians, philosophers, and historians would follow until the modern age.

[117] Han Dawei (David B. Honey), "*Shiji 'Rulin liezhuan'* xushifa chutan," 188.

[118] Huang Pumin 黃朴民, *Tian ren heyi: Dong Zhongshu yu Liang Han Ruxue sichao yanjiu* 天人合一： 董仲舒与两汉思潮研究 (Changsha: Yu-Lu shushe, 2013). See especially pages 209–233 for the influence of the Baihutong conference confirming the orthodoxy of Dong Zhongshu's thought.

[119] On this process, see Lü Shihao, *Cong* Shiji *dao* Hanshu

Chapter Four

Textual Criticism in the Western Han: Recovery and Reconstitution

Xun Yue 荀 悅 (148–209), an eleventh-generation descendant of Xunzi, was an experienced literatus. At imperial command, he compiled a redaction of the *History of Han* called the *Chronicles of Han* 漢 紀 in thirty chapters, modeled after *Mr. Zuo's Commentary*. He also composed a series of essays on political and cultural themes, called *Extended Reflections* 申鑒. In this work, he perceptively comments on the exigencies of textual scholarship and the problems of dealing with malleable and unstable bamboo manuscripts that had been handed down from antiquity. His insights provide a welcome entre into this chapter, and are excerpted as follows:

> Confucius composed the classics, which were originally in a single form, undoubtedly so. Old and Modern school texts are different, but both camps claim their versions are the true and original classics. The understanding of the former masters of the Old and Modern is unified, undoubtedly so. But the interpretations of different lineages and various theories diverge; still, they all claim to be either associated with Old or Modern texts. Confucius lived in the distant past and was not detailed in his exegesis. Anciently, the former masters disappeared without exception—who were able to succeed them?
>
> With the extinction of learning under the Qin, documents were hidden up in the walls of houses, and the understanding of the classics was cut off at both court and countryside. Reaching the rise of the Han, scattered texts were collected and obscure doctrine reconstituted, but no systematic learning remained. Some writing was faded or effaced; some language was from various regions; and some texts emerged at different times. Sometimes the first impressions of scholars were erroneous; up and coming scholars inherited them and went even further afield. Therefore, a single source turned into ten currents, heavenly water flowed back on itself, and disputers rose up in profusion. Holding to one text does not guarantee complete accuracy, but when comparing and evaluating several, there is certain to be value in such an examination.
>
> 仲尼作經，本一而已，古今文不同，而皆自謂真本經；古今先師，義一而已，異家 別說不同，而皆自謂古今。仲尼邈而靡質，昔

先師沒而無聞，將誰使折之者。秦之　滅學也，書藏於屋壁，義絕於朝野，逮至漢興，收摭散滯，固已無全學矣，文有磨　滅，言有楚夏，出有先後，或學者先意有所借定，後進相放彌以滋蔓。故一源十流，　天水違行，而訟者紛如也。執不俱是，比而論之，必有可參者焉。[1]

Faced with these and similar challenges, the need for paying close and rigorous philological attention to the manuscript remains of the past was probably ever-present in the minds of scholars. Happily, such concerns occasionally surfaced in the imperial consciousness as well.

The Western Han experienced three periods of intense imperial sponsorship of collecting and collating early manuscript remains: the early period, middle period, and late period. Historian Ban Gu 班　固 (32–92) describes these movements as follows:

> With the rise of the Han, they reformed the failings of the Qin, and collected bamboo fascicles and collections on a large scale, and opened up the avenue for donating works. But by the time of Filial Emperor Wu (r. 147–87 BC), works were missing and bamboo strips in disarray, the rites were spoiled and music defunct. His Highness sighed and exclaimed, "I feel very grieved by this." Thereupon he established the policy of storing books and set up the office for copying them; all works, even down to the level of the commentaries and explanations of the various masters, filled the imperial archives. By the reign of Emperor Cheng (r. 33–7 BC), since the books were rather scattered or lost, he sent the internuncio Chen Long to seek out lost books throughout the empire. He commanded Liu Xiang, the Household Counsellor, to collate the classics, commentaries, various masters, poetry and prose-poems; Ren Hong, Colonel of the Regiment of Foot Soldiers, was commanded to collate the military manuals; Ying Xian, the Court Astrologer, was commanded to collate mathematical and technical works; and Li Guiguo, the Imperial Doctor, was commanded to collate medical and esoteric manuals.
>
> 漢興，改秦之敗，大收篇籍，廣開獻書之路。迄孝武世，書缺簡脫，禮壞樂崩，聖上喟然而稱曰：朕甚閔焉！於是建藏書之策，置寫書之官，下及諸子傳說，皆充祕府。至成帝時，以書頗散亡，使謁者陳農求遺書於天下。詔光祿大夫劉向校經傳諸子詩賦，步兵校尉任宏校兵書，太史令尹咸校數術，侍醫李柱國校方技.[2]

In a later chapter, I will treat Liu Xiang 劉向 (77–6 BC) and his son Liu Xin's 劉歆(46 BC–AD 23) editorial work performed amid the welter of manuscript

[1] *Shenjian*, "Shishi" 時事 (ZZJC ed.), 2.13.
[2] *Hanshu* 30.1701.

holdings of the imperial archives. Here the attention is on the recovery and reconstitution of texts as part of the scholarly project during the mid-Western Han, not the production of critical editions at the end of the era.

The first means of recovery was the fortunate discovery of a hidden cache of texts. Wang Chong 王充 (127–c. 100 BC) calls attention to an instance of this:

> During the era of the Filial Emperor Xuan (r. 74–49 BC), a girl from Henei broke open an old house. She obtained one chapter each of *Lost Changes*, *Rites*, and *Esteemed Documents* and submitted them to the throne. Emperor Xuan conveyed this news to the erudites; afterwards the *Changes*, *Rites*, and *Esteemed Documents* was each augmented by one chapter, and the *Esteemed Documents* in 29 chapters was now set.
>
> 至孝宣皇帝之時，河內女子發老屋，得逸易禮尚書各一篇，奏之。宣帝下示博士，　然後易禮尚書各益一篇，而尚書二十九篇始定矣。[3]

A second type of recovery was uninterrupted transmission, through which a text was privately preserved and transmitted through the Qin and on into the Han; it was evidently only revealed when safe to do so. The royal prince Liu De 劉　德 (d. 129 BC), known posthumously as King Xian of Hejian 河間獻王, was an active promoter of hoarding long-harbored works:

> De was enthroned during the second year of the reign of Emperor Jing the Filial (r. 157–141 BC). He cultivated learning, was fond of antiquity, and established the facts and sought the truth. He obtained fine books from the people, made fair copies and returned these copies; but he kept the originals. He offered rewards of gold and silk to call for them. Through these means, masters of the way and technical arts from the four quadrants did not regard a thousand miles too far to come. Some of them possessed old books from their forbearers and ancestors; many of them were turned in along with memorials to the king; hence the books he received were numerous, and on par with those at the Han court. At that time, the King of Huainan also was fond of books, but the books he called for were mostly superficial works of debaters. The books obtained by King Xian were all old books written in ancient script from before the Qin, such works as the *Rites of Zhou*, *Esteemed Documents*, *The Rites*, *Records of Ritualists*, *Mengzi*, and *Laozi*. All were either classics, commentaries, explanations, or records, whatever the seventy disciples of Confucius had treated. In his scholarship, he promoted the Six Classics, and established erudites for the *Poems of Mr. Mao* and *Mr. Zuo on the Spring and Autumn Annals*. He cultivated the rites and music, and submitted to the learning of the Ruists. In his deliberations he inevitably followed the Ruists. All of the various Ruists in Shandong followed in

[3] "Zhengshuo pian" 正說篇, in *Lunheng* (ZZJC ed.), 269.

his train.

德以孝景前二年立，修學好古，實事求是。從民得善書，必為好寫與之，留其真， 加金帛賜以招之。縣是四方道術之人不遠千里。或有先祖舊書，多奉以奏獻王者， 故得書多，與漢朝等。是時，淮南王安亦好書，所招致率多浮辯。獻王所得書皆古 文先秦舊書，周官，尚書，禮，禮記，孟子，老子之屬，皆經傳說記，七十子之徒 所論。其學舉六藝，立毛氏詩，左氏春秋博士。修禮樂，被服儒術，造次必於儒者。山東諸儒者從而游。[4]

Archaeological evidence of the transmission of a text from the Qin to the Han is seen most prominently in a manuscript recovered from the Mawangdui 馬 王 堆 cache. Entombed in 168 BC and excavated in 1983 and 1984, multiple silk manuscripts were discovered in the third tomb of a complex of three at the archaeological site called Mawangdui 馬王堆, located near the city of Changsha 長沙, Hunan. Two manuscripts of the *Laozi* 老子 were discovered, numbered MS *jia* 甲 (A) and *yi* 乙 (B). The first manuscript had to have been written before 195 BC, and the second one sometime between 195 and 188 BC. What is striking is the transition from Qin to Han orthography that is manifested in the fact that MS A is written in Qin small seal script, while MS B is written in Han clerical script.[5] An instance of lesser import is the orthography of a single word in a bamboo text of the *Laozi* recently published by Peking University.[6] Among a group of bamboo manuscripts of unknown provenance that were donated to the university is a complete manuscript of the *Laozi* in some 176 integral slips and 105 broken slips; it is divided into two chapters, one named *First Part of the Classic of Laozi* 老子上經, which corresponds to the *Dao* half of the received version, and the second named *Last Part of the Classic of Laozi* 老子下經, which corresponds to the *De* half of the received version. Although dating from the Western Han, it preserves an orthographic peculiarity that is characteristic of Qin spelling. Pericope (*zhang* 章) 45, which corresponds to traditional pericope 1,

[4] *Hanshu* 53.2410. See Zhong Zhaopeng 钟肇鹏, "Hejian Xianwang Ruxue de sixiang yu guwen jingxu 河间献王的儒学思想与古文经学, *Chuantong wenhua yu xiandaihua* 2 (1999): 42–47.

[5] Guojia Wenwuju Guwenxian Yanjiushi 国家文物局古文献研究室, *Mawangdui Hanmu boshu*, 馬王堆漢 墓 帛 書 vol. 1 (Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe, 1980). For a physical description of these two manuscripts, see Gao Heng 高亨 and Chi Xichao 池曦朝, "Shitan Mawangdui Hanmuzhong de boshu Laozi" 试谈就马王堆汉墓中的帛书老子, in Hunansheng Bowuguan 湖南省博物馆, ed. *Mawangdui Hanmu yanjiu* 马王堆汉墓研究 (Changsha: Hunan Renmin Chubanshe, 1981), 95–101.

[6] Beijing Daxue Chutu Wenxian Yanjiusuo 北京大学出土文献研究所, ed. *Beijing Daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu* 北京大学藏西汉竹书, II. (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 2012), 144.

the famous *incipit*, reads, "The way that may be trodden is not constantly trodden" 道可道非恒道也.[7] The orthography in question is the final particle *ye* 也 . It is a compound character *yi* 殹 formed by a combination of two elements; this occurrence is the only instance in the entire corpus of Western Han bamboo strips possessed by Peking University that preserves this antiquated Qin spelling. This is one example in the process of transmission, if not of an actual manuscript, then at least of an early Han exemplar of a Qin textual lineage that passed down to the Han, which did not overly depend on recovered pre-Qin manuscripts in ancient graphs.

