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Notes

Introduction


2. Ryle, 2, 480. See also ibid., 2, 474.

3. Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures, 9. Geertz’ best known case study in thick description is “Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight,” in The Interpretation of Cultures, 412–453; see also Local Knowledge, 55–70; and, most recently, Available Light, 133–140. The value of thick description to history and anthropology is discussed cogently in Biersack, 74 ff. See also Tongs, esp. 3 ff.

4. E.g., Li Jinglin; Defoort; Van Norden, “What Should Western Philosophy Learn from Chinese Philosophy?”; Thoraval; Laurence G. Thompson, 19 ff.; Hatton; and Hall and Ames, e.g., 325. See also He Zhonghua et al.

5. As in the famous formulation by Whitehead, 63: “The safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato. . . . Thus in one sense by stating my belief that the train of thought in these lectures is Platonic, I am doing no more than expressing the hope that it falls within the European tradition.”

6. E.g., Lloyd and Sivin, 16–81 (with a sustained investigation of the institutions of patronage); Lewis, Writing and Authority in Early China, 73–83; and idem, “Warring States Political History,” 641–645.

7. Duda; Soles; Vorenkamp; Ahern; Tseu, 130 ff. (who argues that Mozi was a “theist”—by which he means monotheist—and thus not a utilitarian). Similarly, Nivison, in The Ways of Confucianism, concerns himself repeatedly with the
question of whether Chinese philosophers offer consequentialist or deontological arguments (see, for example, 106–108, 210, and 274).

8. Joseph S. Wu, 1 and 7f., calls this “the fallacy of ‘the misplaced hamburger’”: like American customers who order hamburgers in a Chinese restaurant, some readers of Chinese philosophy vainly seek certain issues familiar from Western philosophy—such as causality and the analytic-synthetic distinction—in Chinese sources. “If we are tempted to write a research paper on ‘The Syllogistic Theory in Confucius’ or ‘Lao Tzu’s Theory of Causality,’ this will be the same as asking for a hamburger in a Chinese restaurant” (7).

Wu’s approach is not the same as the avowed methodology of Quentin Skinner, 1, 86f.: “The question we accordingly need to confront in studying . . . texts is what their authors—in writing at the time they wrote for the specific audience they had in mind—could in practice have intended to communicate by issuing their given utterances.” The difference is that Skinner consciously assumes the task of gauging authors’ intentions, a form of the intentional fallacy devastated by Keane, 205ff. I hope to avoid the specter of intentionalism in these essays by referring to the (often multifaceted) meanings that texts had in their culture, rather than to the authors’ intended “illocutionary force,” to use the phrase that Skinner has borrowed from J. L. Austin. On intentionalism, see also the classic essay by Wimsatt and Beardsley, “The Intentional Fallacy” (and Skinner’s most recent response, 1, 90–102).

9. Some critics of thick description argue that it is naturally suited to the analysis of particular situations and phenomena rather than to synthetic accounts of culture or society as a whole. See, for example, Walters, 551f.

10. These are the so-called category 4 languages, judged to be the most difficult of those offered at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Presidio of Monterey (private communication from Command Sergeant Major Eugene B. Patton III). See also Hadley, 26. To be sure, certain languages not taught at Monterey may be even harder.

11. A useful conspectus is Shaughnessy, New Sources of Early Chinese History. See also the extensive review by Giele. Qian Cunxun, 15–36, provides an overview of the field current to the mid-1980s; Scarpri, “Riscrivere la storia e la cultura della Cina antica,” is more up to date.

12. The textual corpus from Mawangdui is published in the series Mawangdui Hanmu boshu, which has still not been completed.

13. See especially chapter 88, “Rulin zhuan” 搭林傳; for a representative example, see Hanshu 88.3597.

14. Thus, for example, Granet, La pensée chinoise, 345; see also Sivin, “Text and Experience in Classical Chinese Medicine,” esp. 187f.

15. Compare the discussion in Wang Bo, Jianbo sixiang wenxian lunji, esp. 188.
16. Liu Xinfang, 403, speculates that some of these texts may have made their way to Chu from other regions. As Friedman, 35 ff., observes, “Chu culture” has become a hot topic of study in Mainland China, in part because it provides the newly wealthy and powerful southern region of the country with a patrimony to be proud of.

17. E.g., MacCormack, 3; Latourette, 1, 53 and 81; and Rosthorn, 36 f.; more circumspect is Duyvendak, e.g., 39. A representative Marxist view is offered in Yang K’uan, “Shang Yang’s Reforms,” esp. 88–99. See also Asano, 264–270; Bodde, “The State and Empire of Ch’in,” 34–38; and Li Jing, 22–42. The scholarly preoccupation with Lord Shang is probably due to the existence of a book purporting to contain his doctrines (Shangqin shu 商君書, of questionable authenticity) and to the old Chinese historiographical trope of attributing social progress to the agency of heroic individuals.

18. Now published in Shuihudi Qinmu zhujian. The most thorough studies in English are by Hulsewé and Yates. A different cache of Qin laws was discovered at Longgang 龍崗, near Shuihudi, and has been published in Longgang Qinjian. Most recently (summer of 2002), a group of administrative documents from the Qin dynasty was found at Liye 里耶, Hunan province 湖南省; see Li Xueqin, “Chudu Liye Qinjian.”


20. Li Jing, 112, argues that the Qin laws were inherently unfair (in that punishments varied according to the social class of the offender) but that, within these bounds, they were fairly applied. This conclusion contrasts starkly with the more old-fashioned view offered in Watson, Records of the Grand Historian: Qin Dynasty, xiv: “Qin’s law are noted . . . for the equality with which they were applied to high and low alike, regardless of social rank.” Cf. also Hulsewé, Remnants of Ch’in Law, 7 f.

21. See, for example, the comments of Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 (1612–1681) in Shikai kaochō 乞求 6, 64, discussed in Goldin, The Culture of Sex in Ancient China, 164n.25.

22. This is one of the central arguments in Darnton (e.g., 4 f. and 77 f.), where Geertz’ method is consciously applied to historiography.

23. Zhou Fagao contains literally hundreds of glosses on early Chinese personal names. See also Allet, Les Chinois et la passion des noms; and Bauer.

24. Thus, for example, Greel, The Origins of Statecraft in China, 67 f. See also Schaberg, A Patterned Past, 63.

25. See, for example, Wang Shoukuan, 7 ff.; Yang Ximei, 274–281; and, for an opposing view, Peng Yushang, esp. 4 ff. The personal names of Wen and Wu were Chang 昌 and Fa 發, respectively.

It is not clear when the practice of granting posthumous names began in
China. See the references in Creel, *The Origins of Statecraft in China*, 68n.55; as well as the discussions in Wang Shoukuan, 1–16; and Tong Shuye, 382–386. Most scholars (e.g., Keightley, 33 ff.) believe that the *gan* names, also called “temple names” 廟號, of Shang kings were determined posthumously. In contrast, the late Zhang Guangzhi (K. C. Chang), in “Shangwang miaohao xinkao,” presented an elaborate argument dividing the *gan* names, which are generally thought to have been posthumous, into two categories and linking these with two putative lineages within the ruling house; this scheme would suggest that the Shang kings must have had at least some idea of their posthumous designations. See also Chang’s “T’ien kan”; as well as Early Chinese Civilization, 72–114; and ‘Guanyu ‘Shangwang miaohao xinkao’ yiwen de buchong yijian.” More recently, Nivison, “The Key to the Chronology of the Three Dynasties,” 13 ff., has suggested that a king’s *gan* name indicates the first official day of his rule in the ten-day week (called *xun* 軍).

26. The discussion below considers only names that were acquired in adulthood, for it was common practice to bestow names on babies and children on the basis of their appearance. Cf. Bauer, 311–313. For example, Tong funcs, the son of Lord Huan of Lu 魯桓公 (r. 711–694 B.C.) and the future Lord Zhuang of Lu 魯莊公 (r. 693–662), was so dubbed because there was speculation that he may have been a bastard and “resembled” (tong) another man: Chunqiu Guliang zhuan zhushu 3.2375a (Huan 6 = 706 B.C.). See also Goldin, *The Culture of Sex in Ancient China*, 141 n.99. The birth of this lad prompts a general discussion of naming in Chunqiu Zuozihuan zhu, 1, 115 f., discussed in Li Xueqin, Li Xueqin juan, 674 ff; Emmrich, 15 ff; Grafflin, 384 ff; Xiao Yaotian, 26–30; and Bauer, 255.


28. Following the commentary of Lu Wenchao 盧文弨 (1717–1796).

29. Following the commentary of Sun Yirang 孫詒讓 (1848–1908).


31. *Lunheng jiaoshi* 25.76.1051 ff.

32. Incidentally, it has been suggested that Mozi himself is also not a proper name but means simply “Tattooed Master,” implying that Mo Di and his followers were convicts or slaves. See, for example, Fung, 1, 79; and Qian Mu, *Mozi*, 1 ff. In contrast, Xu Xiyu, 67, points out that no contemporary document confirms this suggestion; consequently, Mo may well have been a genuine surname. See also Chow, “A New Theory on the Origins of Mohism,” 126 ff; and Gu Jiegang and Tong Shuye. In the early twentieth century some scholars speculated that Mozi may have been a foreigner, but there is no concrete evidence for this assertion either. See the review by Zhang Jiewen.

33. “Guji liezhuan” 滑稽列傳, Shiji 126.3197–3199. A man by the same name appears in various contexts (most notably *Mencius* 4A.17) as a renowned philoso-
pher or rhetorician; it is impossible to know whether the same person is intended. See Sato, 78 f.; and Goldin, *Culture of Sex*, 174 n. 94.


35. The surname Chunyu was taken from the name of the capital of the ancient state of Zhou 周; see Chunqi Zuoqiu zhujü, 1, 108 (Huan 5 = 707 B.C.). See also the comments by Ying Shao in “Xingshi” 始氏 (as reconstructed from surviving fragments), *Fengyu tongyi jiaozhu*, 509. Cf. Zhu Hongbin, 481. So Chunyu kun might just mean “the shaved man from Chunyu.” Granet, *Dances et légendes de la Chine ancienne*, 17n.1, misconstrues the name totally and reads it as though it were “Shun Yukun.”


37. Liuyu jishi 27.922–924. For later elaborations, see “Dangwu” 常務, *Lushi chunqi jiaoshi* 11.596; and “Wudu” 五蠹, *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu* 49.1104. This passage is discussed further in chapter 2, below.


39. Following the commentary in *Lushi chunqi jiaoshi* 14.800n.45.


42. “What’s in a Name?” 29. Cf. also Hsu, 72: “Sun the Cripple.” Incidentally, Sun Bin’s writings have recently been discovered and reconstructed; see *Sun Bin Bingfa*. For translations, see Sawyer; and Lau and Ames.

43. Petersen, “What’s in a Name?” 28 f.

44. See Chunqi Zuoqiu zhujü, 1, 107 (Xi 僳 23 = 637 B.C.) for piaoxie. Petersen has pointed out in a private correspondence that two of Chonger’s famous half-brothers also have meaningful names: the foolhardy Yiwu 異吾 (Destroy Me) and the revenant Shensheng 申生 (Born Again). The latter name might also be explained as Born in Shen; see Emmrich, 19.

45. See especially the example of Lao Ai 婆宜 (Lustful Misdeed) discussed in Goldin, *Culture of Sex*, 82 ff. One might also be suspicious of the name Han Fei 韓非
(Han the Refuter), since Han Fei is one of the most elcnetic writers in the history of Chinese philosophy. Like Sun Wu, the name Han Fei may be what Průšek calls *trop typique*. (The ancient name Fei is elsewhere interpreted as *fei* 飛, “to fly”; see Zhou Fagao, 26; and Bauer, 313n.1.) Han Fei himself attributes the famous paradox “A white horse is not a horse” 白馬非馬也 to a man named 兒說; this name is usually pronounced Ni Yue, but might also be read as Ni Shui, meaning Ni the Persuader (or perhaps even Wa Shui 喃説, Babbling Persuader). Text in “Wai chushuo zuo shang” 外儲說左上, *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu* 11.32.674.

It is sometimes suggested that Ke 柯, the personal name of Mencius, might be interpreted as an abbreviation for *kanke* 坎柯 (hard times), which would refer to his indigence; see Zhou Fagao, 203f. And for the various explanations of Confucius’ personal name (Qiu 丘, Hillock), see the commentary of Duan Yucai 段玉裁 (1735–1815) in *Shuowen jiezi Duan zhu fu liushu yinyun biao* 8A.31a (under the character *ni* 音), reproduced in Zhou Fagao, 218. Cf. also Jensen, 196; Emmerich, 16m.75; Xiao Yaotian, 27; and Granet, *Dances et légendes*, 432f.

Zhai Hao 翟陽 (1736–1788) explained the name Jieyu 接與 (see *Analects* 18.5) as Receiving the Chariot (namely, of Confucius), but other exegetes disagree. See the commentary in *Lunyu jishi* 36.1261ff. There is another possibility: in a later tale Jieyu is said to have been courted by a royal emissary whose chariots left deep grooves in front of his gate. (This visitation prompted Jieyu and his wife to change their names and flee the land.) See *Han-Shi waizhuan jianshu* 2.183; and *Lienü zhuang buzhu* 2.37f. (“Xianming” 賢明).

Finally, the name of Gongshu Ban 公輸般, the famous engineer whose siege machinery Mozi confounds in “Gongshu” 公輸, *Mozi jiaozhu* 13.30.764–765, may belong to the same category. In his commentary to “Ailei” 爱頌, *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshu* 21.1465n.10, Gao You asserted that Gongshu is the appellation of Lu Ban 魯般, which appears to be an ordinary name. But *Lu ban* might also mean “a carpenter from Lu,” since *ban* 般 (or *pan* 槃) can bear the sense of “to construct,” as in the *Shijing* (Mao 56, “Kaopan” 考槃); see *Shijing zhuxi*, 1, 160. On the basis of similar evidence, Chen Guangyu suggests that the Shang king known as Pangeng may have earned that name in honor of his role in constructing a new capital for the dynasty.

46. I borrow both these renderings from Mair, *Wandering on the Way*, 46f. and 126f., respectively.

47. Wang Shoukuan, 220–229, places this text in the fourth century B.C. *Analects* 5.15 also discusses the rationale behind the choice of a certain posthumous name.


49. See Bauer, 8–15, for the various categories of names in traditional China.
50. Cf. Chenyang Li, 94: “The Confucians would say that a person’s name becomes meaningful when it bears some description of the person.”

51. For some general studies of Xi Wangmu, see Lü Simian, Lü Simian shuo shi, 1–5; Frühauf; James; Cahill; Birrell, 171–175; Major, Heaven and Earth in Early Han Thought, 200 ff.; Rainey; Fracasso; Wu Hung; Loewe, Ways to Paradise, 86–126; Mathieu. 4n.109 and 180–185; Münke, 301–306; Ying-shih Yü, “Life and Immortality in the Mind of Han China,” 96 ff.; and Dubs.

There are well-known references to a spirit named Xiμ in the oracle bone literature; for a concise review, see Rao Zongyi, Zhongguo zongjiao sixiang shi xinya, 109–114. Schipper, “Taoism: The Story of the Way,” 54n.12, writes that Xi Wangmu “is not mentioned in the Confucian Classics… which in fact do not mention a single female deity, as they are profoundly misogynistic.” But the statement in “Dalüe” 大詁, Xunzi jijie 19.27.489, that the sage Yu 禹 studied at Xi Wang Guo 西王國 must be an allusion to the legend that Yu visited Xi Wangmu. For other references, see esp. “Wuxing” 無形, Lunheng jiaoshi 2.7.67; as well as Han-shi wuzhuan jianshu 5.500; and Xinxu xiangzhuan 5.142. However, Karlgren, “Legends and Cults in Ancient China,” 271, assuming that Yu “would not have had a female teacher,” takes Xiwang mu as 西王母, “acres of the Western King”; for the name can also refer to a place, as in, for example, Mu tianzi zhuang 2.5b; and “Shì” 釋地, Erya zhushu 7.2616b.

52. “Shiqin” 釋親, Erya zhushu 4.2592b. Frühauf, 50, is aware of this passage, but denies its significance.


54. The most frequent occurrence is probably in Hexagram 35 of the Yijing, “Jin” 靈, Zhou-Yi zhengyi 4.49b: “One receives these boon blessings from one’s wangmu” wangmu  отношении Shang-Clark. Even the most accomplished translators sometimes render this mistakenly as “royal mother”: e.g., Shaughnessy, I Ching, 139. Most other published translations have “grandmother,” “departed grandmother,” “ancestress,” and so forth. Compare the commentary in Du Yi huitong 5.423. Wang Fanzhi, 67, suggests a connection between this wangmu and Xi Wangmu. Wangfu as “deceased paternal grandfather” is attested also in “Quli shang” 曲禮上, Liji zhengyi 3.1248b.

55. “Bing” 病, Rishu jiazhong 疾書甲種, strips 七〇正言 to 七三正言, in Shuihudi Qinmu zhiyuan, 193. For the characters presented here as zuo 作, the editors of Shuihudi Qinmu zhiyuan have zuo 零; and for gui 副, the editors have sui 歲. For the readings presented here, see Liu Lexian, 117 n.2. 5. One might not expect gui zai xi fang 副在西方 at the end of the second section, because the offerings and infirmities discussed there all clearly pertain to the color yellow, and the west is naturally associated with white (as in the next section of the text, not cited here). Cf. Kudō, 35. The types of animals offered in sacrifice also do not conform
to later Five Phase systems. For example, according to the chart in Sterckx, 79, red corresponds to feathered beasts and yellow to hairless ones. In Warring States sources, such details vary.

For similar passages from Shuihudi, see “Youji” 有疾, Rishu yizhong 日書乙種, Shuihudi Qinmu zhujian, 246. Wangfu appears to be associated with disease in materials from Baoshan as well: see “Bushi jidao jihu 卜筮祭酒記錄, strip 222, in Baoshan Chujian, 34. Cf. Chen Wei, Baoshan Chujian chutan, 154f.

56. On the basis of similar usage in other early medical texts, Kudo, 39, explains the phrase de zhi 得之 as an indication that eating the food of the sacrifice is the cause of the illness in question. See also Liu Lexian, 118–119. For a different interpretation, see Wu Xiaosheng, 75f. See also Xu Fuchang, “Shuihudi Qin jian Rishu zhong de guishen xinyang,” 923–924.

57. The three characters wu kan xing 衛堪行 are not easy to understand; perhaps the meaning is that a shaman named Kan carries out the worship of wangmu. Wu Xiaosheng, 71, identifies Kan with the spirit Kanpi 堪彼, who is mentioned in “Da zongshi” 大宗師, Zhaungzi jishi 3A.6.247. But Wu presents no evidence to support this conjecture. Kanpi probably refers to the same spirit elsewhere called Qinpi 欽馳. (In Old Chinese, the name would have been *kam-pii.) See, for example, “Xishan jing” 西山經, Shanhai jing jiaozhu 2.50; and “Zhang Heng lie zhu” 張衡列傳, Hou-Han shu 49.1931. The commentary of Lu Deming 隆德明, Zhaungzi jishi 3A.6.249n.11, asserts that the name appears as Qinfu 欽負 in the Huainanzi, but no such form is found in the received text (the nearest equivalent being Qianju 干且). See the well-documented discussion in Zhaungzi jiaoquian, 6.235n.10. See also Sterckx, 172 and 299n.26.

