

Chapter 5

The Odes in Excavated Manuscripts

Martin Kern

子曰：書不盡言，言不盡意。然則聖人之意，其不可見乎。子曰：聖人立象以盡意，設卦以盡情偽，繫辭焉以盡其言，變而通之以盡利，鼓而舞之以盡神。

The Master said: "Writing does not fully express the words; words do not fully express the ideas." As this is so, can the ideas of the sages not be discerned? The Master said: "The sages established the images to fully express their ideas, they arranged the hexagrams to fully express what is genuine and what is fabricated, they appended statements to these to fully express their words, they let them transform and be continuous to fully express their benefit, they drummed and danced them to fully express their spirituality."

Zhou Yi 周易, "Xici zhuan" 繫辭傳

Introduction

The present study is a preliminary step toward a full account of the *Odes* (Shi 詩) quotations and discussions in the texts from Guodian 郭店 tomb 1 (Jingmen 荊門, Hubei; tomb sealed ca. 300 B.C.E.), Mawangdui 馬王堆 tomb 3 (Changsha 長沙, Hunan; tomb sealed 168 B.C.E.), and Shuanggudui 雙古堆 tomb 1 (Fuyang 阜陽, Anhui; tomb sealed 165 B.C.E.). The exact identity and status of the Guodian tomb occupant is still unclear; the Mawangdui tomb belongs to the family of Li Cang 李蒼 (d. 185 B.C.E.), who was ennobled as Marquis of Dai 戴 and appointed as Chancellor of the principedom of Changsha in the early years of the Han dynasty. The Shuanggudui tomb belongs to Xiahou Zao 夏侯臯 (d. 165 B.C.E.), the Marquis of Ruyin 汝陰. In addition to manuscripts from these known

places, another large corpus of Chu bamboo strips, probably dating from the late fourth century B.C.E., was purchased by the Shanghai Museum on the Hong Kong antique market in 1994. The first volume of their publication contains two manuscripts with quotations from the *Odes*.¹

Compared to the received Mao 毛 tradition of the *Odes*, the textual fragments and quotations unearthed from these tombs provide us with a host of textual variants that in some instances may challenge the traditional reading of certain songs. In a first analytic step, the variants need to be determined as either graphic or lexical. In another step, the *Odes* quotations—whether or not including any variants—need to be considered as proof texts in the Guodian and Mawangdui manuscripts where they are embedded in a larger argument of expository prose. As Mark Edward Lewis has pointed out, such quotations of the hallowed songs not only sanctioned the truth claims made in their embedding text; their potential ambiguity was in turn “eliminated through the insertion of quotations into arguments that indicated how the verses were to be read.”²

The present study does not aim at a comprehensive semantic discussion of excavated *Odes* fragments, nor will it pursue the thorough interpretation of individual passages that differ from the received tradition, or even discuss the fascinating issue of early *Odes* interpretation in general, onto which the newly excavated manuscripts have opened new perspectives. As a necessary preliminary to such more ambitious endeavors,³ I will discuss individual *Odes* variants from Guodian, Mawangdui, and the Shanghai Museum in a merely technical way, comparing them with their transmitted counterparts and with each other. As the fragments from Shuanggudui are far more numerous, and as they have already received scholarly attention,⁴ I will draw on their individual variants only occasionally. Nevertheless, their overall statistics will be presented in order to put the phenomenon of *Odes* variants in a broader perspective. Undoubtedly, new manuscript finds will further help to refine the preliminary results I can present here; with the *Odes* being the most frequently invoked text in both the received literature from early China and excavated manuscripts, we can be fully confident of obtaining many more quotations and variants from future text finds.

The broader suggestions that I will derive from the following examination of the *Odes* fragments concern the nature of the anthology, the issue of oral and written transmission, the status of the written text, and—finally and briefly—the relation between text and ritual in early China. They are, needless to say, tentative. At this moment in the history of early China studies, it seems quite unwise to offer sweeping statements on these

issues, as any new textual find may substantially alter the picture. This, however, does not mean that we have nothing to say; with the evidence from the *Odes* quotations in the Guodian, Mawangdui, Shuanggudui, and Shanghai Museum manuscripts, certain hypotheses seem more persuasive than others. As I will argue, the *Odes* fragments from these various sites help us to reconsider some assumptions about the transmission of the *Odes*, most notably the idea that by the early second century B.C.E.—not to speak of the late fourth century B.C.E.—there was a more or less standardized written version of the *Odes*, shared among the cultural elite.⁵ This widely held assumption itself is related to certain claims concerning the cultural status of writing in early China, claims that deserve to be checked against the mounting evidence from recent manuscript finds.⁶

The problem of *Odes* variants is, of course, well known already from transmitted texts and has been dealt with in both traditional and modern scholarship. While the Mao 毛 recension (*Mao Shi zhuan* 毛詩傳) survives—probably only more or less intact—in Zheng Xuan’s 鄭玄 (127–200) *Mao Shi zhuan jian* 毛詩傳箋⁷ and has been transmitted in remarkably stable condition, it also has since late Eastern Han times largely eclipsed competing versions of the *Odes*. Only indirectly, through *Odes* quotations in various early texts, do scholars get occasional glimpses at some of the other recensions that were circulating in Western Han times but were mostly lost after the Eastern Han, notably those of the “three scholarly lineages” (*san jia* 三家) of the *Odes*, *Han Shi* 韓詩, *Qi Shi* 齊詩, and *Lu Shi* 魯詩. Nearly thirty titles of Western Han exegetical works associated with one of these three or with the Mao recension are known by their titles, but apart from the Mao version, only Han Ying’s 韓嬰 (fl. ca. 150 B.C.E.) *Han Shi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳⁸ has survived. Exegetical works associated with the *Qi Shi* and the *Lu Shi*—both named after the regions of their origin—have perished altogether. However, with the *Odes* being the most intensely and widely quoted text of Warring States and Han times, a plethora of citations in received texts is available. These *Odes* fragments show not only a certain number of textual differences but in some instances also significantly different interpretations.⁹ Several Qing scholars have collected and studied both the textual variants and the exegetical differences, with the three most comprehensive works being those by Li Fusun 李富孫 (1764–1843),¹⁰ Chen Qiacong 陳喬樞 (1809–1869),¹¹ and Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (1842–1918).¹² In addition to *Odes* quotations that can be identified with songs in the received *Mao Shi* corpus, a number of texts, or fragments of them, are quoted as *Odes* in transmitted texts but do not have counter-

parts in the *Mao Shi*. These are usually labeled “lost odes” (*yi shi* 逸詩), and are assembled in several Ming and Qing compilations and studied mainly in relation to the traditional claim, first advanced by Sima Qian 司馬遷 (145–ca. 85 B.C.E.), that Confucius compiled the *Odes* anthology from a ten-times-larger corpus of songs.

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

The distribution of *Odes* passages in the manuscripts from Shuanggudui, Mawangdui, Guodian, and the Shanghai Museum is as follows:

1. The more than 170 bamboo strip fragments from Shuanggudui carry passages of sixty-five songs known from the *guofeng* 國風 section and four songs known from the *xiaoya* 小雅 section of the Mao recension.¹³ Songs from all but one of the fifteen *guofeng* subsections are represented (only “Gui feng” 檜風 songs are missing), and the titles given for both songs and sections match those of the received Mao version. However, from their substantial textual variants as well as from an apparently different order of the songs it seems clear that the Shuanggudui version of the *Odes* cannot be related to any of the four known Western Han recensions;¹⁴ it may represent another, hitherto unknown, scholarly lineage in the reception of the *Odes*.¹⁵

2. In a section that has been labeled “Wu xing” 五行 (Five forms of conduct; sometimes also “De xing” 德行 [Virtuous conduct]), the Mawangdui silk manuscript contains textual fragments of seven *Odes*—four of them known from the *guofeng*, two from the *daya* 大雅, and one from the *Shang song* 商頌 section of the Mao text.¹⁶ Structurally, the Mawangdui “Wu xing” text consists of a short basic text and its much

longer explications. This textual organization is known from some transmitted texts as a division of *jing* 經 (canon) and *shuo* 說 (explanation), and it accounts for certain repetitions among the *Odes* quotations in the “Wu xing” silk manuscript. In some cases, the interpretation of the *Odes* in the *shuo* passages differs radically from the Mao exegesis.¹⁷ The earlier “Wu xing” bamboo manuscript from Guodian includes only the *jing* portion of the text and occasionally has shorter *Odes* quotations; it hence does not contain the repeated quotes in the *shuo* section, nor does it have a quotation of “Guan ju” 關雎 (which appears only in the *shuo* part of the Mawangdui manuscript).¹⁸

3. The “Zi yi” 緇衣 (Black robes) bamboo manuscript from Guodian, a different version of the text of this name that forms a chapter in the received *Liji* 禮記, contains text fragments of seventeen *Odes*—three from the *guofeng* (in altogether four quotations), eight from the *xiaoya* (nine quotations), five from the *daya* (nine quotations), and one that has no parallel in the Mao recension and should therefore be regarded as a “lost ode.” Another version of the “Zi yi” is among the Shanghai Museum strips; as its text matches that of the Guodian “Zi yi,” it includes all of the *Odes* quotations found in the latter.

4. A discussion of the *Odes* appears in a highly fragmentary manuscript among the Shanghai Museum strips that the editors have labeled “Kongzi shilun” 孔子詩論 (Confucius’s discussion of the *Odes*). A text of slightly more than one thousand characters on parts of twenty-nine bamboo strips, this manuscript mentions three pieces from the *Zhou song* 周頌, five from the *daya*, twenty-one from the *xiaoya*, twenty-three from the *guofeng* (here called *bangfeng* 邦風),¹⁹ and seven titles not found in the present anthology. Nine of the known songs and one unknown song are quoted directly.²⁰

This distributional picture is related to the different nature of the manuscripts under consideration: the “Kongzi shilun” is devoted to a discussion of the *Odes* and suggests the existence of a relatively fixed corpus not too different from the received anthology. The Shuanggudui manuscript is undoubtedly a copy of the *Odes* anthology, or of a partial version of it. It includes notes on the number of characters for individual songs as well as for the individual sections of the *guofeng*. The textual unit according to which the songs were written on the bamboo strips was not the whole song but the single stanza (*zhang* 章).²¹ Stanzas of up to eleven lines were mostly written on one strip, and characters were written in smaller script if a certain number of them had to be accommodated on a single strip. For

stanzas with up to only six lines in length, the lower part of the strip was left blank; for stanzas with twelve or more lines, the characters were evenly distributed over two strips. It is difficult to draw conclusions from the fact that the Shuanggudui bamboo fragments include only passages from a large number of *guofeng* songs in addition to four *xiaoya* pieces. Considering the very poor condition of these excavated bamboo fragments, one might suspect that the other parts of the anthology have simply vanished over time. Yet as no fragment from the *daya* and *song* 頌 sections is among the surviving fragments, one would then perhaps have to assume either (a) that the different sections *guofeng*, *xiaoya*, *daya*, and *song* were buried somewhat separately from one another and were therefore subject to different environmental conditions, or (b) that the *daya* and *song* corpora were not part of the text buried at Shuanggudui.

By contrast, the *Odes* passages in the “Wu xing” and “Zi yi” manuscripts from Guodian, Mawangdui, and the Shanghai Museum are embedded as quotations into a continuous textual framework. In these manuscripts, the *Odes* do not stand on their own but serve to support—apparently due to the traditional authority with which they were imbued—particular arguments made in the surrounding text. This citation practice is identical to that in transmitted pre-imperial and early imperial texts.

While the *Odes* fragments appear thus in three different types of texts, I believe it is still possible to discuss them together because (a) they belong to the same written context of elite tombs where they represent the same type of traditional learning; (b) in the Shanghai Museum manuscript corpus, two of the three types appear together; and (c) both the *Odes* anthology (as from Shuanggudui) and the texts that include *Odes* quotations are not occasional writings but written instantiations of texts with a history of transmission (received in the case of the “Zi yi,” not received in that of the “Wu xing”). I thus assume that these writings were produced under similar circumstances. The philological analysis of the *Odes* quotations in these different types of manuscripts, presented below, seems to confirm this a priori assumption: all manuscripts show the same kind and distribution of textual variation in the writing of the *Odes*.

The Odes and Their Textual Variants in Tomb Manuscripts: Distribution, Patterns, Issues

The *Odes* texts proper of the Shuanggudui fragments—if we leave the accompanying notes on the respective sections and on the number of their characters aside—include 820 characters; of these, 220, or 26.8%, are with certainty textual variants.²² The actual number of character variants might be substantially higher since on the badly damaged bamboo strips, 212 of the 820 characters are only partly legible; in 63 of these cases, the character fragments contain clear evidence of variants, and only these I have included among the overall number of 220. Theoretically, all the remaining 149 character fragments could equally contain some variant elements. To be accurate, we should therefore note that the 820 characters, compared to the Mao recension, contain between 220 (26.8%) and 369 (45%) variants. By contrast, the fragments from the Han, Qi, and Lu recensions, as far as they are known from quotations in other transmitted texts, altogether contain no more than 18 variants (2.2%) for the same body of texts.²³

The *Odes* quotations in the “Wu xing” manuscripts from Mawangdui contain 158 characters, 50 (31.6%) of which are textual variants compared to the Mao version. For the same body of quotations, the *san jia* fragments contain 5 (3.2%) variants. Of the 158 characters from the Mawangdui silk text, 50 also occur on the bamboo strips of the Guodian “Wu xing” chapter, now including 18 (36%) variants; for these 50 characters occurring in the Guodian “Wu xing,” the *san jia* texts have 2 (4%) variants. All Guodian variants differ from both the Mao text and the Mawangdui manuscript.