Modern researcher Li Ling identifies some seven major finds of classical texts that occurred during the Western Han; these were recovered from ruined walls, found in obscure archives, or donated to the regional or capital thrones from unknown provenances. Of classical texts, as apart from historical or literary works, these include two manuscripts of the *Documents*, three copies of the *Ceremonials and Rites*, three editions of the *Changes*, one copy of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, two manuscripts of *Zuo's Commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals*, and one copy each of the *Rites of Zhou*, *Records of Ritualists*, *Analects*, *Mencius*, and *Classic of Filial Piety*.[8]

A third type of recovery consisted of the oral transmission of a text from master to disciple, then from the disciple-turned-master to a new generation via personal instruction until, at some point later in time, the text was ultimately put to bamboo or silk. In chapter 3 we saw how the text of *Gongyang's Commentary on the Spring and Autumn* was transmitted orally over multiple generations until finally recorded during the early Han, and later we will see another example in the case of the transmission of the *Documents*. When a master's explication was passed down along with the text, this combination formed what is known as the "rules of a scholastic lineage" (*jiafa* 家法), that is, the reading rules of how to determine a text, parse it grammatically, chant it accurately, and explicate it according to the scholastic stance of the master. Qing classicist Hui Dong 惠 棟 (1697–1758) comments on the oral transmission of both text and commentary during the Han: "The men of Han who mastered the classics possessed 'rules of a lineage', hence masters of the Five Classics appeared. The study of exegesis all derived from the oral transmissions of masters. Afterwards they were written on bamboo or silk" 漢人通經有家法，故有五經師。訓詁之學，皆師所口授。其後乃著竹帛.[9]

To conclude this section, I cite Jiang Fan's 江藩 (1761–1830/31) elegant encapsulation of the question of document transmission from the Qin to Han through both written and oral means:

[7] *Beijing Daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu*, strip 124, back side, 144.

[8] Li Ling 李零, *Jianbo gushu yu xeushu yuanli u* 簡帛古书与学术源流 (Beijing: Sanlian Shudian, 2006), 89–91.

[9] Hui Dong, *Jiujing guyi* 九經古義, "Shushou" 述首 (HQJJ ed.), 3:2803 (p. 1).

> Qin amalgamated all-under-heaven, burned the *Poems* and *Documents,* murdered the scholars of technical arts, and the Way of the sages fell by the wayside. Nevertheless, scholars hid out among the hills, lowlands, and cliffs. They embraced the surviving classics, and transmitted oral explanations so they were not lost in the world; they were brought forth when the Han arose.
>
> 秦併天下，燔詩書，殺術士，聖人之道墜矣。然士隱山澤巖之間者。抱遺經，傳口說，不絕於世。漢興乃出。[10]

Two case studies follow. I have chosen arguably the two most important of the pre-Qin Classics, the *Documents* and the *Poems*, for in-depth treatment because of both their intrinsic importance to the Confucian intellectual program and their ongoing roles in the history of Chinese classical scholarship.[11] But more importantly, the circumstances of their transmission from the Warring States through the Qin to the Han may be regarded as typical, and reflect the three major transmission modes of private hoarding, accidental discovery, and oral impartation.

4.1. Written Transmission: The Case of the Documents

The prime example of the course of recovery and reconstitution of an ancient text is the *Documents,* known during the Han under the augmented title of *Esteemed Documents* 尚書, an embellishment to the hoary title of *Documents* made most likely by disciples of the Qin erudite Master Fu 伏生 during the early Han, since Fu refers to the text as the *Documents* in quotations preserved from his lost commentary.[12] Master Fu was instrumental in transmitting this text in two

[10] Jiang Fan, *Hanxue shichengji jianshi*, 1:2.

[11] The *Shangshu* was also important for its contribution to the political policies of the Han, especially the control of imperial in-laws and officials, the operation of the bureaucracy, and the practice of remonstrating the throne; a similar political utility of the *Chunqiu* has already been seen earlier. See Li Weitai 李偉泰, *Liang Han Shangshuxue jiqi dui dangshi zhengzhi de yingxiang* 兩漢尚書學及其對當時政治的影響. *Wenshi congkan* 文史叢刊, No. 43 (Taipei: Taiwan Daxue, 1976). Neither these aspects of this classic nor the literary value of the *Shijing* will be explored in this chapter.

[12] *Shang* is explained in one of four ways: an apocryphal text suggests that it implies texts from "on high," or "heavenly"; Wang Chong posits that it refers to political texts from "on high" directed to those "down below"; Ma Rong explains that it refers to texts from "highest antiquity." But it most likely functions as an honorific, "esteemed," reading *shang* 上 , Old Chinese **daŋʔ*, as *shang* 尚 **daŋh*; both words seemed to have coalesced in pronunciation by the Han. See the treatment of the possible significance of the title of this classic by Liu Qiyu 刘起釪, *Shangshu xueshi dingbuben* 尚书学史订补本 (Beijing: Xinhua Shudian, 1989), 4–9; and Cheng

formats. The first one was oral; with the destruction of the physical sources of learning under the Qin, one quote clarifies the process of this oral transmission:

> Fu was summoned but was unable to travel due to his age. So the Chamberlain for Ceremonials and Authority on Ancient Affairs Chao Cuo (ca. 200–154 B.C.) was sent to read [Fu's version]. Fu was more than ninety years in age, and could not speak correctly, so his speech could not be understood. He had his daughter translate his words for Chao Cuo. The speech of people from Qi was different in many ways from that of Yingchuan speech [modern Yuzhou 禹州 in central Henan, Chao Cuo's natal place], so Cuo misunderstood twenty or thirty percent. He roughly transcribed and read the text according to his own understanding.
>
> 徵之，老不能行，遣太常掌故鼂錯往讀之。年九十餘，不能正言，言不可曉，使其女傳言鼂錯。齊人語多與潁州異，錯所不知者凡十二三，略以其意屬讀而已。[13]

The written version of the text of the *Documents* was one that had survived in poor shape within the walls of Master Fu's home. The "Monograph on Bibliography" of the *History of Han* explains that "when the Qin burned the books and prohibited learning, only Master Fu of Qi hid up [the *Documents*] in his wall. When the Han arose, this text had become lost; but they sought it [from Master Fu] and obtained twenty-nine chapters. He used it to teach between the Qi and Lu regions." 秦燔書禁學，濟南伏生獨壁藏之。漢興亡失，求得二十九篇，以教齊魯之間.[14] Dialectal misunderstandings point to a parallel situation with the Qi and Lu versions of the *Analects*. "It has been suggested," notes Anne Cheng, "that both derive from a common source, written or oral, and that they were composed at about the same time."[15] Yet the former text contains Qi dialect words, while the latter text contains Lu dialect words. The Qi linguistic elements were introduced into the text of the *Analects* by the editorial intervention of one Huwu Zidu 胡毋子都 from Qi, who assisted a Mr. Gongyang 公羊氏 in transcribing the text around 150 BC.[16]

Master Fu's tattered written version of the *Documents* in ancient script was deposited in the imperial library; the transcribed version as dictated to Chao Cuo through the medium of his daughter's translation was recorded in the

Yuanmin 程元敏, *Shangshu xueshi* 尚書學史 (Taipei: Wunan Tushu Chuban Gufen Youxian Gongsi, 2008), 20–32.

[13] Wei Hong 衛宏 (fl. 20 AD), "*Zhaoding Guwen Shangshu* xu" 詔定古文尚書序, cited from the commentary of Tang scholar Zhang Shoujie 張守節 at *Shiji* 101.2746.

[14] *Hanshu* 30.1706.

[15] Anne Cheng at Xinzhong Yao, ed., *RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedia of Confucianism*, 2 vols. (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), 79.

[16] *RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedia of Confucianism*, 79.

contemporary spelling; and this newly transcribed, orthographically updated edition circulated as the father of the New Text School of the *Esteemed Documents*, in twenty-eight (later twenty-nine) chapters. The new nomenclature for this recently transcribed version should not obscure the fact that Master Fu's original tatterdemalion manuscript was an Old Text version. The classical competition between Old and New Text adherents will await a later chapter for analysis, but it is necessary to cite the Qin origins of this debate as another hitherto neglected contribution to the history of classical scholarship made by this much maligned regime. As pointed out by Chen Zhongfan (1998–1982), when the First Emperor standardized various regional scripts and normalized the Qin form of clerical writing, all contemporary documents had to be rendered into the new standard hand, and classics and commentaries, glosses and notes that circulated from the past had to be rewritten in the new orthography.[17] This reasonable requirement for the sake of effective administration set in motion a far- reaching rift in the world of classical scholarship: it inaugurated the exoteric, outer textual side of the later debate between the two classical camps as the modern script was favored, indeed required, even as the importation of the esoteric, inner interpretive frameworks from the "scholars of techniques," including Confucians, set up the intellectual, hermeneutic side of the debate that broke out for both political and intellectual reasons during the late Western Han and early Eastern Han dynasties.

A second edition of the Old Text *Documents* was discovered when a wall of Confucius's ancient residence was demolished to accommodate new construction. It has been posited by Li Xueqin that this version in ancient characters was composed in the Qi-Lu script in common use in the area during the late Warring States period, with an occasional overlay of Chu characters, since the area had been absorbed by Chu around 256 or 255 BC.[18] This version was part of a cache of manuscripts that had been hidden up, according to hoary tradition, by Kong Fu 孔 鮒 (264–208 BC), an eighth-generation descendant of Confucius, sometime around 213 BC when the proscription against private ownership of books began to take effect. This ancient text was accompanied by the *Poems*, some ritual texts, and a few masters' works. These texts eventually made their way into the hands of Kong Anguo 孔安國 (156– 74 BC); according to Sima Qian 司 馬 遷 (ca.

[17] See Chen Zhongfan 陳中凡, "Qin-Han jinwen jingshi zhi fangshihua" 秦漢今文經師之方士化, in *Chen Zhongfan lunwenji* 陳中凡論文集 (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1993), 95–99. In the West, an intriguing if not close parallel occurred with the librarians of Alexandria; they selectively transcribed ancient texts written in the old outdated script into the new standard Ionic alphabet to make them accessible to the public. See L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 8–9.

[18] Li Xueqin 李学勤, "Lun Kongzi bizhongshu de wenzi leixing" 论孔子壁中书的文字类型, in *Zhongguo gudai wenming yanjiu* 中国古代文明研究 (Shanghai: Huadong Shifan Daxue Chubanshe, 2009), 264–67.

145–86 BC), Kong was an eleventh- generation descendant of Confucius; Lu Deming 陸 德 明 (556–627) claims that he was a twelfth-generation descendant.

The account in the *Kong Congzi* reads as follows:

> Chen Yu said to Ziyu [Kong Fu]: Qin is planning to extinguish the books of the Former Kings. Since you, sire, are the owner of these books, you in danger (sic). Ziyu said: "I do not deal with learning that can be put to use. I am known only to my friends, and I am not a friend of Qin. How, then, can I be danger (sic)? Nevertheless, I do perceive a frightening element in the present situation. Qin will eventually search for all the books of the world and burn them. Unless I remove these books, a disaster will follow. I shall hide these books and wait. Then, when, Qin sends people to look for them, I shall have no worries."
>
> 陳餘謂子魚曰：秦將滅先王之籍，而子為書籍之主，其危矣。子魚曰：吾不為有用 之學。知吾者、惟友。秦非吾友，吾何危哉？然顧有可懼者，必或求天下之書焚之， 書不出則有禍。吾將先藏之以待其求，求至無患矣。[19]

This anthology includes a letter composed by Kong Zang 孔 藏 to his cousin Kong Anguo, in which Zang attributes the discovery of these ancient texts to the will of heaven.[20]

4.1.1. The Old Text Esteemed Documents

Ban Gu's narrative of the editing of the *Documents* commences with Master Fu's initial textual recovery, but soon turns to the Old Text version:

> As for the *Old Text Esteemed Documents*, it emerged from within Confucius's wall. At the end of the reign of Emperor Wu, Prince Gong of Lu demolished Confucius's residence, desiring to expand his palace; he obtained the *Old Text Esteemed Documents*, as well as some commentaries on the rites, the *Analects*, and the *Classic of Filial Piety*, all in a score and more of fascicles and written in ancient script. When Prince Gong entered the residence, he heard the sounds of drums, zithers,

[19] *Kong Congzi* 孔叢子, *Zhongguo zixue mingzhu jicheng* 中國子學名著集成 ed. (Taipei: Zhongguo Zixue Mingzhu Jicheng Bianyin Jijinhui, 1977), 2. (卷中) 27b–28a; trans. Yoav Ariel, *K'ung-Ts'ung-Tzu. A Study and Translation of Chapters 15–23 with a Reconstruction of the* Hsiao Erh-ya *Dictionary* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 77. In another work on the *Kong Congzi*, Yoav Ariel identifies two other possible candidates who were credited with hiding the books in the wall of Confucius's residence: Kong Fu's brother Zixiang 子襄 and an unidentified ancestor of Kong Anguo; see Ariel, *K'ung-Ts'ung-Tzu: The K'ung Family Masters' Anthology. A Study and Translation of Chapters 1–10, 12–14* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989), 15.