For the name Kan, Wolfgang Behr (private communication) has suggested a possible connection with the Old Turkic word qam, meaning “sorcerer, shaman.”


59. Yang goes on to propose that wang is actually an error for shen, but this is not likely: the two characters are not easily confused, and in any case, it is wang that must be considered lectio difficilior. (On the concept of lectio difficilior, the more difficult reading, see, for example, Maas, § 16a et passim.)

60. See the commentary in Xunzi jianshi, 278. The passage is in “Liyun” 禮運, Liji zhengyi 22.1426a: “Thus the rite is carried out in the suburbs, and the many spirits receive their offices from it” 故禮行於郊，而百神受職焉.

61. Titles conventionally applied to females, similarly, can be used by male gods: consider hou 后, literally “queen,” the title of such deities as Houji 后姬 (Millet God) and Houtu 后土 (Soil God), even though the former is normally conceived as male. (The sex of the latter is ambiguous.) Karlgren, “Some Fecundity Symbols in Ancient China,” 16, interprets hou in this context as a verb, “to rule over,” because “a title in Chinese is put after, not before its principal word”
(emphasis in original). But there are many counterexamples (e.g., King Ji 王季, the father of King Wen of Zhou; and Marquise Yi of Zeng 曾侯乙).

Miller, 199 et passim, discusses references to a certain Jinxing 晋王, which may be a designation of a local riverine goddess with whom the Jin shrines 晋祠 have long been associated. See, for example, Weishu 106A.2466. Jinxing can hardly mean “King of Jin,” because the ancient state of Jin was a marquisate, not a kingdom. (I have been unable to find a single instance in which the ruler of Jin is called Jinxing.) Thus Jinxing probably means “spirit of the Jin [waters]” and could refer either to this goddess or to Tang Shuyu 唐叔虞, the progenitor of the House of Jin.

62. Taking wang 在 this sense, incidentally, explains the name of the antipodal deity Dong Wanggong 東王公 (or Dong Wangfu 東王父), usually rendered as “King Father of the East” (no doubt on the model of “Queen Mother of the West”). But the phrase wanggong, which normally means “kings and dukes,” makes little sense as a royal title; rather, the name Dong Wanggong probably means something like “Spirit Lord of the East.”

63. For wang 往, “past,” compare the words attributed to Jieyu in Analects 18.5: “One cannot remonstrate with the past” 往者不可諫.

64. See Mao 254, “Ban” 板: “August Heaven is shining and bright; it is with you wherever you go” 吳天日明，及爾出王. Tjan, 1, 30n.87, lists several ancient texts that attempt to forge a quasi-etymological link between wang 王, “king,” and wang 往, “to go.”

65. Schafer, “Ritual Exposure in Ancient China,” 161. Qiu Xigui, 253, explains, however, that the phonetic component of kuang 狂 and kuang 狂 was not wang 王 in archaic script; rather, it was a protoform of the character now written wang 往 (presumably in the sense of “going across” to the spirit world). In addition to Qiu’s other examples, wang 狂, “to go,” should probably be added to this group; cf. Wang Li, 352 f.


67. See Wang Shumin’s discussion in Zhuangzi jiaoquen 111n.8.

68. The Shiming 釋名 of Liu Xi 劉熙 (fl. ca. A.D. 200) glosses the wang of wangfu and wangnu as wang 往: wangfu is “he who returns and wangnu 往 in household” 家中所歸往也. See “Shi qinshu” 釋親屬, Shiming shuzheng lu 3.11.150. The commentaries of Bi Yuan 翟元 (1730–1797) and Ye Dejiong 葉德炯 both emend this wang to 往, yielding “he who comes and goes in the household.”

69. Many examples are cataloged inoblin, 145–310, but the numerous abbreviations and unkeyed citations make those tables unnecessarily difficult to use. See also Ames, “Thinking through Comparisons,” 107; and Unger, 70–71.

70. “Zhongyong,” Liji zhengyi 52.1629b. For more on the Application of Equilibrium, see Tu Wei-ming, Centrality and Commonality. The gloss appears to be lifted
from *Mencius* 7B.16, which is probably an older text; I cite from the *Application of Equilibrium* because the occurrence of the gloss there is better known.

71. See, for example, *Analects* 4.5. For more on the place of *ren* in Confucius’ philosophy, see, for example, Lau, *Confucius: The Analects*, 14–22.


73. This is known as *shu* 節, reciprocity. See, for example, Fingarette; Van Norden, “Unweaving the ‘One Thread’ of *Analects* 4:15”; Ivanhoe, “Reweaving the ‘One Thread’ in the *Analects*”; Creel, “Discussion of Professor Fingarette on Confucius”; S. Y. Chan; and Nivison, *Ways of Confucianism*, 59–76.

74. *Ren* 仁 may have originally denoted a nobleman (as opposed to *min* 民, used for the people at large). See, for example, Graham, *Disputers of the Tao*, 19. But by Confucius’ day, the word could freely be extended to any (morally noble) person.

75. Old Chinese reconstructions are taken from Baxter, with modifications corresponding to Baxter’s unpublished “Old Chinese, Version 1.1,” which is briefly described in Baxter and Sagart, 72n.19.


78. A quotation from “Yaodian” 傑典, *Shangshu zhengyi* 2.119af.

79. *jia* 家 has two Old Chinese readings, *kwe* and *kus.

80. Compare the translation in Tjan, 2, 576.

81. Cf. Anthony C. Yu, 239: “Without the conventions of the alphabet as stable phonetic anchors, determining in Chinese whether an appeal to identical or approximate vocalization for semantic elucidation indicates a real cognate or merely sporting with sounds is difficult.” For a similar example involving the characters *gong* 公 and *si* 私 (which both contain the element 亻), see chapter 3, below.


83. Baxter reconstructs *tshin* for *qin*, but the initial cluster almost certainly reflects an older *sn*. (Compare his own discussion in Baxter, 223f.) It is clear that many of the words for which he reconstructs an initial *tsh-* must have had a consonant cluster involving *s*. For example, for *qing* 青, “green, the color of life,” he reconstructs *srēng*, but for *qing* 淸, “pure,” which belongs to the same phonetic series, he has *tsheng*. More plausible would be an initial cluster *sr-* for both words.

84. See, for example, *Mencius* 1A.1, *Mengzi zhengyi* 2.43, for a similar usage: “There has never been someone who was *ren* and yet neglected those who were *qin* to him” 未有仁而遺其親者也.

86. Xunzi jijie 16.22.420.
87. Jakobson, 411.
88. See, for example, Long Yuchun, 107–126; and Goldin, Rituals of the Way, 145n.35.
89. For a similar emphasis on annotation, see Nienhauser, “The Implied Reader and Translation,” 19.
90. See, for example, Quine, Theories and Things, 1–23; Ontological Relativity and Other Essays, 1–25; and, generally, Word and Object. See also Gibson.

1. The Reception of the Odes in the Warring States Era


Around the same time as Giles, scholars in China were voicing similar criticisms of the commentarial tradition to the Odes; for typical examples, see Gu Jiegang, “Ye you si jun”; and Hu Shi, “Tantan Shijing.” A representative sample of comparable opinions can be found in Pauline Yu, 45f. See also Lin Qingzhang, 107–112; Li Jiashu, 91–94; Wong and Lee; and Zhao Peilin, 273f. Gu Jiegang’s views of the Odes are also discussed at length in Zhao Zhiyang, 267–295.

2. See, for example, Riegel, “Eros, Intversion, and the Beginnings of Shijing Commentary,” 147n.14; Su Xuelin, 19–24; Van Zoeren, 92ff.; and Zhao Peilin, 251–269. For dissenting opinions, see Wang Chengliu; and Liu Simian, Liu Simian dushe zhaji, 692ff.

3. Compare the opinion of Wu Wanzhong, 87: “We consider the tendency to explain the Odes in this manner to be more or less related to the ideology of Confucian scholars at the beginning of the Han who regarded the rituals as the bonds of an established social order.” See also Rouzer, 15–26; and Watson, Early Chinese Literature, 292–230.

For more on the notion that the Odes were originally folksongs, see Luo Qikun, 57–73; Lu Hongsheng; and esp. Qi Wanli.


5. The fragmentary remains of the three competing schools of exegesis (known as Qi, Lu, and Han), similarly, do not always agree with the interpretations found in the Prefaces and the Mao commentary. See, for example, Lin Yao-lin; and the classic studies in Pi Xirui, 2.12–25 and 41–44. The three lost traditions of the Odes are described in Hightower, 251ff.

Among the recently discovered “Shanghai Museum manuscripts,” which surfaced on the Hong Kong antiquities market in 1994 and were quickly purchased by the Shanghai Museum, is a discussion of the Odes ascribed to Confucius and
titled *Kongzi shilun* 孔子詩論. This text offers pithy interpretations of several odes, differing substantially from those of the received Prefaces. But as the provenance of the Shanghai Museum manuscripts is still unknown, they are considered here only in the notes. The first two volumes of these manuscripts have been published under the general editorship of Ma Chengyuan. Although the manuscripts may well be genuine, their authenticity is not established by Ma Chengyuan’s publication.


7. Both texts date to the fourth century at the latest. *Wuxing* was discovered at both Mawangdui and Guodian; *Ziyi* has been transmitted as a chapter of the *Liji* and was found in an alternate recension at Guodian. (Both texts are discussed in chapter 2, below.) The Mawangdui *Wuxing* includes an “Explication” 説 of the text that probably dates to the Han dynasty. The Shanghai Museum manuscripts (including *Kongzi shilun* and another version of *Ziyi*) are not included in this catalog. References to the *Odes* in *Kongzi shilun* are listed in Zhou Fengwu, “*Kongzi shilun* xin shiwen ji zhuju,” 166–172.

8. See the Appendix. This total does not include roughly thirty alleged references (some of them questionable) to lost odes and perhaps another thirty-five general references to the entire collection or one of its three sections. If one were to add such references to the total, the sum would approach six hundred.

Dong Zhi’an, *Xian-Qin wenxian yu xian-Qin wenxue*, 35–45 and 64–88; and Schmölz, 155–163, both contain useful (but incomplete) charts that can be consulted in conjunction with the appendix here. For references to the *Odes* in the *Zuo zhuan*, see Zeng Qinliang, 13–29; Zhang Suqing, 261–288; Yang Xiangshi; and Kamata Tadashi, 346ff. and 362–378. For references in the *Xunzi*, see Pei Puyan, 152–169. For the *Li shi chunqiu*, see Tian Fengtai, 357–359. For the *Zhanguo ce*, see He Jin, 180–182.


10. Ibid. See also *Mencius* 2B.2.


13. For *ru* 如 as *er* 而, see Karlgren, *Glosses on the Book of Odes*, §471. But in “Loan Characters in Pre-Han Texts II,” §§529 and 532, Karlgren rejects similar proposals in other contexts.


19. “Minggui xia,” *Moz aozhu* 8.31.340. This quotation is effective, insofar as evidence from canonical texts is considered to be decisive in Mohist epistemology. See, for example, Graham, *Disputers of the Tao*, 52 f. On Mozi’s general view of the Odes, see Wang Changhua, 67–77; and Luo Genze, esp. 147–150.

Karlgren, *Glosses on the Book of Odes*, § 751, points out that Mao seems to have understood this line as a description of King Wen’s activities while still alive. The same is implied in “Guyue” 古樂, *Lushi chunqiu jiaoshi* 5.286. Cf. Dong Zhi’an, “Lushi chunqiu zhi lun Shi yin Shi yu Zhangguo moqi Shixue de fazhan,” 40.


21. See the commentary in *Shijing yidu*, 355 ff.

22. See *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan*, 4, 1313 (Zhao 9 = 533 B.C.); Mencius 1A.2, *Mengzi zhengyi* 2.45–47; and “Wu Ju lun tai mei er Chu dai” 伍專論臺美而楚殆, *Guo Yu* 17.545. Cf. Sterckx, 113; Chun-chieh Huang, 91; Schaberg, “Social Pleasures in Early Chinese Historiography and Philosophy,” 20; Schmödl, 131; and Zeng Qinliang, 374–375.


24. See the commentary of Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (A.D. 127–200) in *Mao-Shi zhengyi* 16C.516b.


interpretation, incidentally, is in line with that of the Minor Preface (Mao-Shi zhengyi 13A.463b).

28. This practice of indiscriminate quotation—called duanzhang quyi 斷章取義, “taking meaning by breaking stanzas,” after Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu, 3, 1145 (Xiang 28 = 545 B.C.)—is a productive theme in the critical literature. For a brief and elegant discussion, see Qian Zhongshu, Guanzhui bian, 1, 224–226; trans. in Limited Views, 221–223.


The names of these sections, incidentally, appear as xia 夏, song 歌, and bang-feng 邦風, respectively, in the Shanghai Museum manuscripts. See, for example, Kongzi shilun, strips 2–3; Ma Chengyuan, 1, 127–129. The “Hymns” are also sometimes called rong 容, as in Xing zi ming chu 性自命出, strips 21 and 66; Guodian Chuju zhujian, 179 and 181. Cf. Kern, “Shi jing Songs as Performance Texts,” 50n.6.

30. All ten instances, furthermore, involve either of the following lines: “The good man, the noble man—his deportment is unified” 觀人君子，其儀一也 and “The good man, the noble man—his deportment is not faulty” 觀人君子，其儀不忒. Apparently these were popular formulæ and were commonly quoted into the Han dynasty. Cf. Wu Wanzhong, 19–30.

31. E.g., Schmölz, 115 and 119; and esp. Shih-Hsiang Chen, 31 and 35. Schaberg, A Patterned Past, 74 ff., suggests that odes involving the figure of King Wen, which dominate the “Greater Elegancies” and “Hymns,” were especially popular because that monarch was conceived as the embodiment of wen itself.

32. See Qian Zhongshu, Guanzhui bian, 1, 104–105 for a discussion of this poem as an alba.

33. The sexual content of the poems might even be conveyed by the title of the section to which they belong. Feng 風 (literally “wind”) is usually understood in this context as the equivalent of feng 風, “to satirize,” and in rendering the term into English, many writers exploit the multivalence of the word “air.” But feng can also denote the mating songs of animals; this sense informs the well-known saying feng ma nü bu xiang ji 風馬不相及, “The loving horses and cattle do not attract each other,” used in Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu, 1, 289 (Xi 4 = 656 B.C.), to describe two states so distant from one another that their herd animals do not interbreed. So it is not far-fetched to read Guofeng as “The Mating Songs of the States.” This suggestion goes back to Lu Kanru and Feng Yuanjun, 15. (The idea seems to have been proposed independently by Chen Mengjia, 5.) See also Geaney, On the Epistemology of the Senses in Early Chinese Thought, 22–30; Sterckx, 170; Zhu Bixiang, 1080 f.; Yuan Changjiang, 225; Lévi, “Langue, rite et écriture,” 167; Su Xueling, 119 et passim; Ye Shuxian, 550–559; Lewis, Sanctioned Violence in Early China, 215; and Gibbs, 287. Kuriyama, The Expressiveness of the Body and the Divergence of Greek and
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Chinese Medicine, 238 ff., refers to many of the same texts as Lewis but does not cite him. See also Kuriyama’s earlier article, “The Imagination of Winds.”

Conventional glosses of feng are reviewed succinctly in Su Xuelin, 113–114; and Qian Zhongshu, Guanzhui bian, 1, 58–59. See also Fan Shuyun.

94. A possible exception may be found in Confucius’ famous statements about the “sounds of Zheng” 鄭聲, which he decries in Analects 15.11 and 17.18. Scholars disagree as to whether Confucius was referring to the subsection of the “Airs” called “Airs of Zheng” 鄭風 or to other songs popular in that state. It may be significant that none of the “Airs of Zheng” appears in the Analects, although Confucius is said to have cited them in other texts (such as Zizi). For a judicious discussion of the issue, see Diény, 17–40. Some scholars have tried to explain Confucius’ statements by considering the content and rhythmic peculiarities of the “Airs of Zheng”: e.g., Luo Qikun, 216–219; Harbsmeier, “Eroticism in Early Chinese Poetry,” 335 ff.; DeWoskin, A Song for One or Two, 92 ff.; Kurihara, 135 ff. and 415 ff.; and esp. Picken, 103. Such arguments hang on the assumption that Confucius was indeed referring to those poems.

Elsewhere, the probity of the “Airs of Zheng” is indeed impugned. When Noble Son Zha of Wu 吳公子札 hears them performed, his prescient comment is: “Beautiful—but it is too trivial, and the people will not be able to bear it. This is why [Zheng] will be among the first to perish” 美哉！其細已甚，民弗能堪也，是其先亡乎！; Chunjing Zuo zhuan zhu, 3, 1162 (Xiang 29 = 544 B.C.). Cf. Nylan, The Five “Confucian” Classics, 91; Van Zoeren, 266 n.39; and DeWoskin, A Song for One or Two, 22 ff. On Noble Son Zha generally, see Cai, 40 ff.; Schaberg, A Patterned Past, 86–95; Schmölz, 168–171; and Zhang Suqing, 109–115.

95. “Dalüe,” Xunzi jije 19.27.511. Xunzi continues: “Their perfection can be compared to that of bells and chimes; their sounds are permitted within the ancestral temple” 其誠可比於金石，其聲可內於宗廟. According to the commentary of Yang Liang, this proverb means that the Odes teach us to rein in our desires even when they are about to overflow. Cf. Goldin, Culture of Sex, 156n.71; Wu Wanzhong, 72; Yuan Changjiang, 150 f. and 166; Du Yongming et al., 1, 332; and Su Xue, 122. Compare also “Ruxiao” 儒教, Xunzi jije 4.8.133: “The ‘Airs’ are not lubricious because they restrain themselves by adopting [the Way]” 故風之所以不逐者，取是以節之也. Cf. Schmölz, 53. Kongzi shilun contains some illuminating statements on this issue. See, for example, strip 3, Ma Chengyuan, 1, 129: “In the ‘Airs of the States’ are included affairs. The people’s customs are encyclopedically observed in them, their fruits greatly collected in them. The words are refined, the sounds good” 邦風其訏物也，箋觀人俗焉，大敘材焉，其言文，其聲善；and strip 10, Ma Chengyuan, 1, 139: “‘The Guan-ing Ospreys’ [i.e., the first poem in the ‘Airs’] uses sex as an allegory for ritual” 關雎以色喻禮. On the last statement, cf. Rao Zongyi, “Zhushu Shixu xiaojian,” 229 f.
There are similar statements in the Analects, e.g., 3.20 and 8.15. For Confucius’ response to eroticism in the Odes, see Goldin, Culture of Sex, 11–13; Harbsmeier, “Eroticism in Early Chinese Poetry,” 333–339; Yau-woon Ma, 24 ff.; and Tsuda, Rongo to Kiishi no shiso 論語と孔子の思想, in Tsuda Sokichi zenshu, 16, 200.

36. For an analysis of several linguistic and prosodic features contributing to the ambiguity of the Shijing in general, see Xiang Xi. See also Qian Zhongshu, Guanzhui bian, 1, 151 ff.; Limited Views, 228 ff.


38. See the commentary in Lushi chunqiu zhushu 22.2773.

39. Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, 581. The careers of Zichan and Shuxiang are studied in Yasumoto. See also Martin, “Le cas Zichan”; Rubin; and Bodde and Morris, 16 ff.