The “Zi yi” manuscript from Guodian contains 193 characters of *Odes* quotations, with 70 (36.3%) differing from their counterparts in the Mao text; in addition it has one complete line of “Du ren shi” 都人士 (Mao 225) not found in the received text. The *san jia* fragments of the same texts contain 12 (6.8%) variants. However, the *san jia* variants are partly included in the “Zi yi” chapter of the *Liji*, which is traditionally considered to belong to a Qi lineage of scholarship and textual production; its *Odes* quotations are therefore taken to represent the *Qi Shi*.

The more fragmentary Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” has only 157 characters of *Odes* quotations, including 67 (42.7%) variants. In addition, one character in “Wen wang” 文王 (Mao 235) is missing, as are particles in two of four lines from “Yi” 抑 (Mao 256), resulting in a trisyllabic—instead of the usual tetrasyllabic—meter. As the bamboo strips are intact in each of these passages, the characters are genuinely missing in the manuscript.

TABLE 5.1

<i>Manuscript text</i>	<i>Number of characters</i>	<i>Number of variants</i>	<i>Variants in %</i>	<i>San jia variants in %</i>
Shuanggudui <i>Odes</i>	820	220-369	26.8-45.0	2.2
Mawangdui "Wu xing"	158	50	31.6	3.2
Guodian "Wu xing"	50	18	36.0	4.0
Guodian "Zi yi"	193	70	36.3	6.2
Shanghai Museum "Zi yi"	157	67	42.7	7.6
Shanghai Museum "Kongzi shilun"	64	26	40.6	3.1

The "Kongzi shilun" has *Odes* quotations of 64 characters with 26 (40.6%) variants. In four more cases of "Yuan qiu" 宛丘 (Mao 136) and "Yi jie" 猗嗟 (Mao 106), particles are eliminated, again resulting in a trisyllabic meter. The statistics of the *Odes* manuscript fragments under discussion are summarized in Table 5.1; the reference recension against which variants are defined is the received Mao text.

It is difficult to decide to which extent the fragmentary data from the *san jia* recensions are comparable to those from the manuscripts. In attributing a particular quotation to one of the three recensions, the Qing scholars in many cases were offering but educated guesses, not hard evidence.²⁴ As we are not always sure that a given variant indeed reflects a distinct Lu, Qi, or Han reading, we also cannot claim that our fragmentary evidence comprises all cases of textual differences in these versions. Moreover, as noted above, earlier editors very likely have already normalized most of the *san jia* quotations according to the text of the dominant Mao recension. Despite these uncertainties and possibly severe distortions of the actual character/variant ratios on the side of the *san jia* texts, some observations are still valid and relevant.

First, while it seems unreasonable to assume that all the characters from Shuanggudui that are only partially legible were indeed textual variants, it would be equally abnormal if all of them were in coherence with

the Mao recension. A ratio of variants somewhere in the middle between the two extremes of 26.8% and 45% would fall right into the range of the *Odes* quotations in the Mawangdui, Guodian, and Shanghai Museum manuscripts.

Second, all manuscript fragments, regardless of whether they come from the late fourth or the second century B.C.E., are orthographically by and large equally distant from the Mao recension, from the *san jia*, and—with one important exception²⁵—from one another. That, according to Ban Gu 班固 (32-92), "the *Odes* remained complete after encountering the Qin [bibliocaust of 213 B.C.E.] because they were recited [from memory] and not only [written] on bamboo and silk"²⁶ is of no particular relevance in this context. Later scholars have referred to Ban Gu's account to explain the textual differences among the four known Han recensions as resulting from the oral transmission of the *Odes* in early Western Han times,²⁷ an argument that Baxter has extended to the Shuanggudui manuscript evidence.²⁸ I would, however, not be surprised if the next find of a pre-imperial manuscript with *Odes* fragments exhibited versions very different from those of the Guodian and Shanghai Museum manuscripts—meaning that the written text of the *Odes* was as unstable before the bibliocaust as it was immediately thereafter. Since the bibliocaust aimed at collecting and burning the "*Odes, Documents* (Shu 書), and sayings of the hundred lineages (*bai jia yu* 百家語)"²⁹ that were circulating outside the imperial court,³⁰ their existence in a plurality of written copies—and perhaps more precisely: written copies of a plurality of teaching traditions—is obviously implied.

Third, the overall factor of textual variants (compared to the Mao recension) in the excavated manuscripts is about ten times higher than the same factor in all three *san jia* recensions taken together. The manuscript evidence from both the late fourth and the mid-second century B.C.E.—that is, before and after the bibliocaust—shows us quite drastically the extent to which the *Odes* could differ in their written form. In light of this evidence, we can no longer uphold the traditional view that the transmitted *san jia* fragments are representing mutually independent oral traditions in their pristine condition. Considering (a) the archaic language of the *Odes* combined with (b) the enormous number of homophonous words in early Chinese, the relatively few variants in the *san jia* fragments cannot represent all the differences that would have resulted from three mutually independent oral traditions. We are therefore left with one of two possible scenarios: the known variants are either mere remnants of originally far more diverging texts, or they reflect the fact that the four recensions were never mutually

independent writings to begin with and may instead have adhered to a single—presumably the early imperial—standard. In fact, the two alternatives are not mutually exclusive: even if the traditionally known Western Han versions of the *Mao shi* and the *san jia* represented a by and large unified imperial text, the manuscript evidence still forces us to assume an overall retrospective standardization of the numerous *Odes* quotations throughout Eastern Zhou and early imperial texts. The only question is whether we assign this standardization already to Western Han or only to post-Eastern Han times, after the *Mao* recension had finally gained its dominance.³¹

Fourth, the fact that all *Odes* variants in the Guodian “Wu xing” manuscript differ from their Mawangdui “Wu xing” counterparts, and that the two cases where the Shuanggudui fragments overlap with Mawangdui citations are again different, suggests that these quotations do not reflect a written transmission of the *Odes* common to any two of the three texts. This point is significant given the relations of proximity in time, space, and contents: on the one hand, the Mawangdui “Wu xing” text is clearly an elaborated version of its Guodian counterpart, and the Mawangdui, Guodian, and Shuanggudui sites belong to the same southern cultural geography of the old state of Chu. On the other hand, the tombs of Mawangdui and Shuanggudui are chronologically separated by no more than a few years. As noted above, it is not clear how the Shanghai Museum strips fit into this picture. They certainly come from the old region of Chu, and they are probably contemporaneous with the Guodian strips. As long as we may suspect that the Guodian and Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” texts are actually retrieved from the same site and are therefore not mutually independent, we have to refrain from speculating on what their differences and similarities actually entail.

The manuscripts under consideration contain different kinds of variants, compared to one another and to their transmitted counterparts. In recognizing such variants, it is not significant whether a text is written in a particular local or regional calligraphic form (e.g., what is summarily called the Chu 楚 script of the manuscripts under discussion) as long as scholars can confidently identify the various graphic elements and transcribe them into standard *kaishu* 楷書 forms.³² In general, we see cases of graphic or lexical variation that can be rationalized on either phonological or semantic grounds. There also are what seem to be downright scribal errors as well as textual differences that resist plausible explanation. Some types of textual variants are more interesting than others or more elucidating in terms of

how to understand the respective *Odes* line; but all are the results of textual production and follow the same regularities—and irregularities—of this production in early China.

In the *Odes* quotations under discussion, variants based on homophony or near-homophony are by far the most numerous ones, and among these, graphic variants that differ only with respect to their semantic classifiers are again the majority. However, at this point of the analysis, it is not possible to determine in every single case whether we are dealing with a lexical or a graphic variant. In general, the fact that two characters belong to the same *xiesheng* 諧聲 (“homophonophoric”) series means that in the overwhelming majority of cases, the two graphs represent homophonous or near-homophonous words and can therefore be used paronomastically for each other.³³ This does not rule out the possibility that they are in fact lexical variants,³⁴ but within the confines of the present study, I will provisionally treat variants that occur within a given *xiesheng* series as graphic variants, representing the same or nearly the same sound and writing the same word. This is but a pragmatic way to illustrate the distribution of different variant types in our manuscripts and does not entail claims on their semantic interpretation; indeed, it should be expected that this largest group of variants in our manuscripts also includes some, though not many (see my argument below), cases that ultimately will be better interpreted as lexical variants.

Bearing this basic qualification in mind, the following survey is limited to discussing the Guodian, Mawangdui, and Shanghai Museum *Odes* variants that occur outside *xiesheng* series; I will not list the plethora of variants—indeed the great majority of all variants—that occur within the same *xiesheng* series. Only where they occur in the same line with other variants will they be mentioned in passing. The following example from the Guodian (strip 3) and Shanghai Museum (strip 2) “Zi yi” manuscripts may demonstrate the distinction:

“Xiao ming” 小明 (Mao 207):

Mao:	靖共爾位，好是正直。
Guodian “Zi yi”:	情共尔立，好氏貞植。
Shanghai Museum “Zi yi”:	靜彝尔立，好是正植。
Liji “Zi yi”:	靖共爾位，好是正直。

Wang Xianqian notes that the Qi version has 靖恭 for Mao 靖共, and in one case 靜共; the Han version has 靜恭 or 靖恭. It is clear that 靖, 靜,

and 情, on the one hand, and 共, 恭, and 龔 (龔), on the other, share the same *xiesheng* series and are therefore homophonous or near-homophonous. The same is true for Guodian and Shanghai Museum 立 as a variant of Mao 位 and for Guodian and Shanghai Museum 植 as a variant of Mao 直. All these variants can be attributed to the simple fact that, by Western Han times, the semantic classifiers were still not yet fixed in the writing system. In addition, Guodian and Shanghai Museum 尔 for 爾 reflects merely a different writing convention, as is Shanghai Museum 𠄎 for 好.³⁵ However, Guodian has two more variants that cannot be explained in this way: 氏 [*gji?] for 是 [*dji?] and 貞 [*trjin] for 正 [*tjinɣ]. In both cases, the graphs bear no relation to each other but represent near-homophonous words and therefore can be used paronomastically.³⁶

The order in which I discuss the individual *Odes* fragments generally follows their sequence in the manuscripts; I group only different quotations from the same *Ode* together with their first instance. My reconstructions of Old Chinese are based on Li Fang-kuei's 李方桂 system with Schuessler's emendations.³⁷ To determine whether or not two graphs could be used paronomastically, I take as a basis the principles laid out by Karlgren: the two graphs must normally represent words that (a) belong to the same *Odes* rhyme group and (b) have homorganic initials.³⁸ As noted by Karlgren and further discussed by Boltz,³⁹ textual evidence forces us to allow occasional exceptions for both principles, but these can be determined only on a case-by-case basis.

The Textual Variants in Guodian and Shanghai Museum "Zi yi" Odes Quotations

"Wen wang" 文王 (Mao 235)

Mao:	萬邦作孚	
Guodian:	萬邦乍孚	(strip 2)
Shanghai:	萬邦復反	(strip 1)
Liji "Zi yi":	萬國作孚	

While 萬 / 萬 and 作 / 乍 / 復 are *xiesheng* series variants, Liji 國 for 邦 may represent a later change due to the tabooed 邦 after 195 B.C.E. (see note 19 above). 孚 [*phju; "to trust"] and 反 ([服] *bjæk; "to submit") do not share the same rhyme group and are also quite different graphs in Chu script. Instead, they may represent two different lexical choices.

Mao: 於緝遐敬止

Guodian:	於偁遐敬止	(strip 34)
Shanghai:	於幾義之	(strip 17)

熙 and 遐 are *xiesheng* variants. The Shanghai Museum manuscript genuinely lacks the graph 敬, as the bamboo strip is without physical damage here. While 緝 [*tshjəp] and 偁 are again *xiesheng* variants, 幾 [*kjə] is neither graphically, phonetically, nor semantically related. Similarly, 義 [*njajh] is unrelated to 熙 [*hjə]. However, 緝熙 [*tshjəp-hjə], also appearing in several other *Odes*, is a near-rhyming binome,⁴⁰ while 幾義 [*kjəj-njajh] is an alliterative one. The interchangeability of the particles 止 [*tjə?] and 之 [*tjə] is well attested. Karlgren notes that 之 originally was only a variant of 止 and calls the words behind the two graphs homophonous; Schuessler and Baxter note a difference in tone.⁴¹

"Shi jiu" 鴈鳩 (Mao 152)

Mao:	淑人君子	
Guodian:	𠄎人君子	(strips 4-5)
Shanghai:	𠄎人君子	(strip 3)

The variant 𠄎 for 淑 [*djəwk]—appearing twice in the Guodian and Shanghai Museum (see also below) "Zi yi" manuscripts—is phonetically grounded, as is 𠄎 for 淑 in a quotation from the same song in the Guodian "Wu xing" manuscript (see below). As Karlgren has noted,⁴² 𠄎 [*tiagwh] "is always used in the sense of" 叔 [*hnjəwk]. While the reconstructed pronunciations do not exactly fulfill the principles for loan graphs, textual evidence shows the interchangeability of the two graphs which in turn are the phonetics in 𠄎 and 淑. In the Shanghai Museum "Zi yi," 君子 is written as one character, that is, as a graphic contraction (*hewen* 合文).