[20] *Kong Congzi*, 3 (卷下) 4b; Ariel, *K'ung-Ts'ung-Tzu. A Study and Translation of Chapters 15–23*, 107.

lutes, bells, and chimes. He thereupon became frightened, and halted the work of demolition.

As for Kong Anguo, he was a descendent of Confucius. He obtained all of these texts, and used them to collate the twenty-nine fascicles [of the New Text version]. He obtained sixteen extra fascicles. Anguo offered them up to the throne,[21] but they were not established in the academies since the court was caught up in the witchcraft scandal.

古文尚書者，出孔子壁中。武帝末，魯共王壞孔子宅，欲以廣其宮，而得古文尚書及禮記、論語、孝經凡數十篇，皆古字也。共王往入其宅，聞鼓琴瑟鍾磬之音，於是懼，乃止不壞。孔安國者，孔子後也，悉得其書，以考二十九篇，得多十六篇。安國獻之。遭巫蠱事，未列于學官。[22]

From the point of view of the development of textual criticism at this time, several things are worthy of note. First, a batch of ancient texts became available; the need for editing these works was probably a matter of personal scholarly interest as much as official court policy. Second, Kong Anguo collected and then collated different editions of the *Documents* in order to edit this newly available version. Third, the offering up of texts to the throne, despite the imprimatur of imperial sponsorship of such efforts, was not an impartial, objective scholarly project that operated independent from political concerns at court.

The narrative continues with Liu Xiang's large-scale canvassing and cataloging of the imperial archives:

Liu Xiang utilized the Old Text version from the archives to collate the texts of this classic as established by the three masters Ouyang 歐陽生 and Greater and Lesser Xiahou. The "Jiugao" chapter had one missing bamboo strip; the "Zhaogao" had two missing strips. For manuscripts that had strips of twenty- five characters, the missing passages were also in twenty-five characters. For those that had strips in twenty-two characters, the missing passages were also in twenty-two characters. The differences in wording amounted to more than 700 characters; missing passages amounted to a score or more. As for written works, compare them with oral commands that are issued to the troops; if their language is not clear, then those who are charged with carrying them out would misunderstand them. Ancient texts should be read in elegant language; hence only through explaining the ancient language with modern language can they be understood.

[21] A chronological difficulty results by maintaining that Kong himself submitted his commentary to the court, an event that occurred well after his death. Most modern scholars resolve this difficulty by amending the text to read that "Kong Anguo's family" offered up the commentary.

[22] *Hanshu* 30.1706.

劉向以中古文校歐陽、大小夏侯三家經文，酒誥脫簡一，召誥脫簡二。率簡二十五　字者，脫亦二十五字，簡二十二字者，脫亦二十二字，文字異者七百有餘，脫字數　十。書者，古之號令，號令於眾，其言不立具，則聽受施行者弗曉。古文讀應爾雅，　故解古今語而可知也。[23]

Sima Qian supplies additional information on Kong Anguo, expanding on his earlier editorial work:

Afterwards, Zhou Ba of Lu, Kong Anguo, and Jia Jia of Luoyang were quite able to interpret the contents of the *Esteemed Documents*. Mr. Kong possessed the *Old Text Version of the Esteemed Documents* and he read it using the Modern Text. Because of this he established his scholastic lineage. By obtaining more than ten fascicles of lost works, it seems that the *Esteemed Documents* was augmented by them.

自此之後，魯周霸、孔安國，雒陽賈嘉，頗能言尚書事。孔氏有古文尚書，而安國以今文讀之，因以起其家。逸書得十餘篇，蓋尚書滋多於是矣。[24]

This passage seems to imply that Kong Anguo founded his own scholastic lineage by his accomplishments in textual criticism and the edition he established. The perplexing passage, "and he read it using the Modern Text," is clarified by the parallel passage in the *History of Han* that states, "Kong Anguo used the characters in the New Text version to read it" 孔安國以今文字讀之.[25] This refers to two processes. The first was when he established the text of the *Documents*. The second was when he composed a commentary to elucidate his text. An example of both is a passage in the "Yaodian" 堯　典 , the initial chapter of the *Documents*. James Legge loosely translates the phrase 光被四表 as "the display of these qualities reached to the four extremities of the empire."[26] Zheng Xuan reads *guang* 光 , Old Chinese **kwaŋ* as "light"; but Kong Anguo reads it as "to fill" *chong* 充, Old Chinese **thjəwŋ*. Duan Yucai 段玉裁 (1735–1815) compares the two different exegetical approaches demonstrated by these two early classicists: "Master Zheng explained the word as 'brilliance', based on the original meaning of the word; the pseudo Kong commentary states that '*guang* should be *chong*.' Here he adopts a loan graph to explain it, using the Modern Text to annotate the Old Text. The wording of Old and Modern texts is different, but the sounds are the same; the pseudo Kong's gloss is better" 鄭君釋以光耀，

[23] *Hanshu* 30.1706.

[24] *Shiji* 121.3125.

[25] *Hanshu* 88.3607.

[26] Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 3:15.

此就本義釋之。偽孔云：光，充也。此就假借釋之。用今文注古文也也。古今文字異而音義同，偽孔訓為長。[27]

It turns out that "reading" (*du* 讀), in the context of classical scholarship, indicates more than the mere chanting or perusal of texts; it encompasses a range of exegetical and explicative activities all designed to parse the text in terms of establishing the correct reading of words, including punctuation. In the case of Kong Anguo, he "reads" or glosses the word *guang* by interpreting it as a loan graph. The multivalence of the term *to read*, specifically in the context of the ancient manuscript tradition of the *Documents*, is explained by Duan Yucai as follows:

> The texts within the walls were all in old writing, hence they were called the *Old Text Esteemed Documents*. The *New Text* version was written in the common scribal hand in use during the Han. To use the *Modern Text* to read them meant the same as reading them with the characters in the *Modern Text*. Whenever anciently "reading" was mentioned, the meaning was not always the same: chanting texts was called "reading"; defining a difficult character was called "reading"; determining the proper loan graph was called "reading"; and drawing out the meaning and extrapolating associations is also called "reading". Kong Anguo applied all four approaches to the documents from within the wall.
>
> 壁中書皆古文，故謂之古文尚書，今文者，漢所習隸書也。以今文讀之，猶言以今字讀之也。凡古云讀者，其義不一：諷誦其文曰讀，定其難識之字曰讀，得其 假借之字曰讀，抽繹其義而推演之曰讀。子國於壁中書兼此四者。[28]

In Kong Zang's letter written to Kong Anguo as preserved in the *Kong Congzi*, Kong Zang praises Anguo's "reading" in determining the text, and he clearly describes what Kong Anguo had done: "By setting the contemporary text against the ancient one, and by using the clerical and seal styles, you succeed in deciphering what was written in the texts in the tadpole style. You have already managed to establish a text of more than fifty chapters, on which you wrote a commentary" 知以今讎古，以隸篆推科斗，已定五十餘篇，並為之傳。[29]

After constituting the text of the *Documents* in old script, Kong Anguo was commissioned by the throne to produce a commentary, as mentioned by Kong Zang. His "Preface" explains the process and purpose of composing this imperially commissioned commentary:

> He received an imperial edict to compose a commentary to the fifty-nine chapters. . . . Thereupon, in order to establish his own explanatory

[27] Duan Yucai, *Guwen Shangshu zhuanyi* 古文尚書撰異 (HQJJ ed.), 1.12a (4:4695).
[28] Duan Yucai, *Guwen Shangshu zhuanyi*, 1.1b (4:4692).
[29] *Kong Congzi*, 3 (卷下) 4b; Ariel, *K'ung-Ts'ung-Tzu. A Study and Translation of Chapters 15–23*, 109.

> commentary, he then investigated with precision and pondered deeply, broadly examining the classics and other works; he gathered and gleaned from all explanatory teachings. In concise prose he extrapolated their meaning, and extended their purport.
>
> 承詔為五十九篇作傳。……於是遂研精覃思，博考經籍，採摭群言，以立訓傳，約文申義，敷暢厥旨。[30]

It seems reasonable to suppose that Kong Anguo's commentary explains the basis of his editorial choices. But this is not what is described by the quote above. Modern specialist Yu Wanli argues that textual minutiae were best left to the oral teachings that a master imparted privately to his pupils; for after all, explaining how to read a text meant explaining the written form, pronunciation, and meaning of each word. The genre of commentary known as "Sections and Lines" (*zhangju* 章 句), should be considered then as the written transcription of a text and its formatting into smaller divisions, all based on the oral teachings of a master. It was such an established text that became the version utilized by a disciple for memorization or transcription.[31] But the space afforded by a written commentary (*zhuan* 傳 or *ji* 記) was best suited for extracting and applying the meaning of the classic in a manner suggested by the variegated expository "records" in the text *Records of Ritualists*.[32] An example of this is another commentary on the *Esteemed Documents*, the *Great Commentary on the Esteemed Documents* 尚書大傳 by Master Fu, now lost, which Qing scholars also characterize as being

[30] "*Shangshuxu*," in *Shangshu zhengyi*, 1.15a. This preface is generally termed the "Preface to the Pseudo- Kong [Anguo] Commentary" 偽孔本書序, a forgery of unknown date but that seems to have been compiled sometime after the time of Xunzi, in the very late Warring States period. It should not be confused with the genuine "Preface" that was discovered within the walls of Confucius's ancient residence and seen and used by scholars as late as the end of the Six Dynasties period. The exegetical work on the *Shangshu* of Chen/Sui scholars such as Gu Biao 顧彪, Liu Zhuo 劉焯, and Liu Xuan 劉炫 on the *Shangshu* marked a turning point, as it was based on this forged "Preface." The most authoritative traditional study of the "Psuedo-Kong Preface" is Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (1842–1917), *Shangshu Kongzhuan canzheng* 尚書孔傳參證, 2 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2011), 2:988–1074; an exhaustive examination of the "Prefaces," genuine and forged, is Cheng Yuanmi 程元敏, *Shuxu tongkao* 書序通考 (Taipei: Taiwan Xuesheng Shuju, 1999).
[31] This notion was first introduced in *A History of Chinese Classical Scholarship*, vol. 1, chap. 8, sec. 8.6, "Zixia and the Genre of the Section and Line Commentary."
[32] Consult the discussion by Yu Wanli 虞萬里, "You Tsingha jian 'Yingao' lun *Guwen Shangshu* 'Xianyou yide' zhi xingzhi" 由清華簡尹誥論古文尚書咸有一德之性質, in *Yufangzhai xuelin* 榆枋齋學林, 2 vols. (Shanghai: Huadong Shifan Daxue Chubanshe, 2012), 1:11–36; pp. 26–27.

closer in nature to those same essays in the *Records of Ritualists*;[33] purely exegetical glossology does not seem to be a major concern of the genre of the *zhuan*.[34]

The nature of the received *Old Text Esteemed Documents*, deemed to have been counterfeit by the majority of Qing classicists, may be clarified if we first examine the circumstances of the circulation of early manuscripts. Texts circulated individually, and if they were lucky enough to be anthologized, often this was a temporary condition. Anthologies that did gain some stability over time cohered together because of the recognition they were afforded by scholars, teachers, and students, factors external to their nature as anthologies but inherent in the utility of their contents. Even volume one of the printed Tsinghua manuscripts forms a temporary anthology, assembled with no guiding principle other than their natures as ancient prose works, and availability as edited texts selected for first treatment by the editorial committee. The content includes manuscripts that had been anthologized earlier into the original *Old Text Esteemed Documents*, now preserved in the New Text version ("Jinteng" 金縢), the *Yi-Zhoushu* ("Chengmei" 程寤, "Huangmen"皇門, "Jigong"祭公), works that were known but now lost to history ("Yinzhi"尹至), and unknown works ("Yingao"尹誥, "Baoxun"保訓, "Qiye"耆夜, "Chuju" 楚 居).[35] It is not inconceivable that some anthologies included texts of disparate natures and dubious thematic relationships. The printed versions of the Shanghai Museum manuscripts and the Guodian manuscripts bear out the diverse nature of the manuscripts of a single provenance, at least in the case of the latter.