40. The most accessible overview of the philosophical orientation of this text is Knoblock and Riegel, 27–55. See also my review of that work in Early Medieval China 7 (2001), 109–139; and Cook, “The Lushi chunqiu and the Resolution of Philosophical Dissonance.”

41. Cf. Dong Zhi’an, “Lushi chunqiu,” 42. One could continue in this vein: since the speaker in Mao 87 is female, Zichan may be acknowledging Jin’s superior force by assuming a feminine voice, if a defiant one. The same ode is used, to the same effect, in an exchange between representatives of Jin and Zheng in Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu, 4, 1381 (Zhao 16 = 526 B.C.). Cf. Martin, “La parole poétique,” 64; idem, “Le Shijing, de la citation à l’allusion,” 15; and Zeng Qinliang, 389–390. Granet, Études sociologiques sur la Chine, 76, berates traditional commentators for finding in Mao 87 “je ne sais quel incident de politique seigneuriale,” making no mention of its versatile usage in diplomatic discourse.

42. Lå Simian, Lü Simian dushi zhaji, 697, notes that the Minor Prefaces frequently explain specific odes in the same manner as Warring States texts. There is one important difference: the Han commentaries aim systematically to associate each poem with specific historical circumstances—a tendency not displayed in the pre-imperial literature. See Zhang Haiyan, 352–358; Wang Shuomin; James J. Y. Liu, 96; and Pauline Yu, 401 ff. See also Schmölz, 129.

43. Maoshizi zhengyi 4C.342b.

44. For more on the relation between a man and a woman as a metaphor for that between a ruler and his subjects, see Goldin, Culture of Sex, 18 ff.


46. For this interpretation of ji 橫, see Karlgren, Glosses on the Book of Odes, § 182.

47. Compare the translation in Legge, 5, 366 ff.
48. Once again, the representative of the weaker state identifies himself with the female voice in the poem.

49. For a similar example, see Martin, “L’entrevue de 525 A.C.”

50. Cf. Schaberg, A Patterned Past, 346n.58 (and, more generally, 72ff. and 234ff.); Lin Qingzhang, 94–95; Martin, “Le Shijing, de la citation à l’allusion,” 15; Su Xuelin, 45; Schmölz, 89ff.; and esp. Van Zoeren, 41. Luo Qikun, 50, interprets such examples rather implausibly as indications of the general decline of aristocratic education during the Springs and Autumns period.


52. Following the commentary of Gao You 高誘 (ca. A.D. 168–212). In Lushi chunqiu zhushu 3.334, Wang Liqi 汎興祖 (1090–1155) once cited a variant of this story from Lienü zhuang 列女傳, in which Confucius says keji zhi tianxia 可以治天下 (one can rule the world) where the Lushi chunqiu has keji wei tianxia. (This remark reveals considerable erudition on Wang Liqi’s part, as the passage is no longer found in the extant Lienü zhuang.) See Hong Xingzu’s commentary to “Fengfen” 萬分, “Jiutan” 九歎, Chu ci zhangju buzhu 16.176 (under the verse zhizu zhe buneng zhi xi 執組者不能制兮).

53. Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, 105.


55. Lunyu jishi. 10.31–1035.

56. Compare the translation in Lau, Analects, 130.

57. Notably in the phrase si yi er yi yi 斯已而已矣, which is sometimes taken as an error for si yi er yi yi ("then just stop").

58. It is impossible to tell whether Confucius’ final comment is intended sincerely or sarcastically. For further exegesis on Mao 34 and its use in this passage from the Analects, see Van Zoeren, 27 and 36; and Riegel, “Poetry and the Legend of Confucius’s Exile,” 15ff. Cf. Goldin, Culture of Sex, 106ff.

For general studies of Confucius’ understanding of the Odes, see, in addition to the works cited in note 35 above: Lévi, Confucius, 63–69; Yuan Changjiang, 59–104; Holzman; Zau; and Gu Jiegang, “Shijing zai Chunqiu Zhangguo jian de diwei.”

59. Lunyu jishi 5.157–159.

60. Cf. Karlsgren, Glosses on the Book of Odes, §167; the translation above contradicts Karlsgren’s § 166.

61. The third line is not found in Mao 57. This problem prompted Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) to assert that the poem in question is not Mao 57 but a lost ode; various other commentators disagree.

62. Compare the translation in Lau, Analects, 68.

64. Cf. Yau-woon Ma, 22.
65. “Bugou” 不苟, Xunzi jjie 2.3.39. The example of “Eggs have hair” is cited also in “Tianxia” 天下, Zhuangzi jishi 10B.33.1105.
67. Elsewhere he affirms that certain lines from Mao 191 (“Jie Nanshan” 簡南山) “refer to” the evil consequences of following Mohism: “Fuguo” 复国, Xunzi jjie 6.10.187f. We should be accusing Xunzi of gross anachronism if we were to judge him strictly by the letter. Cf. Harbsmeier, “Eroticism in Early Chinese Poetry,” 337ff.
68. It is not certain whether jiugao 九皋 means “nine marshes” or “ninth marsh.” Cf. Karlgren, Glosses on the Book of Odes, § 484.
69. “Ruxiao,” Xunzi jjie 4.8.128. Cf. Yuan Changjiang, 130. Hexagram 61 (“Zhongfu” 中孚) of the Yi jing contains a similar image—“A squalling crane is present in the shade” 鳴鶴在陰—with a strikingly similar traditional explanation. To quote Wang Bi 王弼 (A.D. 226–249): “If your stand is sincere and your dedication perfect, then even if you are located in darkness and obscurity, things will surely respond to you” 立誠焉至，雖在閨常，物亦應焉. Text in Zhou-Yi zhengyi 6.71b. Likewise the Xici 時辭 commentary, Zhou-Yi zhengyi 7.79f., focuses on the noble man’s ability to transform the world from within his closet. Lloyd and Sivin, 74, ridicule such interpretations.
71. For a fine recent study of the text, see Cook, “Consummate Artistry and Moral Virtuosity.”
72. Ikeda, 187; see also Ikeda’s translation on p. 188 and discussion in 192n.23. Other scholars interpret the passage differently; e.g., Pang Pu, Zhubo Wuxing bian jiaozhu ji yanjiu, 34; and Wei Qipeng, Jianbo Wuxing jianshi, 15–17.
74. For the various possible meanings of this line, see Karlgren, Glosses on the Book of Odes, § 40.
75. The sexual nuances of the word gou 潛 (translated here as “to join”) are discussed in the commentary by Zheng Xuan and the subcommentary by Kong

78. On the intentional fallacy, see the Introduction, note 8, above. Geaney, “Mencius’s Hermeneutics,” discusses the differences between Mencius’ position and ordinary intentionalism. See also James J. Y. Liu, 95 ff.

2. Xunzi in the Light of the Guodian Manuscripts

1. For the first official report of this excavation, see Hubei Sheng Jingmen Shi Bowuguan. On the date of the tomb, see Li Boqian, 18–19; Liu Zuxin, 31; Wang Bo, “Meigu Guodian Daxue Guodian Laozi guoji xueshu taolunhui jiaoyu,” 2; Peng Hao, “Guodian yihao mu de niandai ji xiangguan de wenti”; idem, “Guodian yihao mu de niandai yu jianben *Laozi* de jiegou,” 13–15; Wang Baoxuan; Luo Yunhuan; and Cui Renyi. The identity of the deceased is unclear; the earlier suggestion that he may have been a tutor to the crown prince of the state of Chu has recently been challenged. See, for example, Xing Wen, 246; and Li Ling, “Guodian Chujian yanjiu zhong de liangge wenti—Meigu Guodian Xueyuan Guodian Chujian *Laozi* guoji xueshu taolunhui ganxiang,” 47–49. Peng Hao, “Guodian yihao mu de niandai yu jianben *Laozi* de jiegou,” 16, concludes that “the tomb occupant may have been born into a prominent aristocratic family and, not having attained rank and status, pursued the theories of Daoism and Confucianism.”

2. Since the publication of *Guodian Chumu zhujuan*, scholars dissatisfied with the editorial group’s choice of the title *Cheng zhi wen zhi* (the meaning of which was never clear) have begun to refer to this manuscript by various other names. The most common such alternate title is *Tian jiang dachang 天降大常 (Heaven Lays Down Its Great Constancy)—or simply Dachang—which is the most important phrase in the text (and is discussed further below). See, for example, Guo Yi, 208–229. In order to avoid confusion, the text is cited here by the name *Cheng zhi wen zhi*. Guo also presents a new arrangement of this text that is vastly more successful than the version in *Guodian Chumu zhujuan*, but as his work
may not be available to all readers, I quote the text as it appears in *Guodian Chumu zhujian*.

3. The first four titles in this list, incidentally, may belong together as a single text. They are written on bamboo strips of the same dimensions and expound remarkably similar ideas, as will be demonstrated below. Cf. Ding Sixin, 358; and Wang Bo, *Jianbo sixiang wenxian lunji*, 249f.

4. Tang and Yu are the sage kings Yao 嘉 and Shun 舜, respectively.

5. Two of the few publications to make this point are Ning Chen, “The Ideological Background of the Mencian Discussion of Human Nature,” 36; and Li Zehou, 420–421.

6. The seminal manifesto of this view is Li Xueqin, “Jingmen Guodian Chujian zhong de Zisi.” See also idem, “The Confucian Texts from Guodian Tomb Number One,” 109–110; “Xian-Qin rujia zhuzuo de zhongda faxian”; and “Cong jianbo yiji Wuxing tandao ‘Daxue,’” esp. 50–51. Jiang Guanghui, “Guodian Chujian yu Zisi—Jian tan Guodian Chujian de sixiangshi yi,” 88, concludes that the following texts were all written by Zisi: *Tang Yu zhi dao*, Ziyi, Wuxing, *Xing zì ming chu*, *Qiongda yi shi*, *Cheng zhi wen zhi* (which he calls Qiujiu 求己), *Lu Mugong wen Zisi* 鲁穆公問子思, and *Liude*. But we do not know nearly enough about the figure of Zisi, let alone his teachings, to make such specific attributions.

One philological argument in favor of an association with the Zisi is made by Liao Mingchun in two separate articles: “Jingmen Guodian Chujian yu xian-Qin ruxue,” 42; and “Guodian Chujian rujia zhuzuo kao,” 71. In his commentary to the *Wenxuan* 文選, Li Shan 李善 (d. a.d. 689) cited a number of lines from Ziyi and attributed them to the Zisi. See “Sizi jiange lun” 四子講論, *Liuchen zhu Wenxuan* Wenxuan 51.14b; and “Da He Shao” 苍何劭, *Liuchen zhu Wenxuan* Wenxuan 24.15b. Since the Zisi still existed in Li Shan’s day, Liao Mingchun surmises that it must have included at least part of Ziyi. And it is well known that Shen Yue 申繹 (a.d. 441–513) listed Ziyi, among other texts, as part of the Zisi in a memorial recorded in “Yinyue shang” 音樂上, *Suishu* Suishu 15.288. However, these points do not convince Cheng Yuanmin, 30–32, who argues that Shen Yue was mistaken and that the ostensible parallels between Ziyi and Zisi are merely repetitions of common Confucian aphorisms.

Other Mainland scholars associate the Guodian manuscripts with Mencian Confucianism; see, for example, Pang Pu, “Chudu Guodian Chujian,” 6. For an overview of Guodian studies in Mainland China, see Jiang Guanghui, “Guodian Chujian yu yuandian ruxue” and idem, “Guodian Chujian yu zaoci daojia.”

7. To date, the most comprehensive study of the graphs used in the manuscripts is Cheung Kwong-yue.

8. Private communication from Professor Xu Shaohua, Wuhan University.


Incidentally, the great Neo-Confucian Cheng Yi 程頤 (1033–1107) also observed that Mencius’ use of the term *xing* was different from that of Gaozi. See Zhu Xi, 18.229. Cheng Yi was referring to a peculiar Neo-Confucian dichotomy between the “fundamental *xing*” 性之本, which corresponds to the principle of the universe, and the “physical *xing*” 性質之性, which is the imperfect human form made up of *qi*. But since neither Mencius nor Gaozi (nor Xunzi, for that matter) makes such a distinction, Cheng Yi cannot be said to have identified the salient difference in usage.


13. *Xing zi ming chu*, strip 9; *Guodian Chumu zhujian*, 179. Compare “Quan-xue” 勤學, *Xunzi jiye* 1.1.2: “The children of Gan, Yue, Yi, and Mo all make the same sounds when born but grow up to have different customs; teaching makes this so” 干、越、夷、貉之子, 生而同聲, 長而異俗, 教使之然也. This idea is echoed in *Analects* 17.2, *Lunyu jishi* 34.1177: “[People’s] *xing* are close to one another; practice makes them distant from one another” 性相近也, 訓相遠也.

14. For the reading of this character as *tian* 天, see Chen Ning, “*Guodian Chumu zhujian* zhong de rujia renxing yanlun chutian,” 39; and idem, “Ideological Background,” 38n.33. But scholars disagree as to the interpretation of the entire phrase. See, for example, Zhou Fengwu, “Guodian Chujian shizi zhaji,” 357 f.; Li Ling, *Guodian Chujian jiaodu ji*, 122 and 124; and Guo Yi, 218.


16. Qiu Xiguí 裘錫圭, in *Guodian Chumu zhujian*, 170n.28, suspects that the character *mo* 莫 should be read as *mu* 墓, thus: “the Sage cannot be venerated [on account of his *xing*].” Guo Yi, 221, interprets this to mean that common people cannot match the Sage’s level of cultivation.

17. *Xing zi ming chu*, strips 3–4; *Guodian Chumu zhujian*, 179.

18. For this translation of *qing*, see Hansen, *A Daoist Theory of Chinese Thought*, esp. 405n.14. The meaning of *qing* (which is also commonly understood either as “essence” or “emotion”) is the subject of much scholarly controversy. I earlier supported a translation along the lines of “essence” (Goldin, *Rituals of the Way*, 112n.2) but am now persuaded that Hansen’s “reality response” works far better for texts such as *Xing zi ming chu*. See also Hansen’s “*Qing* (Emotions) 情 in Pre-Buddhist Chinese Thought.”
19. Yucong 1, strips 22–23; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 194. The preceding section appears to be missing a strip, but it is clear that the subject of discussion is the same: “Of the Way of Humanity, some [components] emerge from inside, some enter from outside. What emerges from inside is humanity, integrity, and trustworthiness; from…” 人之道也，或由中出，或由外入，由中出者，仁、忠、信，由——and here the text breaks off.

20. Liude, strip 26; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 188.


23. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 1, 139f. See also “Ruxiao,” Xunzi jjie 4.8.133, and the discussion in Pueft, To Become a God, 187.


26. For this reading, see Ning Chen, “Ideological Background,” 24. Guo Yi, 237, and Li Ling, Guodian Chujian jiandu ji, 108, both suggest ni 逆 (which might mean “lead astray” in this context).

27. This confusing sentence is variously interpreted; see the discussion in Ding Sixin, 252. Most recently, the editors of the Shanghai Museum manuscripts have suggested (dubiously) that the “four techniques” refer to the canonical Odes, Documents, Rites, and Music. See Ma Chengyuan, 1, 230f; and Chen Ligui, Xing-qi cong lun shuo ‘dao,’” 146–150. More plausible is a connection with Xunzi’s statement that “the Way is not the Way of Heaven or the Way of Earth, but what people take as the Way and what the noble man is guided by” 道者，非天之道，非地之道，人之所以道也，君子之所道也; “Ruxiao,” Xunzi jjie 4.8.122. Yang Liang’s explanation: “This is to emphasize that the Way of the Former Kings is not a matter of yin and yang, mountains and streams, or prodigies and anomalies, but the Way as it is practiced by human beings” 重說先王之道非陰陽、山川、怪異之事，是人之所行之道也. Cf. Tang Yijie, 272.

28. Liude, strips 24–25; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 188.

29. For the reading zhi 志, see Liao Mingchun, Zhou-Yi jingshuan yu Yixue shi xinlun, 231. Cf. Kern, “Shi jing Songs as Performance Texts,” 69f. Consider also Kongzi shilun, strip 1; Ma Chengyuan, 1, 123: “The Odes do not depart from the will” 詩亡離志.

30. Yucong 1, strips 37–41; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 194–195. The text goes on to include the Rites, Music, and Documents in the canonical group. (Li Ling, Guodian Chujian jiandu ji, 163, argues that the editors of Guodian Chumu zhujian have jumbled the original order of the classics in this passage.) Cf. Wang Bo, jianbo si-xiang wenxian lunji, 37f.
For similar statements in received texts, compare “Tianxia,” Zhuangzi jishi 10B.33.1067: “The Odes speak of aspirations; the Documents speak of affairs; the Rites speak of actions; the Music speaks of harmony; the Changes speak of yin and yang; and the Springs and Autumns speak of titles and allotments.” 詩以道志，書以道事，禮以道行，樂以道和，易以道陰陽，春秋以道名分。Also Shenzi 慎子: “The Odes are bygone aspirations; the Documents are bygone announcements; the Springs and Autumns are bygone affairs” 詩往志也，書往誡也，春秋往事也, in P. M. Thompson, §97; the source text is Yilin 2.14b.

31. Cf. Wang Zhongjiang, “Jingdian de tiaoqian,” 51 f. Incidentally, some recent unpublished conference papers have suggested that the Guodian manuscripts refer here to prototextual traditions, rather than actual canonical texts, but the two references to the Springs and Autumns constitute good evidence that these are indeed to be understood as texts largely as we have received them. Pines, “Intellectual Change in the Chunqiu Period,” 82 ff., for example, has suggested provocatively that the received Springs and Autumns derives from ritualistic reports to ancestral spirits inscribed on e 策 (large bamboo strips)—in other words, that the Chunqiu was a written text from the time of its inception. See further Pines, Foundations of Confucian Thought, 17 f. Cf. also Kern, “Shi jing Songs as Performance Texts,” 70; Guo Qiyong, “Guodian Rujia jian de yiyi yu jiazi,” 6; and Liao Mingchun, Zhou-Yi jingzhuan, 229 ff. Li Ling, “Cong jianbo faxian kan gushi de tili he fenlei,” 36, remarks that titles such as Odes and Springs and Autumns might refer generally to bibliographic categories rather than to specific texts.


33. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 3, 55. Compare also Yucong 2, strips 10–12, Guodian Chunma zhujian, 203: “Desires are born of human nature; deliberation is born of desires; rebelliousness is born of deliberation; contention is born of rebelliousness; partisanship is born of contention.” 欲生於性，慮生於欲，悖生於慮，爭生於悖，黨生於爭.

34. “Xing’e,” Xunzi jjie 17.23.441.


36. Knoblock, 1, 296n.53, cites this proposed emendation by Yu Xingwu 于省吾 (b. 1896). The traditional commentators are baffled by the phrase.

37. “Fei xiang” 非相, Xunzi jjie 3.5.78–79.

38. The xingxing (also written 狸狸) is described in “Nanshan jing” 南山經 and “Haimei nanjing” 海內南經, Shanhai jing jiaozhu 1.1 and 10.325, respectively. See also Yuan Ke’s notes (especially 325n.2); and Strassberg, §§2 and 263.