Mao:	其儀一兮	
Guodian:	其義戎也	(strip 39)
Shanghai:	其義一也	(strip 20)
Liji "Zi yi":	其儀一也	

As also in other lines from the *Odes* (see below), the two particles 兮 [*gi?] and 也 [*ljaj?] are interchanged not because of any graphic or phonetic proximity but perhaps because of their function as merely rhythmic particles. 儀 and 義 belong to the same *xiesheng* series, as do 戎 and 一.⁴³

"Ban" 板 (Mao 254)

Mao:	下民卒瘵	
Guodian:	下民卒担	(strip 7)
Liji "Zi yi":	下民卒瘵	

The three variants 担, 瘳, and 瘳 are homophonous [*tanʔ]. Due to physical damage, the line is missing in the Shanghai Museum “Zi yi.”

“Jie nan shan”節南山 (Mao 191)

Mao:	不自為政	
Guodian:	不自為貞	(strip 9)
Shanghai:	正	(strip 5)
Liji “Zi yi”:	不自為正	

In the Shanghai Museum manuscript, only the last character of the line is preserved. As in the case of 正 [*tjɪŋh] / 貞 [*trjɪŋ] above, 政 [*tjɪŋh] and 貞 could be used paronomastically, with their words having homorganic initials and belonging to the same *Odes* rhyme group. The Liji “Zi yi” variant 正 (also in the Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” [strip 5]) belongs to the same *xiesheng* series as 政.

Mao:	赫赫師尹	
Guodian:	峩峩市尹	(strip 16)
Shanghai:	號號市尹	(strip 9)

The reduplicatives 峩峩 and 號號 are to be interpreted as 號號; 號 [*hərjak] and 赫 [*hərak] both belong to the rhyme group and have homorganic initials. Another phonetically related variant of the same reduplicative appears in a “Da ming” 大明 quotation in the Guodian and Mawangdui “Wu xing” manuscripts (see below). 師 [*srjəj] and 市 belong to the same *xiesheng* series.

Mao:	民具爾瞻	
Guodian:	民具尔瞻	(strip 16)
Shanghai:	民具尔詹	(strip 9)

While 瞻 [*tjam] and 瞻 are obvious *xiesheng* variants, 詹 may also be phonetically related. According to Duan Yucai’s 段玉裁 (1735–1815) commentary in the *Shuowen jiezi*, the phonetic in 詹 is 𠂔,⁴⁴ which would then account for 詹 as well.

“Yi” 抑 (Mao 256)

Mao:	有覺德行	
Guodian:	又夬惠行	(strip 12)
Shanghai:	又共惠行	(strip 7)
Liji “Zi yi”:	有梏德行	

又 for 有 is a mere writing convention, as is 惠 for 德. As for the second character of the line, the Shanghai Museum variant makes it clear that the very similar one in Guodian is to be read as 共. However, it seems

impossible to relate this to either the Mao recension or the Liji “Zi yi” (presumably representing the *Qi shi*). 覺 [*kərəwk] and 梏 [*kəwk], sharing the same rhyme group and having the same velar initial, are perfectly interchangeable. I assume that 共 [*gjuŋh] is to be taken as 恭 [*kjəwŋ], which then also shares the velar initial, the main vowel, and a related rhyme group. In this case, the Guodian and Shanghai Museum variants may give a new clue to the hitherto difficult interpretation of the second character.⁴⁵

Mao:	四國訓之	
Guodian:	四方恐之	(strip 12)
Shanghai:	四或川之	(strip 7)

While 訓 [*hjuəns] and 恐, as well as Liji “Zi yi” 順 [*mljuəns] and Shanghai Museum 川 [*khljuan], belong to the same *xiesheng* series, the relation between 方 [*pjan] and 國 [*kwək] is not phonetic but purely semantic (“regions”/“states”). By contrast, 或 [*gwək] is merely a *xiesheng* variant for 國.

Mao:	慎爾出話	
Guodian:	誓尔出話	(strip 30)

慎 [*djɪns] and 誓 [*djats] are neither phonetically nor graphically related; the variant 誓 (also as 訢) occurs quite regularly in Chu manuscripts, but its exact explanation is still awaited.⁴⁶ It might be to some extent based on semantic grounds (“cautious”/“solemn”). Due to physical damage, the present line is lost in the Shanghai Museum manuscript.

Mao:	敬爾威儀	
Guodian:	敬尔畏義	(strip 30)
Shanghai:	敬尔威義	(strip 16)

While 儀 [*ɲjaj] and 義 [*ɲjajh] belong to the same *xiesheng* series, 威 [*ʔjuəj] and 畏 [畏] [*ʔjuəjh] belong to the same rhyme group and have labio-laryngeal initials. In addition, one notes the semantic proximity of the two words (“to overawe”/“fearful”). In “Ji zui” 既醉 (Mao 247, see below), Guodian (but not Shanghai Museum) has again the variant 畏 for 威.

Mao:	淑慎爾止	
Guodian:	誓誓尔止	(strip 32)
Shanghai:	誓訢尔止	(strip 16)

On 淑 / 誓, see “Shi jiu” above; on 慎 / 誓 / 訢, see above.

Mao:	不愆于儀	
Guodian:	不侃于義	(strip 32)
Shanghai:	不侃	(strip 16)
Liji “Zi yi”:	不魯于義	

The Shanghai Museum manuscript is physically fragmentary here. 儀 / 義 is again the usual *xiesheng* series phenomenon. 佩 [*khan] and the *Liji* “Zi yi” variant 𠄎 belong to the same *xiesheng* series, while 𠄎 is traditionally glossed as representing the same word (“to transgress”) as 愆 [*khərjan]. Therefore, it seems that the Mao text follows a different writing convention, while the *Liji* “Zi yi” text and the Guodian and Shanghai Museum manuscripts differ only within the confines of a single *xiesheng* series. In any case, all three variants belong to the same rhyme group and have velar initials.

Mao:	白圭之玷	
Guodian:	白珪之石	(strip 35)
Shanghai:	白珪之砧	(strip 18)

While 圭 [*kwi] and 珪 [*kwi] as well as 玷 [*tiam?] and 砧 [*trjəm] belong to the same respective *xiesheng* series, 砧 and 石 [*djak] are graphically closely related, with the former only containing two more strokes. I suspect the Guodian version shows a scribal lapse here, as two lines later, the text includes the following parallel phrase:

Mao:	斯言之玷	
Guodian:	此言之砧	(strip 36)
Shanghai:	此言之砧	(strip 18)

Here, both Shanghai Museum and Guodian have 砧 for 玷, that is, a variant within a single *xiesheng* series; one may therefore suspect that in the earlier line, the Guodian scribe, perhaps accidentally, did not write the full form of the character. Mao 斯 [*sji] and Guodian and Shanghai Museum 此 [*?sji?] belong to the same rhyme group, have affricate initials, and are synonymous particles.

“Du ren shi” 都人士 (Mao 225)

Mao:	其容不改	
Guodian:	其頌不改	(strip 17)

Due to physical damage, the line is lost in the Shanghai Museum manuscript. 容 [*ljun] and 頌 [*sljunh] share the same rhyme group but do not have homorganic initials (dental vs. affricate). Nevertheless, their interchangeability—based on both semantic and phonetic grounds—is well attested, for example, in the Guodian “Xing zi ming chu” 性自命出 manuscript.⁴⁷

“Zheng yue” 正月 (Mao 192)

Mao:	執我仇仇	
------	------	--

Guodian:	執我戠戠	(strips 18–19)
Shanghai:	毅我戠戠	(strip 10)

It is not clear which word Guodian 戠 might represent, but any member of the 考 [*khəw?] *xiesheng* series would fulfill the phonetic criteria to serve as a loan character for Mao 仇 [*gjəw]. 毅 most likely belongs to the same *xiesheng* series as 執, with 幸 (GSR 685) as the phonetic. 戠 is to be interpreted as part of the 各 [*klak] *xiesheng* series. No relation to 仇 is apparent.

“Ju gong” 車攻 (Mao 179)

Mao:	允矣君子	
Guodian:	躬也君子	(strip 36)
Shanghai:	夔也君子	(strip 18)
<i>Liji</i> “Zi yi”:	允也君子	

The variant sequence 躬 / 允 [*ljjuən?] / 夔 [*tshjuən] is most likely phonetically related, with 允 and 夔 sharing the same *xiesheng* series. On strip 5 of the Guodian “Zi yi,” 躬 is used for 尹; in the parallel passage on strip 3 of the Shanghai Museum “Zi yi,” the character is again 夔. 允 and 尹 are listed in the same rhyme group (and may have been homophonous or near-homophonous); as argued by the Guodian editors, the phonetic in 躬 is 目.⁴⁸ Guodian, Shanghai Museum, and the *Liji* “Zi yi” have 也 [*ljaj?] for Mao 矣 [*ljə??]; in the language of the *Odes*, the two particles are interchangeable not on a phonetic basis but in (loose) semantic terms.

Mao:	展也大成	
Guodian:	廛也大成	(strip 36)
Shanghai:	畧也大成	(strip 18)

I follow Qiu Xigui’s reading for the first graph in the line as 廛 [*dran?], which, he argues, is “close in sound [to 展 (*trjan?) and therefore] interchangeable.”⁴⁹ No semantic relation is apparent. The Shanghai editors interpret 畧 as 則 [*tsək], which I find doubtful when comparing other instances of 則 in Chu script manuscripts.⁵⁰ 盛 and 成 belong to the same *xiesheng* series.

“Ge tan” 葛覃 (Mao 2)

Mao:	服之無斃	
Guodian:	備之亡憚	(strip 41)
Shanghai:	備之亡臭	(strip 21)
<i>Liji</i> “Zi yi”:	服之無射	

The variants 亡 / 無 [both *mja] simply reflect different writing

conventions. Guodian and Shanghai Museum 備 [*Gbǝk̥h; “to complete”] for 服 [*bjək; “to make”] might be lexical, although the two meanings are clearly related; however, on phonological grounds, the two graphs can as well have been used paronomastically. 斲 [*ljak] in Mao and 斲 [*ljak] in Guodian belong to the same *xiesheng* series; 射 [*ljak] in *Liji* “Zi yi” is homophonous with either one and well attested as a loan graph for 斲. By contrast, the Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” has 臭, which the Shanghai Museum editors declare to be “the same character” as 斲; more strictly, it is 罍 [*ljak] which belongs to the same *xiesheng* series.

“Lu ming” 鹿鳴 (Mao 161)

Mao:	示我周行	
Guodian:	旨我周行	(strip 42)
Shanghai:	覲我周行	(strip 21)

示 [*mgjǝjʔh; “to show”] and 旨 [指] [*kjǝjʔ; “to point”] share the same *Odes* rhyme group, have homorganic initials, and are semantically related. Shanghai Museum 覲 belongs to the same *xiesheng* series as 旨.

“Guan ju” 關雎 (Mao 1)

Mao:	君子好逑	
Guodian:	君子好戩	(strip 43)
Shanghai:	君子好坐	(strip 22)
<i>Liji</i> “Zi yi”:	君子好仇	

逑 [*gjǝw] and 仇 [*gjǝw] are homophonous and semantically related.⁵¹ For the phonetically related 戩, see “Zheng yue” above. Shanghai Museum 坐 is an unidentified character. 𠄎 is a different writing convention for 好.

“Ji zui” 既醉 (Mao 247)

Mao:	朋友攸攝	
Guodian:	𠄎友𠄎𠄎	(strip 45)
Shanghai:	𠄎𠄎𠄎𠄎	(strip 23)

The variants 𠄎 and 𠄎 for 朋 [*bǝŋ] and 𠄎 for 攝 [*hnjap] both belong to the same respective *xiesheng* series; 𠄎 [*nǝrǝp] is near-homophonous⁵² and in addition semantically related. 𠄎 [*ljǝw] and 攸 [*ljǝw] are semantically unrelated but homophonous.

Mao:	攝以威儀	
Guodian:	𠄎以𠄎義	(strip 45)
Shanghai:	𠄎以威義	(strip 23)

On the variant 𠄎義 for 威儀, see “Yi” above. The variants 攝 / 𠄎 / 𠄎 are as in the preceding line.

The evidence from the two “Zi yi” manuscripts can be briefly summarized as follows: the Guodian “Zi yi” manuscript contains twenty-six character variants⁵³ that do not occur in the same *xiesheng* series as their counterparts in the received tradition. Nineteen of these variants are unambiguously phonetically related and can be used paronomastically. Of the seven remaining cases, 國 / 方 are clearly semantically related, and 慎 / 誓 (twice) probably so; 矣 / 也 and 兮 / 也 are particles that might be primarily rhythmically motivated; 𠄎 / 允 awaits further clarification but is most likely phonetically based. Only 玷 / 石 can be interpreted as a scribal error; but 石 undoubtedly represents 玷 here, which in turn is in the same *xiesheng* series as 玷. There is no instance where a variant must be interpreted as an error that occurred in the process of copying the text from another written version. The Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” contains twenty-three variants outside the *xiesheng* series,⁵⁴ fifteen of which are phonetically related. The remaining cases are the binome 幾義 for 緝熙 (counted as two variants), the particle variants 也 / 兮 and 也 / 矣, the probably semantically related 斲 / 慎, the reduplicative 𠄎𠄎 / 仇仇, as well as the instances of 𠄎 / 展 and 坐 / 逑 where I consider the respective Shanghai Museum graph as unidentified.

The Textual Variants in Shanghai Museum

“Kongzi shilun” Odes Quotations

The non-*xiesheng* variants in the *Odes* quotations of the “Kongzi shilun” are relatively few.

