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Abstract

In September, 2019, Anhui University published the first volume of Warring States bamboo-slip manuscripts in its collection. The bamboo slips were purchased by the university in 2015 on the antique market. This volume contains ninety-three slips that correspond with all of or portions of fifty-seven poems in the Guo feng 国風 (Airs of the States) section of the Shi jing 詩經 (Classic of Poetry). The manuscript is written in the script of the ancient state of Chu 楚, and thus presumably was robbed from a tomb somewhere in the territory of that state. This preliminary study of the manuscript presents close readings of six representative poems, comparing the versions in the manuscript with those of the received text. It concludes with consideration of how to understand the textual variants apparent in the manuscript, and also the significance of the manuscript for the composition and especially the transmission of the Shi jing in the pre-Qin period.
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摘要

在2019年9月，安徽大学出版了该校收藏战国竹简第一本图录。这些竹简是2015年在古董市场购买的。这本图录包括93条竹简，相当于《诗经. 国风》内的57首诗。写本的文字很明显是楚国文字，应该说明这批竹简是从一座楚墓盗墓的。本文对文献的六首诗作介绍，特别注重写本和传世《诗经》的异文，并且讨论异文应该怎样理解，对先秦时代《诗经》的传授有什么意义。

关键词

《诗经》、竹简、写本、异文、文献传授

At the beginning of 2015, Anhui University acquired a cache of bamboo-slip manuscripts. These slips, like so many of the slips that have entered Chinese museum and university collections in recent years, are the result of tomb robbing, such that their archaeological provenance is unknown. Nevertheless, the slips have been subjected to various authentication tests, which have produced a scholarly consensus in China that they are authentic.1 First, three specimens from the slips and the lacquer basket in which they were packed were sent to Peking University’s Carbon 14 testing lab, which determined a date for them of 2280 years ago. Next, the National Cultural Artifacts Bureau (國家文物局) conducted infrared spectroscopy and X-ray diffraction analysis, determining that the slips date to the early to mid-Warring States period. The writing on the slips was also examined by various paleographers, both at Anhui University and also from elsewhere in China, and they have all determined the slips to be authentic manuscripts from the Warring States state of Chu楚.

1 The slips have been published in Anhui daxue Hanzi fazhan yu yingyong yanjiu zhongxin 安徽大學漢字發展與應用研究中心 ed., Anhui daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian 安徽大學藏戰國竹簡 1 (Shanghai: Zhongxi, 2019). General information concerning the slips is drawn from the Preface to this volume; pp. 1–7. For other general studies of the Anhui University Shi jing manuscripts, see Huang Dekuan 黃德寬, “Anhui daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian gaishu” 安徽大學藏戰國竹簡概述, Wenwu 文物 2017.9, 56–58; Huang Dekuan, “Lüelun xinchu Zhanguo Chu jian Shi jing yiwen ji qi jiazhi” 略論新出戰國楚簡《詩經》異文及其價值, Anhui daxue xuebao (Zhexue Shehui kexue ban) 安徽大學學報(哲學社會科學版) 2018.3, 71–77; Hao Shihong 郝士宏, “Xinchu Chu jian Shi jing Qin feng yiwen jianzheng” 新出楚簡《詩經·秦風》異文箋證, Anhui daxue xuebao (Zhexue Shehui kexue ban) 2018.3, 78–82.
The Anhui slips include a number of different types of manuscripts, but volume 1, which is the only volume so far published, is devoted exclusively to a fragmentary manuscript in ninety-three slips that corresponds to portions of the received Shi jing. Complete slips of this manuscript are 48.5 cm long and 0.6 cm wide. The slips were originally bound with three binding straps, the top strap about 2 cm from the top of the slip, the middle strap in the very middle of the slip, and the bottom strap also about 2 cm from the bottom of the slip. The space above the top binding strap is left blank, while beneath the bottom binding strap is written a number, written in small graphs to the right side of the slip, from 1 to 117; these indicate the sequence of the slip. However, twenty-four of the slips—18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 30, 56–58, 60–71, 95–97—are missing, such that there are only ninety-three slips extant in the cache. Most of the slips are complete or nearly so (for instance, some are missing the top portion above the top binding strap), though there are also several slips that are quite fragmentary. The backs of the slips are reported to have diagonal markings of the sort that are now known for most Warring States bamboo slips, though they are difficult to see on the full-size photographs of the slips that have been included in a packet together with the volume. However, these photographs do show that the backs of many of the slips reveal impressions from the fronts of other slips that pressed on them within the scroll. All of this renders the sequence of the slips, often disputed with other Warring States manuscripts, quite transparent.