The axiom that anthologies can contain diverse texts of unrelated genres is the assumption behind Zhang Binglin's 章炳麟 (1868–1936) solution to the conundrum of the authenticity of the received *Old Text Esteemed Documents* that can accommodate at least some of these chapters and render them respectable and usable. He reads some early documents not as original works that later became canonized but as later commentaries to these earlier works. His most prominent

[33] See the treatment by Huang Kaiguo 黃開國, "Jianlun Fusheng yu *Dazhuan*" 簡論伏生與大傳, *Jingxue yanjiu luncong* 經學研究論叢 8 (2000): 137–48.

[34] In the West, the Latin grammarian Priscian (Priscianus Caesariensis, fl. AD 500) notes the distinction between the commentary as interpretation and glosses as textual explanation: "('Commentary') means the book containing the exposition of the sense and not the letter [of a text], but 'gloss' [means the book] containing the exposition of the meaning and the letter, and it is called 'gloss', almost 'tongue or speech' because it explains the letter fully, just like the teacher's speech." Trans. by Suzanne Reynolds, *Medieval Reading: Grammar, Rhetoric and the Classical Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 29.

[35] Li Xueqin reports that among all of the bamboo documents preserved in the Tsinghua collection, over twenty are from the *Shangshu* or related generically to it. See Li Xueqin, "Tsinghua jian yu *Shangshu Yi- Zhoushu* de yanjiu" 清华简与尚书逸周书的研究, *Journal of Historiography* 史学史研究 2 (2011): 104– 110.

example is the *Taishi* 泰 誓 chapter of the *Old Text Esteemed Documents* that had been found and added to the corpus when a young woman discovered this chapter in an old house sometime during the reign of Xuan Di 孝宣帝 (r. 74–49 BC) (she also discovered a lost chapter from the *Changes* and *Rites)*.[36] Zhang suspects that this work was originally a commentary to the original *Taishi*, a commentary known as the *Taishgu* 泰誓故 that is mentioned in the "Zhouyu" 周與 chapter of the *Tales of the States* 國語 . Zhang credits this commentary to the authorship of Fu Sheng.[37] Zhang actually regards the entire *Lost Documents of the Zhou* as being composed of commentaries which he terms "external records" (*waiji* 外記). (According to Zhang, a "record" was a commentary, just like the *gu* 故 that described the commentary credited to Master Fu as noted above.)[38]

Without reference to Zhang Binglin's imaginative paradigm, Yu Wanli proposes the same origin in the commentarial literature of one pseudo-Old Text chapter. He posits that the "Xianyou yide" 咸有一德 chapter presently preserved in the *Old Text Esteemed Documents* was not purposely fabricated out of whole cloth intended to deceive. Instead, it was an old commentary by Kong Anguo on an original chapter of the same name.[39] The presumably original "The Declaration of Yin" is an excavated manuscript included among the Tsinghua bamboo manuscripts. Viewed from the paradigm of a classic versus its commentary, the discussion of the nature of the *Old Text Esteemed Documents* shifts from a question of authenticity versus fabrication to that of generic nature and purpose.

Below I present the English translations of the texts of these two documents— one an assumed genuine chapter from this classic, and the other a possible commentary on that text—to demonstrate just what type of relationship exists between the two texts. I have placed in bold the most obvious points of thematic contact and accepted the transcription and exegetical glosses of Yu Wanli.[40]

"Yingao" 尹誥

[36] Wang Chong 王充 (27–97), "Zhengshuo pian" 正說篇, in *Lunheng*, 269.

[37] Zhang Binglin, *Taiyan Xiansheng Shangshu shuo* 太炎先生尚書說 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2013), 12–13.

[38] Zhang Binglin, *Taiyan Xiansheng Shangshu shuo*, 3, 2.

[39] Yu Wanli, "You Tsinghua jian 'Yingao' lun *Guwen shangshu* 'Xian you yide' zhi xingzhi." Michael Nylan proposes five theories that could account for the conflicting evidence concerning the origin of the *Old Text Esteemed Documents*; theory four proposes the eclectic nature of the sources that made up this early anthology, including a combination of classics and commentaries. See her "The *ku wen* Documents in Han Times," *T'oung Pao*, Second Series, 81 (1995): 25–50.

[40] I derive the text of "Xianyou yide" as transcribed and annotated by Yu Wanli, "You Tsinghua jian 'Yinggao' lun *Guwen Shangshu* 'Xianyou yide' zhi xingzhi", 1:12–19. The text of "Xianyou yide" in the *Shangshu* is found at *Shangshu zhengyi* 8.24b–30b.

It was thus that Yin regarded Tang as possessing the single virtue.[41] Yi Yin was concerned over Heaven's destruction of the Xia's western appanage. He said, "Xia cut itself off from its people; the masses also did this (cutting themselves off from their ruler); without the people, there would be none to defend the appanage. This ruler caused resentment among the people; the people responded by engaging their rebellious minds. I will quickly destroy Xia. Now m'lord, why can't you understand this?" Zhi (Yi Yin) then made a declaration to Tang, saying, "We can work in concert with our allies. Now it is thus that the people in distant climes harbor the intent to return." Tang said, "Oh, alas! How can I bless the people and prevent my masses from transgressing my words?" Zhi said, "Lord, you must reward them. The gold and jade, fields and appanages will be dispensed to the people to favor them." He then sent the masses to the central appanage Bo.

"Xianyou yide" 咸有一德

After Yiyin restored the governance to his ruler, he was preparing to announce his retirement. He thus stated his admonitions concerning virtue. He said, "Oh, alas! It is difficult to trust Heaven; its mandate lacks constancy. Make your virtue constant to preserve your throne. If your virtue is not made constant, the Nine Provinces will be lost. The King of the Xia was unable to utilize virtue, and was contemptuous of the spirits and mistreated the people, so august Heaven did not preserve him. **It inspected all quarters and enlightened one who could possess the mandate and earnestly seek the single virtue; this would make him the ruler of the spirits." Only Yin himself and Tang both possessed this single virtue,** were able to share the will of Heaven, receive the bright mandate of Heaven, deploy the armies of the Nine Provinces, and thereby change the calendar of Xia. **It isn't that Heaven is partial to us of the Shang, but that Heaven aids those of the single virtue; it is not that Shang seeks the people of all-under-heaven but that the people gravitate to those with this single virtue. Only when virtue is single will all actions be auspicious; when virtue is in two or three forms, then all actions will be inauspicious.** It is only when auspiciousness and inauspiciousness do not mistakenly appear among men that Heaven is seen to dispense calamities or blessings according to virtue.

Now the king has newly assumed the mandate, and merely has to renew his virtue. **From beginning to end just keep it single, and just renew it daily**. In employing officers, just target the virtuous and just employ this type as close advisors. When serving the one-on-high, employ virtue; when serving those below, stress the people. **In difficulty be prudent; just be harmonious and single.** Virtue has no constant master; learn from those who are lords of goodness. **Goodness has no constant lord, accord with those able to be single in their virtue.** This caused the myriads of people to all say: "Great indeed are the words of the king." They also said: **"Single minded is the mind of the king."** He is able to stabilize the prosperity of the former kings, and long warranty the lives of the common people.

Oh, alas! In the ancestral temple with its seven generations, we can observe their virtue; from the head of the myriad people, we can observe his governance. If the ruler opposes the people, who would he command? If the people opposes the ruler, who would they serve? Do not elevate yourself and slight others. If the common men and women do not exert their utmost, with whom would the lord of the people accomplish his merit?

The only point of contact between the two texts is the theme of the "single virtue." The classic asserts it without explanation. But the commentary expounds upon it at length and does not comment on any other aspect of the classic; it also liberally treats other aspects of virtue. Yu Wanlai posits that "single" virtue is a nod to Yao's practice of only using a net with a single side instead of the three-sided nets in common use. This move demonstrated his "humaneness" toward animals in that it allowed more animals to escape royal hunts. In this view, "single virtue" is the virtue of "all-embracing humaneness."[42]

One rational argument against regarding the ancient language of the "Xianyou yide" text as a commentary is the fact that its prose largely reads like the stiff, lofty language of other texts included among the *Esteemed Documents*. How can the language of the two texts be of a piece if one text, a classic, is ostensibly early and one, a commentary, is ostensibly late? Apparently, commentarial language can be composed in the same archaic register as the classic. A quote from an early commentary on the *Esteemed Documents* chapter "Hongfan" preserved in the *History of Han* "Five Phases" monograph bears this out:

> In the fourth month of the first year of the Yuanping reign title (87 BC), Emperor Zhao (94–74 BC) died without an heir. The Prince of Changyi

[41] This line has traditionally been read, as it has been transmitted in the *Guwen Shangshu*, as, "It was thus that Yin and Tang both possessed this pure virtue." For Yu Wanli's novel reading of this line, see his "Tsinghua jian 'Yingao' 'Wei Yin ji ji tang xianyou yide' jiedu'" 清華簡尹誥佳尹既及湯咸又一德解讀, *Yufangzhai xuelin*, 1:1–10.

[42] Yu Wanli, "'Xian you yide' zhi 'yi' xinjie" 咸有一德之一新解, in *Yufangzhai xuelin*, 1:37–55. For general background on the concept of virtue in the *Guwen shangshu*, see Jiang Qiuhua 蔣秋華, "*Wei Guwen Shangshu* sixiang shilun—yi 'de' wei li 偽古文尚書思想試論—以德為例, Yang Jinlong楊晉隆 and Liu Bohong 劉柏宏 eds., *Wei-Jin Nanbeichao jingxue guoji yantaohui lunwenji* 魏晉南北朝經學國際研討會論文集 (Taipei and Nangang: Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan Zhongguo Wenzhe Yanjiusuo, 2016), 1: 203-219.

Liu He (ca. 92–59 BC) was enthroned. When Liu ascended the throne, the sky was murky and the sun was not visible during the day nor the moon at night. When Liu desired to set forth on an excursion, Xiahou Sheng, the Counsellor of the Palace, remonstrated in the chariot, saying: "When the sky is murky and does not rain, among the officials is one plotting against the One-On-High. So where does His Highness want to go?" Liu became enraged, and had him bound and turned over to the care of an official. The official was Huo Guang (d. 68 BC), the Honorable and Great General. At the time, Guang was plotting with Zhang Anshi, the General of Chariots and Cavalry, to depose Liu. Guang yielded in favor of Anshi, thinking that he had leaked news of their plot. But Anshi had not leaked at all, so he summoned Sheng for an interrogation. Sheng cited *The Commentary to the Five Phases in the Great Plan*, quoting, "When the imperium does not extend to its ultimate, the punishment is constant murkiness. If it persists for a time, then one below is targeting the One-On-High." He did not dare to speak plainly, hence he stated that an official was plotting.

昭帝元平元年四月崩，亡嗣，立昌邑王賀。賀即位，天陰，晝夜不見日月。賀欲出， 光祿大夫夏侯勝當車諫曰：天久陰而不雨，臣下有謀上者，陛下欲何之？賀 怒 ， 縛勝以屬吏，吏白[=伯]大將軍霍光。光時與車騎將軍張安世謀欲廢賀。光讓安世， 以為泄語，安世實不泄，召問勝。勝上洪範五行傳曰：皇之不極，厥罰常陰，時則 有下 人伐上。不敢察察言，故云臣下有謀。[43]

The language of the commentary is certainly couched in a register much more elevated than Xiahou Sheng's paraphrase of it.