39. Others (e.g., Knoblock, 1, 206; and Ivanhoe, “A Happy Symmetry,” 313) construe this sentence to mean that the noble man eats stews and steaks made of xingxing meat.
40. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 1, 206.
41. This was the philosophical position that I deduced from Xunzi’s writings in *Rituals of the Way*, 72 ff. and 103 ff.; at the time, I considered it quite revolutionary within the Confucian school.
42. *Yu tong 1*, strip 31; *Guodian Chunmu zhujuan*, 194.
43. *Yu tong 2*, strip 1; *Guodian Chunmu zhujuan*, 203.
44. For the reading *jiang* 降, see Guo Yi, 210; and Chen Wei, “Guodian Chunmu bieshi,” 70.
45. For the reading *zuo* 作, see Li Ling, *Guodian Chunmu jiaodu ji*, 123.
46. *Cheng zhi wen zhi*, strips 31–33; *Guodian Chunmu zhujuan*, 168. Guo Yi, 211, and Ding Sixin, 304, both assert that similar notions are present in the “Da Yu mo” 大禹谟 chapter of the *Shangshu*, but I can find no obvious parallel. Compare here *Zun deyi*, strips 5–6; *Guodian Chunmu zhujuan*, 173: “Yu ordered his people in accordance with the Way of Humanity; Jie disordered his people in accordance with the Way of Humanity. Jie did not change Yu’s people before he could disorder them; Tang did not change Jie’s people before he could order them. The Sage orders the people by means of the Way of the people” 禹以人道治其民, 桀以人道亂其民, 桀易禹民而後亂之, 汤不易桀民而後治之, 聖人之治民, 民之治也.
47. Cf. Li Zehou, 412 f.
48. E.g., Sato, 302–314; Hu Jiacong; Yu Mingguang; Li Deyong; Ivanhoe, “A Happy Symmetry,” 316 f.; and Du Guoxiang, 97–125. The most sophisticated discussion to date is Stalnaker.
49. For a fuller account, see Goldin, *Rituals of the Way*, 14–17. See also Uchiyama, 83 ff.; Yearley; and Tang Junyi, 57 f.
51. Following the commentary of Hao Xing. For *xing* 刑 as “mold,” see Makeham, “The Legalist Concept of *hsing-ming*,” 100–106.
52. I insert the character *you* 有 on the basis of the pattern in the next clause.
54. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 2, 238–239.
56. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 2, 180.
57. *Zi*, strips 8–9; *Guodian Chunmu zhujuan*, 129. For the received version of this passage, which differs slightly from the Guodian version, see “Zi,” *Liji zhengyi* 55.1650a–b. Compare *Mencius* 4B.3, in *Mengzi zhengyi* 16.546: “If the lord regards his subjects as his hands and feet, the subjects will regard their lord as their belly and heart” 君之視臣如手足, 則臣視君如腹心.
superiors are fond of ritual, none among the people will dare not be reverent; if the superiors are fond of righteousness, none among the people will dare not be submissive; if the superiors are fond of trustworthiness, none among the people will dare not apply their [genuine] disposition.”


60. Zun deyi, strips 36–37; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 174. Wang Bo, Jianbo sixiang wenxian lunji, 259, suggests that Zun deyi is intended as an explication of Ziyi.

61. Cheng zhi wen zhi, strips 1–3; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 167.

62. Perhaps most famous are the examples in the “Jian’ai zhong”兼愛中 and “Jian’ai xia”兼愛下 chapters of the Mozi. Thus “Jian’ai zhong,” Mozi jiaozhu 4.15.159: “In the past, King Ling of Chu [r. 540–529 b.c.] was fond of slight waists in his warriors; thus King Ling’s subjects would all restrain themselves and eat once [a day]”昔楚靈王好小細要＝細腰，故靈王之臣，皆以一飯為節. See also Geaney, On the Epistemology of the Senses, 67–80 and 137f.

63. See, for example, “Jiebi”释蔽, Xunzi jijie 15.21.397: “The mind is the lord of the body and the patron of ‘spiritual illumination’ [i.e., deliberation]. It issues commands but does not receive commands”心者，形之君也，而神明之主也，出令而無所受令. Cf. Geaney, On the Epistemology of the Senses, 95; and Goldin, Rituals of the Way, 20f. and 31f. A similar idea appears in Wuxing, strips 45–46, Guodian Chumu zhujian, 151: “The six [organs]—the ears, the eyes, the nose, the mouth, the hands, and the feet—are the mind’s servants. If the mind says ‘yes,’ none of them dares say ‘no’; [if it] assents, none of them dares not assent”耳目鼻口手足六者，心之役也，心曰唯，莫敢不唯；諸，莫敢不諾. Compare the text in Ma-wangdui Hanmu boshu, 1, 18–19; and Ikeda, 485. For the reading yi 役, see Guo Yi, 201; and Yan Shixuan, 399–400.

64. Xing zì ming chu, strip 23; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 180.

65. Xing zì ming chu, strips 36–37; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 180.

66. There seems to be a character missing here.

67. “Yuelun”樂論, Xunzi jijie 14.20.382. This pejorative sense of wéi 倭 can be confusing, since Xunzi normally employs the term to denote the good “artifice” that transforms one’s evil xing.


69. This statement is difficult to construe, and there is a conspicuous lack of commentary about it. Perhaps Xunzi means to say that music (“sounds and tones,
movement and quietude”) is a technique for improving the xing and thus fulfilling the Way of Humanity; this would be in line with his general views.

70. Unlike most commentators, I prefer not to emend xi 言. See the commentary of Hao Yixing. Coincidentally, cong 言, which is another possible reading (xi and cong are easily confused because of their graphic similarity), has a comparable meaning.

71. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 3, 80.


75. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 3, 82.

76. Xing zi ming chu, strips 23–26; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 180.

77. For the readings tao 逃 and ji 椋, see Guo Yi, 244; and Li Ling, Guodian Chujian jiaodu ji, 109. On the basis of the faint parallel in “Tangong xia” 懸弓下, Liji zhengyi 9.1304b f., Chen Lai, 313, suggests the reading qi 感, “sorrowful,” for ji. See also Peng Lin.

78. Following the editors’ suggestion of zuo 作. Perhaps zuo 作 (“blessed”) might fit the context better.

79. For a description of the “Wu” and “Xia” dances, see, for example, Shaughnessy, Before Confucius, 166–169; and Maspero, China in Antiquity, 154–157. “Lai” is the title of Mao 295, an ode that was sung as part of the Wu dance (which takes its own name from Mao 285). The “Shao” is supposedly the music of the sage king Shun; see, for example, Analects 3.25, 7.14, and 15.11.

80. “Fei shier zi” 非十二子, Xunzi jijie 3.12.94. This xing 行, of course, is not to be confused with xing 性, the term discussed above. The passage is discussed in Chun-chieh Huang, 106. The authenticity of this reference to Zisi and Mencius, incidentally, is sometimes questioned; see the careful study by Zheng Liangshu, Zhuzi zhuzuo niandai kao, 228–238, who concludes that it is in fact genuine. See also Liang Tao, “Si-Meng xuepai kaoshu,” 281 ff.

81. The term “Five Constancies” apparently derives from the Han dynasty. See, for example, Hanshu 56.2505, where the term is explained in a memorial by Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (179–104 B.C.); and “Wen Gong” 文公, Lunheng jiaoshi 9.28.408. Cf. Svarverud, 287.

82. E.g., Guo Moruo, Qingtong shidai, 53 ff.; and Gu Jiegang, “Wude zhongshih shuo xia de zhengzhi he lishi,” 407 ff. See also Akatsuka, Chūgoku kodai shisōshi ken-
kyū, 388f. Knoblock, 1, 215–219 (and 300n.5), is aware of the Mawangdui Wuxing text but nevertheless prefers to take Xunzi’s use of the phrase as a reference to the Five Phases. Wang Bo, Jianbo sixedang wenxian lunji, 59–71, discusses the possible connections between the “Five Xing” of Wuxing and the Five Phases.

83. The pathbreaking article to make this point was Pang Pu, “Mawangdui boshu jiekai Si-Meng wuxing shuo zhi mi,” 馬王堆帛書解開了孟五行說之謎 (Wenwu 1977.10, 63–69), reprinted in Zhubo Wuxing pian jiaochu ji yanjiu, 121–132. See also Asano, 607f.; and Wei Qipeng, “Si-Meng wuxing shuo de zai sikao.”

It has been assumed until recently that the oldest mention of the famous phrase shen qi du 慎其獨 (“cautious when alone”—an attribute of the moral junzi) was in “Bugou,” Xunzi jije 2.3.46, and that its appearance in such texts as Wuxing and “Zhongyong” could be traced back to this usage; e.g., Riegel, “Eros, Intoverson, and the Beginnings of Shijing Commentary,” 165f.; Dai Junren, 2, 845f.; and Hughes, 171, who considers shen qi du a “suspiciously late” term in “Zhongyong.” (For less widely cited appearances of the phrase, see “Liqi” 禮器, Liji zhengyi 23.1434b; and the ancient commentary to “Daxue” 大學, attributed to Zengzi, Liji zhengyi 60.1673a.) With the discovery of the Guodian “Wuxing” and the appearance of the phrase in two places in that text (strips 16–18; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 149–150), it is clear now that if one text was borrowing from another, it was Xunzi who took from Wuxing, and not vice versa. Cf. Liu Xinfang, 344f. The language of the relevant passage from “Bugou” (with its emphasis on xing 形, or giving the proper internal form to one’s de 德) is reminiscent of Wuxing (as well as “Zhongyong”) and may represent Xunzi’s attempts to come to grips with this earlier Confucian tradition. Cf. Sato, 286–295; Akatsuka, Juka shiso kenkyu, 479f.; and the inadequate discussion in Goldin, Rituals of the Way, 19f.

84. The story appears in “Youzu” 有徂, Xunzi jije 20.28.326–328. Cf. Li Yinghua. Doubts about the authenticity of the “Youzu” chapter go back to Yang Liang, who attributed it to Xunzi’s disciples; see his comment to “Youzu,” Xunzi jije 20.28.320. Knoblock, 3, 237f., presents the attractive argument that “Youzu” is part of a corpus of traditional materials that Xunzi selected as a “proper curriculum” for Confucians. The implication in “Youzu” that Heaven can be fickle and that an individual’s talent and virtue do not by themselves guarantee success is hard to reconcile with Xunzi’s philosophy as it is presented in the more reliable chapters of the book. See further Liang Tao, “Zhujian Qiongda yi shi yu zaoqi rujia tianrenquan,” 68–69; and Ning Chen, “The Problem of Theodicy in Ancient China,” 65f.


86. Lunyu jishi 31.1050.

87. Compare the translation in Lau, Analects, 132.

88. Qiongda yi shi, strip 11; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 145.
89. “Youzu,” Xunzi jijie 20.28.527.
90. Qiongda yi shi, strips 1–2; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 145.
92. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 3, 249.
93. For a different account of the relationship between “Youzu” and Qiongda yi shi, see Liao Mingchun, “Jingmen Guodian Chujian yu xian-Qin ruxue,” 43–45; and idem, “Guodian Chujian rujia zhuzuo kao,” 72. Other close parallels to Qiongda yi shi appear in Han-Shi waizhuan jianshu 7.599–601; and “Zayan” 雜言, Shuoyuan jiaozheng 17.422 ff. The lines of transmission among these several texts are blurry; many of the historical examples in Qiongda yi shi do not appear in Xunzi’s account but are included in the Han-Shi waizhuan and Shuoyuan, although the latter two are probably later than Xunzi. Presumably all four texts were making use of a common set of sources or fund of commonplaces.
94. Guodian Chumu zhujian, 164n.16.
95. Zhongxin zhi dao, strips 6–7; Guodian Chumu zhujian, 163.
96. “Wangba” 王霸, Xunzi jijie 7.11.228.
97. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 2, 169.
98. Li Zehou, 421, suggests another possible parallel: Qiongda yi shi, strip 1 (Guodian Chumu zhujian, 145), says: “There is Heaven and there is man; there is a division between Heaven and man” 有天有人，天人有分; this is reminiscent of Xunzi’s concept of the distinction between Heaven and man. See, for example, his reference in “Tianlun,” Xunzi jijie 11.17.308, to “those who are enlightened with respect to the division between Heaven and man” 明於天人之分. Wang Bo, jianbo sixiang wensian lunji, 82–84, argues that the discussion of abdication in “Zhenglun,” Xunzi jijie 12.18.331–336, may have been written in response to views like those expressed in Tang Yu zhi dao.
99. For a survey of Xunzi’s insights into linguistics, see William S.-Y. Wang; and Djamouri.
100. “Bugou,” Xunzi jijie 2.3.38.
101. See, for example, Goldin, Rituals of the Way, 83–95. Xunzi’s argument, essentially, is that such paradoxes commit the fallacy of equivocation, as defined in Copi, 92–93. Cf. Wang Guowei, 123 ff.
104. However, even this aspect of Xunzi’s philosophy appears to be anticipated by the recently excavated text Lubang dahan 魯邦大旱 (There Was a Great Drought in the State of Lu), one of the Shanghai Museum manuscripts, a corpus that many scholars suspect may be related to Guodian. In Lubang dahan, Confu-
Mencius states that the best way of dealing with a drought is not to make offerings to natural spirits but to emphasize good government (for which he uses the interesting term xingde 行德). See Ma Chengyuan, 2, 201–210. (For xing in other contexts, see Major, “The Meaning of hsing-te.”) A similar idea appears also in “Shenda” 慎大, Lüshi chunqiu jiaoishi 15.845; trans. Knoblock and Riegel, 341.

105. Following the commentary of Hao Yixing.
106. Following the commentary of Lu Wenchao 盧文弨 (1717–1796).
108. Following the commentary of Wang Niansun 王念孫 (1744–1832).
110. See Goldin, Rituals of the Way, 66–67; and Xu Junru, 151.
112. It is important to reiterate that the philosophical positions outlined above are not exemplified by all of the Guodian manuscripts; therefore, the following discussion does not consider the three Laozi texts, The Magnificent One Produced Water (Taiyi sheng shui 太一生水), or The Five Forms of Conduct. The last text is sufficiently vague to allow for several different interpretations, but I believe that its conception of the five virtues as “formed internally” 形於內 (strips 1–4; Guodian Chunlu zhuan, 149) is incompatible with Liude, for example, which affirms that humanity is internal and morality external. We are probably still correct in taking Wuxing as a document closest to the Mencian school of Confucianism. Cf. Asano, 608 ff. It can be no coincidence, for example, that the five virtues are listed in Mencius 7B.24, Mengzi zhengyi 28.991. Nevertheless, it is apparent from the above discussion that Xunzi was aware of the Wuxing tradition and referred to it in his works. Guo Lihuai suggests that Xunzi intended to criticize Wuxing for its understanding of ritual and music, with which his own views were incompatible.

Yucong 4, which has been shown to differ in important respects from Yucong 1–3 (Ding Sixin, 214–222), is also not considered here.

113. Guanzu jiaozheng 10.26.156: “Humanity emerges from inside; morality is constructed from outside” 仁從中出，義從外作. Luo Xinlui, 28, mentions also the passage in “Jing xia” 經下, Mozi jiaozhu 10B.41.543, without indicating that this is an intended refutation of the “humanity is internal, morality is external” maxim. Cf. Graham, Later Mohist Logic, Ethics and Science, 450–451; and Guo Moruo, Shi pipan shu, 273. For similarities between “Jie” and Tang Yu zhi dao, see Wang Bo, Jianbo sixiang wenxian lunji, 80–82.

115. Cf. Chen Guying, 404; Li Zehou, 420; Chen Lai, 304; and Pang Pu, “Kong Meng zhi jian.” 32. The various extant references to Gaozi are conveniently assembled in Zhang Bingnan, 76–80. For an opposing view, see Ding Sixin, 357 f.
116. *Liude*, strips 15–23; *Guodian Chumu zhujian*, 187–188. Cf. Luo Xinhui, 28f. Such lists of virtues appropriate to various social roles were not uncommon in ancient China. See the examples cited in Liao Mingchun, “Jingmen Guodian Chujian yu xian-Qin ruxue,” 63–65; cf. also idem, “Guodian Chujian rujia zhuzuo kao,” 81. To Liao’s examples one can add the “six forms of compliance” 六順 in *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, 1, 32 (Yin 隱 3 = 720 b.c.): “The lord is righteous; the subject carries out [the lord’s commands]; the father is kind; the son is filial; the elder brother is loving; the younger brother is respectful” 君義，臣行，父慈， 子孝，兄愛，弟敬; as well as *Mencius* 7B.24, *Mengzi zhengyi* 28.991: “the relation of humanity to father and son, the relation of righteousness to lord and subject, the relations of ritual to guest and host” 仁之於父子也，義之於君臣也，禮之於 賓主也.

117. *Liude*, strips 26–30; *Guodian Chumu zhujian*, 188.

118. These ritual prescriptions seem to square with those found in “Sangfu” 喪服, *Yi Ni zhu* 30.1103b–5c and 34.1123b.

119. Probably read shài, “to reduce.” A similar sense is found in the phrase qinqin zhi shai 親親之殺, “decreasing [categories of] intimacy with relatives,” in “Zhongyong,” *Li Ji zhengyi* 52.1629b. Liu Guosheng, 43, reads this character as 顚, “to rebel against.” See also Ding Sixin, 347.

120. Pang Pu, “Chudu Guodian Chujian,” 8, compares the argument in *Liude* with *Mencius* 7A.35. Cf. also Pines, “Friends or Foes,” 40; and Li Weiwu, 66.

121. Compare the translation in Lau, *Analects*, 121. See the Introduction for the Chinese text of this passage. A similar dilemma is explored in “Gaoyi” 高義, *Li Shi chunqiu juoshi* 19.1247; Knoblock and Riegel, 485.


125. Graham, *Later Mohist Logic*, 171, in what is still the most lucid account of this technique of disputation.

126. Dai Junren, 2, 1341, suggested this many years before the discovery of the tomb at Guodian. (See also 2, 1345–1348, and 3, 1848 ff.)


130. *Zun deyi*, strips 36–37; *Guodian Chumu zhujian*, 174. This is apparently a quotation from “Ziyi,” strips 14–15; *Guodian Chumu zhujian*, 129.

131. Thus Liu Huan 劉耀 (a.d. 433–489), cited by Lu Deming 陸德明 (556–627) in his commentary to “Ziyi,” *Li Ji zhengyi* 55.1647b. See also Cook, “Cong li-
jiao yu xingfa,” 9; and Cheng Yuanmin, 34. As we have seen (note 6, above), Ziyi is also frequently attributed to Zisi rather than to Gongsun Nizi.


133. For the meager information available on Gongsun Nizi, see Cheng Yuanmin, 32–34; Ruan Tingzhuo, _Xian-Qin zhuzi kaoji_, 33–45; Guo Moruo, _Qingtong shidai_, 182–201; and Forke, _Geschichte der alten chinesischen Philosophie_, 188. According to _Hanshu_ 30.1725, he was a disciple of one of Confucius’ seventy disciples; this would place him in the mid-fifth century B.C. However, Cheng Yuanmin, 32–33, suggests that this notice is incorrect and that Gongsun Nizi was in actuality a disciple of Confucius himself. Some scholars (such as Guo Moruo, _Qingtong shidai_, 186) suspect that the name Gongsun Long 公孫龍, which appears in the list of Confucius’ disciples in _Shiji_ 67.2219, is an error for “Gongsun Ni.” Finally, Couvreur, 2, 514, says that Gongsun Nizi “vivait, dit-on, deux ou trois siècles avant notre ère.” Unfortunately, Couvreur does not specify the source of his information, and I can find no source that corroborates it.