Slips contain between 28 and 37 characters per slip, representing fifty-seven poems from several different portions of the Guo feng section of the Shi jing. These are (according to the names given to the sections in the manuscript): “Zhou nan” 周南 (ten poems2), “Shao nan” 召南 (fourteen poems), “Qin” 秦 (ten poems), “Hou” 侯 (six poems), “Yong” 邺 (seven poems), and “Wei” 魏 (ten poems). Each individual poem is written consecutively across one or more slips. In some, but not all, poems, the ends of individual lines are marked with small horizontal lines to the bottom right of the last character of the line. Invariably, the end of a poem is marked by a small black square to the lower right of the last character. The next poem then follows immediately after it, through the end of each individual section. New sections begin on new bamboo slips.

For instance, after the last poem of the “Zhou nan” section (slip 20), there is a

---

2 There is a notation at the end of this section “Zhou nan shi you yi” 周南十又一 “Zhou nan: 11,” indicating that the manuscript included eleven poems, matching the number in the received Shi jing. However, two slips, numbers 18 and 19, are missing from the manuscript. These slips would have contained the last four characters of the poem that corresponds to the Shi jing poem “Han guang” 漢廣 “The Han is Broad” (Mao 9), the entirety of the poem “Ru fen” 汝墳 “The Banks of the Ru” (Mao 10), and the first fourteen characters of the poem “Lin zhi zhi” 麟之趾 “Hooves of the Lin” (Mao 11).
blank of about three characters followed by the notation “Zhou nan shiyouyi” 周南十又一 “Zhou nan: 11,” followed by a black hook-shaped mark indicating the end of a section; this indicates both the name of the section and also the number of poems in it. The remainder of the slip is left blank except for the slip number (slip 20 廿) at the very bottom. In the case of the “Shao nan,” the last poem, known in the received text of the Shi jing as “Zouyu” 騒虞 (Mao 25) but written in the manuscript as “Cong hu” 從唬 (slips 40–41, and doubtless having a different meaning from that usually understood by the received tradition), is quite fragmentary, so that any section label is no longer extant. The last poem of the “Qin feng” section (slip 59), “Quan yu” 權舆 “Sprouts” (Mao 135), is also fragmentary, so that in this case too there is no section label extant. The last poem of the “Hou” section (slip 83), “Shi mou zhi jian” 十畝之間 “Within Ten Acres” (Mao 111), is followed by a blank space and then the notation “Hou liu” 侯六 “Hou 6,” apparently indicating the number of poems in the section; it is followed by a hook-shaped mark indicating the end of a section. This is then followed, after another blank space that would correspond to three characters, by the three characters (plus one duplication mark) 作魚寺=. followed by another space, what appears to be a solid black mark (of the sort indicating the end of a poem), another space, and then the thirteen characters 魚者索人見隹心虫之者虫之 (the last three characters of which are very faint, as if some attempt was made to erase them) that seem not to correspond to any poem in the received text of the Shi jing. Xu Zaiguo 徐在國, the co-editor-in-chief of the Anhui slips, suggests that they were practice writings on the part of a scribe.3 The six poems in this “Hou” section, the title of which does not correspond to any section in the received text, correspond to six of the seven poems in the received version of the “Wei feng” 魏風 (Mao 108–113).4 The next