“Lie wen” 烈文 (Mao 269)

Mao:	無競維人	
Shanghai:	乍競佳人	(strip 6)

While 維 / 佳 belong to the same *xiesheng* series, 乍 [作] [*tsak] and 無 [*mja] are phonetically unrelated. Traditional commentators have always interpreted 無 only as a rhetorical negative (“is he not . . . !”), that is, as an emphatic copula. This corresponds well with 乍 [作], and the Shanghai editors argue that because the two graphs 乍 [作] and 亡 [無] are similar, Mao 無 goes back to a copyist’s error.⁵⁵

“Huang yi” 皇矣 (Mao 241)

Mao: 予懷明德
Shanghai: 懷尔稟惠 (strip 7)

In the received text of this line, the god addresses King Wen 文 of Zhou 周 in direct speech. This understanding probably also underlies the Shanghai Museum line, yet the personal pronouns are exchanged: instead of “I cherish [your] shining virtuous power,” the line now reads “[I] cherish your shining virtuous power.” 稟 for 明 is a *xiesheng* variant; 惠 is a mere writing convention for 德.

“Yuan qiu” 宛丘 (Mao 136)

Mao: 洵有情兮
Shanghai: 旬有情 (strip 22)

As in the following line (not further discussed here), the Shanghai Museum manuscript does not include the final particle 兮, offering a trisyllabic line instead of the usual tetrasyllabic verse form. 旬 [*gwin] and 洵 [*səwjin] share the same rhyme group and have initial clusters that are to some extent related (labiovelar vs. labialized dental sibilant); I therefore interpret them as phonetically related.

“Yi jie” 猗嗟 (Mao 106)

Mao: 四矢反兮
Shanghai: 四矢奭 (strip 22)

For this line, the Han recension has 四矢變;⁵⁶ 反 [*mpjanʔ] and 變 [*pərjuans] belong to the same rhyme group and both have labial initials. As pointed out by the Shanghai Museum editors,⁵⁷ a bell inscription from the southern tomb of Marquis Yi of Zeng 曾侯乙 (Leigudun 擂鼓墩, Suizhou 隨州, Hubei), dated ca. 433 B.C.E., has 馥 for 變, apparently with 奭 as the phonetic. This suggests that 反 / 奭 are interchangeable on phonological grounds. Here as in the following line, the Shanghai Museum version does not include the final particle 兮, giving the line as trisyllabic.

“Shi jiu” 鴈鳩 (Mao 152)

Mao: 其儀一兮
Shanghai: 其義一氏 (strip 22)

The line appears also in the “Zi yi” and “Wu xing” manuscripts (see above and below). While 儀 [*ɲjaj] and 義 [*ɲjajh] are common *xiesheng* variants, 氏 [*giʔ] is interchangeable with 兮 [*giʔ] phonetically. In the following line of the same quotation, we see another variant:

Mao: 心如結兮
Shanghai: 心女結也 (strip 22)

Here, as in quotations in the “Zi yi” and “Wu xing” manuscripts, 兮 [*giʔ] is also interchangeable with the phonetically and graphically unrelated 也 [*ljajʔ]. This indicates a relatively loose use of these particles, perhaps mainly for rhythmic purposes.

Altogether, the *Odes* quotations in the Shanghai Museum “Kongzi shilun” include six non-*xiesheng* variants. Three of them can be analyzed phonologically. In addition, we see the particle variant 兮 / 也, the pronoun change from 予 to 尔, and the variant 無 / 乍, where the 無 of the received text may be regarded as a graphic error.

The Textual Variants in Guodian and Mawangdui “Wu xing” Odes Quotations

As above, I will discuss only those variants that are not simply deviations within the same *xiesheng* series.

“Cao chong” 草蟲 (Mao 14)

Mao: 亦既覯止
Guodian: 亦既詢止 (strip 10)
Mawangdui: 亦既詢之 (§ 5A)

On the variant 止 / 之, see “Wen wang” in the “Zi yi” manuscripts discussed above. The same variant occurs in another line of this *Odes* quotation in the Mawangdui manuscript, with 亦既見之 for 亦既見止. Wang Xianqian notes that 覯 [*kuh] in the Mao version should be read as the homophonous 遯 [*kuh; “to meet with”],⁵⁸ as it appears in the Lu version of the *Odes*. The Guodian and Mawangdui variants 詢 [*guʔ] and 詢 [*ku], which belong to one *xiesheng* series, are semantically unrelated, but phonetically interchangeable, with 遯.

Mao: 憂心懨懨
Mawangdui: 憂心投投 (§ 5A)

The reduplicatives 懨懨 [*trjuat-trjuat] and 投投 [*tuats-tuats] are semantically unrelated but have homorganic initials and belong to the same *Odes* rhyme group. In addition to quoting directly from “Cao chong,” the two manuscripts also paraphrase other lines of the same song. Here, the reduplicative 忡忡 [*thrjəwŋ-thrjəwŋ] of the Mao line 憂心忡忡 appears as

恫恫 [*tjəwŋ-tjəwŋ] in the Guodian texts (strip 12); as Wang Xianqian has noted, the Lu version had 憺憺 [*tjəwŋ-tjəwŋ], while the Qi version had 冲冲 [*drjəwŋ-drjəwŋ].⁵⁹ All these variants share the same rhyme group and have homorganic initials.

“Shi jiu” 鵙鵙 (Mao 152)

Mao:	淑人君子	
Guodian:	婁人君子	(strip 16)
Mawangdui:	叔人君子	(§ 7A)

叔 [*hnjəwk] and 淑 [*djəwk] belong to the same *xiesheng* series. For the phonologically acceptable variant 婁, see the note on the “Shi jiu” quotation in the “Zi yi” manuscripts above.

Mao:	其儀一兮	
Guodian:	其義罷也	(strip 16)
Mawangdui:	其宜一氏	(§ 7A)

For other quotations of this line, see above. The rarely used character 罷 is known only from excavated texts, beginning with an instance in a Shang oracle bone inscription.⁶⁰ In the Guodian corpus, it also appears twice on strip 8 of the “Taiyi sheng shui” 大一生水 manuscript, once on strip 18 of the “Cheng zhi wen zhi” 成之聞之 manuscript, and once on strip 25 of the “Yu cong 4” 語叢四 manuscript.⁶¹ The graph has further been identified on strip 200 of the “Bushu jidao jilu” 卜筮祭禱記錄 divination manuscript from Baoshan 包山 tomb 2. This tomb is located less than ten kilometers away from the Guodian site and dated between 323 and 316 B.C.E.; its similarity to Guodian tomb 1 has in fact been used to date the latter in the same period or only a few years later.⁶² In the “Bushu jidao jilu,” the Chinese editors of the bamboo strips have interpreted 罷 through a vague parallel from a *Guoyu* passage as 嗣 (“successor”)—a meaning that does not fit the present line of “Shi jiu.”⁶³ Another occurrence of 罷 is in the text of the E Jun Qi 鄂君啟 tallies, found in Shou Xian 壽縣 (Anhui) and dated 323 B.C.E.; here, a considerable variety of interpretations of the graph has been offered.⁶⁴ However, in the E Jun Qi, “Taiyi sheng shui,” and “Yu cong 4” texts, the reading of 罷 as 一 is probably the most persuasive choice. By contrast, the graph seems to be used as a loan for 能 in the Guodian “Cheng zhi wen zhi” manuscript. Most likely, the phonetic in 罷 is 能 [*nəŋ].⁶⁵ In the *Odes*, 能 rhymes with words of the rhyme category 之 (with final *-ə); 能 may thus also be reconstructed as *nəʔ.⁶⁶ However, this still cannot phonologically explain the use of 罷 for 一 [*ʔjit].

儀 [*ŋjaj] and 義 [*ŋjajh] belong to the same *xiesheng* series; 宜 [*ŋjaj] is homophonous with and semantically closely related to 儀. For the discussion of the final particles 氏 [*gjiʔ] / 兮 [*giʔ] / 也 [*ljajʔ], see the discussion of the line in the “Zi yi” and “Kongzi shilun” manuscripts above. The variant 氏 for 兮 occurs also in the following line from the same song:

Mao:	其子七兮	
Mawangdui:	其子七氏	(§ 7A)

“Yan yan” 燕燕 (Mao 28)

Mao:	燕燕子飛	
Mawangdui:	□□于蜚	(§ 7A)
Mawangdui:	嬰嬰于罪	(§ 7B)
Shuanggudui:	匱匱于非	(strips 21, 23)

The line is quoted twice in the Mawangdui manuscript. 蜚 [*pjəʔ], 飛 [*mpjəʔ], and 非 [*pjəʔ] are homophonous; 罪 [*bjəʔh] is near-homophonous, being within the same *Odes* rhyme group and sharing the labial initial. The different words are also semantically related. The reduplicatives 燕燕 [*ʔians-ʔians] and 嬰嬰 (perhaps representing 嚶嚶 [*ʔin-ʔin]?) do not share the same *Odes* rhyme group but might be sufficiently close in sound to be interchangeable. The variant 匱匱 [*ʔians-ʔians] in the Shuanggudui manuscript is homophonous with 燕燕. In the Shanghai Museum “Kongzi shilun” manuscript (strip 10), the song “Yan yan” is also mentioned, here written as 駸駸. As a member of the 晏 [*ʔjanʔ] *xiesheng* series, 駸 is perfectly interchangeable with 燕.

Mao:	泣涕女雨	
Guodian:	深涕女雨	(strip 17)
Mawangdui:	汲涕女雨	(§ 7A)

The Mawangdui variant 沸 [*mpjət] for Mao and Guodian 涕 [*thiəʔ(h)] seems to be a scribal error, confusing two very similar graphs; in another quotation of the same line in the Mawangdui “Wu xing” manuscript, the text has, correctly, 涕. The variants 汲 [*kjəp] and 泣 [*khərjəp] are perfectly interchangeable; for the identification of the respective character in the Guodian manuscript, Qiu Xigui suggests 深 (cf. 罨 *gləp),⁶⁷ which would seem again interchangeable with the Mao and Mawangdui characters.

“Da ming” 大明 (Mao 236)

Mao:	赫赫在上	
Guodian:	虞虞才上	(strips 25–26)

Mawangdui: 壑壑在上 (§ 17A)

Mawangdui: 赤赤在嘗 (§ 17B)

The line appears twice in the Mawangdui manuscript. 在 [*dzəʔ] and 才 [*dzə] belong to the same *xiesheng* series. 上 [*djaŋ] and 嘗 [*djaŋ] are homophonous. The reduplicatives 赫赫 [*hərak-hərak], 康康 [𪚩𪚩] *hərjak-hərjak], 壑壑 [*hak-hak], and 赤赤 [*khljak] are all in the same rhyme group, with 赫 and 赤 also being in the same *xiesheng* series; the *k- in 赤 is velar, while the *h- in the other three cases is laryngeal. As velars and laryngeals are almost homorganic, their coincidence is generally accepted in loan characters.

Mao: 上帝臨女

Guodian: 上帝賢女 (strip 48)

There is no phonetic or semantic relation between 臨 [*brjəm] and 賢 [*gin]. Qiu Xigui suspects that the latter is a scribal error for the former; comparing other occurrences of the two graphs in Chu manuscripts, I find this doubtful.⁶⁸ It is also possible to think of a genuine lexical variant: instead of the received “God on High is looking upon you,” the Guodian text would read “God on High regards you as worthies.” The second line of the couplet is the following:

Mao: 無貳爾心

Guodian: 毋貳尔心 (strip 48)

Mawangdui: 毋貳爾心 (§ 26A)

Mawangdui: 毋澆醜心 (§ 26B)

While the homophonous negatives 無 [*mja] and 毋 [*mjə] are often interchanged, and 爾 / 尔 [*njajʔ] and 醜 belong to the same *xiesheng* series, I have no conclusive explanation for the variant 澆 instead of 貳 [*njəjh; 貳] is in the same *xiesheng* series with 貳]. Note that the *jing* section of the Mawangdui text has 貳 where the *shuo* section has 澆.⁶⁹

“Wen wang” 文王 (Mao 235)

Mao: 於昭于天

Guodian: □□于而 (strip 30)

There is no phonetic relation between 天 [*thin] and 而 [*njə]. However, paleographically, 天 and 而 are so extremely similar in Chu script that they occasionally have been confused by modern scholars.⁷⁰ If in the present case we accept the transcription of the graph as 而, we perhaps have to blame the scribe for his carelessness. The same problem is apparent in two other instances in the Guodian “Wu xing” text.⁷¹ The present and following line are also quoted in the Shanghai Museum “Kongzi shilun.”

Mao: 文王在上

Mawangdui: 文王在尚 (§ 18B)

上 [*djaŋh] and 尚 [*djaŋh] are homophonous and also semantically closely related.

“Chang fa” 長發 (Mao 304)

Mao: 不競不綖

Guodian: 不彊不棨 (strip 41)

Mawangdui: 不勳不救 (§ 20A)

綖 [*gjəw], 棨 [*gjəw], and 救 [*kjəwh] belong to the same *xiesheng* series. 競 [*gərjaŋh] and 彊 [彊] [*gjaŋ] are in the same *Odes* rhyme group, and both have the same velar initial. 勳 [*kjah or *gja(h)] also has a velar initial and the same main vowel as 競 and 彊 but not the *-ŋ final; in the Mawangdui manuscript, it is glossed as 彊 (“strong”).

Mao: 不剛不柔

Guodian: 不彊不矛 (strip 41)

剛 [*kaŋ] and 彊 [彊] [*gjaŋ] are in the same rhyme group and both have a velar initial. While 柔 [*njəw; “flexible”] and 矛 [*mjəw; “lance”] are usually not considered to belong to the same *xiesheng* series and have no homorganic initials, the Guodian text obviously employs a simplified version of the graph 柔. In the present case, 矛 is to be taken not in its usual meaning (“lance”) but as a character belonging to the 柔 *xiesheng* series. Not only in this *Odes* quotation but also in the sentence preceding it, the Guodian manuscript has 矛 where the Mawangdui manuscript has 柔.⁷²

“Guan ju” 關雎 (Mao 1)

Mao: 窈窕淑女

Mawangdui: 菱芍□□ (§ 25B)

The assonating binome 窈窕 [*ʔiəwʔ-gliawʔ], in the variant 窈糾 [*ʔiəwʔ-kjawʔ] also attested in “Yue chu” 月出 (Mao 143), must be seen as interchangeable with 菱芍 [*kəraw-tiawk] despite the phonetic differences between 窈 and 菱.