134. Thus Zhang Shoujie 張守節 (fl. a.d. 737), in his commentary to _Shiji_ 24.1234n.11. See Cook, “Yue Ji,” 3–7, on Gongsun Nizi and his possible connection to the “Yueji.” See also Zhu Ziqing, _Jingdian changtan_, 33; and Guo Moruo, _Qingtong shidai_, 185. The extant “Yueji” is heavily indebted to Xunzi, and Gongsun Nizi (whatever his exact dates) must have lived long before Xunzi.


137. Cf. Ding Sixin, 178f; Chen Ning, “Guodian Chumu zhujian zhong de ru-jia renxing yanlun chutan,” 44; and Chen Lai, 309. (Chen Lai, 305, also speculates briefly on the possible influence of _Xing zi ming chu_ on Xunzi.) For a contrary view, see Liao Mingchun, “Jingmen Guodian Chujian yu xian-Qin ruxue,” 60–62; and idem, “Guodian Chujian ruja zhuzuo kao,” 78–79.

138. Igai Hirohito, _Junshi hoi_, 14b, glossed the “Master Gongsun” 公孫子 in “Qiangguo,” _Xunzi jjie_ 11.16.295, as a reference to Gongsun Ni. Few other commentators follow this suggestion, however, as there is no firm evidence for it.

139. The evidence of the Guodian manuscripts should also put to rest the long-standing debate over whether Gaozi was a Confucian, a Mohist, or a “Daoist.” For the particulars of this controversy, see Liao Qifa, 160–164; Kodama, “Junshi jinseiron no shihen,” 204f; Shun, 119–126; Nivison, _The Ways of Confucianism_, 130–132; Scarpri, _Studi sul Mengzi_, 38ff.; and Scarpri, “Gaozi, Xunzi e i capitoli 6Al–5 del _Mengzi_.” It is well known that a figure named Gaozi appears in “Gongmeng” 公孟, _Mozu jiaozhu_ 12.48.708–709. One cannot say for sure that this is the
same Gaozi, but I suspect it is—in part because this Gaozi also emphasizes the virtues ren and yi. The passage thus implies that Gaozi was Mozi’s junior and Mencius’ senior (and was born not long before 410 B.C.). See the commentary of Cao Yaoxiang 曹耀湘 (fl. 1906) in Mozi jiaozhu 12.48.730n.155. See also Qian Mu, Xian-Qin zhuzi xinian, § 62; and Mei, 241n.1.

140. Cf. Chen Ning, “Guodian Chunmu zhujian zhong de Rujia renxing yanlun chutan,” 44–46, with which this précis is largely in agreement.

141. As recently as 1997, when Wuxing was known only from Mawangdui, it was possible for Riegel, “Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings of Shijing Commentary,” 145n.5, to suppose that “the Wiehsing p’ien version of early Confucian Innerlichkeit clearly owes a conceptual debt to Xunzi.” Now it is obvious that the debt is the other way around. This is just one example of the many respects in which our understanding of early Confucianism will have to be revised in light of the Guodian manuscripts.

3. Han Fei’s Doctrine of Self-Interest

1. E.g., Sahleen, 328; Lévi, Han-Fei-tse ou Le Tao du Prince, 520; Watson, Han Fei Tzu, 106; and W. K. Liao, 2, 286. Similarly, the translator F. W. Mote obfuscates the discussion in Hsiao, A History of Chinese Political Thought, 388, with his choice of the renderings “public” and “private.”

Thiel, 249, suggests, more defensibly, gemeinnützig and eigensüchtig. Knoblock and Riegel, 70–75, have “impartiality” and “selfish partiality”—renderings that might not be satisfactory for the Han Fei but are appropriate for these passages in the Lushi chunqiu. See “Guigong” 貢公 and “Quzi” 去私, Lushi chunqiu jiaoshi 1.44–62. Cf. also Sellmann, 37–43; and Cook, “The Lushi chunqiu and the Resolution of Philosophical Dissonance,” 318ff. (“community” and “self-interest”). Another early discussion of gong and si appears in the Shenzi 慎子, in P. M. Thompson, §§ 73ff.

Finally, “Jian’ai xia,” Mozi jiaozhu 4.16.175ff., draws a similar distinction between jian 聚 (universalism), or acting in the best interests of the community at large, and bie 別 (separatism), or acting in one’s private—and ultimately self-destructive—interests.

2. Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 19.49.1105.

3. Following the commentary of Wang Xiansheng 王先慎 (1859–1922).

4. Cf. Miao Fenglin, 53; Mizoguchi, 3f. and 42; Sawada, “Sen-Shin ni okeru kōshi no kannen,” 1f; Kurita, 371f; Kanaya, Shin-Kan shisōshi kenkyū, 41 and 44; and Itano, 197. Han Fei’s argument is cited by Xu Shen 許慎 (ca. A.D. 55–ca. 149) in the entry for gong in Shuowen jiezi jizhu 2A.218. Of course, this explanation of the graph is epigraphically untenable.

5. Cf. Oliver, 230. The Shenzi fragments (P. M. Thompson, §§ 29ff.) espouse a
similar point of view: rulers must bear in mind that their underlings act out of self-interest.

6. Cf. Hsiao, History of Chinese Political Thought, 388; Chen Qitian, 177 ff.; Kanaya, Kanaya Osamu Chugoku shisō ronshū, 1, 441; and, more generally, Hsu, 152. Compare also “Gufen” 孤分, Han Feìzi xin jiaozhu 4.11.251.

Gong in this sense probably referred originally to the lord of a state, as in such terms as gongjia 公家 (the Duke’s family) and gongshi 公室 (the Duke’s household); later, as an abstract noun, it came to denote anything that benefits the lord. Cf. Chun-chieh Huang, 61 and 72; Huang Junjie, Mengxue sixiangshi lun, 1, 147 ff. (with copious primary sources); Ochi, 1, 52–55; Liu Jiyaoh, 179; Sawada, “Sen-Shin ni okeru kōshi no kannen,” 31; Tay, 551; Kurita, 377; Wu Ch’i-ch’ang, 67 ff; and Gu Jiegang, Gu Jiegang gushi lunwenji, 2, 328.

7. On these alliances, see, for example, Lewis, “Warring States: Political History,” 632 ff.; Yang Kuan, Zhanguo shi, 341–421.


9. Following the commentary of Chen Qiyu. On mingshi (names and realities), see, for example, Makeham, “The Legalist Concept of hsing-ming,” 93 and 112–114. The phrase is similar to xingming (see below) and probably means what the ministers say and what they do. Consider “Shénying” 審應, Lūshī chūnqu jūānshi 18.1141: “Take their statements as their ‘names,’ and grasp their ‘realities’ in order to hold them responsible for their ‘names’” 以其言為之名，取其實以責其名. For possible connections between Han Fei zi and Lùshī chūnqu, see Hu Shi, Hu Shi wenxuan, 3, 253 f.

10. This line is difficult to construe. Probably the meaning is that courtiers will put forward all manner of hit-and-miss schemes, hoping for a stroke of luck, because they know that they will not be punished if their proposals fail. Compare the translation in Lévi, Han-Fei-te, 524 f.: “[Comme les souverains] omettent de les châtier si elles échouent, les sophistes et les rhéteurs ont toutes les raisons de tenter leur chance en hasardant des suggestions qui pourraient leur apporter—saït-on jamais—glorie et fortune.”

11. For representative examples, see “Zhushu” 主術, Huainan Honghe jijie 9.295, which laid the groundwork for the Han imperial ideology; and the “Tongzhì” 通志 chapter of the lost Fu zi 傳子 of Fu Xuan (A.D. 217–278), reconstructed from fragments in Yan Kejun, Quan Shanggu Sandai Qin Han Sängū Liu chao wen 48.4a–5b. The former source is discussed in chapter 6 below; the latter in Holcombe, 36, and Paper, 25 and 46–51.

For more general studies of gong and si in Chinese thought, see Jiang Rongchang; and Mizoguchi, 3–89. The famous saying “All under Heaven is gong” 天下為公 is found in “Lìyun,” Liji zhengyi 21.1414a.

12. “Wudu,” Han Fei zi xin jiaozhu 19.49.1122, following the commentary of
Gu Guangqi 顧廣圻 (1776–1835). Some commentators also suggest that *weiše* 为设 should be read *weiše* 为设 (thus *weiše zhāchéng* "plan falsely and flatter deceitfully"), but Chen Qiyu disagrees. The “Altars of Soil and Millet” are a common synecdoche for the state.


15. Following the commentary of Wang Xianshen.

16. “Shuinan,” *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu* 4.12.254. Compare “Yuhe,” *Lǔshí chūnqiú jiaoshì* 14.815: “There was once a client who played the oboe in order to obtain an audience with the King of Yue. He played the *yu, jue, gong, zhi,* and *shang* notes without error, but the King of Yue did not approve; when he produced rustic tones, in contrast, [the king] did approve. In the Way of persuasion there are also cases like this” 客以吹箏見越王者，羽角宮徵商不謬，越王不善，為野音而反善之。說之道亦有如此者也．Cf. Lloyd, 77 ff.; and Oliver, 221 ff.

17. See esp. Rong Zhaozu, 31a–33a. Similarly, Brooks opines that the “doctrinal reversals (on transcendency and Confucianism)” of the *Han Feizi* imply a long “internal timespan.” This sort of theorizing always assumes that a writer must maintain a consistent world view. See Lundahl, esp. 92–113, for a succinct overview of scholarship on this issue and some thoughts on using “inconsistencies” as a criterion in determining the authenticity of the collection. To date, the most rigorous investigation of the issue is Zheng Liangshu, *Han Fei zhi zhushu ji sixiang*.

18. Graham, *Disputers of the Tao*, 267 ff. Saussy, *Great Walls of Discourse and Other Adventures in Cultural China*, 149, aptly cites *Han Feizi* as an example of a Chinese philosophical book that cannot be forced “into a systematic unity.”


This idea is doubtless influenced by Sima Qian’s decision to place his biography of Han Fei together with that of Laozi and by Sima’s own opinion: “[Han Fei] liked the doctrines of ‘forms and names’ and ‘standards and techniques,’ but his roots were in Huang-Lao” 喜刑名法術之學，而其歸本於黃老.” Laozi Han Fei lie-zhuan” 老子韓非列傳, *Shiji* 63.2146. Cf. Anne Cheng, 233 ff.


21. *Boshu Laozi jiaozhu*, 74. Compare also *Laozi* 42: “The Way engendered the One; the One engendered the Two; the Two engendered the Three; the Three
engendered the Myriad Things” 道生一，一生二，二生三，三生萬物; Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 29.

22. The seminal work on Shen Buhai is Creel, Shen Pu-hai. See also Asano, 231–239; and Vandermeersch, 41 ff. et passim. Shen Buhai is still often overlooked and misunderstood. For example, in a serious and otherwise well-informed work, Lin Congshun, 128 ff., continually compares the “Zhushu” chapter to Han Fei—rather than to Shen Buhai, whom he almost never cites—even though Shen Buhai would bear out Lin’s points more clearly.


24. Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 349, fragment 1 (6), with a slightly different translation. The source text is Qunshu zhiyao 36.630. See also chapter 6, below. (Shen Buhai’s “Dati” is to be distinguished from the chapter 29 of the Han Feizi, which bears the same title.)


26. See, for example, Makeham, “The Legalist Concept of hsing-ming,” 88–92; and Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 119 f.

27. Cf. Lévi, “Quelques aspects de la rectification des noms dans la pensée et la pratique politiques de la Chine ancienne,” 33–38; Dai Junren, 2, 912; and Creel, What Is Taoism? and Other Studies in Chinese Cultural History, 79–91. Similar ideas appear in the Shenzzi fragments: “Duties are received according to one’s abilities; lucre is received according to [one’s performance of] one’s duties” 以能受事，以事受利 (P. M. Thompson, § 27; the source text is Qunshu zhiyao 37.636).

Makeham, “The Legalist Concept of hsing-ming,” 97, objects that ming in xingming refers not to the minister’s title but to his “claim to possess a certain ability and competence.” But this distinction is not one that Han Fei himself makes; on the contrary, it is clear from the passage above that the minister’s title is to be bestowed on him precisely according to the claims that he makes (“One who speaks spontaneously makes a ‘name’”). Therefore ming refers either to the minister’s title or to his claims.

28. Creel, Shen Pu-hai, fragment 1 (4); the source text is Qunshu zhiyao 36.630.

29. See, for example, Lewis, “Warring States,” 609; and, more generally, Zhang Chuanshi, 140–208; as well as Lü Kan. The function of the tally is well illustrated in an anecdote in “Shangde” 上德, Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi 19.1257; Knoblock
and Riegel, 487. See also the fragment from Shenzi in P. M. Thompson, § 70; the source texts are Taiping yulan 430.5a; and Beitiang shuchao 104.10a.

30. Han Fei is fond of this image and repeats it in “Zhudao,” Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 1.5.81; and “Erbing” 二柄, Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 2.7.126. Cf. Lévi, “Quelques aspects de la rectification des noms,” 35 ff.; Makeham, “The Legalist Concept of hsing-ming,” 107 ff.; and Hsu, 153. The idea that words and actions must correspond like two halves of a tally appears also in “Jian’ai xia,” Mozi jiaozhu 4.16.177. See also Geaney, On the Epistemology of the Senses in Early Chinese Thought, 79 ff. and 93 ff.; and Lewis, Writing and Authority in Early China, 31.


32. E.g., Laozi 37: “If one is tranquil and without desires, the world will rectify itself.” 不欲以靜，天下將自正, Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 427; and Laozi 19: “Abrogate sagehood, abandon wisdom, and the people will benefit a hundredfold” 革聖棄智，民利百倍, Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 311ff. Han Fei uses similar language in “Erbing,” Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 2.7.131.

33. Creel, Shen Pu-hai, fragment 1 (5); the source text is again Qunshu shiyao 36.630. Han Fei attributes a similar argument to Shen Buhai in “Wai chu shuo you shang” 外儲說右上, Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 13.34.775; see Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 364ff., fragment 16.

34. Following Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 349n.6.

35. Cf. Lévi, Han-Fei-te, 48–52. Similar ideas appear in military manuals of the same era. Consider Sunzi: “Subtle! Subtle! He arrives at shapelessness. Divine! Divine! He arrives at soundlessness. Thus he can be a Director of Destiny to his enemy” 聰乎！聰乎！至於無形，神乎！神乎！至於無聲。故能為敵之司命，and “Thus the acme in shaping the army is to arrive at shapelessness; if you are shapeless, then those who are deep in your midst cannot spy, and the wise cannot scheme” 故形兵之極，至於無形，無形，則深間不能窺，智者不能謀 (“Xushi” 虛 實, Shi ji jia zhu Sunzi jiaoh B.6.112 and 122). The “Director of Destiny” is the god of death.

36. These are (1) when a minister is able to shut the ruler’s access to the outside world, (2) when a minister attains control of the state’s wealth, (3) when a minister usurps the power to issue commands, (4) when a minister is able to carry out enterprises that earn a reputation for righteousness, and (5) when a minister is able to ensconce his own partisans in the government. See “Zhudao,” Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 1.5.74f. Quot servi tot hostes—or, as Han Fei puts it, “Superiors and inferiors fight a hundred battles a day” 上下一日百戰；“Yangquan,” Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 2.8.170.

4. Li Si, Chancellor of the Universe


China’s First Unifier is still the only book-length study of Li Si in English. Other useful studies include Meng Xiangcai, 229–238; Bodde, “The State and Empire of Ch’in”; Machida, 111–131; Ma Feibai, 1, 216–228; Hsiao, A History of Chinese Political Thought, 434–446; Miyazaki, 5, 230–266; and Hu Shi, Zhongguo zhongguo sixiangshi changban, 75–82. Durrant, “Ssu-ma Ch’ien’s Portrayal of the First Emperor,” is an incisive study of Sima Qian’s treatment of the First Emperor and Qin imperial institutions with passing references to Li Si.

2. For a rarely cited but insightful study of this problem see Lévi, “Sima Qian, Han Wudi et l’eternité.”

3. “Li Si liezhuo” 李斯列傳, Shiji 87.2539.

4. “Yibing,” Xunzi jijie 10.15.280, contains a fragment in which Li Si disagrees with his teacher about the reasons for Qin’s success. Cf. Sato, 270 ff.; Lévi, Les fonctionnaires divins, 187; and Oliver, 208 ff.

5. “Li Si liezhuo,” Shiji 87.2539.

6. Ibid., 87.2544.


9. “Han shijia” 韓世家, Shiji 45.1878, records the date as 234; this is possible if we assume that Han Fei departed from Han late in 234 and arrived in Qin early the next year. The matter is discussed further in Bodde, China’s First Unifier, 62–77. For an overview of Li Si’s relations with Han Fei, with somewhat different conclusions, see Ma Feibai, 1, 454–456.

10. “Cun Han” 存韓, Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 1.2.29–37.

11. Ibid., 1.2.37–42.

12. Ibid., 1.2.42–47.


15. The discussion of Li Si’s influence on the First Emperor in Yu Kunqi, 257 ff., is brief and inconclusive.

16. This we can deduce from the fact that he is still mentioned in 219 B.C. as a “chamberlain” 僕, the same Wang Wan and one Wei Lin 隗林 (sometimes called Wei Zhuang 隗狀) are listed as chancellors in that year. But the sources are clear that Li Si was chancellor by 213. It is commonly, but erroneously, supposed that Li Si was appointed chancellor immediately after the unification in
221; even as eminent a scholar as Loewe, in A Biographical Dictionary of the Qin, Former Han and Xin Periods, 228, makes this mistake. The source of the confusion is probably “Li Si liezhu,” Shi ji 87.2546, which implies that he was already Chancellor when he objected to Wang Wan’s feudalistic proposals, though it is clear from “Qin shihuang benji,” Shi ji 6.239, that he was then still Commandant of Justice. Cf. Ma Feibai, 2, 869.


22. Cf. Yu Kunqi, 101 ff. It is perhaps not a coincidence that Sand Hill was also the name of a legendary pleasure park erected by the apolustic King Zhōu of Shang; see “Yin benji” 殷本紀, Shi ji 3.105. Cf. Sterckx, 112. Although geography at the time of King Zhōu is largely a matter of speculation, traditional commentators are convinced that the two Sand Hills refer to the same place; see, for example, Shi ji 3.107n.7 and 6.26n.3.

23. An ancient bronze model of such a chariot was recently excavated and is currently on display in the Museum of the First Emperor’s Mausoleum, Shaanxi province. See Wang Xueli; as well as Peng Wei and Yang Zhenhong, 265 ff.
24. “Qin shihuang benji,” Shi ji 6.264; and “Li Si liezhu,” Shi ji 87.2548.