It seems highly likely then, that among the chapters of the so-called pseudo-*Old Text Esteemed Documents*, are included leftover commentaries from the Warring States, Qin, and Han eras—*Lazarus taxa* among some intentionally fabricated texts that appear once again, not in the fossilized textual record, but in the intellectual horizons of scholars. Whatever the provenance of these individual chapters, the Qing dynasty saw a trend in classical scholarship concerning the *Old Text Esteemed Documents* that, on the one hand, attacked its genuineness during the early Qing, and, on the other hand, increasingly appreciated its importance during the late Qing.

First, the doubting trend. The authenticity of the *Old Text Esteemed Documents* has been doubted since suspicions were raised by the Northern Song classicist Wu Yu 吳 棫 (ca. 1100–1154) in his *Supplemental Commentaries on the Documents* 書裨傳. The stance of Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200), given his great prestige, deepened these doubts and impacted all subsequent historical views on

[43] *Hanshu* 27.3a.1459.

this hoary classic in numerous ways.[44] The concentrated attention of early Qing textual critics on the nature of this work, most prominently by Yan Ruoqu 閻 若 璩 (1636–1704), *The Old Text Esteemed Documents Clarified and Verified* 尚書古文疏證, and Hui Dong 惠棟 (1697–1758), *Investigations into the Old Text Esteemed Documents* 古文尚書考 created the consensus view that the Old Text version was a forgery perpetrated during the Eastern Jin dynasty, a view that has held up to the present.[45] The recent discovery of texts related to the *Esteemed Documents* among the bamboo manuscripts donated to Tsinghua University seems to confirm this consensus, and, according to Li Xuejin, "settles the case" of historical forgery.[46]

Second, the appreciating trend. Despite the solidity of the consensus for fabrication, alternate views have occasionally bubbled to the surface since the late Qing period that, if not refuting the charge of spuriousness, at least carve out a place for the text in terms of interpreting the Confucian Way. For instance, Cantonese classicist Gui Wencan 桂文燦 (1823–1884) concedes the spurious nature of the Old Text version, yet finds value in it nevertheless:

> The traces of forgery of the *Old Text Esteemed Documents*, classic and commentary, up to the present are still obvious; there is no need to look into the matter further. Yet the way to handle this text has not been suitably applied. During the Qianlong period someone submitted a memorial to the throne petitioning to abolish this forged classic. Vice-minister Zhuang Cunyu 莊存與(1719–1788) from Wujin advised that the work contained many refined and reasonable phrases of note; based on this he advanced his arguments that, since the work was of utmost value, he thus blocked this petition.
>
> 古文尚書經注至今日而偽迹昭著，無庸再辨，惟處治之道未得其宜。乾隆中有奏請廢其偽經者。以武進莊侍郎存與議謂篇中多精理名言，以之進講最為有益，中止。[47]

[44] See Yang Xinxun杨新勋, *Songdai yijing yanjiu* 宋代疑经研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2007), 199–206; Li Xueqin 李学勤, "Zhu Xi de *Shangshu* xue" 朱熹的尚书学, in *Guwenxian conglun* 古文献丛论 (Beijing: Zhongguo Renmin Daxue Chubanshe, 2010), 239–46.

[45] A good starting point for this sea change in historical interpretation is Wu Tongfu 吴通福, *Wanchu Guwen Shangshu gong'an yu Qingdai xueshu* 晚出古文尚书公案与清代学术 (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 2007). Consult also Liu Qiyu 刘起釪, *Shangshu xueshi*, 279–85.

[46] Li Xueqin, "Tsinghuajian jiupian zongshu" 清华简九篇综述, *Wenwu* 2010.5:51–57.

[47] Gui Wencan, *Jingxue bocailu* 經學博採錄 (Taipei: Ming Wen Book Company, 1992), 1.12a–b.

Gui continues by eliciting the support of his teacher Chen Li 陳澧 (1810–1882) concerning the value of the "refined and reasonable phrases of note" in the Old Text Version, which support we will not examine here. Elsewhere, Chen further voiced his own views concerning the importance of the Old Text version in his famous *Reading Notes from the Eastern Family School* 東塾讀書記. He first notes the fact that the commentary of Zheng Xuan differed from that of the pseudo-Kong Anguo commentary, and that often the pseudo-Kong's interpretations were superior to those of Zheng. He concludes: "It seems Psuedo-Kong read Zheng's commentary, and changed those interpretations over which he had reservations; for this reason Pseudo-Kong cannot be abandoned. The Pseudo-Old Text, classic and commentary, can be abandoned, but the twenty-eight fascicles of the Pseudo-Kong commentary [which correspond to the New Text version] cannot be abandoned" 蓋偽孔讀鄭注， 於其義未者則易之，此其所以不可廢也。偽古文經傳可廢，二十八篇偽傳不可廢.[48] It should also be recalled that Song period interpreters of the *Esteemed Documents* drew the best textual support for their hermeneutics from the Old Text version, not the New Text version.[49]

This trend of appreciating the Old Text version continues today. A modern editor of the *Esteemed Documents*, Huang Huaixin, holds a broad-minded view of the value of the Old Text version and the Pseudo-Kong commentary equal to that of Chen Li and Gui Wencan. His attitude is based on the nature of commentaries in ancient China, for the written version of a commentary may be nothing more than the final end of a long line of oral transmission that may have handed down teachings that long antedate the recording of the commentary. Extraneous, even anachronistic, elements therefore can be expected in a text with a long history of transmission.[50] And two recent modern Chinese translations of the *Esteemed Documents* include the so-called pseudo-Old Text chapters that have hitherto been disregarded as a matter of course; these two versions, however, do not treat the issue of authenticity.[51]

[48] Chen Li, *Dongshu dushuji*, in *Chen Li ji* 陳澧集, 6 vols. (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 2008), 2:1–326; p. 97.

[49] Li, "Zhu Xi de *Shangshu* xue," 240–41. See more fully Liu Qiyu 劉起釪, "Songxue yi wei *Guwen* wei sixiang yuanyuan jianliqi lixue (Daoxue)" 宋學以偽古文為思想淵源建立起理學 (道學), *Shangshu xueshi Dingbuban* 尚書學史訂補版, (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1989), pp. 274-79.

[50] Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, "Jiaodian qianyan" 校點前言, *Shangshu zhengyi* 尚書正義, ed. Zhang Qizhi 張豈之 (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 2007), 3.

[51] Wang Shishun 王世舜 and Wang Cuiye 王翠叶, trans., *Shangshu* 尚书 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2012); and Li Min 李民 and Wang Jian 王健, *Shangshu yizhu* 尚书译注 (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Shudian, 2012). Two prominent primers of the *Shangshu* published in Taiwan represent the traditional neglect of the Old Text chapters: Wu Yu 吳璵, *Xinyi Shangshu duben* 新譯尚書讀本 (Taipei: Sanmin Shuju, 1977); and Guo Jianxuan 郭建勳 *Xinyi Shangshu duben* 新譯尚書讀本 (Taipei: Sanmin Shuju, 2005).

4.1.2. The New Text Esteemed Documents

Ban Gu commences his treatment of the textual history of the *Esteemed Documents* with the New Text version:

> Qin burned the books and prohibited learning, Master Fu of Jinan was the sole person to hide up his version in a wall. By the rise of the Han it was lost, but he did find twenty-nine chapters, and utilized them to teach between the regions of Qi and Lu. By the time of the Filial Emperor Xuan (r. 91–49 BC), the versions of Ouyang and Greater and Lesser Xiahou were established in the academies.
>
> 秦燔書禁學，濟南伏生獨壁藏之。漢興亡失，求得二十九篇，以教齊魯之間。訖孝宣世，有歐陽、大小夏侯氏，立於學官。[52]

The adoption of this version in the academies and the use of its various editions marked official sponsorship, something that would take the enormous influence of Zheng Xuan's attention to overcome. The popularization of the Old Text version is seen in the example of two grand official projects. First was the "Xi-ping Stone Classics" 熹平石經; they were carved between the years 175–183; the New Text version of Master Ouyang was adopted as base text, with occasional textual variora noted from the editions of the two Xiahou (see chap 9 for these specialists). But during the Wei dynasty, sometime between 240 and 249, a second grand project was mandated when the court adopted the Old Text version for its own "Three Styles Stone Classics" 三體石經.

Ban Gu's "Bibliographical Monograph" details the commentarial work composed by Master Fu and his successors on this newly circulated text. They include the following, commencing with Kong Anguo's redacted Old Text version into contemporary characters: *Old Text Classic of the Esteemed Documents* 尚書古文經 46 scrolls; *Classic* 經 29 scrolls, which we may assign to the editorial work of Master Fu; *Commentary* 傳 41 fascicles, which we attribute to Kong Anguo; *Ouyang's Sections and Lines* 歐陽章句 31 scrolls; this work was based on Master Fu's oral recitation and parsing of the text. Following are *Great and Lesser Xiahou's Sections and Lines* 大、小夏侯章句 29 scrolls each, *Greater and Lesser Xiahou's Explanatory Glosses* 大、小夏侯解故 29 fascicles,[53] and *Ouyang's Oral Explanations of the Meaning* 歐陽說義 2 fascicles.[54] The last two exegetical works are indeed full- fledged commentaries,

[52] *Hanshu* 30.1706.

[53] The Greater Xiahou refers to Xiahou Sheng 夏侯勝 (fl. 70 BC); Lesser Xiahou was his son, Xiahou Jian 夏侯建.

[54] *Hanshu* 30.1705. Ouyang refers to Master Ouyang 歐陽生, whose name, according to Ban Gu's "Biographies from the Grove of Confucians," was Hebo 和伯

entitled "Commentarial Records" 傳記. The full titles demonstrate the concern of these works with the purport of the classic, not with constituting the proper parsing of its text: *Liu Xiang's Commentarial Records on the Five Phases* 劉向五行傳記 11 fascicles and *Xu Shang's Commentarial Records on the Five Phases* 許商五行傳記 1 fascicle.[55] No other general commentarial or exegetical works are listed for this classic.

The nature of many of these commentaries on the *Esteemed Documents*, for both Old Text and New Text versions, betrays the fact that the earliest exegetical work was concerned with establishing and explaining its texts, as apart from its messages. It seems it was not until Liu Xiang at the end of the dynasty that a commentary appeared with the official term *zhuan* and that focused exclusively on the content of the classic. It is unclear whether this trend toward textual criticism is a reflection of reality or due to the vagaries of historical preservation of these particular titles. For it must be recalled that the use of the term *zhuan* was ambiguous by Han Ying; Ban Gu's "Biography of the Grove of Confucians" explains that "Han Ying also taught the *Changes*, and extended its meaning through composing a commentary" 韓生亦以易授人，推易意而為之傳.[56] This focuses the use of this type of commentary on the message of the text, not its medium. But his dual commentaries on the *Poems*, the *Esoteric Commentary* 內傳 and the *Exoteric Commentary* 外傳, reflect two opposite thrusts, the former exegetical, and the latter interpretive. What is clear from the above discussion on the *Documents* is the importance of textual criticism during the Western Han, as exemplified most broadly by critical study of this classic. Next, the example of textual criticism of the *Poems* by four separate exegetical schools underscores the importance of the oral tradition of transmission that persisted well into the Han.

4.2. Oral Transmission: The Case of the Poems

If the *Documents* as a text was transmitted through the dual tracks of recovered manuscripts—the Old Text versions—and dictated transcription—the New Text version—the *Poems* was seemingly reconstituted exclusively through oral transmission; at least there is no specific historical incident to point to that indicates a recovered document. Ban Gu asserts the latter track and assumes the former:

> What was preserved after encountering the Qin was due to oral transmission, not solely being recorded on bamboo or silk. With the rise of the Han, Sire Shen of Lu made exegetical glosses on the *Poems*, and Yuan Gu of Qi and Master Han of Yan both composed commentaries.

. He was a disciple of Master Fu. *Hanshu* 88.3603. See Cheng, *Shangshu xueshi*, 628–34, for comparative treatment of these works by the two Xiahou and Master Ouyang.