Mao: 寤寐思服

Mawangdui: 唔昧思伏 (§ 25B)

寤 [*ŋah] and 唔 [*ŋah], as well as 寐 [*mjəs] and 昧 [*məs], belong to the same *xiesheng* series. 服 [*bjək] and 伏 [*bjək] are homophonous.

Mao: 悠哉悠哉

Mawangdui: 繇才繇才 (§ 25B)

悠 [*ljəw] and 繇 [*ljaw] differ in their rhyme groups. Nevertheless,

悠 and 遙 [*ljaw] have been proposed as interchangeable,⁷³ which would justify the paronomastic use of 絲 in the present case. The particles 哉 [*tsə] and 才 [*dzə] are near-homophonous.

Mao: 輾轉反側.

Mawangdui: 媵轉反廁 (§ 25B)

側 [*tsrjək] and 廁 [*tshrjəʔh] belong to the same *xiesheng* series, as do 轉 [*mtrjuanʔ] and 轉 (it is not clear which word of the series the graph might represent). 輾 [*trjanʔ] and 媵 [*gərjuan; probably to be interpreted as 卷 (*-kjuanʔ)] share the same *Odes* rhyme group but differ in their initials (dental vs. velar). However, both 輾轉 and 媵轉 represent rhyming binomes and as such are likely to have written the same word.

In sum, the *Odes* quotations in the Guodian “Wu xing” manuscripts include eleven variants that are not in the same *xiesheng* series as their counterparts in the Mao recension. Eight of these variants represent paronomastic usages based on homophony or near-homophony. In one of these cases—廣廣 in “Da ming” 大明 (Mao 236)—a reduplicative is involved; the same reduplicative, corresponding to 赫赫 in the received *Odes*, also occurs in the “Jie nan shan” 節南山 (Mao 191) quotation of the Guodian “Zi yi” manuscript; in the Shanghai Museum “Zi yi,” it is written as 號號. Apart from graphic variants that are phonetically related, the Guodian “Wu xing” manuscript contains three other cases: 而 for 天 is most likely either a writing mistake or has not been accurately identified in the modern transcription; 賢 for 臨 might be either a scribal error or a lexical variant; and 也 for 兮 represents a change of the final particle that cannot be explained phonologically.

The *Odes* quotations in the Mawangdui “Wu xing” include twenty-four variants outside the *xiesheng* series. Twenty-one of these are paronomastic, in three cases involving reduplicatives and in two cases occurring twice (絲才絲才). Three variants cannot be explained on phonological grounds: 沸 for 涕 is most likely a scribal error; 漘 for 貳 might represent a lexical variant; and 勳 for 競 is semantically but not phonetically or graphically related.

*The Presence of the Oral in the Written:
Reflections on the Early History of the Odes*

In their overwhelming majority, the Guodian, Shanghai Museum, and Mawangdui *Odes* variants can be regarded as graphic: they represent different characters that in any given case very likely write one and the same word. It should be noted that this assumption applies even more conclusively to variants within *xiesheng* series, some of which I have only mentioned in passing but which in fact far outnumber all other cases. Only in very few cases are we unable to determine the kind of phonetic relation that most likely suggests a paronomastic character use instead of a scribal error or a lexical variant. While allowing for the possibility that in some exceptional cases, a lexical variant might be hidden behind what appears to be merely a loan character, there is good reason to believe that most of these cases indeed represent paronomastic usages. Lexical variants do not need to be homophonous or near-homophonous. If they occurred with some frequency, we would hence expect a recognizable number of phonological distinctions. As this is not the case, we have no particular reason to engage in what would mostly amount to mere speculation.

On closer examination, it appears that especially with two types of words the relation between word and character was relatively loose: particles and rhyming or reduplicative binomes. The reduplicative 赫赫 [*hərak-hərak], for example, appears in the Guodian, Shanghai Museum, and Mawangdui quotations from “Jie nan shan” (Mao 191) and “Da ming” (Mao 236) as either 號號, 泉泉, 齣齣, 虞虞, 壑壑, or 赤赤. The reduplicative 仇仇 [*gjəw-gjəw] from “Zheng yue” (Mao 192) appears as 哉哉 in the Guodian and as 戠戠 in the Shanghai Museum “Zi yi.” Similarly, 燕燕 [*ʔians-ʔians; in “Yan yan,” Mao 28] is written 嬰嬰 (Mawangdui), 匱匱 (Shuanggudui), or 駮駮 (Shanghai Museum). In the quotations from “Cao chong” (Mao 14), 憒憒 [*trjuat-trjuat] appears as 袞袞, while 忡忡 [*thrjəwŋ-thrjəwŋ] is written 惇惇, 愷愷, or 冲冲; and the famous assonating binome in “Guan ju,” 窈窕 [*ʔiəwʔ-gliawʔ], in the variant 窈糾 also attested in “Yue chu” 月出 (Mao 143), is written 菱芍 in Mawangdui. In the Shanghai Museum “Zi yi,” the near-rhyming binome 緝熙 [*tshjəp-hjə] of the received text is written 幾義 [*kjəj-ŋjajh]. These and a string of other examples from our manuscripts show precisely the picture we get from other early texts with strong performative elements, like the Western Han *fu* 賦.⁷⁴ The unusual graphic instability of rhyming, alliterative, and reduplicative binomes suggests that their written form was by and large

irrelevant, as long as they represented certain—and only approximate—aural values. Moreover, they disprove any straightforward interpretation of such binomes on the basis of the written form of their characters.⁷⁵

The second group of words that appear with particular frequency as written in different ways are grammatical particles. They mostly, but not always, are phonetically related: 氏 and 是, 斯 and 此, 也 and 矣, 止 and 之, 氏 and 兮 or 也, 在 and 才, and 哉 and 才 are examples occurring in our manuscripts. These are usually unstressed syllables in their poetic lines, and even in the final position they often are not part of the rhyme scheme.⁷⁶ In many cases they seem to have contributed to poetic euphony primarily in rhythmic terms. That particles could be interchanged without being phonetically related shows furthermore that their characters were not necessarily aimed at the same word; this seems to indicate that particles in the *Odes* are employed in less strict a fashion than in the classical Chinese prose of the Warring States period. Moreover, in several cases of the Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” and “Kongzi shilun” manuscripts, the final 兮 is simply absent, resulting in a trisyllabic, and not the usual tetrasyllabic, meter.

Interchanged particles and binomes in the *Odes* did not rigorously adhere to the phonological principles seen in the paronomastic use of other words because the specific word behind a character, that is, a specific semantic value, is not in the same way at stake as in other words. In the case of an onomatopoeic reduplicative or euphonic rhyming binome, the sheer presence of sound overrules narrow semantic distinctions that would be considered important in other paronomastic usages of graphs where the crucial question was whether different written forms would still represent the very same word. Similarly, particles could have very different sounds, as long as they served to structure speech in rhythmic patterns.

Before moving to some suggestions on the transmission and reception of the *Odes* in late Warring States and early imperial times, it is useful to consider more specifically the transmission of the “Wu xing” text for the same period, as we can judge it from the two independent manuscript versions. (As noted above, I am reluctant to consider the Guodian and Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” manuscripts as mutually independent and therefore will not discuss them under this paradigm.) At present, I will not concern myself with the question of whether or not the additional *shuo* part from Mawangdui was composed only after the date of the Guodian tomb, that is, some time in the third or early second century B.C.E., and how this might tally with other philosophical and exegetical developments during this period. Instead, I am first of all interested in how the *jing* portion from

Mawangdui is related to that from Guodian. What is the evidence from the *Odes* quotations, and how is this evidence related to that of the embedding philosophical “Wu xing” texts proper?

Comparing the *Odes* variants in both manuscripts, one recognizes that, in all cases, the manuscripts differ not only from the Mao version but also from each other. Apart from these graphic differences, there are two other ways in which the two “Wu xing” versions differ in their treatment of the *Odes*. First, the Mawangdui text in four instances introduces a quotation with *shi yue* 詩曰 (“an *Ode* says”).⁷⁷ This never occurs in the Guodian “Wu xing” version, although the Guodian “Zi yi” manuscript does include such introductory formulae, showing that they are not altogether a later phenomenon in referring to the *Odes*. Second, the Mawangdui quotations are in three instances significantly longer: for “Cao chong,” the Mawangdui text has five lines (of which Guodian has only the last three), for “Shi jiu,” it has four lines (Guodian only the last two), and for “Yan yan,” it has six lines (Guodian only the very last). These three quotations are from the *guofeng*; from the *ya* and *song* sections, both “Wu xing” manuscripts quote only couplets.⁷⁸ The differences in the length of the quotations as well as in the introductory formulae provide some auxiliary, though weaker, evidence that the two manuscripts are independent instances of writing down a verbally highly coherent “Wu xing” text.⁷⁹

Turning to the two “Wu xing” manuscripts as a whole and comparing their degree of graphic difference to that between their two sets of embedded *Odes* quotations, one finds a somewhat lower, yet still substantial, ratio of non-*xiesheng* variants. Most likely, this results from the different nature of archaic poetic diction versus late Warring States/early imperial philosophical discourse; the latter includes many of the most basic words of the Chinese language that certainly were less prone to be written in many different ways. Yet apart from their graphic variants, the two manuscripts differ occasionally (a) in the presence or absence of particles, (b) in some additional passages, mostly in the Mawangdui manuscript, that have no counterpart in the other text,⁸⁰ and (c) in the overall textual order. In the first of the altogether twenty-eight paragraphs distinguished by Ikeda and others, only a slight change in internal order can be discerned; but later on, whole paragraphs are arranged in a different sequence. In the Guodian manuscript, the twenty-eight Mawangdui *jing* paragraphs are arranged as follows: 1–9, 13, 10–12, 17–19, 14–16, 20–23, 25, 24, 26–28. The different order of the two manuscripts has been interpreted as a reflection of two different philosophical arguments; at least one of the two manuscript sponsors chose

to change the order of whatever the original sequence—possibly yet another one—may have been.⁸¹ Be this as it may, and despite their geographical proximity, the two manuscripts represent two written versions of the “Wu xing” text that distinctly differ from each other in orthography and in textual order. In its philosophical orientation as well as in its way of using the *Odes*, the “Wu xing” essay is obviously connected with the fourth- and third-century B.C.E. Ru 儒 philosophical discourse and may itself have exerted a certain influence on it.⁸² We should therefore not be surprised if more versions of the text were to surface in future excavations.

Similarly, comparing the Guodian and Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” manuscripts with their *Liji* counterpart, we see substantial graphic differences as well as a very different textual order. This is perfectly in line with other known manuscripts that have transmitted counterparts, like the three Guodian manuscripts containing passages known from the *Laozi* 老子, the *Yi* 易 manuscript from Mawangdui,⁸³ or the *Odes* from Shuanggudui.

How can we best explain the actual relation between the two “Wu xing” versions? Obviously, the Mawangdui scribe could not have looked at the very Guodian text we see today, as it had already been buried for about a century. But is the Mawangdui text copied from a written text closely resembling the Guodian version? What did the Mawangdui scribe look at? Did he look at anything at all? There are at least three possible scenarios under which such manuscripts could have been produced: (a) a scribe copied from another written version; (b) somebody used a written version to read the text aloud to the scribe; or (c) a scribe wrote the text from memory or oral recitation.⁸⁴

The first scenario would ideally lead to a text with very few, if any, differences between the earlier and the new version. This, clearly, is not the case here. The textual differences between the two “Wu xing” manuscripts, between the Guodian and Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” and their *Liji* counterpart, and between the manuscript *Odes* quotations and their received text are in all cases both numerous and substantial. But what if the copyists were just careless or even somewhat lacking in competence? Given the nature of the Chinese script, we would expect graphically similar characters, but these would represent not merely different words but *words of very different sounds*. In the manuscripts under discussion, we see the opposite: *very different graphs* representing words of identical or near-identical sounds that mostly fulfill the rigid criteria of paronomastic use. There is no way in which a Mawangdui copyist following a written model related to the Guodian texts could consistently arrive at this type of textual variant.

Moreover, even the variants in our manuscripts that are not phonetically related are in most cases graphically so different that they still cannot be interpreted as cursory misreadings of a hurried copyist, while even those exceptional cases where this would be possible can still be taken as scribal errors that would occur under any circumstances, with or without a written model. Scribal errors are not necessarily copyist’s errors.

The second scenario would account better for the actual evidence. In this case, however, we would still conclude that no particular attention was given to graphic consistency between the earlier and the later version, because these two, as a quality control measure, could have been compared instantaneously. As a result, we would expect a certain number of corrections in the later text—but they are not there.⁸⁵ Thus, although an earlier written model may have served to contain the text, it cannot have provided a standard to write it. Yet graphically independent as they are from their possible earlier models,⁸⁶ the manuscripts still betray a definite attention to the aesthetics of their outward appearance: expensive silk in the case of Mawangdui, beautifully balanced calligraphy in those of Guodian and the Shanghai Museum. This attention, however, is devoted not to graphic “correctness” (if there was any such concept at all) but to the texts as exquisite items of display.

The third scenario would tally equally well with the evidence: a text was written down from memory or as it was heard. There was no written model at hand to begin with and to which the new version had to, or possibly could, adhere. Instead, this version represented a singular local act of writing, independent of any other such act.