26. For insightful discussions of Sima Qian’s view of history, see Puett, Ambivalence of Creation, 177–212; and Durrant, The Cloudy Mirror, 123–143. Another character who stares up at Heaven when he recognizes his imminent doom is the refugee General Fan Wuqi 樊於期: “Gike liezhu” 刺客列傳, Shi ji 86.2532; compare the parallel account in “Yan taizi Dan zhi yu Qin wanggū” 蒲太子丹質於秦亡歸, Zhuangzi c 31.1134. In similar scenes, two other Qin generals who have lost their sovereigns’ favor, namely, Bai Qi 白起 and the aforementioned Meng Tian, ask what crime they have committed against Heaven before committing suicide (“Bai Qi Wang Jian liezhu” 白起王翦列傳, Shi ji 73.2337; and “Meng Tian liezhu,” Shi ji 88.2570). Cf. Bodde, Statesman, Patriot, and General, 63 f. The thrust of these commonplace to suggest that the rise and fall of the Qin dynasty followed some predetermined and mysterious plan. The tragicomic climax occurs in
the story of Jing Ke 荊軻 (d. 227 B.C.), the master swordsman whose attempt to assassinate the future First Emperor is foiled at the last instant. With no armed guards standing in his way, Jing Ke is confounded by the unlikeliest of foes: an attendant physician, who hurls a medicine bag at Jing Ke, impeding him just long enough for the monarch to ready his own weapon. For a moment, the future of the world depended on this frail doctor and his sack of nostrums. See “Cîke liezhuan,” Shiji 86.2535; and “Yán taizi Dan zhi yu Qin wanggu,” Zhanguo ce 31.1139. Cf. Fields.

29. Ibid., 87.2555 ff.
30. Ibid., 87.2559.
31. Ibid., 87.2562.
32. E.g., Balazs.

5. Rhetoric and Machination in Stratagems of the Warring States

1. “Le roman de Sou Ts’in”; and Mélanges posthumes sur les religions et l’histoire de la Chine, 3, 52–62. The general observation that Zhanguo ce cannot be reckoned as history goes back at least to the time of Chao Gongwu 吳公武 (d. 1171). See He Jin, 133.

2. See the classic study by Zheng Liangshu, Zhanguo ce yanjiu, esp. 177–212; as well as He Jin, 24–59 (with He’s study of the historicity of the text, 132–154); and Durrant, Cloudy Mirror, 101 ff. Pokora, “Pre-Han Literature,” 28, remarks that “much information given en passant” in Zhanguo ce can be corroborated from other sources. See also Vasil’ev, 20 ff. and 90 ff. (cited by Pokora).

3. Thus Watson, Early Chinese Literature, 75. See also Reding, 341, who calls the work “une vaste collection de pièces rhétoriques, des exercices d’école sans doute.”


5. The last work has long been attributed to Cicero. See, for example, Grube, 165–167 (as well as 92–102 for the Rhetoric, and 168–192 for De oratore).

6. Intrigues: Studies of the Chan-kuo Ts’ê; and “The Chan-kuo Ts’ê and Its Fiction.” Crump’s complete translation, Chan-kuo Ts’ê, has gone through several editions, and he has gathered some selections for a more general readership in Legends of the Warring States.

7. Crump, Intrigues, 103 ff. Cf. He Jin, 59–82, who emphasizes that such rhetorical exercises represent only a portion of the materials in Zhanguo ce.

15. Cf. Lloyd and Sivin, 249; Nylan, “Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han,” 220; Kennedy, *Comparative Rhetoric*, 143; and Garrett, 221.
17. The most comprehensive discussion appears in chapter 12 of the *Han Feizi*, “Shuinan.” Cf. Xing Lu, 275–277; and Lloyd, 77f. See also chapter 3 above.
18. *Institutio Oratoria* III.8.34; trans. Butler, 497, slightly modified. *Ad Herennium* III.2 makes a similar point: “Deliberative speeches are either of the kind in which the question concerns a choice between two courses of action, or of the kind in which a choice among several is considered”; trans. Caplan, 157. Cf. Bonner, 53.
19. *Zhanguo ce* 3.117f.; Grump, *Chan-kuo Ts’e*, §57. (For the reader’s convenience, the corresponding section numbers in Grump’s translation will be provided for all references to the *Zhanguo ce*, although the translation offered here will sometimes differ substantially.)
23. But see the description of the hunt in Mao 154, “Qiye,” *Mao-Shi zhengyi* 8A.391a, for an example of chiasmus in the *Odes*: “For private [consumption] are the yearling boars, but we present the three-year-old boars to the lord” 言于其 禮，獻于孝公. Cf. Unger, 101.
24. For some possible cases of hypallage in classical Chinese, see Unger, 105–107. (The major weakness of this otherwise useful reference book is that it is organized according to standard categories of Greco-Roman rhetoric and thus cannot take into account those characteristic Chinese devices for which there are no conventional Western equivalents.) Yang Bojun, 104, also discusses instances in which an attribute is placed before a nominal phrase other than the one it is intended to modify. See also Unger, 42–65, for some examples of anaphora and related figures in classical Chinese.
25. *Intrigues*, 100.
26. E.g., Genesis 1:9–10: “And God said, ‘Let the waters [A] under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let dry land [B] appear.’ And it was so. And God called the dry land [B] earth, and the gathering together of waters [A’] called He seas; and God saw that it was good.” Unger, 118, calls this chiasmus als Gedankenfigur (as opposed to als Wortfigur).

27. For example: “You must not be alone in knowing [the worth of a possession]” 必無獨知, in “Sikou Bu wei Zhou Zui wei Zhoutjun” 司寇布為周最謂周君, Zhanguo ce 2.60 (Crump, §4). Unger, 119–120, uses the term brachylogia for this device.


29. See, for example, Cartius, 79 ff. See also Blinn and Garrett; Cole, 88 ff.; and Bonner, 60 ff.

30. Schaberg, A Patterned Past, 43 ff., finds a number of similar devices in the speeches of the Zhouzuan.

31. “Su Qin shi jiang lianheng” 蘇秦始將連橫, Zhanguo ce 3.81; Crump, §47.

32. “Zhang Yi you wu Chen Zhen yu Qinwang” 張儀又和陳轸於秦王, Zhanguo ce 3.127; Crump, §54.


34. Bentham, 43–53.

35. E.g., “Wei Qinwang” 請秦王, Zhanguo ce 5.266; Crump, §75.

36. E.g., “Qin keqing Zao wei Ranghou” 契客卿趙造護侯, Zhanguo ce 5.172; Crump, §89.

37. E.g., “Qi Xuanwang jian Yan Chu” 齊宣王見顏斶, Zhanguo ce 11.409; Crump, §130.

38. Ibid., 11.410.

39. “Su Qin shi jiang lianheng,” Zhanguo ce 3.80; Crump, §47.


41. “Su Qin shui Qi Minwang” 蘇秦說齊閔王, Zhanguo ce 12.433; Crump, §158. On Meng Ben, see chapter 6, note 61, below.


44. “Chu jiang fa Qi” 楚將伐齊, Zhanguo ce 8.330–331; Crump, §117.

45. “Qin Xuan taihou ai Wei Choufu” 秦宣太后愛魏醜夫, Zhanguo ce 4.167; Crump, §98. This item is illustrative of the typically pragmatic Chinese attitude toward the question of life after death. Compare Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu, 3, 1013 (Xiang 14 = 559 B.C.): a duke intends to lie to his ancestral spirits but is dissuaded
by a noblewoman, who observes that if such spirits do not exist, there is no reason to converse with them, whereas if they do exist, they cannot be deceived. 無神，何告？若有，不可誤也。Cf. Pines, Foundations of Confucian Thought, 86; and Schaberg, A Patterned Past, 129.

46. See Qian Mu, Xian-Qin zhui xinian, 617, for Zou Ji’s dates.

47. “Chenghou Zou Ji wei Qi xiang” 『成侯齊為齊相』, Zhanguo ce 8.318; Crump, §118.

48. “Han Gongshu you Qi Wei” 韓公叔有齊魏, Zhanguo ce 14.496; Crump, §207. Crump, Chan-kuo Ts’e, 42ff., cites further examples of this topic (which he calls “doubled persuasion”). See also Lloyd, 76; Raphal, 120; and Kroll, 125.


50. “Su Dai wei Yan Zhaowang” 蘇代謂燕昭王, Zhanguo ce 29.1073f.; Crump, §459.

51. “Yanwang wei Su Dai” 燕王謂蘇代, Zhanguo ce 29.1075; Crump, §460.

52. Consider, for example, the well-known tale at the beginning of the Zuozhuan in which a penitent son and his mother are reconciled despite his headstrong vow not to see her until they have arrived in the Yellow Springs 黃泉, the mythic home of the dead: he meets his mother in a tunnel by a subterranean watershed: Chunjiu Zuozhuan zhu, 1, 14f. (Yin 1 = 722 B.C.). Cf. Schaberg, A Patterned Past, 184f., and idem, “Social Pleasures,” 5ff. Mencius 4B.24 contains another piece with this theme: the archer Yungong Si 廣公之 斯 is sent by his lord to kill Zizhuo Ruzi 子濯孺子. But Yungong Si’s teacher happens to have been Zizhuo Ruzi’s student. Yungong Si cannot disobey his ruler, but he cannot kill his master’s master, either. His solution is to remove the tips from his arrows before shooting Zizhuo Ruzi. See also Chunjiu Zuozhuan zhu, 3, 1012f. (Xiang 14 = 559 B.C.). Finally, a much later example from a different kind of literature: a beautiful girl is importuned by an ardent suitor but has vowed to save her virginity for marriage; so she satisfies her lover and still preserves her maidenhead by allowing him to sodomize her. See Li Yu, The Carnal Prayer Mat, trans. Hanan, 1971f. (I cite Hanan’s translation because reliable and unabridged Chinese editions of Rou putuan are notoriously difficult to find. This passage appears just after the midway point of chapter 17.)

53. The controversy over the correct pronunciation of Zengzi’s given name is centuries old. Fang Yizhi 方以智 (1611–1671) and Wang Yinzhi 王引之 (1766–1834) both contend that it should be read Can (rather than the more usual Shen); see Shiki kaichū kashō 67.32. Hong Enbo 洪恩波 (fl. 1897), ibid., points out that Xu Shen evidently followed the other reading in Shuowen jiezi jīzhù 6A.1275, for he says that the character shen 森 is read like the shen in Zeng Shen” 讀若曾參 之參 (the modern Mandarin pronunciation sen 森 is irregular; one would expect
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56. “Pang Cong yu taizi zhi yu Handan,” *Zhanguo ce* 23.845–846; Crump, § 302. As we have seen under the rubric of Apophthegm, “three men make a tiger” apparently went on to become a maxim.


59. “Jing Xuanwang wen qunchen” 荊宣王問群臣, *Zhanguo ce* 14.482; Crump, § 176. As in the example of the tiger and the fox, King Xuan mistakenly assumes that neighboring states fear his general, Zhao Xixu 昭奚恤, when they are really afraid of the king’s army.

60. “Su Li wei Zhoujun” 蘇厲為周君, *Zhanguo ce* 2.56; Crump, § 13.


63. “Zhao qie fa Yan” 趙且伐燕, *Zhanguo ce* 30.1115; Crump, § 468.

64. “Qin xing shi lin Zhou er qiu jiuding” 秦興師臨周而求九鼎, *Zhanguo ce* 1.1–3; Crump, § 20.

65. “Qi zhu Chu gong Qin” 齊助楚攻秦, *Zhanguo ce* 4.133–138; Crump, § 58. Chen Zhen proposes a way out of this quagmire, a Type C Dilemma. The King of Chu should gain Qin’s friendship by offering a city to that state. Chu and Qin can then attack the isolated Qi, and Chu will obtain in battle a city to match what was given to Qin. The King of Chu does not heed this counsel.


67. “Chenghou Zou Ji wei Qi xiang,” *Zhanguo ce* 8.318; Crump, § 118.

68. “Zhao qu Zhou zhi jidi” 趙取周之祭地, *Zhanguo ce* 1.32; Crump, § 32.


70. Compare the episode in *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, 1, 269f. (Ming 2 = 660 B.C.), in which a crown prince is outfitted with abnormal clothing, signifying his father’s disfavor. “The clothes display the person” 衣身之章也, observes a member of the prince’s retinue. See Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 63 and 225.

72. Rhetoric I.i.21 and II.xxiii.4; trans. Freese, 31 and 301. Similarly, some of the examples that Aristotle uses to illustrate “stating the reason for the false impression” (to legein ten aitian tou paradoxou: Rhetoric II.xxiii.24; trans. Freese, 319) could be classified under Tiger and Fox.

73. De inventione Lxxxi–xxxiii. Elsewhere, Cicero discusses the merits of complexio, or dilemma (Lxxix): “A dilemma is a form of argument in which you are refuted, whichever alternative you grant, after this fashion: ‘If he is a scoundrel, why are you intimate with him? If he is an honest man, why accuse him?’”; trans. Hubbell, 85. The general idea of being lost in all possible cases is present in both the Roman and Chinese versions of dilemma. On dilemma generally, see Copi, 237–241.

74. “Weiwang yi Chuwang meiren,” Zhanguo ce 17.553–554; Crump, §200. There are two variants of this story in “Nei chushuo xia,” Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 10.31.634f. See also Knechtges, “Wit, Humor, and Satire in Early Chinese Literature (to A.D. 220),” 89f.

75. The commentator Bao Biao 鲍彪 (1106–1149) opines that the king must have suffered from some illness that produced a foul smell.

76. Even Mencius (Mencius 3B.9, Mengzi zhengyi 13.446) felt compelled to respond to the potentially damning criticism that he was “fond of disputations” 好辯, an insinuation that he distorted the truth. Cf. Lloyd and Sivin, 63f.; and Zhenhua Zhang, 35. Compare also the Wang Bi version of Laozi 81, Bashu Laozi jiaozhu, 155: “Those who are good do not debate; those who debate are not good” 善者不辯, 辯者不善.

77. See “Mengchang jun chu xingguo zhi Chu” 孟嘗君出行國至楚, Zhanguo ce 385–387; Crump, §153.

78. Crump discusses the early reception of the text in Chan-kuo Ts’e, 28f.

79. This idea is expressed perspicuously in the preface to the work by Zeng Gong 曾聖 (1019–1083, misidentified in Durrant, Cloudy Mirror, 102, as “Zeng Gu”), “Zeng Zigu xu” 曾子固序, Zhanguo ce, 1200.


81. There may be a character missing here; Miao Wenyuan, 13, inserts hua 畫 on the basis of an unspecified edition.

82. As Liu Xiang has explained earlier, moral instruction was the august policy of the preceding Zhou dynasty.

83. Compare the language in Sima Qian’s comment (Shiji 71.2921) after the biography of Gan Luo 甘羅, the grandson of the aforementioned Gan Mao: “Gan Luo was young, but he produced one extraordinary plan, and the rumor of it rebounded in subsequent ages. Though not a noble man of scrupulous conduct, he was indeed a strategist of the Warring States. That was the moment when Qin was mighty, and the world was especially inclined to plots and schemes!”
6. Insidious Syncretism in the Political Philosophy of Huainanzi

Epigraph. “Über den Gemeinspruch: Das mag in der Theorie richtig sein, tautg aber nicht für die Praxis” (1793), Gesammelte Schriften, 8, 290ff.; Political Writings, trans. Nisbet, 74. Cf. Fleischacker, 4f. See also Kant’s “Muthmaßlicher Anfang der Menschengeschichte” (1786), Gesammelte Schriften, 8, 121: “We need only look at China, whose position may expose it to occasional unforeseen incursions but not to attack by a powerful enemy, and we shall find that, for this very reason, it has been stripped of every vestige of freedom” (trans. Nisbet, 232).

1. See, in addition to the sources cited below, Jin Chunfeng, 244–245; Chen Qitian, 70f.; Miyamoto, 9 et passim; Honda, 182–186; and Lü Simian, jingsi jiti, 196. Miyamoto, 16ff., suggests that “Zhushu” should be read as an indictment of the Han state.

2. Zhongguo zhonggu sixiangshi changbian, 155.


4. The Huainanzi was commissioned by Liu An, Prince of Huainan. See Vankeerberghen, The Huainanzi and Liu An’s Claim to Moral Authority; Kandel, “Der Versuch einer politischen Restauration”; and Wallacker. For the history of the text, see Roth, The Textual History of the Huai-nan-tzu; Yu Dacheng, 1–56; as well as the three appendixes to Zheng Liangshu, Huainanzi jiaoli, 322–408.

5. Xu Fuguan, 2, 156. For the phrase tianxia weigong, see chapter 3, note 11, above.

6. The Art of Rulership, 164. See also Ames, “The Art of Rulership’ Chapter of the Huai Nan Tzu,” 239: “It would seem that the author of this chapter … attempts to concede the minimum amount of political structure necessary to guarantee the maximum degree of individual freedom.” It will become clearer in the course of this chapter why “art” is a problematic rendering of the term shu.

7. My choice of the word “autism” is inspired by the recent clinical observation that the inability to attribute mental states to other human beings is an essential feature of the horrible psychiatric disorder of the same name. See, for example, Baron-Cohen et al.; and Astington, 145–149. Naturally, I do not mean to suggest that the authors of “Zhushu” were really “autists” as the term is used in contemporary medicine—only that their avowed conception of the mind is stunted.

8. Despite Li Ling, “Cong jianbo faxian kan gushu de tili he fenlei,” 31, who includes Daoism (together with Confucianism and Mohism) in his list of genuine ancient schools.

10. Cf. Smith, esp. 145–150; Csikszentmihalyi, 88; Queen, 5–11; and Ames, “Putting the Te back into Taoism,” 123. Sima Tan’s famous essay (“Liu jia zhi yaozhi” 六家之要指) dividing all antique thought into six categories, called *jia* 家, is preserved in “Taishi gong zixu,” Shiji 150.2288–2293. The meaning of the term *jia* in such contexts is disputed; Petersen, “Which Books Did the First Emperor of Ch’in Burn?” 34 ff., argues that in classical times it would have referred to “specialists” or “experts.” Some writers (e.g., Lloyd and Sivin, 53) mistakenly assert that “Liu jia zhi yao zhi” is the first text to use *jia* in this sense. But see the much earlier usage in “Jiebi,” *Xunzi jijie* 15.21.393. As Petersen demonstrates (38 ff.), this sense is common in Xunzi. Cf. also Dai Junren, 2, 885.

There is some disagreement as to whether Sima Tan, and not his son Sima Qian, wrote “Liu jia zhi yaozhi” as it has survived. See, for example, Wang Qu-chang, *Zhuzi xuepai yaojuan*, 159n.1.; however, Fu Wuguang, 111, speculates that the text was written by Sima Tan early in life.

11. This is Xu Fuguan’s description in 2, 146 ff.

12. A parallel passage in *Qunshu zhiyao* 41.714 has *dong* 動 for *du* 度, thus: “Once he has moved…”

13. Quotations from chapter 9 of the *Huainanzi* are cited according to two editions. “L” refers to Liu Wendian, *Huainan Hongjie jijie*; “S” refers to the more widely circulated *Sibu congkan* edition. Readers can also follow Ames’ translation, since he indicates the S page numbers in his margins; however, the translations here often differ significantly from those of Ames. Quotations from other chapters are cited in Liu Wendian’s edition.