[55] Xu Shang was an important official at the end of the century, ca. 3 BC, who served in the office of Chamberlain for the Palace Revenues.

[56] *Hanshu* 88.3613.

> Sometimes they gleaned insights from the *Spring and Autumn Annals* or adopted miscellaneous theories, and sometimes their interpretations were not in accordance with the original intent. If forced to choose, then the Lu came closest. The Three Specialists were all accepted in the academies. In addition to them was the school of Mr. Mao, who claimed that the *Poems* was transmitted from Zixia. Despite being popular with King Xian of Hejian, it did not get officially accepted.
>
> 遭秦而全者，以其諷誦，不獨在竹帛故也。漢興，魯申公為詩訓故，而齊轅固、燕韓生皆為之傳。或取春秋，采雜說，咸非其本義。與不得已，魯最為近之。三家皆列於學官。又有毛公之學，自謂子夏所傳，而河間獻王好之，未得立。[57]

The various editions of the *Poems* as taught by the so-called "Three Schools of exegesis on the *Poems*" 三家詩 that were formed during the Western Han dynasty have historically been considered as belonging to the New Text tradition of classical scholarship.[58] This classification merely means that the texts had been transcribed into the modern or "new" script in contemporary use, known as the Han clerical style. The Mao school was a private exegetical tradition that circulated without benefit of official sponsorship; it eventually won out over the others, and in the form of the synthetic scholarly commentary of Zheng Xuan's *Notes on the Mao Poems* 毛詩箋that was based on the Mao reading with suitable references to other Three-School readings, it ever-after assumed the status of academic orthodoxy.[59] The Mao text has always been regarded as representing the Old Text tradition, but in terms of orthography, this classification is meaningless, for no ancient transmitted text of this classic is claimed to have

[57] *Hanshu* 30.1708. For English translations with annotations of the biographies of the founders of the Three Schools, Shen Pei, Yuan Gu, and Han Ying, see James Hightower, "The *Han-Shih Wai-Chuan* and the *San Chia Shih*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 11 (1948): 241–310; Appendix I, pp. 268–78.

[58] See Hightower, "The *Han-Shih Wai-Chuan* and the *San Chia Shih*;" Steven Van Zoeren, *Poetry and Personality: Reading, Exegesis, and Hermeneutics in Traditional China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 80–115; Zhao Maolin 赵茂林, *Liang Han Sanjia shi yanjiu* 两汉三家诗研究 (Chengdu: Ba-Shu Shushe, 2006); and Wang Liqing 王禮卿, *Sijia Shizhi huigui* 四家詩恉會歸, 4 vols. (Shanghai: Huadong Shifan Daxue, 2009).

[59] Chen Huan 陳奐 (1786–1863) distills how Zheng utilized Three Schools readings as follows: "In the *Notes* there are cases where he adopts Three Schools readings to elucidate Mao; there are also cases where he changes Mao based on Three School readings. He does not go beyond these two types of examples" 箋中有用三家申毛者，有用三家改毛者。例不外此二端. Chen Huan, *Zhengshi jian kaozheng* 毛氏箋攷徵 (HQJJ ed.), 11:4169–4175, p. 4170.

survived into the Han.[60] This erroneous classification may have resulted from the ambiguity inherent in the translated term "old text" (*guwen* 古 文), which can just as accurately be rendered as "ancient script," indicating the orthography of a text rather than its age. Qing classicists seemed to have recognized the ambiguity of the term and opted for the latter meaning. For instance, Feng Dengfu 馮登府 (1783–1841) uses the term in its literal sense of "ancient script" in his exegetical work *Epexegesis and Verification of the Textual Variora of the Three Masters on the Poems* 三家詩異文疏證; both his first and last glosses bracket his work with the notion of the basis of the Mao version in "ancient script."[61] More clearly, Chen Qiaocong 陳 喬 樅 (1809–1869) contrasts his gloss on a Mao reading with an obvious reference to the orthography of its textual variant in reference to the word "islet" (*zhou* 州). Chen comments that "this was an ancient written form of Master Mao. Adding the water element on the side to make *zhou* 洲 was a common form of modern writing" 此毛氏古文也。加水旁坐洲乃今文俗體耳.[62] Most obviously, Qian Daxin 錢 大 昕 (1728–1804) lists *guwen* as one of the three styles of calligraphy employed in the stone classics engraved during the Wei dynasty, along with seal and clerical forms.[63] Nevertheless, the exegetical and hermeneutical competition between Old Text and New Text schools has governed historical views of the interpretive thrust of each school and has even generated some generalities concerning the different approaches to textual exegesis employed by the respective textual critics.

In Ruan Yuan's 阮元 (1764–1849) preface to his collation notes to the *Poems*, titled *Collation Notes on the Commentary and Sub-commentary on the Mao Poems* 毛詩注疏校勘記, he introduces some of the textual complexities involved in studying these four different versions of the *Poems* and their separate exegetical methodologies, and thankfully he employs the explicit terminology of "ancient graphs" (*guzi* 古字) rather than ambiguous *guwen* "Old Text" or "ancient script":

> When investigating the textual differences in the Mao version, we find that the classic was different compared to the three schools of Lu, Qi, and Han. The Qi and Lu texts of the *Poems* have been lost for a long time, but the Han text was preserved until the Song period. The textual variants that can be seen and investigated in various works reveal that on the whole the Mao version employed many ancient characters, while the

[60] A point already noted by Hightower; see "The *Han-Shih Wai-Chuan* and the *San Chia Shih*," 264–65.

[61] Feng Dengfu, *Sanjiashi yiwen shuzheng* (HQJJ ed.), 8:11011–41.

[62] Chen Qiaocong, *Shijing sijia yiwen kao* 詩經四家異文攷 (HQJJ ed.), 13:5781–5860; p. 5781.

[63] Qian Daxin, "Yizi sanzi shijing" 一字三字石經, in *Shijiazhai yangxin yulu* 十駕齋養新餘錄, *juan* 2, appended to *Shijiazhai yangxinlu*, 4 vols. *Guoxue Jiben Congshu* ed. (Taipei: Commercial Press, 1968), 4:504.

> Han version used many modern characters. Sometimes it is necessary to verify them by comparative examination in order to ascertain the meaning of the Mao version. As for Mr. Mao's transmission of the *Poems*, the same character may be glossed and explained differently in separate chapters; in all likelihood the explanation was based on the linguistic context, not in seeking the meaning by glossing the word. But one cannot interpret the Mao commentary without grasping the loan characters in the *Rites of Zhou*. Mao did not substitute characters; it was with Zheng Xuan and his *Notes* that we start to see examples of characters being substituted. However, when he commented on the *Rites*, Zheng developed a theory for substituting characters; still for the *Poems* he was not willing to explain this openly.
>
> 攷異於毛詩經有齊魯韓三家之異者。齊魯詩久亡，韓詩則宋以前尚存。其異字之見於諸書可攷者大約毛多古字，韓多今字。有時必互相證而後可以得毛義也。毛公之傳詩也同一字而各篇訓釋不同，大抵依文以立解，不依字以求訓。非執於周官之假 借者不可以讀毛傳也。毛不易字，鄭箋始有易字之列。顧注禮則立說以改其字而詩則多不欲顯言之。[64]

The main exegetical principle at question consists of identifying certain characters as loan characters standing for other, usually more standardized, orthographies in order to ascertain the correct reading of a word, and therefore being able to the correctly interpret the passage in which the word occurs. This principle is explained in some depth by Ma Ruichen 馬瑞辰 (1782–1853), a younger contemporary of Ruan Yuan:

> The Mao version of the *Poems* is a work in ancient script; the nature of many of the characters in the classic [as opposed to the commentary] is that of loan characters. When the Mao commentary explains the poems, in some cases he realizes that a particular character is a loan graph for another one; so he explains the word by the normalized character that the loan has replaced. In some cases he does not explain the word by the normalized character, but explains it by the general meaning of the normalized character. Those who elucidate the *Poems* must first master its loan characters; only then will the meaning of the classic become clear. The Qi, Lu, and Han texts adopted modern characters; their texts of this classic in many cases used normalized characters, and their commentaries to this classic quoted other poems to explain one poem. It is precisely in the cases where they mostly employed normalized characters that they can thereby investigate and verify the loan characters in the Mao *Poems*.
>
> 毛詩為古文，其經字類多假借。毛傳釋詩，有知其為某字之假借

[64] *Maoshi zhengyi*, "*Maoshi zhushu* jiaokanji xu," 1a.

，因以所假之正字 釋之者；有不以正字釋之，而即以所釋之正字之義釋之者。說詩者必先通其假借， 而經義始明。齊、魯、韓用今文，其經文多用正字，經傳引詩釋詩，亦多用正字者， 正可藉以考證毛詩之假借。[65]

Despite this critical attention to textual differences, on one level, that of the essential oral text that lay behind the written surface of the orthography, the textual traditions of the Three Schools were more similar to each other and to that of the Mao tradition than otherwise. Judging by the textual variations collected over the ages by Chen Huan, Chen Qiaocong, Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (1842–1917), and other modern like-minded tabulators and collators like Yuan Mei,[66] together with the evidence from the recently excavated documents in bamboo and silk, it seems that the oral text or the "message" of the *Poems* was integrally preserved in memory from the Zhou through the Qin and up to the Han; the differences in the various written texts or "records" subscribed to and promoted by these various schools seem to be largely orthographic preference. In other words, the oral text of all four schools is fundamentally the same, but the written texts—the differing transcriptions—varied in the choice of graphs used to spell these texts.[67] Of course, this does not argue for unity of interpretation or application; such concerns were different for each scholastic lineage. But for centuries these graphic variations have obscured the essential unity of the "message" of the *Poems* taught by these different schools via their proprietary textual "records."[68] This is something that Sima Qian mentioned in passing, but that has not been clearly articulated until recently: "His [Han Ying's] language is

[65] Ma Ruichen, *Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi* 毛詩傳箋通釋 (HQJJ ed.), 10:2071. Consult his entire essay on that page entitled "*Maoshi* guwen duo jiajie kao" 毛詩古文多假借考.

[66] Yuan Mei 袁梅, *Shijing yiwen huikao bianzheng* 詩經異文彙考辯證 (Jinan: Qi-Lu Shushe, 2013).

[67] Yu Wanli 虞萬里, "Cong Xiping canshi he zhujian 'Ziyi' kan Qingren sijia Shi yanjiu" 從西平殘石和竹簡緇衣看清人四家詩研究, in *Yufangzhai xuelin*, 1:109–54; p. 119 and Martin Kern, "The Odes in Excavated Manuscripts," in Martin Kern, ed., *Text and Ritual in Early China* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 149–93. A recent recognition of the oral background to the transmission of the *Poems*, while highlighting the need for more attention to be paid to the orthography, is Edward L. Shaughnessy, "Unearthed Documents and the Question of the Oral Versus Written Nature of the *Classic of Poetry*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 75.2 (December 2015): 331–75.

[68] The difference in information science between the intellectual message of a work and its physical records is introduced in *A History of Classical Scholarship*, I, chap 3, sect 3.1, "Bamboo Books and Editorial Freedom." My chief authority is Harold Roth, "Text and Edition in Early Chinese Philosophical Literature," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 113 (1993): 214–27.

rather different from that of the Qi and Lu schools, but his meaning is the same" 其語頗與齊魯閒殊，然其歸一也.[69]

This essential unity is apparent in the very first poem, Mao #1, "Cawing Ospreys" 關雎:

關關雎鳩 Guan-guan go the ospreys,
在河之洲 On the islet in the river.
窈窕淑女 The modest, retiring, virtuous, young lady:
君子好逑 For our prince a good mate she.[70]

The word *qiu* 逑, Old Chinese **gu*, is the orthography preserved by the Mao text. It is defined by Mao as "a match" *pi* 匹. The Lu and Qi texts adopted the graph *qiu* 仇, a virtual homonym. This reading is utilized by Zheng Xuan in his commentary on this line, stating that "an aggrieved mate is called a rival" 怨偶曰仇; that Zheng Xuan, whose commentary was based on the Mao text, would utilize this reading indicates the possibility that originally the Mao version may have written 仇 not 逑 .[71] The graphic alternation between **gu* as either 逑 or 仇 begs the question whether this variant is lexical or orthographic, meaning that what is at question is whether the different orthographies are merely variations of the same word, that is, orthographic variants, or are they intended to represent different words and meanings, that is, lexical variants?[72] Making this distinction, according to Boltz, is one of the most important tasks of the textual critic.[73] At base, the phonetic "message" of these three texts is the same; when realized in the orthography as individual words, this message on the semantic level may or may not be unified. Mao #7, "Tuju" 兔 罝 , provides some support for the unity of the message, for it adopts the Lu/Qi reading *qiu* 仇 in the similar linguistic context of a formula, "That stalwart, martial man, / Would be a good companion for his prince" 赳赳武夫，公侯好仇.[74] The word *qiu***gu* may be spelled as either 逑 or 仇 , as they are obviously orthographic variants representing the same basic word.