On the basis of our texts, it seems impossible to decide between the second and the third alternative. It perhaps is not even necessary, as both scenarios share the same basic implication: with or without a written model at hand, we cannot identify an attempt at orthographic consistency. Instead, the written text—in addition to being a display item—served its most elementary function: to represent the sounds of the language. The problem is the very substantial number of early Chinese homophonous words written not only with partly different graphs (as in the case of members of the same *xiesheng* series) but with entirely unrelated ones. Paronomastic variants of a caliber as discussed above or as in 州 for 舟 [both *tjəw], 居 [*kjah, *kja] for 車 [*khlja, *kəlja], and 騷 [*səw] for 埽 [*səw?]⁸⁷—to mention just some examples from the Shuanggudui *Odes*⁸⁷—illustrate the challenge: even an educated reader who would know that these graphs represented the same (or nearly the same) sounds was confronted with a written textual

surface that was not self-evident with respect to the specific words behind it. In order to decide on the right word, the reader indeed would have to already know the text or would need somebody to explain it to him or her.⁸⁸ Where did this knowledge come from? How did one master a text that on its written surface alone could be quite opaque? The best answer to such questions is perhaps a traditional one: we know from Warring States and early imperial sources that textual learning was conducted in teacher-disciple lineages, that is, through direct instruction. Indeed, the vast number of possible loan characters in the writing system—as we now see them in the manuscripts—made teaching and memorization not only a priority in the reception and transmission of texts but a plain *sine qua non*. This is true for contemporaneous prose compositions like the “Wu xing” text; it applies all the more to poetic texts like the *Odes*, characterized by an archaic diction, difficult words, and the general absence of particles. Judging from the manuscript evidence, the dialogical master-disciple exchange that provides the structure for many early Chinese philosophical texts is more than a rhetorical gesture; it is a reflection of how things were done.

Han historical texts are replete with remarks that in the early empire, the works of the traditional canon were orally “discussed” (*lun* 論), “expounded” (*yan* 言), “practiced” (*xi* 習), “explained” (*shuo* 說, *jiang* 講), and, as expression of their “mastery” (*zhi* 治), “recited” (*song* 誦).⁸⁹ Such practices of instruction and performance were directly inherited from earlier times, if one recalls the frequent instances of ritual *Odes* recitation in the *Zuo zhuan*, of Confucius speaking of “reciting the three hundred *Odes*,”⁹⁰ or of *Mozi* mentioning those who “recite the three hundred, play the three hundred with strings, sing the three hundred, dance the three hundred.”⁹¹

The oral use of texts is further reflected in the fact that the works of the Six Arts (*Liu yi* 六藝, including *yue* 樂, music, which may or may not have been a written canon)⁹² and Five Canons (*Wu jing* 五經) were not transmitted as isolated scriptures but always embedded in an exegetical tradition deemed necessary to transform an archaic and hermeneutically open text into a repertoire of historical paradigms of continual relevance.⁹³ As the canonical works provided ultimate standards to measure and guide contemporary social practice, exegetical teaching both reaffirmed their elevated status and constructed the necessary bridge by which they could be approached. This is definitely true for the archaic works of the *Odes*, the *Documents*, and the *Changes* but might as well have been extended to contemporaneous texts of a certain status, namely, texts to be transmitted. The strong oral element in the practice of teaching and passing on the

canon, reflected in the use of the verbs listed above, does not preclude the use of written versions. But if our sources do not mislead us, these written versions were considered neither the primary goal nor the principal vehicle of this practice. The evidence from the manuscripts may thus illustrate both: the existence of written texts and their integration into practices of oral instruction.⁹⁴

By placing the *Odes* into such a context of early canonical teaching and transmission, the large number of textual variants in their manuscript quotations becomes less disturbing. Moreover, these variants—whether between two manuscripts or a manuscript and the received anthology—are in their vast majority paronomastic, a fact aptly mirrored in the host of paronomastic glosses delivered by the early imperial commentators. Whatever the originally intended words behind such graphic variants may be, we can safely conclude that the received transmission of the *Odes* through the Mao recension is astoundingly faithful in its representation of the original sounds of the text. We should also note that the manuscripts limit their *Odes* quotations almost entirely to songs that appear in the received text, and that they quote them as proof texts to support specific philosophical arguments. In sum, by the late fourth century B.C.E., the *Odes* were the most prestigious Chinese text, they had reached a high degree of canonization, and they were largely fixed in their wording.

At the same time, it seems impossible to argue for a standard written version of the *Odes* in Warring States times. We tend to acknowledge this in some general sense, based on what we know from the literary tradition;⁹⁵ yet only the manuscript evidence shows us the true extent to which early written versions of the *Odes* could actually differ. Furthermore, they are a helpful reminder of the fact that *all* received pre-Qin texts went through the hands of Han and later editors. For none of these texts that quote more or less extensively from the *Odes*—*Zuo zhuan* 左傳, *Xunzi* 荀子, *Liji* 禮記, *Guoyu* 國語, *Lunyu* 論語, *Mengzi* 孟子, *Mozi* 墨子, *Yanzi chunqiu* 晏子春秋, *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策, *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋, *Guanzi* 管子, *Han Feizi* 韓非子, *Xiaojing* 孝經⁹⁶—can our received version be traced back beyond the first printed editions. These date from the Song period—twelve or more centuries after the original composition of their texts. Similar to the low percentage of known *san jia* variants, the overall graphic coherence of *Odes* quotations in these texts suggests a pervasive Han or post-Han standardization according to the Mao recension.

There are also more particular reasons for questioning the orthographic uniformity of early *Odes* quotations in received texts as being original. Due

to their archaic diction, the *Odes* were perhaps more, not less, prone to be written in widely diverging ways than other texts endowed with a history of transmission. Yet because of their canonical status and thus relatively stable framework of learning, their actual written form may also have mattered less than that of contemporary prose. Scribal casualness—something that has been recognized in certain early manuscripts⁹⁷—did not ruin the text as long as the graphs represented words of the right sound. On the other hand, this seems to open the view on a much more diverse world of writing than the one suggested by the uniformity of *Odes* quotations across the broad range of received ancient texts. Even where two manuscripts come from the same old region of Chu and contain largely the same materials, as in the case of the two “Wu xing” manuscripts from Guodian and Mawangdui (and to a significantly lesser degree in that of the Guodian and Shanghai Museum “Zi yi”), their *Odes* quotations are written in such different fashion that it is hard to imagine how they could possibly reflect a unified written *Odes* corpus as their basis. In sum, for the late pre-imperial and early imperial period, we witness the double phenomenon of a canonical text that is as stable in its wording as it is unstable in its writing.

From the use of writing in administrative, economic, legal, divinatory, hemerological, medical, and a number of other practical matters, all of them documented in excavated manuscripts,⁹⁸ it is clear that writing was widely employed as an important technology. The earliest testimony to this technology is supplied by the Shang oracle bone and plastron inscriptions, from which we already know the existence of a group of writing specialists.⁹⁹ For Western Zhou times, it has been compellingly argued that bronze inscriptions were composed on the basis of archives that were kept on perishable materials, and there is every reason to assume the presence of specialized scribes in charge of both archival records and inscriptions.¹⁰⁰

On the other hand, it seems to me that, for early China, the later Chinese tradition as well as modern scholarship in its wake has sometimes exaggerated the status of writing at the expense of all other forms of human cultural practice, notably among them the performance of texts.¹⁰¹ If the early Chinese had any desire to mass-produce those early texts that were manifestly recognized as canonical by the late fourth century B.C.E., they certainly had the means to accomplish such an endeavor in the same way as they were able to locally mass-produce all kinds of weapons, tools, ritual objects, and also administrative writings.¹⁰² We are still looking for some more suggestive traces of such textual mass production than we have glanced so far from both the literary tradition and the archaeological record.

Indeed, before the empire, early Chinese authors rarely cared to emphasize the cultural status of written texts. We find an occasional note here and there:¹⁰³ in *Mozi* 墨子, Master Mo is once seen carrying “very many writings” (*zai shu shen duo* 載書甚多) while traveling;¹⁰⁴ in several other places, the same text reiterates the importance of writing to preserve and transmit knowledge.¹⁰⁵ In a *Zhuangzi* 莊子 passage of possibly early Han times, it is noted (and despised) that important words are generally put into writing, and that writings are therefore held in esteem.¹⁰⁶ And in *Han Feizi*, Master Han Fei argues that when families “store” (*cang* 藏) legalist and military writings, they spend their time talking about these matters instead of engaging in them; by contrast, in the land of an enlightened ruler there are no writings on bamboo (*wu shujian zhi wen* 無書簡之文).¹⁰⁷ But there are no reports about the practice of copying texts, about presenting texts (in the way bronze vessels, weapons, clothing, or *Odes* performances were presented), about forging, stealing, losing, buying, exchanging, or arguing over written texts, or about whatever else one may imagine. Even as late as in Eastern Han times, pictorial representations of reading books are exceedingly rare.¹⁰⁸ There is no question about the canonical status and wide circulation of particular texts, about a certain degree of elite literacy, or about the use of writing in numerous local contexts. That canonical and other texts were written down is attested by our manuscripts; that writing was used as a form of cultural display is evident from Shang oracle bones as well as from sometimes quite spectacular bronze inscriptions (one may just think of the beautiful characters, inlaid in gold, on the mid-fifth-century B.C.E. bells buried with Marquis Yi of Zeng 曾侯乙). That prior to the Han writing was indeed *the primary and most prestigious form* of representing and transmitting the canonical texts has yet to be shown. Whenever Warring States texts of the Ru 儒 tradition wish to present cultural mastery, they describe it as the mastery of ritual propriety and as the use of texts as one aspect in the expression of ritual propriety.¹⁰⁹ The kings, nobles, scholars, and philosophers who in our early sources are shown as memorizing, performing, and teaching the canon in general, and the *Odes* in particular, are masters of texts as they are masters of ritual. As Confucius reminds us, to know the *Odes* without being able to apply them in diplomatic exchange is but an idle exercise.¹¹⁰ Did any of the nobles mentioned in *Zuo zhuan*, when prompted for an *Odes* recitation, excuse himself for a moment to nervously rush through his piles of bamboo strips? Did Confucius need to look things up in order to be left neither with “nothing to use in speech” nor “standing with the face straight to the wall”?¹¹¹

Trusting the sources, I believe it is this sure mastery of the text, internalized through memorization and externalized in performance, that guaranteed the stable tradition of the canon and that allowed scholars and nobles alike to make sense of *Odes* quotations (Guodian, Shanghai Museum, Mawangdui), *Odes* discussions (Shanghai Museum), or the whole anthology (Shuanggudui) in whatever idiosyncratic and local fashion of writing they came. While a good portion of these written versions may have looked aberrant and opaque to the uninitiated, they were perfectly coherent and transparent to those who knew. Written versions of the anthology like the one found at Shuanggudui, and perhaps written discussions of the *Odes* like the one obtained by the Shanghai Museum, will have played their role in the transmission of the *Odes*. At the same time, it is hard to imagine how this transmission could have worked without being embedded in adequate oral instruction.

But why were texts related to the *Odes* and other (philosophical, technical, etc.) writings buried in tombs, alongside a host of ritual paraphernalia? We do not really know. Let me venture a suggestion: the deceased was a sponsor and custodian of learning, and the usually eclectic selection of texts reflects to some extent this person's sponsorship or even mastery of certain philosophical, religious, and technical matters. In their exquisite calligraphy (Guodian, Shanghai Museum) and materiality (the silk in Mawangdui), the entombed texts were perhaps ritual commodities of representational value. In the dark splendor of the grave chamber, and entirely beyond the notion of orthographic "correctness," these manuscripts pleased the eyes of the spirits, contributing to the material splendor that surrounded the dead. In life, true mastery of poetry and philosophical discourse found its ultimate expression in oral performance. The elegant manuscript, perhaps, was its adequate visual form. In death, it was the only one.

NOTES

I am grateful to Wolfgang Behr, William G. Boltz, Michael Nylan, Andrew H. Plaks, and Nathan Sivin for their very helpful comments on earlier versions of this chapter.

1. Volume two, published only after the present study was completed, contains several additional *Odes* quotations in the manuscript "Min zhi fumu" 民之父母. They do not contradict the present conclusions.

2. Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China*, 168.

3. Important studies on *Odes* interpretation in the Mawangdui "Wu xing" 五

行 silk manuscript include Riegel, "Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings of *Shijing* Commentary," and Cook, "Consummate Artistry and Moral Virtuosity." Following the Princeton conference, I have extended my findings from the present study to issues of early *Odes* exegesis; see Kern, "Early Chinese Poetics in the Light of Recently Excavated Manuscripts," where I relate some fundamental interpretative differences to the only-gradual development of a standardized written version of the anthology.

4. A full discussion of the Shuanggudui variants can be found in Hu and Han, *Fuyang Han jian Shijing yanjiu*.

5. For the same conclusion, see O Man-jong, *Cong shi dao jing*, 132–137.

6. For a survey of early archaeological sites with manuscripts, see Giele, *Database of Early Chinese Manuscripts*. For my various arguments regarding the status of the written text and its relation to oral performance in early China, see my *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih huang*, 94–104, 143–144; "Feature: Mark Edward Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China*"; "*Shi jing* Songs as Performance Texts"; "Ritual, Text, and the Formation of the Canon"; and "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the *Fu*."

7. For some succinct comments on the philological problems in dealing with the Mao recension, see Knechtges, "Questions about the Language of *Sheng Min*."