14. An allusion to *Laozi* 2, *Boshu Laozi jiaozhu*, 231 ff. In accordance with the aims of this study, I attempt to cite all important parallels in older traditions that Liu An’s clients can be expected to have known. Later parallels are presented only when they shed light on the *Huainanzi* itself and are not regularly considered. The frequent parallels furnished by the received *Wenzi* 文子 are not cited, as that text was almost certainly compiled after the *Huainanzi*. This was first demonstrated by Gu Guanguang 顧觀光 (1799–1862) in his *Wenzi jiaokan ji*, 1a; see also Ding Yuanzhi, esp. 145–202; and Kandel, *Wen Tzu*, 6 ff., and 323–332 for a useful list of parallels between the two texts. The recent discovery of an ancient version of the *Wenzi* at Dingxian 定縣, Hebei province, has fueled speculation that the *Wenzi* might actually antedate the *Huainanzi*. For the most recent discussions, see Le Blanc, *Le Wen zi à la lumière de l’histoire et de l’archéologie*, 1–10; Chen Ligu, “Shi jiu jinben Wenzi yu Huainanzhi de bu chongxi nei-long tu zhe guben Wenzi de jige sixiang lunzhi”; Zeng Dahui, and Zhang Fengqian.

15. Cf. Aihe Wang, 194. See also chapter 3 above.

16. Following the commentary of Gao You, who notes that some editions
read *mou* 謀 for *jian* 謀; Ames, *The Art of Rulership*, 239n.2, observes that *mou* fits the rhyme scheme. Moreover, *jinjian* 進諫 is a frequent classical compound, so *jin-mou* qualifies as *lectio difficilior.*

17. Following the commentary of Sun Yirang 孫詒讓 (1848–1908).

18. This passage is virtually lifted from Shen Dao (P. M. Thompson, § 111): “His feet could walk, but his attendants led him forward; his mouth could speak, but his envoys made the laudatory speeches” 足能行而相者導進，口能言而行人稱辭; the source text is *Taiping yulan* 76.9a. Wang Yinglin 王應麟 (1223–1296) also cites the passage a number of times, e.g., *Han Yiwen zhi kaozheng* 漢藝文志考證 6.15b, in *Yuhai*. Cf. further Ames, *Art of Rulership*, 239n.2; and Ruan Tingzhuo, “Lun *Huananzi* ju xian-Qin zhu zhi shu hu guanxi,” 73. (The last study, however, misses more allusions than it catches.)

19. See, for example, Creel, *What Is Taoism?* 79–91. Surprisingly, Slingerland’s new book-length study of *wuwei* deliberately removes Han Fei from consideration (see, for example, 288n.9); this decision severely limits the book’s usefulness for the study of later texts, such as *Huananzi*, that derived their concept of *wuwei* directly from such antecedents.

20. Following the suggestion of Chen Qiyu in *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu* 16.38.913n.1; most commentators agree that “Dongjiang” (or “Dongxiang”) refers to a place. A parallel passage in the *Lunheng*, however, reads *Dongjiang zhi gong* 東匠之宮 (the house of Dongjiang); Dongjiang is sometimes taken to be the name of the murdered husband. See “Fei Han” 非韓, *Lunheng jiaoshi* 10.29.444; cf. the translation in Forke, *Lun-heng*, 1, 443.


22. Following the commentary of Ota Masashi 太田方 (d. 1829).

23. Compare the *Shenzi* (P. M. Thompson, § 92): “It is certain that the many will vanquish the few” 罂之勝寡，必也; the source text is the commentary of Li Shan in *Liuchen zhu Wenxuan* 57.3b (cited erroneously as 57.2b in Thompson).

24. Cf. Itano, 226ff.; and Lévi, *Les fonctionnaires divins*, 57—and 38, where he erroneously refers to Zichan as a disciple of Confucius, though the latter was a generation younger. The same mistake, curiously, appears also in Kamenarović, *Xun Zi (Siuon Tseu) introduit et traduit du chinois*, 235; and idem, *Wang Fu*, 286. (Cf. Martin, “Le cas Zichan,” 69n.1.) There is a similar criticism of Zichan in *Mencius* 4B.2: Zichan may be magnanimous in using his own vehicles to help people ford rivers, but it would be more effective and would require less personal labor simply to build bridges.

Elsewhere, however, Han Fei admires Zichan: see “Xianxue” 顯學, *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu* 19.50.1147; and cf. Hsiao, *A History of Chinese Political Thought*, 390. In fact, in the *Zuozhuang*, the figure of Zichan is famous for charging officials with tasks that accord with their skills, as the doctrine of *shu* warrants; see, for example,

25. Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 356f., fragment 6; the source texts are Yiwen lei ju 54.967; and Taiping yulan 638.4b. Compare the reference to “relying on standards” 任法 in the Shensi (P. M. Thompson, § 64); Qunshu zhiyao 37.639. There is also a parallel passage in “Renfa” 任法, Guanzi jiao zheng 15.45.255.

26. Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 370 ff., fragments 17 (2) and 17 (3). The source text is “Renshu” 任數, Lushi chunqiu jiaoshi 17.1065.

27. See Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 370n.4, for a discussion of Marquis Zhaoxi’s dates.


29. Compare the translations in Vandermeersch, 227f.; and Richard Wilhelm, Frühling und Herbst des Lü Bu We, 270f. See also Asano, 233; and Numajiri, 273.

30. Cf. Lévi, Les fonctionnaires divins, 180 f.; and Zhang Shunhui, 11. Compare also the usage in Analects 9.25, Lanyu jishi 18.618: “Make integrity and trustworthiness your ruler; do not befriend anyone unequal to yourself; and do not be ashamed to correct your mistakes” 主忠信，毋友不如已者，過則不懼改。

31. Kanaya overlooks this point in his study of the term, “Mui to injun” 無為而因循, Kanaya Osamu Chûgoku shisô ronshû, 2, 353–365. “Yinxun” was also the title of a chapter of the Shen 慎; see Qunshu zhiyao 37.636. Cf. Dai Junren, 2, 859.

32. Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 391 f., fragment 27; the source text is the Shiji jijie 集解 by Pei Yin 裨貤 (fl. A.D. fifth century), Shiji 63.2146n.2. See also Makeham, “The Legalist Concept of hsing-ming,” 90f. The passage does not appear in extant editions of the Xinshu; cf. Xinshu xiangzhu, 384. For the term duzi 賦資, see Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 391n.6; as well as Bodde, China’s First Unifier, 205f. It should be added that duzi was an unpopular phrase after the Qin dynasty since the Second Emperor, inspired by a memorial of Li Si, used it as a euphemism for raising taxes and executing rivals (Shiji 87.2557). Cf. Machida, 117; and Hsiao, “Legalism and Autocracy in Traditional China,” 126f.

33. Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 349, fragment 1 (6), with a slightly different translation. The source text is Qunshu zhiyao 36.630. See chapter 3 above. Ames, The Art of Rulership, 239n.6, notes several classical antecedents to this passage, but both he and Ruan Tingzhuo overlook the oldest source, namely, Shen Buhai. See Svarverud, 161n.28.

34. Following the commentary of Gao You.

35. Cf. Xu Fuguan, 2, 142f. Hu Shi, “Du Lushi chunqiu” 論呂氏春秋 (1930), in Hu Shi wencun, 3, 240 ff., demonstrates that this conception of statecraft had been mapped out carefully in the Lushi chunqiu, an important source for the Huainanzi. Cf. also Sellmann, 103–115; and Tian Fengtai, 139 ff. and 244 ff.
For a general comparison of Lishi chunqiu and Huainanzi, see Akatsuka, Shoshi shiso kenkyu, 613 ff. and 630 ff.

36. Compare Laozi 49; Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 63: “The Hundred Clans all entrust their eyes and ears to him; the Sage treats them all as children.” 百姓皆注其耳目焉，聖人皆孩子.

37. The same expression, fucei 務誠, is attributed to Shen Buhai in Qunshu zhiyao 36.629; Creel, Shen Pu-hai, 343 ff., fragment 1 (1). Cf. Asano, 235. Wang Niansun, in his commentary (L 9.293), points out that the phrase also appears both in “Renfa,” Guanzi jiaozheng 15.45.256 (= Guanzi jijiao 45.759) and in “Nan yi” 難一, Han Feizi xin jiaozhu 15.36.852. Ames, The Art of Rulership, 249n.158, claims that a similar passage appears in the Shen 慎 zi but does not cite an edition in his bibliography, and I have been unable to locate the phrase in the extant fragments of that work. However, the concept of using people with different talents as resources is well attested: “The abilities of inferiors are not the same, but all are of use to the sovereign. Therefore the great lord relies on the people’s abilities as his resource” 下之所能不同而皆上之用也。是以大君因民之能為資 (P. M. Thompson, § 34 f.; Qunshu zhiyao 37.657). Cf. Wang Yongxiang et al., 93 ff. (which contains one of the few recent studies of Shen Dao in any language).


39. Contrast the scheme laid out in Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu, 3, 1016 (Xiang 14 = 559 B.C.): “Lords are established over the people to act as their superintendents and shepherds; helpers are then assigned to the lords to act as their teachers and protectors, and to prevent the lords from transcending due measure” 有君而為之貳，使御保之，勿使過度. Cf. Schaberg, A Patterned Past, 150. The Huainanzi does not countenance this degree of moral autonomy on the part of ministers.


41. Slingerland, 109 ff., argues against what he calls a “Legalistic interpretation” of wuwei in such texts as Laozi, denying that the concept can be taken as an “authoritarian technique” of the all-powerful ruler.

42. This example is drawn from “Zhongji” 重己, Lishi chunqiu jiaoshi 1.34 (cf. Ames, The Art of Rulership, 252n.231), but the inspiration for the image appears to go back to “Qushui” 秋水, Zhuangzi jishi 6B.17.590f.: “An ox or horse has four legs; that is Heaven. Haltering the horse’s head and running a string through the ox’s nose is man. Thus it is said: Do not destroy Heaven by means of man” 牛馬四足，是謂天；落[是各]馬首，穿牛鼻，是謂人。故曰：無以人滅天. For the reading of luo 落 as luo 落, I follow the commentary of Cheng Xuanying 成玄英 (fl. 631–652).
 Needless to say, in this formulation, running a string through an ox’s nose is the opposite of “following the nature of things.” Therefore, despite the recent suggestions that the Zhuangzi text may have been redacted at the court of Liu An, we must keep in mind that the authors of the Huainanzi still felt free to allude to passages in the Zhuangzi in the course of formulating arguments that were entirely incompatible with that source. (For an allusion closer to the original spirit of “Qiushui,” see L. 1.20.) For connections between the Zhuangzi and Huainanzi, see Roth, “Who Compiled the Chuang-tzu?” esp. 118 ff.; Le Blanc, “From Ontology to Cosmogony; Rand, 7 ff.; Dai Junren, 2, 898 ff.; Kusuyama; Wang Shumin, “Huainanzi yu Zhuangzi”; and Zhou Junfu. Le Blanc, Huai-nan Tzu, 83, shows that the text to which Huainanzi alludes most often is Zhuangzi.

43. Following the commentary of Zhuang Kuiji 莊逵吉 (1760–1813).
44. Zaofu was the charioteer of King Mu of Zhou. See, for example, Shiji 5.175; and Mu tianzi zhuang 1.4a. See also Mathieu, 185–186; and Granet, Danses et légendes, 1, 363 ff.
46. Following the commentary of Gao You.
47. This passage may be inspired by “Shiwei” 翦威, Lushi chunqiu jiaoshi 19.1280: “The Former Kings employed their people as they drove fine horses; they kept their responsibilities light and their restrictions fresh” 先王之使民，若御良馬，輕任新節. Compare also the anecdote in “Dasheng” 端生, Zhuangzi jishi 7A.19.660 ff., with parallels in many texts, including the “Aigong” 哀公, Xunzi jiji 20.31.545 ff.
48. Cf. Kanaya, Rō-Sō teki sekai, 213 ff.; idem, Shin-Kan shisōshi kenkyū, 519; and Miyamoto, 7 ff.
49. Cf. Uno, 155; Xu Fuguan, 2, 140 ff.; and Hu Shi, Zhongguo zhongguo sixiang-shi changbian, 82.
50. For more on political “covenants” (or “bonds”) in ancient China, see Lewis, Sanctioned Violence in Early China, 68 ff.
51. The text continues with two more examples to the same effect. There is considerable textual disagreement concerning the phrase juexue 捷穴, which is addressed in the commentaries of Wang Niansun and Tao Fangqi 陶方琦 (1845–1884).
52. Following the commentary of Wang Niansun.
53. Following the commentary of Gao You.
54. Following the commentary of Gao You.
55. See Laloy, 507 ff., for the “grand bouillon,” or dageng 大羹, a symbol of Yao’s frugal living. Gao You’s gloss on buhe 不和, “not harmonized,” is buzi buwui 不致五味: “one does not bring the Five Flavors.” Yu Yue 俞樾 (1821–1907) also points out that the parallel passage in the Zuozhuan reads dageng buzi 大羹不致,
with a similar meaning ("[into] the Great Soup one does not bring [seasoning]"); *Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu*, 1, 86 (Huan 2 = 710 B.C.). *Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu*, 4, 1419 (Zhao 20 = 522 B.C.), similarly, uses the example of seasoned soup as part of a philosophical argument about the difference between he 和 and tong 同; and see the parallel in *Yanzi chunqiu jishi* 7.442 f. Cf. Knechtges, “A Literary Feast: Food in Early Chinese Literature,” in *Court Culture and Literature in Early China*, 51.

56. This is an approximation of what the context seems to demand. Fengyang 奉養 (lit. “presenting nourishment”) usually implies filial conduct but can also mean simply “way of life.”

57. The examples of King Ling and King Goujian are commonplace in philosophical literature. See chapter 2, note 62, above.

58. For this name and the seminal study on the subject, see Graham, *Studies in Chinese Philosophy and Philosophical Literature*, 67–110. See also Graham, *Disputers of the Tao*, 64–74; as well as Lewis, *Sanctioned Violence in Early China*, 176 f.; and Oshima.

59. *Mengzi zhengyi* 11.367. See the commentary of Zhao Qi 趙岐 (d. A.D. 201) for the terms yong 養 and sun 養. Mencius’ refutation, which follows, is famous; see also *Mencius Ta 7A.32, Mengzi zhengyi* 27.925–926. For more on Xu Xing, see, in addition to Graham’s article, Forké, *Geschichte der aliens chinesischen Philosophie*, 559 f.; and Fung, 1, 144 f. Qian Mu, *Xian-Qin zhuizi xinian*, §113, identified him with one Xu Fan 許犯, who is said in “Dangran” 當染, *Lishi chunqiu jiaoshi* 2.96, to have studied with the Mohist Qin Guli 勤滑盧; see also Qian Mu, *Mozi*, 56 f.; and, more recently, Wang Liqi in *Lishi chunqiu zhushu* 2.236. This idea has been refuted several times. See esp. Fang Shouchu, 143 f.; as well as Hsiao, *A History of Chinese Political Thought*, 61 n.6 and 220 n.21; and Yang Junguang, 304 f.


61. See the commentary of Tao Fangqi for information on Chang Hong and Meng Ben. Chang Hong appears in *Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu*, 4, 1624 f. (Ai 2 = 492 B.C.) and is the central figure in an account in *Guoyu* 3.144 ff.; see also the sources cited in Yang Bojun, as well as Ames, *The Art of Rulership*, 253 n.267. Tao Fangqi presents a fragment of Xu Shen’s commentary to the *Huainanzi* (preserved in *Qunshu zhiyao*), asserting that Meng Ben came from the state of Wei 衛; Ying Shao agrees in his commentary to *Hanshu* 44.2199 n.6. Cf. also Wang Quchang, *Qinshi*, 181. Ames, *The Art of Rulership*, 253 n.268, says he is a hero from Qi.


63. Thus Hucker, 5671.

64. E.g., Vankeerberghen, *The Huainanzi and Liu An’s Claim to Moral Authority*, 89; Kanaya, *Rō-Sō toki sekai*, 148; Xu Fuguan, 2, 146 ff.; and Lin Congshun, 122. Xu Fuguan, 2, 150, goes so far as to suggest that the Confucianism evident in “Zhushu” can be traced back to the school of Zisi and Mencius.
65. *Li ji zhengyi* 60.1674c. I know of no commentator who has made note of this parallel. Forke, *Geschichte der mittelalterlichen chinesischen Philosophie*, 44n.3, points out the similarity with the opening line of “Shu” 韚, *Shizhi* A.370c. The authenticity of the *Shizhi*, however, is doubtful (despite Graham’s treatment in *Disputers of the Tao*, 495). See Zhang Xitang; and especially Jin Dejian, who presents considerable evidence that much of the *Shizhi* was “restored” in the third century A.D. and even later.

66. See the Introduction, note 73, above.

67. See, in addition to the example below, L 9.302 ff., S 9.16a; and L 9.313, S 9.21a.


69. One of the most famous examples is “Xianxue,” *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu* 19.50.1124 ff. See also “Wudu,” *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu* 19.49.1096; and *Shiji* 87.2550 (discussed in chapter 4 above), where Zhao Gao persuades Li Si to anoint Huhai as Second Emperor of Qin—rather than his eldest brother, Fusu, whom the First Emperor had designated just before dying—by telling Li Si that he might thereby demonstrate “the wisdom of Confucius and Mozi 孔墨之智. Cf. Bodde, *China’s First Unifier*, 32, who also interprets the reference to Confucius as evidence that the *Shiji* account cannot be contemporaneous with the facts it narrates, since “references like these … fit in very well with the spirit of the Han dynasty, when Confucianism became orthodox, and when Confucius was regarded as the ultimate arbiter for all conduct” (93). On the contrary, it is evident that Zhao Gao, by mentioning Mozi in the same breath, does not view Confucius as “the ultimate arbiter.” Zhao Gao’s genuine contempt of Confucius’ teachings is revealed by his repeated cajoling of Huhai for clinging to such outmoded notions as righteousness and filial piety (despite Dawson, 158). His rhetorical purpose is to refer to Confucius as one of any number of wiseacres whose fame extends to generations after their death and whom Li Si can emulate by backing the right horse.

The earliest such casual references to Confucius and Mozi seem to appear in the *Lushi chunqiu*; see, for example, “Buqin 不侵, *Lushi chunqiu jiaoshi* 12.640: “Confucius and Mozi were scholars of plain garments, but rulers of ten thousand chariots and lords of one thousand chariots could not compete with them for the scholars [that they attracted]” 孔墨布衣之士也，萬乘之主、千乘之君，不能與之爭士也. Cf. also “Siwu 思務, *Xinyu jiaozhu* B.12.173: “Among Mozi’s disciples, there were many brave scholars; among Confucius’ disciples there was much dao and de' 墨子之門多勇士，仲尼之門多德 (a fascinating statement in its own right).

70. *Zhuangzi jishi* 1B.2.63: “The Way is darkened by ‘small achievements’; words are darkened by ‘glory and flowers.’ Thus we have the ‘right and wrong’ of
the Confucians and Mohists, by which they affirm what the other denies and deny what the other affirms” 道隱於小成，言隱於榮華。故有儒墨之是非，以是其所非而非其所是. The commentary of Cheng Xuanying explains xiaocheng 小成 (small achievements) as constructed virtues that do not encompass the Way and ronghua 荣華 (glory and flowers) as euphuistic, and hence unreliable, speech.

71. A land famed for its fine horses, according to the commentary of Xu Shen, cited by Tao Fangqi.

72. Gao You writes that a taotu 騃於 is a wild horse (yema 野馬), echoing the definition in “Shichu” 釋畜, Erya zhushi 10.2652b. In common Han usage, the term denotes a horse from the steppe (e.g., Shi ji 110.2789); this is clearly the sense intended here. However, taotu also appears as the name of a mythical (blue) creature akin to a horse in the “Haiwai beijing” 海外北經, Shanhai jing jiaozhu 8.294. Cf. Strassberg, § 250.