[69] *Shiji* 121.3124; reiterated by Ban Gu in *Hanshu* 88.3613.

[70] *Maoshi zhengyi* 1a.20a; Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 4:1.

[71] Wang Xianqian, *Shi Sanjiayi jishu* 詩三家義集疏, 1915. Rpt. *Huxiang wenku* 湖湘文庫, 2 vols. (Changsha: Yuelu Shushe, 2010), 1:26. That Zheng was not a strict adherent of the Mao school but an eclectic critic who freely drew on the other three schools for his interpretations should give us pause before insisting that all readings preserved by Zheng should be viewed as reflecting those of the Mao school.

[72] For this distinction, consult William G. Boltz, *The Origin and Early Development of the Chinese Writing System* (New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1994), 158–67, and Boltz, "Textual Criticism *More Sinico*," *Early China* 20 (1995): 393–405.

[73] Boltz, *The Origin and Development of the Chinese Writing System*, 106.

[74] *Maoshi zhengyi* 1c.3a; Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 4:14.

By the early Tang, Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574–648) notices that the sounds of these separate graphs were divergent; nevertheless, he concludes that the "sound was different but the meaning the same" 異音義同.[75] The case of the term *qiu*gu* seems to support the essential linguistic and semantic unity of at least this poem.

Taking a look at the entire poem reveals the trend toward unity despite textual variants.

Mao	Lu	Qi	Han	
關關雎鳩				Guan-guan go the ospreys,
在河之洲	州	州	州	On the islet in the river.
zhou *tjaw	same	same	same	
窈窕淑女				The modest, retiring, virtuous,
				young lady:
			O[76]	For our prince a good mate.
參差荇菜	槮	槮	槮	Here long, there short, is the
				duckweed,
cen *ts'am	shan *ts'am			
	葚	葚	葚	
xing *garaŋʔ	yan *cljanʔ			
左右流之				To the left, to the right, borne about by the current.
窈窕淑女				The modest, retiring, virtuous,
				young lady:
寤寐求之				Waking and sleeping, he sought her.
求之不得				He sought her and found her not, And
				waking and sleeping he thought
寤寐思服				about her.
				Long he
悠哉悠哉輾轉反側				thought; oh!
				Long and
參差荇菜				anxiously;
				On his side, on his
				back, he turned, and

[75] *Maoshi zhengyi* 1a.21a.

[76] O indicates no character attested for this edition.

				back again.
				Here long,
				there short, is
				the
				duckweed;
左右采之				On the left, on the right, we gather it.
窈窕淑女				The modest, retiring, virtuous,
				young lady:
				With lutes, small and large, let us give
琴瑟友				her friendly welcome.
				Here long, there short, is the
之參差				duckweed;
				On the left, on the right, we cook and
荇菜				present it.
左右芼之	芼	芼	覒	The modest, retiring, virtuous,
				young lady:
mao *maw			yan*maw	With bells and drums let us show our
				delight in her.
窈窕淑				
女鍾鼓				
樂之				

The linguistic unity of the text is obvious; all paired variants are homophones of each other except for 荇 xing*garaŋʔ and 葚 yan *cljanʔ. These two graphs obviously represent different words, unless their graphic similarity persuades us to regard one character as a visual variant loan graph for the other, which I chose to do, and thus we can rightly ignore the divergence in phonology. The variants in this poem are all of the graphic variety. For an example of variants that are lexical, let us examine another poem.

Mao #211, "Extensive Fields" 甫田[77]

Mao	Lu	Qi	Han	
倬彼甫田	倬	倬	蓧/篠	Bright are those extensive fields,
dao *tŏk	same	same	dao *tog/	

[77] *Maoshi zhengyi* 14a.1a–13a; Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 4:376–77.

			圃	
fu *pi̯wa	same	same	pu *pwo	
歲取十千				A tenth of whose produce is annually levied.
我取其陳				I take the old stores,
食我農人				And with them feed the husbandmen.
自古有年				From of old we have had good years,
今適南畝				And now I go to the south-lying areas.
				Where some are weeding, and
				some gather the earth
或耘或耔	耘	芸	耘	
yun *giwən	same	yun *giwən	same	
zi *tsiəg	O	zi*dz'iəg	O	
黍稷薿薿		擬		The millets look luxurious;
yi*ngiəg	O	ni *ngiəg	O	
攸介攸止				
烝我髦士				And in a spacious resting place,
				I collect and encourage the men of greater promise.[78]

A few comments are in order concerning the orthographic alternation between 倬 dao **tŏk* 蓧 / 篠 dao **tog*. The word is defined by Xu Shen as "Vegetation growing inverted; it follows the grass element with *dao* as phonetic" 艸木倒，从艸到聲; but Gui Fu 桂馥 (1736–1805) regards this definition as being an error introduced by later scholars. Based on earlier glosses in the *Close to Elegance* 爾 雅 onomasticon, *Elucidation of the Texts of Canonical Works* 經典釋文, and *Expanded Rhymes* 廣韻, the meaning should be "vegetation that is large" 艸大也.[79] It is this more authentic but less well-known definition that Zhang Binglin chose for the title of one of his books, a title which would be

[78] Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 4:376–77.

[79] *Shuowen jiezi yizheng* 說文解字義證 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998), 4.72a.

otherwise inscrutable. Family tradition and the memory of his students assert that Zhang pronounced this character in the acceptable alternate pronunciation of *zhuo*, yielding *Zhuo Han sanyan* 蓧漢三言, *Three Speeches Expanding/Enlightening Han [Learning]*.[80] This alternate pronunciation is hinted at by a loan graph of this character, namely the Mao reading of *dao* 倬 . The phonetic element *zhuo* 卓 is what yields this alternate pronunciation, and this despite Hao Yixing's 郝 懿 行 (1757–1825) note that "*Dao* and *dao* share the same sound and meaning" 倬蓧音義同.[81] Hao had earlier noticed that "*Zhuo* and *dao* are the same" 卓與 倬 同 , without following his own reasoning to the logical conclusion that an alternate pronunciation zhuo **tŏk* might be yielded by this alternate orthography, a difference in pronunciation that registered in the Mandarin dialect of his age. Wang Niansun 王念孫 (1744–1832) does concede the viability of the two orthographies of 卓 倬 , but semantically equates *zhuo* with 灼 zhuo * *tiək* to yield the definition of "bright."[82] If this describes the actual etymology of this word, then this would be the first instance in this poem of a textual variant being lexical rather than graphic.

Another possible instance is the variation between "extensive" 甫 fu **pi̯wa* and "park" 圃 pu **pwo*. An argument can be made that the phonological similarities of these words indicate that an orthographic variant is at issue here. But Zheng Xuan glosses the word as follows: "The word *pu* refers to an adult male" 甫之言丈夫也, a nod to the ancient system of taxing agricultural fields on the basis of the male peasants who worked them.[83] This indicates that Zheng regards this textual variant as lexical in nature. It is instructive to note that of the remaining three stanzas, only in one instance is a textual variant recorded. In stanza two, an alternation occurs between the Mao and Qi reading of "drive" 御 yu **ngiəg* and the Lu reading of "welcome" 迎 *ying* **ngiəng*.

An examination of the remaining nine poems subsumed by Wang Xianqian under his novel rubric of "Decade of 'Extensive Fields'" 甫田之什 (distributed in standard editions within the adjacent groups of "Decade of Northern Hill" 北山之什 and "Decade of Mulberry-Finch" 桑扈之什) reveals an equal paucity of lexical variants. Out of twenty-three textual variants, only four, or 17 percent, may be regarded as lexical; that is, conveying a different intellectual "message" via an alternate textual "record." And the percentage of textual variants in this grouping

[80] Zhang, *Zhuo Han sanyan* 蓧漢三言(Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian, 2011), "Preface", 4. The three "lectures" include "Zhuo Han weiyan" 蓧漢微言, "Zhuo Han changyan" 蓧漢昌言, and "Zhuo Han yayan zhaji" 蓧漢雅言劄記.

[81] Hao Yixing, *Erya yishu* 爾雅義疏, *Han xiaoxue sizhong* 漢小學四種, 2 vols. (Chengdu: Ba-Shu Shushe, 2001), 2:892 (1a.8b).

[82] Wang Niansun, *Guangya shuzheng (fu suoyin)* 廣雅疏證附索引 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2004), 4a.7a.

[83] *Maoshi zhengyi* 14a.1a.

is only 3 percent. Spot checking another grouping of poems, the eleven odes in the first section of the *Poems* known as "South of Zhou" 周 南 , we find thirty-five textual variants, none of which are lexical; the percentage of textual variants in this grouping is only 5 percent. A final check on a set of poems in the "Eulogia" 颂 section of "The Decade of Qingmiao" 清廟之什 reveals similar statistics. The percentage of textual variants in this set of poems is 4 percent, with only 3.8 percent of them being lexical variants. The striking paucity of textual variants in this sampling of poems reveals a remarkable unity of intellectual message and orthographic consistency over time.

Just as the unity of intellectual message does not equate with the unity of orthographic transcription, neither does it lead to a unity of interpretation on the part of these separate schools. The Mao school is characterized by its tendency to eulogize the virtue of the Zhou rulers, their queens, and other royal ladies. For instance, the "Minor Preface" 小序 to the Mao poems interprets the first entry, Mao #1, "Cawing Ospreys" ("Guanju") as directed at the queen and other residents of the imperial seraglio as follows:

> The "Guanju" celebrates the virtues of the Queen The "Zhounan" and the "Shaonan" show how the beginning was made correct, and the foundation of royal transformation. Therefore, in the "Guanju" we have joy in obtaining virtuous ladies to be mates to her Lord; anxiety to be introducing ladies of worth; no excessive desire to have the lord to herself; sorrow about modest retiring ladies [not being found for the harem], and thought about getting ladies of worth and ability,—all without any envy of their excellence:—this is what we have in the "Guanju."
>
> 后妃之德也。周南召南正始之道，王化之基。是以關雎樂得淑女以配君子， 憂在進賢，不淫其色，哀窈窕，思賢才而無傷善之心焉，是關雎之義。[84]

By way of contrast, the Lu school, followed by the schools of Qi and Han, interpreted "Cawing Ospreys" as not eulogizing the queen of King Wen and her attendants but "satirizing" (*ci* 刺) the sexual indulgence of one Zhou ruler, presumed to be King Kang 康 王 (r.1005/3–978 BC).[85] An example is a quote from a biography in the *History of Han*, "Biography of Du Qin" 杜 欽 傳 , which quote has dropped out of current editions but has been preserved by Wang Xianqian: "Qin said, 'The one who composed the "Cawing Osprey" sighs over his highness's fondness for sexual allure without measure; he hoped to obtain a

[84] *Maoshi zhengyi* 1a.3b, 18b; Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 4:36–37.