8. On this work, see Hightower, *Han Shih Wai Chuan*; on the relation between the *Han Odes* and those of the other lineages, see Hightower, "The *Han shih wai chuan* and the *San chia shih*," and Lin, *Xi Han sanjia shixue yanjiu*.

9. For an exemplary study of *Lu Shi* exegesis, see Asselin, "The Lu-School Reading of 'Guanju.'"

10. *Shijing yiwen shi*. The work was later complemented by Zhang Shenyi 張慎儀 (Guangxu [1875–1908] period) in *Shijing yiwen bushi*.

11. *Shijing si jia yiwen kao*. The work was later complemented by Jiang Han 江瀚 (fl. ca. 1875) in his *Shijing si jia yiwen kao bu*.

12. *Shi san jia yi jishu*.

13. For the Shuanggudui fragments, I base myself on Hu and Han, *Fuyang Han jian Shijing yanjiu*; for references to individual passages, I give the number of the respective bamboo strip fragment.

14. Hightower, "The *Han shih wai chuan* and the *San chia shih*," 245, also notes differences in sequence between the Mao recension and the *Han Shi waizhuan*.

15. As argued by Hu and Han, *Fuyang Han jian Shijing yanjiu*, 28–35. The evidence Hu and Han cite for the different order of the songs in the Shuanggudui recension is one of the marvelous details of archaeological finds: because the cords that originally linked the bamboo strips are all rotten, and because each strip, or pair of two strips, never contained text from more than one stanza, it is now impossible to determine the overall sequence of individual stanzas, let alone of songs or whole *guofeng* sections. However, because adjacent strips pressed against one another in the tomb, there are ten cases (in six groups of strips) where one strip carries on its back traces of the text from the front of another strip, establishing the direct sequence of these strips and showing that the internal order of the Shuanggudui *Odes* differed from that of the Mao recension.

16. For the Mawangdui "Wu xing" text, I base myself on Ikeda, *Maotai Kanbo hakusho gogyōhen kenkyū*. For another transcription of the Guodian and the Mawangdui "Wu xing" manuscripts, as well as for their comparison, see also Pang, *Zhu bo "Wu xing" pian jiaozhu ji yanjiu*, 1–87, and Liu Xinfang, *Jianbo Wu xing jiegou*. For the quotations, I give the paragraph (*zhang* 章 [= §]) numbers according to Ikeda, with "A" denoting the *jing* 經 and "B" denoting the *shuo* 說 sections; thus, "§ 5A" denotes *zhang* 5, *jing* section.

17. See Riegel, "Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings of *Shijing* Commentary"; Cook, "Consummate Artistry and Moral Virtuosity."

18. For the Guodian manuscripts, I base myself on Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*; for the "Zi yi" text, see 129–137, for the "Wu xing" text, 149–154. For the quotations, I give the number of the respective bamboo strips.

19. *Bangfeng* is likely the original name, changed to *guofeng* only after 195 B.C.E., when *bang* became tabooed as the late Han founding emperor's (Liu Bang 劉邦, posthumously Han Gaozu 漢高祖, r. 202–195 B.C.E.) given name.

20. For the "Zi yi" and "Kongzi shilun" manuscripts, I base myself on Ma Chengyuan, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (yi)*.

21. By contrast, the Shanghai Museum "Kongzi shilun" seems to discuss whole songs, while occasionally referring to one of their stanzas; see Ma Chengyuan, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (yi)*, 143 (strip 14), 155 (strip 25).

22. I am counting reduplicatives as two characters; on the other hand, I do not count the frequent writing convention 𠄎 for 其 as a variant.

23. For the *san jia* recensions, I base myself on the notes provided in Wang Xianqian, *Shi san jia yi jishu*.

24. For a critique of the rather arbitrary methods employed by Chen Qiacong, see Hightower, "The *Han shih wai chuan* and the *San chia shih*," 252–253 n. 26.

25. The exception is the relation between the Guodian and the Shanghai Museum "Zi yi" texts: twenty-eight of the sixty-seven variants in the Shanghai Museum manuscript coincide with their counterparts in the Guodian text. This coherence corresponds with the overall appearance of the two "Zi yi" manuscripts: in addition to sharing many of their graphic peculiarities, they are of precisely the same length, contents, and internal textual order (and exhibit the same differences from the received "Zi yi" in the *Liji*). Furthermore, all of this applies to the relation between the Guodian "Xing zi ming chu" 性命命出 and the Shanghai Museum "Xing qing lun" 性情論 manuscripts—and all of it is entirely unprecedented among independently found manuscripts or a manuscript and its received counterpart. The evidence thus corroborates the suspicion (Ma Chengyuan, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (yi)*, 2) that the Shanghai Museum strips—which began to appear on the Hong Kong market just a few months after the Guodian manuscript excavation of late 1993—may indeed have come from the Guodian area (or even site?) we are already familiar with.

26. *Hanshu* 30.1708.

27. E.g., Hightower, "The *Han shih wai chuan* and the *San chia shih*," 265: "From citations referred to each of the schools it is clear that there were minor

textual variants, frequently only alternative graphs for the same word. This is precisely the situation one would expect to obtain with a text written from memory by different hands."

28. Baxter, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*, 355–366.

29. *Shiji* 6.254–255, 87.2546.

30. The versions studied by the imperial erudites were exempted from the ban. On the historicity and meaning of the bibliocaust, see my *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih Huang*, 183–196, with further references given there.

31. These considerations, of course, speak directly against Hightower's conclusion quoted in n. 27 above.

32. With regard to the Chu script, Teng, *Chu xi jianbo wenzi bian*, and the corrections of this work given by Li Ling, "Du 'Chu xi jianbo wenzi bian,'" provide ample assurance.

33. For a discussion of the phenomenon of the *xiesheng* series, see Boltz, *The Origin and Early Development of the Chinese Writing System*, 90–126. In *Loan Characters in Pre-Han Texts*, 1–9, Bernhard Karlgren explicitly excludes characters belonging to the same *xiesheng* series from his analysis of possible loan characters (*jiajie zi* 假借字) since they are by their very nature "authorized" to be used paronomastically for one another. However, there are instances where characters in the same *xiesheng* series show distinct phonetic differences and are not mutually interchangeable as loan characters. Yet these instances are rare enough to not disqualify the general assumption about the overwhelming majority of *xiesheng* variants, and leaving them aside here does not disqualify the particular analysis and argument put forward in the present chapter. I am grateful to Wolfgang Behr for alerting me to the complexity of the issue; see also his "'Homosomatic Juxtaposition' and the Problem of 'Syssemantic (Huiyi) Characters.'"

34. See Boltz, "Manuscripts with Transmitted Counterparts," 258–262.

35. On the latter, see Ma Chengyuan, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (yi)*, 174. The same variant occurs also in other *Odes* quotations in the Shanghai Museum "Zi yi" (strips 21, 22); below, I will not treat this form as a genuine variant.

36. The 氏 / 是 example seems not to follow the principle of homorganicity (see below) as *g- is a velar and *d- is a dental initial. However, as Boltz has argued, paleographic evidence from pre-imperial texts suggests reconstructing 是 also with the *g- initial; see Boltz, *The Origin and Early Development of the Chinese Writing System*, 169.

37. Schuessler, *A Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese*.

38. See Karlgren, *Loan Characters in Pre-Han Texts*, 1–18.

39. See Boltz, *The Origin and Early Development of the Chinese Writing System*, 90–101.

40. See Karlgren, "Glosses on the Siao ya Odes," 116–118 (no. 618).

41. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, nos. 961, 962 (hereafter cited in the pattern "GSR 961, 962"); Schuessler, *A Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese*, 829–831, 835–836; Baxter, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*, 809.

42. GSR 1165a–c.

43. Here and elsewhere, the editors of the Guodian strips mistakenly

transcribe as 弋 what should be 戈; see Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 18, 20, 130–131. (I am grateful to Wolfgang Behr for alerting me to the problem.) This, however, does not affect the interpretation as 一; see He Linyi, *Zhanguo guwen zidian*, 1080, who argues that the element 戈 in the numerals “one,” “two,” and “three” goes back to 戈. Xu Shen 許慎 (ca. 55–ca. 149) in his *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 explains 弋 as an old form of 一 [*?jit]; see *Shuowen jiezi zhu* 1A.1b. That 弋 is indeed used for 一 in both instances is clear from the transmitted parallels: in the above line from “Shi jiu,” the *Mao Shi* parallel is 一, in the text on strip 17, the parallel is 壹 (the usual long form of 一 in transmitted texts) in the received *Liji* chapter; see Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 130, and *Liji zhengyi* 55.420b. Also, the Shanghai Museum “Zi yi” (strip 20) has 一 in this very quotation; see Ma Chengyuan, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu* (yi), 64, 195. In the Guodian manuscripts, 戈 appears in the same way further on strip 14 of the “Qiong da yi shi” 窮達以時 manuscript, on strip 9 of the “Xing zi ming chu” 性命出 manuscript, and on strips 39, 40, and 43 of the “Liu de” 六德 manuscript, in all cases transcribed as 弋 by the Guodian editors. See Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 28, 61, 72, 145, 179, 188.

44. *Shuowen jiezi zhu* 2A.49a–b.

45. For the traditional discussion of 覺 / 梏, see Karlgren, “Glosses on the Siao ya Odes,” 69 (no. 503).

46. For the same variant, see also below in another quotation from “Yi.” The variant 誓 occurs in several other places in the Guodian corpus, e.g., on strip 11 of the “Laozi” 老子 “A” manuscript; see Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 111, and Qiu Xigui’s comment (115 n. 30).

47. See Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 179, 181. Qiu Xigui (182 n. 17) notes that 頌 is the original character for 容. See also Zheng Xuan’s paronomastic gloss in his *Zhou li* 周禮 commentary that “the meaning of 頌 is 誦, or 容” (*Zhou li zhushu* 23.158a).

48. The reconstruction for 尹 is unclear. For Karlgren, 允 and 尹 were homophonous; see GSR 468a and 1251. Dong, *Shanggu yinyun biao*, 220, lists the two characters in the same rhyme group and tone but with different initials. For the appearance of these variants earlier in the “Zi yi,” see Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 129 (with discussion at 132 n. 15 and 135 n. 90); and Ma Chengyuan, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu* (yi), 177.

49. Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 135 n. 91.

50. See Teng, *Chu xi jianbo wenzi bian*, 350; Zhang Shouzhong et al., *Guodian Chu jian wenzi bian*, 77–78.

51. For a discussion, see Karlgren, “Glosses on the Kuo Feng Odes,” 86 (no. 2).

52. While the reconstruction shows a difference in vowel between 囿 and 攝, the Shanghai Museum editors cite a “du ruo” 讀若 (“read as”) gloss from the *Shuowen jiezi* that equates 囿 phonetically with 轟 [*njap]; see Ma Chengyuan, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu* (yi), 198–199.

53. Here, I count reduplicatives as only a single variant. On the other hand, I count each individual case of the same variant. In addition to the variants

discussed here, the *Odes* quotations in the Guodian “Zi yi” manuscript have one instance of character displacement in “Qiao yan” 巧言 (Mao 198), one completely different line in “Du ren shi” 都人士 (Mao 225), and one passage unattested in the received *Odes* text. All these are textual variants, but not on the level of the single graph. Finally, there is also one unintelligible graph in “Du ren shi,” not counted here.

54. I do not include the missing character in “Wen wang” in this number. Also, I do not count the two missing particles in “Yi” that result in a change from tetrasyllabic to trisyllabic meter.

55. See Ma Chengyuan, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu* (yi), 133.

56. See Wang Xianqian, *Shi san jia yi jishu*, 396.

57. Ma Chengyuan, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu* (yi), 152.

58. See Wang Xianqian, *Shi san jia yi jishu*, 76.

59. *Ibid.*, 75.

60. See He, *Zhanguo guwen zidian*, 77.

61. See Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 125, 167, 218.

62. See Allan and Williams, *The Guodian Laozi*, 119.

63. Hubei sheng Jingsha tielu kaogu dui, *Baoshan Chu jian*, 32 and 53 n. 359.

64. See the translation and annotation by Lothar von Falkenhausen in chapter 3.

65. In agreement with He, *Zhanguo guwen zidian*, 77.

66. See GSR 885; Schuessler, *A Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese*, 438; Baxter, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*, 687 (“Bin zhi chu yan” 賓之初筵; Mao 220) and 717 (“Sang rou” 桑柔; Mao 257).

67. See Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 152 n. 19.

68. Teng, *Chu xi jianbo wenzi bian*, 515, 678–679.

69. As Ikeda, *Maotai Kanbo hakusho gogyōhen kenkyū*, 554–555, notes, none of the editors of, or commentators on, the Mawangdui “Wu xing” manuscript has been able to explain the variant 澆. This remains true for those who wrote after him, like Pang Pu and Liu Xinfang.

70. See Zeng, *Changsha Chu boshu wenzi bian*, nos. 30 and 75.

71. Namely, on strips 20 and 26; see Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 150. The problem also appears in the Mawangdui “Wu xing” manuscript; see Ikeda, *Maotai Kanbo hakusho gogyōhen kenkyū*, 364.

72. See Jingmen shi bowuguan, *Guodian Chu mu zhujian*, 151 (strip 41); Ikeda, *Maotai Kanbo hakusho gogyōhen kenkyū*, 419.

73. See Karlgren, *Loan Characters in Pre-Han Texts*, no. 1994.

74. See Kamatani, “Fu ni nankai na ji ga ōi no wa naze ka”; Kern, “Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the *Fu*.”

75. This conclusion supports earlier findings made in transmitted texts; see Kennedy, “A Note on Ode 220”; Knechtges, *Wen xuan, or Selections of Refined Literature*, vol. 2, 3–12.