73. This rhetorical strategy can be traced back to the Lüshi chunqiu; see Cook, “The Lüshi chunqiu and the Resolution of Philosophical Dissonance,” 316 and 322n.39.

74. Following the commentary of Wang Niansun.

75. Compare the insightful discussion of anti-intellectualism in Yu Yingshi, Lishi yu sixiang, esp. 10 ff.


77. Some commentators suggest that xian 弦 should be read as se 瑟, “cither”; see Le Blanc, Huai-nan Tzu, 138n.86.

78. Compare the translation in ibid., 138. This manner of thinking, including the specific example, is borrowed from “Zhaolei” 召類, Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi 20.1360. Gong 宫 and jue 角 are the first and third note in the pentatonic scale, respectively. Such observations led to the practice known as houqi 候氣 (waiting for the qi), whereby the movements of qi were monitored with the aid of twelve specially tuned pitch pipes. See Hulsewé, “Watching the Vapors”; and Bodde, Essays on Chinese Civilization, 351–372.

79. See Ames, The Art of Rulership, 242n.43, for the sources of the story of Ning Qi, who gained the attention of Lord Huan by singing as the latter passed by his cart. Sometimes it is said that Ning Qi made his music by beating on the horn of an ox, a detail presumably related to the tradition that he was a master at physiognomizing cattle. There is a later treatise on that subject bearing his name; see Sterckx, 26. But the oxcart is more plausibly understood in Ning Qi’s case as an emblem of poverty: a wealthier man would have had a horse (Sterckx, 49).

80. Shang 商 is the second note of the pentatonic scale. Xu Shen’s opaque gloss on shang, added by Tao Fangqi (“The sound of metal is clear” 金聲清), must have been intended as an explanation of its cosmological significance.
Elsewhere Xu Shen is quoted as saying that *shang* refers to “autumnal sounds” 秋聲, as Tao notes. Cf. also Laloy, 422. Metal 金 and Autumn 秋 go together according to the *Huainanzi*’s famous cosmography. In a fragment of his lost *Xin lun* 新論, Huan Tan 恒譯 (43 B.C.–A.D. 28) confirms that each of the five notes corresponds to one of the Five Phases and four seasons (*gong* remains in the center); *shang* corresponds to autumn. See Pokora, *Hsin-lun (New Treatise) and Other Writings by Huan T’an*, fragment 124; the source texts are *Taijing yulan* 701.3b.f. and *Beitang shuchao* 132.10b. Similarly, *Liutao* 3.24a asserts that *shang* is the note pertaining to metal; cf. DeWoskin, *A Song for One or Two*, 76. Xu Shen appears to be saying that Ning Qi’s song was plaintive.

However, commentators have missed the significance of *shang* in this context. *Shang* is the note of the vassal (*gong* corresponds to the lord), and Ning Qi is doing his best to enter Lord Huan’s service. See “Yueji,” *Li ji zhengyi* 37.1528a. Compare also the remarks on *shang* in *Fengsu tongyi jiaozhu* 6.275. Cf. Major, “Celestial Cycles and Mathematical Harmonics in the *Huainanzi*,” 122.

Finally, in the account in chapter 12 of the *Huainanzi* (I. 12.389), Ning Qi travels to Qi with a group of merchants 商派 (cf. “Ju’nan” 舊南, *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi* 19.1311) and wishes to sell 商 his cart to Lord Huan; perhaps some connection is intended.

81. A similar idea is articulated more fully in the “Benjing” 本經 chapter (I. 8.265.f.). For the various traditional instruments, see, for example, Kurihara, 542–584.

An ancient fragment, variously attributed, claims in the same spirit that musical instruments respond to the emotions of a performer. Thus human beings must be even more receptive to such stimulation: “Bells and drums, if struck in anger, will sound martial; if struck in sorrow, they will sound doleful; if struck in happiness, they will sound joyous. As one’s sentiments change, so do their sounds. The genuine perception of sentiments extends even to bells and chimes—how much more so to human beings!” 鐘鼓之聲，怒而擊之，則武；憂而擊之，則悲；喜而擊之，則樂。其意易，其聲亦易。意誠感之達於金石，而況人乎！This passage is preserved in two collectanea: *Taijing yulan* 575.4b (which cites *Shizi* as the source), and *Beitang shuchao* 108.2a (ascribed to *Yinwenzi* 尹文子). See also *Shizi* B.380b. “Xiuwen” 修文, *Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 19.497, places a near parallel in the mouth of Confucius. Cf. Lewis, *Sanctioned Violence in Early China*, 220.


83. “Yuelun,” *Xunzi jije* 14.20.380: “Music is what the Former Kings used to adorn their happiness; armies, brigades, hatchets, and halberds are what the Former Kings used to adorn their anger” 且樂者，先王之所以為喜也，軍旅鉞鋤者，先王之所以為怒也。

85. Following the commentary of Gao You, with the emendation proposed by Chen Changqi 陳昌齊 (1743–1820).

86. Compare the translations in Cook, “The Lüshi chunqiu and the Resolution of Philosophical Dissonance,” 338; DeWoskin, A Song for One or Two, 87f.; and Richard Wilhelm, Frühling und Herbst des Lü Bu We, 75.

87. Similarities between the conception of music in Lüshi chunqiu and that in Xunzi are observed in Numajiri, 61–73.

88. Following the commentary of Bi Yuan 畢沅 (1730–1797) and others.

89. “Dayue” 大樂, Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi 5.255.

90. Following the commentary of Gao You.

91. Following the commentary of Gao You.

92. Compare the translations in Cook, “The Lüshi chunqiu and the Resolution of Philosophical Dissonance,” 324ff.; Yimin Jiang, 169f.; DeWoskin, A Song for One or Two, 55ff.; and Richard Wilhelm, Frühling und Herbst des Lü Bu We, 56.

93. Cf. Puett, To Become a God, 174–175. See also “Mingli” 明理, Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi 6.357–359. Such ideas are adumbrated in the Guoyu (e.g., “Shan Mugong jian Jingwang zhu dazhong” 蘭穆公諫景王鑄大鍾, 3.128), which also reserves a central role for music in the regular order of nature, though without subscribing to a rigidly materialistic system. Cf. Schaberg, A Patterned Past, 113ff.; and James Hart.

94. Major, Heaven and Earth in Early Han Thought, 112.

95. Following the commentary of Wang Niansun.

96. A quote from Laozi 42; Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 29.

97. There is an element of paronomasia here: except for the difference in tone, the words zhong 鐘 (bell) and zhong 種 (sow) would have been virtual homophones in Old Chinese, as they are today.

98. On the Five Phases generally, see Sivin, Traditional Medicine in Contemporary China, 70ff.; and Major, “Substance, Process, Phase.”

99. Compare the translation in Major, Heaven and Earth in Early Han Thought, 108–110. See also idem, “Celestial Cycles and Mathematical Harmonics,” 125ff.

100. For more on the “Tianwen” 天文 chapter, see esp. Major, Heaven and Earth in Early Han Thought, 55–139, which provides a translation and commentary of the entire text. Cf. also Taki, 17–54; Fung, 1, 396f.; Yang Molei; and Laloy, 514ff.


102. Xun 辛 and chang 常 are measures of distance (one chang is equivalent to two xun); both are to be understood as terrible misses for an archer. Cf. Vankeerberghen, The Huainanzi and Liu An’s Claim to Moral Authority, 190n.4.
103. See Ames, *The Art of Rulership*, 242n.40f., for classical sources of these two anecdotes. See also Yimin Jiang, 45ff.

104. See especially Lévi, “Quelques examples de détournement subversif de la citation dans la littérature classique chinoise,” 44–50.


106. Following the commentary of Yang Liang after the first appearance of the term shan 擔, *Xunzi jijie* 12.18.331.

107. Compare the translation in Knoblock, 3, 41.

108. Following the commentary of Chen Qiyue.


110. Following the suggestion of Creel, *Shen Pu-hai*, 365.

111. There is a similar passage later in the chapter: “When happiness and anger are formed in the heart and wishes and desires are apparent on the outside, then those who hold offices will depart from rectitude and flatter their superiors” 喜怒形於心，著[＝著]欲見於外，則守職者離正而阿上 (L. 9.299f.; S 9.15a). For the emendation of the 著 者 to 著 著, see the commentary of Wang Niansun.

112. See Ames, *The Art of Rulership*, for classical sources of these legends.

113. A quotation from *Laozi 54; Boshu Laozi jiaozhu*, 85.


115. Cf. especially Queen, 20f., with whose conclusions this chapter is fundamentally in agreement.

116. Shi ji 130.3289.

117. Cf. Roth, “Who Compiled the *Chuang-tzu*?” 83ff.; Zhang Shunhui, 5ff. and 302f.; and Dai Junren, 2, 892f. For an opposing view, see Queen, 10f.

7. Ban Zhao in Her Time and in Ours


2. Ayscough, 265.

4. Chen Dongyuan, 49f.
5. Van Gulik, 97.
6. Englert, 52 (“bedeuteten … eine gewaltige Last für die Frauen”).
7. Enoki, 11. He also holds the tenuous line that *Lienü zhuan* “is a description of actual behavior of Confucian women” (5).
10. Goldin, *Culture of Sex*, 99 ff. Ban Zhao’s invention of tradition seems to be in line with the general observation of the phenomenon in Hobsbawm, 4: “we should expect [the invention of tradition] to occur more frequently when a rapid transformation of society weakens or destroys the social patterns for which ‘old’ traditions had been designed, producing new ones to which they were not applicable, or when such old traditions and their institutional carriers and promulgators no longer prove sufficiently adaptable and flexible.”
11. In Swann, xiv, n. 12.
14. The originality of this idea has been overstated by scholars such as Mann and Hinsch; a similar argument was presented some years ago in a German publication that Chen does not cite: Fricker, 190 ff. and 273 ff.
16. Ibid., 254.
17. *Hou-Han shu* 84.2796.
18. Ibid., 84.2790.
19. As in “You adore me, attractive and yaotiao” 子慕子兮善窈窕, in “Shanggui” 山鬼, *ju ge* 九歌, *Chuci zhangju buzhu* 2.46. This line may be intended to recall “Guanju.”
21. In Swann, x. Swann describes and translates these fragments in toto (74–81 and 100–130).
22. Von Zach, 1, 133–135.
24. In Swann, xii.
8. Those Who Don’t Know Speak

1. E.g., Alan K. L. Chan, 1; and Mair, Tao Te Ching, xi.


3. This phenomenon is observed also in Clarke, 53.

4. Part of the problem may be the lingering misconception that the Chinese language is uniquely free of grammar and thus open to immediate and intuitive comprehension. For example, Northrop, 316, writes: “Sentences, furthermore, in Chinese are constructed by setting such purely individual symbols the one after the other in columns in the order in which the items which they denote in immediate experience are associated.” This statement is untrue—sentences in Chinese are constructed according to rules of syntax—and pernicious, insofar as it implies that as long as a reader is in tune with the appropriate “associations,” he or she can understand Chinese writing without bothering to learn the grammar. (Some of Northrop’s other assertions are even more absurd and call into question his familiarity with Chinese—as on p. 319, where he says that because the language is tonal, “if a person speaking Chinese becomes emotionally excited, thereby throwing his voice into a higher key than that required for the meaning which he desires to convey, he automatically says something having nothing to do with what he intended.”) Likewise such luminaries as Schweitzer, 177; Granet, Études sociologiques sur la Chine, 124–136; and Rosemont, “On Representing Abstractions in Archaic Chinese.” For a corrective discussion, see Saussy, Great Walls of Discourse and Other Adventures in Cultural China, 75–90; and cf. Harbsmeier, Language and Logic, 85 ff. Rosemont’s position is criticized pungently in Cikoski, 18 ff. According to Mair, “Ma Jianzhong and the Invention of Chinese Grammar,” 6, the notion that Chinese has no grammar may be traced in part to a faulty paradigm that considers only morphology, and not syntax, as “grammar.”

5. Li Yu, Jou Pu Tuan (trans. Richard Martin from the German version by Franz Kuhn). This has now been superseded by the masterful direct translation by Patrick Hanan.

6. It should be borne in mind that the same method informed a Laozi translation by no less a figure than Leo Tolstoy (1828–1910). Two standard works on the subject are Shifman, 41–50; and Bodde, Tolstoy and China, 20 ff. (See also the stringent review of the latter work by Boodberg, Selected Works of Peter A. Boodberg, 481–493.)

The first American writer to popularize the practice of attacking Chinese poetry with no knowledge of the language was Ezra Pound (1885–1972); see Durant, “Packaging the Tao,” 77. There is a vast bibliography on this issue; some basic works are Spence, 168 ff.; Kenner, esp. 192–231 and 445–459; Yip; Kennedy, Selected Works of George A. Kennedy, 443–462; and Achilles Fang. Pound’s eminence
has prompted as fine a scholar as Sauss to concede that this poet has taught English speakers “what to look for, what to value, what to avoid” in Chinese poetry (Great Walls of Discourse, 62).


8. On Le Guin’s lifelong involvement with Daoism, see Herman, “Daoist Environmentalism in the West.”

9. Kiang, the author of several books in Chinese and English, was a former secretary of Yuan Shikai 袁世凱 (1859–1916) who was forced to flee China after denouncing his usurpatory employer. Byner met Kiang in 1918, when they were both on the faculty at the University of California at Berkeley. Kiang later returned to China and accepted the position of Minister of Education in the puppet state of Manchukuo. He was imprisoned afterward and is thought to have died in jail on December 6 or 7, 1954. See Byner, Chinese Translations, 3–12.


11. Mitchell, x. After the introduction, Mitchell’s book ceases to be paginated, so it will be cited below by chapter number.

12. Compare the review by Eoyang, 492; and further LaFargue, 256 f. and 273 n. 3. The notion that Eastern philosophies—Daoism and Buddhism in particular—are essentially interchangeable seems to be widespread in popular writing; e.g., Capra, 19: “Although [Hinduism, Buddhism, and Taoism] comprise a vast number of subtly interwoven spiritual disciplines and philosophical systems, the basic features of their worldview are the same.”

13. The archaeological discovery of the Guodian Laozi in 1993 has only complicated what was already a knotty problem. See Allan and Williams; and Henricks, Lao Tzu’s Tao Te Ching.


15. Miles, vii.

16. For the case of Byner, who relied on at least fourteen different published translations, see Lattimore, 311 ff.; also Byner, Selected Letters, 178 f.


19. Tao Te Ching, 60.

20. Lao-tzu Te-Tao Ching, 54. Also Carus and Suzuki, 75: “Merit he accomplishes, but he does not dwell on it. Since he does not dwell on it, it will never leave him”; and John C. H. Wu, 5: “He accomplishes his task, but does not dwell upon it. And yet it is just because he does not dwell on it that nobody can ever take it away from him.”

21. See the notes in Bashu Laozi jiaozhu, 233.

22. Wing-tsit Chan, The Way of Lao Tzu (Tao-te ching), 101. Chan may have been influenced by Blakney, 54: “As he succeeds, he takes no credit. And just
because he does not take it, credit never leaves him.” (Chan knew Blakney’s translation and referred to it throughout his notes.) Lau, Lao Tsu, 58, is similar: “It accomplishes its task yet lays claim to no merit. It is because it lays claim to no merit that its merit never deserts it.”

23. Mitchell renders the relevant passage in chapter 2 as “When her work is done, she forgets it. That is why it lasts forever.”

24. Miles, 123.
27. Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 169 ff.

29. Henricks, Lao-tzu Te-Tao Ching, 40, renders it more clearly: “To think you have no rival is to come close to losing my treasures.” “My treasures,” on this interpretation, are compassion 慈, frugality 儉, and not presuming to be the leader of the world 不敢為天下先, enumerated in chapter 67, Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 160.

30. Le Guin, 89.
32. Here and following, Chan’s translation is used as a baseline for two reasons: it is the most literal, and Mitchell, Miles, and Le Guin all reveal their indebtedness to it. My reliance on Chan for this purpose in no way implies that his is the only acceptable translation.

33. Chan, The Way of Lao Tsu, 116. He notes that wei 为 and zhi 知 are inverted in several editions, so the phrases that he has translated as “without knowledge” and “without taking any action” could be transposed.

34. Miles, 36.
35. Le Guin, 13.
37. Cf. LaFargue and Pas, 284. Some scholars, such as Hardy, 181–185, grant that popular interpretations of Daoism, though they may represent “bad scholarship,” may still be valuable as “good religion” in their own right.


40. Chinese Translations, 351.
43. Thus Hinton, 894. My example from chapter 51, below, is also taken from this review. Ames, “Putting the Te back into Taoism,” 121–151, contends that even
specialists have neglected to account for de in studies of Daoist philosophy. There is even a translation by a native speaker of Chinese that deletes de from the title of the book: Wang Keping, The Classic of the Dao.


45. For a judicious discussion, see Ivanhoe, “The Concept of de (‘Virtue’) in the Laozi.”

46. Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 72.


48. Mitchell, x.

49. Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 8 ff.


51. Waley, The Way, 191, might also have been Mitchell’s inspiration: “Were it not that the ten thousand creatures can bear their kind, they would soon become extinct.” Cf. also John C. H. Wu, 79: “If the ten thousand creatures were not reproductive, they would be likely to come to extinction”; and, most recently, Ivanhoe, The Daodejing of Laozi, 42: “If the myriad creatures lacked what made them flourish they might become extinct.” The Chinese term mie 規, “to annihilate, to exterminate,” can have the sense of extinguishing a clan or nation but not normally that of making a species extinct—an idea that is probably anachronistic.

52. Mitchell’s translation evinces a pronounced fondness for green causes, and at times such allusions are forced into the text in purposefully jarring language. E.g., chapter 46: “When a country is in harmony with the Tao, the factories make trucks and tractors. When a country goes counter to the Tao, warhead are stockpiled outside the cities.”


54. Boshu Laozi jiaozhu, 237.

55. Compare the review by Ann-Ping Chin, 38.

56. Le Guin, 111.


59. Le Guin, 34.

60. Ibid., 114 f. Compare the review by Herman, 687; and idem, “Daoist Environmentalism in the West,” 398.

61. Van Norden, “Method in the Madness of the Laozi,” 203, remarks that we can appreciate the value of the Daode jing while still recognizing that it “expresses a synoptic vision which we would be ill-advised to adopt.”

62. All rankings cited below were obtained on March 7, 2002.

63. See, for example, McDowell.

64. With this addition, Penguin Putnam now offers four competing translations under different imprints: Blakney; Lau; Richard Wilhelm, Tao Te Ching;
and, with the most presumptuous title, Jonathan Star, *Tao Te Ching: The Definitive Edition*.

Blakney’s qualifications are also dubious; he was a missionary in Fuzhou 福州 in the 1920s but does not seem to have had any specialized training in classical Chinese. His avowed methodology yields speciously fluid prose: “It is my belief that a finished translation should be free of all traces of the original language, especially when they mar English diction. If parts of the original are obdurately obscure, it is better, it seems to me, to omit them rather than to carry the obscurity over into English” (x). Blakney’s understanding of *ziran* is criticized in Liu Xiaogan, “Naturalness (*Tsu-jan*), the Core Value in Taoism,” 212.

65. All the reviews can be found on the appropriate pages of Amazon’s website.