[85] On the Lu school of satirical interpretation and its survival in post-Han literature up to the early Tang, see Martin Kern, "Beyond the 'Mao Odes': *Shijing* Reception in Early Medieval China," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 127 (2007): 131–42; and Mark Laurent Asselin, "The Lu-School Reading of 'Guanju' As Preserved in an Eastern Han *Fu*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117 (1997): 427–43.

virtuous woman to match the gentleman'" 欽言：作關雎之人，嘆在上之好色無度，冀得淑女配君子也; an early commentator identifies Du Qin as an adherent of the Lu school.[86]

A description of the evils of sexual overindulgence is preserved in the *History of Han* biography of Du Zhou 杜 周 ; it explicitly links Mao #1 with the campaign against such a debilitating practice:

> The institution of queens and consorts is the commencement of short and long lives, order and rebellion, and survival and perishing. In tracing the waning age of the Three Dynasties, perusing the sacrificial feasts of the reigns of Zong and Xuan, and observing the recent cases of verified tallies, when has disaster ever not sprung from the power of women? For this reason the "Cawing Ospreyes" laments those noisy beauties who wear jade belts. It realizes that those who are besotted with sex harm their natures and shorten their years, and those who depart from the proper institutions and measures lead dissipated lives. The world would become impacted, and decline as a matter of course; hence it celebrates a chaste maiden, hoping to match her up, and celebrates the depth of her loyalty and piety, and actions of sincere humaneness.
>
> 后妃 之制，夭壽治亂存亡之端也。跡三代之季世，覽宗、宣之嚮國，察近屬之符驗，禍敗曷常不由女德？是以佩玉晏鳴，關雎歎之，知好色之伐性短年，離制度之生無厭，天下將蒙化，陵夷而成俗也。故詠淑女，幾以配上，忠孝之篤，仁厚之作也。[87]

This warning against licentiousness behavior and its resultant physical debilitation leads to another school of interpretation that ran from the late Zhou to the Han. Its roots are found in the *Master Xun* and flourished in the Chu manuscripts. Martin Kern introduces this independent school of interpretation as follows:

> Yet another early reading of the song differed more radically from the Mao tradition in not even taking "Fishhawks" ["Cawing Ospreys"] as an expression of superior morality. This reading is now known from two recently excavated bamboo manuscripts: the early Han "Five Modes of Conduct" (Wu xing 五行) manuscript from Mawangdui 馬王堆 (Changsha, Hunan) and the late Warring States "Confucius's Discussion of the *Odes*" (Kongzi shilun 孔子 詩 論), likely to date from ca. 300 B.C. and now housed in the Shanghai Museum. Both texts submit that "'Fishhawks' uses [the expression of] erotic allure to lead through illustration to ritual propriety" . . . 以/由色諭於禮.[88]

[86] Wang, *Shi Sanjiayi jishu*, 1:21.

[87] *Hanshu* 60.2669.

[88] Kern, "Beyond the 'Mao Odes,'" 135. For this hitherto unsuspected school of interpretation of the *Poems*, consult Jeffrey Riegel, "Eros, Introversion, and the

Grave doubts have been raised about the methodological soundness of Qing classical scholarship attempting to reconstruct the separate textual "records" of the Three Schools, in particular the practice of ascribing ancient textual variants to one or another of the four early schools of *Poems*. I noted the overwhelming unity of textual message and record demonstrated in the sampling of textual variations included earlier. Another, more negative way to view these data, is to regard them as saying something about the methodological weakness of reconstructing early textual traditions based on incomplete written remains of the past. Bernhard Karlgren early on launches the attack by offering some general critiques about the limits of Qing textual criticism and faults the handling of this mass of textual material for three basic shortcomings: First, its lack of linguistic method and knowledge of the phonology of Old Chinese, which he calls Archaic Chinese. Second, its overreliance on ancient Chinese dictionaries, which were little more than collections of word glosses, to the disastrous neglect of early textual parallels in other works. Third, its wholesale acceptance of all textual evidence regardless of whether or not it had corroborative value, for much of this evidence merely parroted earlier glosses that were accepted without reservation but lacked independent value.[89] Such caveats are well taken but miss the fundamental flaw of scholarship on the Three Schools, that of ascribing a textual variant to one school or another on the basis of the identification of a later commentator or on the circular or faulty reasoning of a Qing exegete.[90]

An instance of this faulty reasoning is the fundamental error of assuming that the "reading rules of a master" (*shifa* 師法) tradition governed classical studies during the Han with an iron hand. This mindset worked out conceptually in subsuming all students who made contact with a master within his scholastic lineage, whether this contact was formal or casual, and therefore assigned all textual readings in the works of these students to the exegetical school of this master. Witness Chen Qiacong: "The 'Biography of Kuang Heng' in the *History of Han* cites the *Poems*, stating 'A good match for the gentleman.' Heng studied the Qi *Poems*, and served the same master as Yi Feng and Xiao Wangzhi" 漢書匡衡傳引詩曰君子好仇。衡治齊詩，與 翼奉蕭望之同師，是所引為齊詩.[91] It may be true that all students mentioned were formal students of the same master, in this case Hou Cang 后倉, and it may be true that the reading preserved in Kuang Heng's *Hanshu* biography accurately reflects the text of the *Poems* utilized by him, but these points have not been demonstrated to be true.

Beginnings of *Shijing* Commentary," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57 (1997): 143–77.

[89] Bernhard Karlgren, *Glosses on the Book of* Odes (Göteborg: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1964), 81–83.

[90] Consult Hightower, "The *Han-Shih Wai-Chuan* and the *San Chia Shih*," 252n26 for the false premises that governed Chen Qiaocong's research.

[91] Chen Qiaocong, *Maoshi Zhengjian gaizi shuo* 毛詩鄭箋改字說 (HQJJ ed.) 12:5766–79; p. 5766.

A striking example of the difficulty in assigning provenance to textual variants is from Mao #211, "Extensive Fields," already examined at length above. The scholarly consensus regards the variation of the word 圃 *pu* **pwo* as belonging to the Han textual tradition, while the normative Mao text reads 甫 *fu* **pi̯wa*. Yet two Qing exegetes record the Han reading as being the same as the Mao text, even while preserving the Han variant of *dao* 蓺 instead of Mao's 倬.[92] It is arbitrary to assign a textual variant to one school or another in the face of conflicting evidence in the extant textual traditions. Furthermore, Wang Xianqian provides evidence that two different editions of the Lu school *Poems* circulated, often offering readings at odds with each other.[93] In a study of the Lu school of exegesis, Yu Wanli compares the results of Qing historical analysis with the evidence of the "Ziyi" manuscripts and the Xiping Stone Classics 西平石經 which used the Lu school readings. He concludes that in only 35 percent of the cases does this new textual evidence conform to the results claimed by the Qing classicists. In other words, the distribution of textual variants among the Three Schools is confirmed by the "Ziyi" manuscripts and the stone inscriptions only one third of the time.[94] This is an important indicator of the flaws in the methodology of Qing specialists on the *Poems* attempting to reconstruct the nature of the Three Schools exegetical traditions.

Given the overwhelming proof that textual variants in the extant evidence is almost uniformly graphic, not lexical, we are safe in hypothesizing that the *Poems* were preserved orally from the late Zhou through the Qin until the Han dynasty in a uniform message, which offered sufficient orthographical complexity and interpretive flexibility to generate different commentarial schools based not so much on textual evidence as on the hermeneutical needs of these schools. Martin Kern explains the textual situation as follows:

> Despite their occasional textual differences, the *Han Shi*, *Qi Shi*, and *Lu Shi* fragments display an overall coherence with one another as well as with the *Mao Shi*. This stands in remarkable contrast to the large number of textual variants in excavated *Odes* [*Poems*] fragments. We cannot measure the extent to which the surviving *san jia [Three Schools]* fragments represent the original form of the canonical text in these recensions. As the fragments are transmitted only in other texts of a literary tradition that since late Eastern Han times was in its *Odes* exegesis dominated by the Mao version, it seems very likely that, in the majority of instances, they might have undergone later adjustment to adhere more closely to the *Mao Shi*. In this case, the remaining textual variants should be seen as a mere residue of originally far greater differences between

[92] See Hao Yixing, *Erya yishu* 1a.8b; Zhu Junsheng 朱駿聲 (1788–1858), *Shuowen tongxun dingsheng* 說文通訓定聲 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1984), "Xiaobu" 小部 7.45a.

[93] See Wang, *Shi Sanjiayi jishu*, 2:800, 805, 1041.

[94] Yu Wanli, "Cong Xiping canshi he zhujian 'Ziyi' kan Qingren sijia Shi yanjiu," 154.

the *san jia* and Mao versions. It seems that only the manuscript variants give us a realistic idea of what mutually independent *Odes* transmission may have looked like in late Warring States and early imperial times.[95]

Kern notes that the percentage of variants among these early manuscripts is much higher than the percentage of variants among the Three Schools traditions, ranging from 31.6 to 40.6 percent for the former, and from 2.2 to 7.6 for the latter.[96] A plausible explanation for this difference in density of variant may be explained by the more fluid state of the orthography in pre-Han writing plus the impact of regional pronunciations not yet impacted by the normalizing trend of the Qin unification.

The results of Kern's intensive examination of textual variation in quotations from the *Poems* that have been preserved in the various bamboo and silk manuscripts excavated over the past forty years contradicts his remarks concerning the normalizing influence of the Mao readings, for "in their overwhelming majority" of variants in the manuscript discoveries, they are graphic, not lexical.[97] This means that in the late Warring States period a normalized text of the *Poems* circulated, at least in terms of its message if not in its various physical records. There is no reason, therefore, to posit the normalizing influence of the Mao tradition on the Han textual records that display a similar tendency toward uniformity of message and record.

A more important issue to explore is whether it is even valid to accept the traditional understanding of four separate exegetical schools of the text of the *Poems* during the Han. The uniformity of textual message belied the need for separate exegetical schools on the text even as political and moral needs encouraged the formation of hermeneutical schools to apply the message of the *Poems* in ways important to the founders of these schools. Apparently, applying the message of the oral text of the *Poems* was the major preoccupation of Yuan Gu and Shen Pei, and the existence of alternate orthographies did not much concern these early masters of this classic except for Han Ying, as seen in his *Esoteric Commentary*.

4.3. Conclusions

"When the Han arose, Confucian masters gathered and gleaned the mass of written works from the remains of burned ashes, and transmitted surviving classics after they had seemingly gone extinct. Great, indeed, was their merit" 漢興，儒生攟摭羣籍於火燼之餘，傳遺經於既絕之後。厥功偉哉.[98] With these sentiments Jiang Fan acknowledges the enormous debt owed by later generations

[95] Kern, "The *Odes* in Excavated Manuscripts," 152.
[96] Kern, "The *Odes* in Excavated Manuscripts," 156, Table 5.1.
[97] Kern, "The *Odes* in Excavated Manuscripts," 175.
[98] Jiang Fan, *Songxue yuanyuanji* 宋學淵源記. Wanyou Wenku Huiyao 萬有文庫薈要 ed. (Taipei: Commercial Press, 1965), 1.1.

to Han classicists. Qian Daxin is less effusive but equally open: "The reason the subtle words of Zengzi and Zisi did not ultimately fall by the way is due to the effort by Han Confucians to assemble and collect them" 曾子子思之微言所以不終墜者實賴漢儒薈萃之力.[99] In the case of the *Documents*, this debt is owed to early Han specialists such as Zhou Ba of Lu, Kong Anguo, and Jia Jia of Luoyang, and Fu Sheng and his disciples Ouyang Sheng and greater and lesser Xiahou; they should all be credited with preserving, editing, and passing on their versions of this classic, a task of vital importance for the history of Chinese political thought and policy and legal theory, and a convenient historical foil for determining both intellectual allegiances and textual approaches. As for the transmitters of the *Poems* Han Ying, Yuan Gu, Shen Pei, and Mr. Mao, their work preserved and made available the riches of this classic that has informed Chinese literary, linguistic, and aesthetic history, a contribution of incalculable importance. The twin media of the oral utterance and the transcribed word both played their parts in this process of textual transmission.

[99] Qian Daxin, *Qianyantang wenji* 潛研堂文集 (SBCK *chubian* ed.), "Jibu," vol. 97, juan 17, pp. 163–64.