76. The manuscript quotations include the following variants in the final position of a line: 之 / 止 (in “Cao chong”), 兮 / 也 / 氏 (“Shi jiu”), and 才 / 哉

("Guan ju"). In all cases, they do not seem to belong to the rhyme pattern; see Baxter, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*, 583, 587, 641. There are, however, other instances in the *Odes* where such particles do rhyme; see Baxter, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*, 809; Takashima, "The So-called 'Third'-Person Possessive Pronoun *Jue* 𠄎 (= 厥) in Classical Chinese," 418.

77. See Ikeda, *Maōtai Kanbo hakusho gogyōhen kenkyū*, 187, 364, 419, 546 (here in the form 設曰).

78. In its *shuo* part, the Mawangdui manuscript also quotes three couplets from "Guan ju" but separates them from one another by brief comments; see Ikeda, *Maōtai Kanbo hakusho gogyōhen kenkyū*, 533.

79. The evidence from the latter two differences seems weaker because the Mawangdui version could simply include some additions to the preceding one from Guodian. But this is excluded by the evidence from the graphic variants.

80. The Mawangdui text contains four passages of forty-two, five, eight, and twelve characters that are not in the Guodian version; on the other hand, the latter has one passage of ten characters not included in the former.

81. See Xing, "Chu jian 'Wu xing' shi lun"; Pang, *Zhu bo "Wu xing" pian jiaozhu ji yanjiu*, 92.

82. The importance of the "Wu xing" text can be measured on two accounts: on the one hand, the text appears in two versions that are separated by about a century. This means it was transmitted over an extended period of time. On the other hand, the second version contains a commentary, signaling the importance of the base text. The vast majority of the hundreds of Chinese articles and book chapters that have appeared on the Guodian manuscripts since their publication in 1998 is devoted to relating these texts to the contemporary philosophical literature.

83. See Shaughnessy, *I Ching*. Despite Ban Gu's claim (*Hanshu* 30.1704) that the *Yi* survived the bibliocaust intact because works on divination were exempted from destruction (*Shiji* 6.255, 87.2546–2547), the textual differences between an early imperial *Yi* manuscript version and its transmitted counterpart are exactly the same as in the cases of those texts that purportedly had suffered from the bibliocaust.

84. I am grateful to Christoph Harbsmeier and Nathan Sivin, who independently from each other have alerted me to scenario b; see also Sivin, "Text and Experience in Classical Chinese Medicine." The practice of having one person read out loud a text to have it written down by one or more scribes is of course nothing new for scholars of Greek and Roman classical literature; see, e.g., Nagy, *Poetry as Performance*, 149–150.

85. For the very few instances of corrections in the Guodian and Shanghai Museum manuscripts, see Kern, "Methodological Reflections."

86. This is probably true already for the Guodian and Shanghai Museum manuscripts, assuming that they are not the very first versions of their texts.

87. Strips 35, 45, 49, 50, 53, 114, 142; see Hu and Han, *Fuyang Han jian Shijing yanjiu*, 5–7, 14, 18.

88. Similarly, Andrew Ford has noted for ancient Greece that manuscripts of archaic songs lacked, among other things, "conveniences for reading, including a standard orthography. Altogether, a lyric song-text of the archaic period was

fairly useless to anyone who had not already heard the song"; see Ford, "From Letters to Literature," 21.

89. Famous references to the recitation (*song*) of canonical texts include comments that Jia Yi 賈誼 (200–168 B.C.E.) became known for his ability to recite the *Odes* and the *Documents* (*Shiji* 84.2491; *Hanshu* 48.2221). When Gongsun Hong 公孫弘 (200–121 B.C.E.) memorialized to promote scholars learned in the traditional canon, he suggested that one should first employ for state service those men who were "able to recite many [canonical works]" (*Shiji* 121.3119; *Hanshu* 88.3594). The *Documents* erudite Fu Sheng 伏勝 (born 260 B.C.E.) is said to have carried canonical books (*jing* 經) with him when traveling and to have recited and memorized them whenever he stopped to rest (*Shiji* 121.3125); we hear the same about Ni Kuan 兒寬 (d. 102 B.C.E.). The *Chunqiu* 春秋 expert Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (ca. 195–115 B.C.E.?) reportedly lectured and recited behind a curtain, and because the number of his students was so large, many of them never got to see him at all (*Shiji* 121.3127; *Hanshu* 56.2495). In his rhapsody known as "Da ke nan" 答客難, Dongfang Shuo 東方朔 (ca. 161–86 B.C.E.) presents his discussion with other scholars, who wondered about his lack of an official career, despite his claim of broad learning and the fact that he could recite countless texts from the *Odes*, the *Documents*, and the "speeches of the hundred scholarly lineages" (*bai jia yu* 百家語; *Shiji* 126.3206; *Hanshu* 65.2864); according to a certainly suspicious account in *Hanshu* 65.2841, he was able to recite 220,000 words of the *Odes* and the *Documents* (exegetical traditions, since the two canons are nowhere close to these numbers?) at the age of sixteen *sui*. (At nineteen *sui*, he is said to have recited the same amount from works on military strategy; see *Hanshu* 65.2841). Sima Qian says in his autobiography that he recited "old texts" at the age of ten (*Shiji* 130.3293; *Hanshu* 62.2714). In 9 B.C.E., Emperor Cheng 成 (r. 32–7 B.C.E.) ordered the Prince of Dingtao 定陶 and future Emperor Ai 哀 (r. 7–1 B.C.E.) to recite the *Odes*, and the Prince of Zhongshan 中山 to recite the *Documents* (*Hanshu* 11.333). Liu Xiang 劉向 (79–8 B.C.E.) "during the day recited [canonical] books and their exegetical traditions, and during the night observed the stars and lunar mansions" (*Hanshu* 36.1963). Chao Cuo 韞錯 (d. 154 B.C.E.), when memorializing his worries about the heir apparent's education, noted that one could "recite many [canonical works] but not understand their explanations" (*Hanshu* 49.2277). When Wang Shi 王式, the teacher of Liu He 劉賀 (ca. 92–59 B.C.E.), Prince of Changyi 昌邑, was accused of not having reproached the prince (and deposed emperor after only 27 days of rule) for his excesses, he insisted that he had instructed the prince from morning to night through the *Odes* and that when they reached the pieces of loyal ministers and filial sons, the prince never failed to repeatedly recite them (*Hanshu* 88.3610). Gong Sui 龔遂 (d. 62 B.C.E.), another classicist in Liu He's entourage, tried to persuade the prince to live with selected men of classical learning and superior morality and, "when sitting, to recite the *Odes* and the *Documents* and, when standing, to practice ritual demeanor" (*Hanshu* 89.3638). In Yang Xiong's 揚雄 (53 B.C.E.–18 C.E.) "Admonition on Ale" (*Jiu zhen* 酒箴), a witty text intended to reprimand Emperor Cheng, "reciting the canonical texts" is a mark of serious character (*Hanshu* 92.3713). Ban Jieyu 班婕妤 (d. ca. 6 C.E.), one of Emperor Cheng's concubines,

is noted for having recited *Odes* of moral contents (*Hanshu* 97B.3984). In his evaluation (*zan* 贊) of Wang Mang 王莽 (45 B.C.E.–23 C.E.), Ban Gu states that Wang “recited the Six Arts [i.e., the canonical works] to embellish his deceitful speech” (*Hanshu* 99B.4194).

90. *Lunyu zhushu* 13.51a (13/5).

91. See *Mozi jiangou*, 418.

92. There are two definitions of the “Six Arts” (*liu yi* 六藝) known in Western Han times: one that included the arts of ritual, music, archery, charioteering, writing, and computing (*Zhou li zhushu* 14.93b) and another that—perhaps first noted in the *Shiji*—referred to the canonical disciplines or books of the *Yi* 易, *Shu* 書, *Shi* 詩, *Li* 禮, *Yue* 樂, and *Chunqiu* 春秋. I am referring to the second set, as its list of titles appears already in the Guodian manuscripts (which, however, do not include the term *liu yi*).

93. I am indebted to Michael Nylan for bringing this aspect of canonical transmission to my attention. See also Sivin, “Text and Experience in Classical Chinese Medicine,” 182, with reference to the transmission of medical texts in the early empire: “When a text is ‘received’ (*shou*) it is not simply handed over, but ritually transmitted and taught.” For further elaboration on this issue, see my “Early Chinese Poetics in the Light of Recently Excavated Manuscripts.”

94. See also Baxter, *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*, 355–366.

95. On the development of the *Odes* as a canonical text through the course of its early hermeneutical history, see Van Zoeren, *Poetry and Personality*, 1–115. A succinct account may be found in Allen, “Postface: A Literary History of the *Shi jing*.”

96. I take this preliminary list from Goldin, “The Reception of the *Canon of Odes* in Zhou Times,” appendix.

97. In a variety of texts, scribes have shown either poor understanding or cavalier handling of the texts they were writing. This has been noted for the Guodian corpus in general as well as for the Western Han administrative bamboo strips from Juyan 居延. See the discussion in Allan and Williams, *The Guodian Laozi*, 134; Loewe, *Records of Han Administration*, vol. 1, 16.

98. See Giele, *Database of Early Chinese Manuscripts*.

99. See Keightley, *The Ancestral Landscape*, 37–39.

100. See Falkenhausen, “Issues in Western Zhou Studies,” 161–167. Shaughnessy (*Sources of Western Zhou History*, 169; “Western Zhou History,” 298–299, 326) and others have repeatedly emphasized the important role and high status of scribes at the Western Zhou court; see also Bagley, “Anyang Writing and the Origin of the Chinese Writing System.” However, it seems to me that some of Shaughnessy’s claims go too far (occasionally based on translations that I find questionable); see Kern, “The Performance of Writing in Western Zhou China.”

101. Kern, “The Performance of Writing in Western Zhou China.” For a healthy dose of skepticism with regard to the status of writing in early China, see also Nylan, “Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han.”

102. See Ledderose, *Ten Thousand Things*; Barbieri-Low, “The Organization of Imperial Workshops”; and Nylan, chapter 1 in this volume. In its summaries of officials in the six ministries, the *Zhou li* 周禮, probably dating

from the fourth or third century B.C.E., lists more than one thousand low-level (unranked) clerks. Excavated manuscripts from Shuihudi 睡虎地 (Yunmeng 雲夢, Hubei 湖北) tomb 11 (sealed 217 B.C.E.) and Zhangjiashan 張家山 (Jingzhou 荊州, Hubei 湖北) tomb 247 (sealed 186 B.C.E.) show that the position of administrative clerk was an entry position into local government; see Zhangjiashan ersiqi hao Han mu zhujian zhengli xiaozu, *Zhangjiashan Han mu zhujian*, 203–204; Xu, *Shuihudi Qin jian yanjiu*, 378–382; Kern, “Offices of Writing and Reading in the Zhouli.”

103. I thank Paul Goldin for several of these references.

104. *Mozi jiangou* 12.407–408.

105. See *Mozi jiangou* 2.62, 4.111, 5.119, 7.185–186, 7.196, 8.214–215, 9.250, 9.254, 12.407, 13.431.

106. See *Zhuangzi jishi* 13.488.

107. *Han Feizi jijie* 19.451–452.

108. For example, among some 450 (mostly Eastern) Han pictorial representations from Sichuan assembled in Gong et al., *Ba Shu Handai huaxiang ji*, only two (nos. 61 and 63) show scholars (?) discussing (?) books.

109. As David Schaberg has shown in his masterful *A Patterned Past*, the entire *Zuo zhuan* is built around the idea of ritual propriety.

110. See *Lunyu zhushu* 13.51a (13/5).

111. *Ibid.* 16.66c, 17.69b (16/13, 17/10).

*Text and Ritual
in Early China*

Edited by
MARTIN KERN

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS
Seattle and London

Contents

Publication of *Text and Ritual in Early China* was supported in part by the Committee on Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences, Princeton University. Additional support was provided by the East Asian Studies Program, Princeton University.

© 2005 by the University of Washington Press
Design and composition by Martin Kern
Printed in the United States of America
12 11 10 09 08 07 06 05 5 4 3 2 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

University of Washington Press
P.O. Box 50096, Seattle, WA 98145
www.washington.edu/uwpress

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Text and ritual in early China / Edited by Martin Kern.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references index.

ISBN 0-295-98562-3 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Chinese classics—Criticism, Textual. 2. Religion in literature.

I. Kern, Martin.

PL2461.Z6T49 2005

895.1'09382—dc22

2005015812

The paper used in this publication is acid-free and 90 percent recycled from at least 50 percent post-consumer waste. It meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Introduction: The Ritual Texture of Early China MARTIN KERN	VII
1. Toward an Archaeology of Writing: Text, Ritual, and the Culture of Public Display in the Classical Period (475 B.C.E.–220 C.E.) MICHAEL NYLAN	3
2. The Composite Nature of Early Chinese Texts WILLIAM G. BOLTZ	50
3. The E Jun Qi Metal Tallies: Inscribed Texts and Ritual Contexts LOTHAR VON FALKENHAUSEN	79
4. The Ritual Meaning of Textual Form: Evidence from Early Commentaries of the Historiographic and Ritual Traditions JOACHIM GENTZ	124
5. The <i>Odes</i> in Excavated Manuscripts MARTIN KERN	149
6. Playing at Critique: Indirect Remonstrance and the Formation of <i>Shi</i> Identity DAVID SCHABERG	194
7. Reimagining the Yellow Emperor's Four Faces MARK CSIKSZENTMIHALYI	226
8. Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Stelae K. E. BRASHIER	249
Works Cited	285
Contributors	311
Index	312