3 Anhui daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian (yì), 125, n. 2. Xia Dazhao 夏大兆, “Anda jian Shi jing ‘Hou liu’ kao” 安大簡《詩經》“侯六”考, Guizhou Shifan daxue xuebao (Shehui kexueban) 貴州師範大學學報(社會科學版) 2018.4, 119–125, esp. 124, argues that yu 魚 is a phonetic loan for wu 吾 “I,” and is a self-referential comment on the part of the scribe referring to his writing of “this poem” (zhi shi 之詩). Because Xia identifies this “Hou” 侯 as referring to the state of Jin 晉, he argued that the scribe was from Jin but had migrated to the southern state of Chu 楚 (whence the Chu orthography of the manuscript). In a subsequent study, he suggests that this scribe was instead a refugee from Chu 楚 living in Jin; “Anda jian Shi jing ‘Hou liu’ xukao” 安大簡《詩經》“侯六”續考, Zhanguo wenzi yanjiu 戰國文字研究 1 (2019), 93–108. In this context, he reads the final thirteen graphs as “The old friends seeing me: Whose heart is thumping? It is mine that is thumping” (昔人見吾者, 誰心蟲之, 余者蟲之). This is certainly a creative reading, but perhaps no more satisfying than Xu Zaiguo’s suggestion that this is merely a scribe practicing his calligraphy.

4 The sequence of the poems in the manuscript is different from that in the received text of the Shi jing. The poems correspond to the following poems in the received text: “Fen ju ru”
section is “Yong” 甬 (i.e., 鄴), slips 84–99, with nine poems in all; slip 99 ends, after a blank space, with the notation “Yong jiu” 甬九 “Yong’ 9,” and then after another blank space, with the notation “Bai zhou” 白舟, which appears to refer to the first poem in the section, known in the received Shi jing as “Bai zhou” 柏舟 “Cypress Boat” (Mao 45). The Anhui editors suggest that this is an indication that even though most poems in the manuscript do not include a title, nevertheless individual poems were known by title. The final section included within the Anhui corpus is “Wei” (slips 100–117) with ten poems. The final slip ends with the notation “Wei jiu” 魏九 “Wei 9” and then “Ge lou” 葛婁, which is the title of the first poem in the section and corresponds to the poem “Ge ju” 葛屨 “Fiber Slippers” (Mao 107), the first poem in the received “Wei feng.” While this poem is indeed found in the “Wei feng” section of the received text of the Shi jing, the other poems in that section, as noted above, are included in the manuscript in the “Hou” section, whereas the other nine poems in this section are found in the received “Tang feng” 唐風. Moreover, the number “nine” here is clearly a mistake, since there are ten poems in the section, none of which is readily combinable with another poem. The identifications of the “Hou” and “Wei” sections is, as the editors say, an issue requiring further study.5

The manuscript is written throughout in the orthography of the Warring States state of Chu. As such, it contains numerous variants vis-à-vis the received text of the Shi jing. Many of these variants are simply different ways of writing the same word as understood in the received text, though many may also indicate different nuances from that or those usually understood in the exegeses of the received text. There are also not a few variants that seem clearly to represent completely different words. Rather than trying to give any sort of statistical accounting of these variants, it seems better for the purposes of this first reading of the Anhui manuscript to give a few examples that reflect different degrees of similarity or difference between the manuscript and the received text. I will examine six separate poems, one from each of the six different sections of the manuscript (the titles of the poems necessarily being as given in the received text). I have selected these poems both because they illustrate certain features concerning the manuscript and also because of their importance within the greater Shi jing exegetical tradition. Nevertheless, I believe they are broadly illustrative of the manuscript as a whole.

I will present the manuscript text, line by line, first in a strict transcription of the original graphs, followed by a loose transcription into current kaishu...
楷書 character forms indicating the underlying words of the text. I will follow this with a side-by-side presentation of this current kaishu transcription together with the received text of the Shi jing, as well as a translation of how I understand both the manuscript text and the received text. Finally, I will provide some discussion of the variants and how they may affect our understanding of the Shi jing.

“Guan Ju” 關雎 “Join, the Osprey” (Mao 1)

關雎鳩才河之洲要翟女君子戴晶 筌 芳菜左右流之要翟女君子 ①
関雎鳩才河之洲要姹淑女君子好逑參沙 芳菜左右流之要姹淑女君子

窈窕淑女君子好逑
Shyly lissome is the chaste girl,
A loving mate for the lord’s son.

參差荇菜左右流之
Up and down the water lilies,
To the left and right drifting them.

窈窕淑女寤寐求之
Shyly lissome is the chaste girl,
Awake and asleep seeking her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anhui University Manuscript</th>
<th>Received Shi jing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>關雎鳩才河之洲</td>
<td>關雎鳩才河之洲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join  Join cries the osprey,</td>
<td>Join  Join cries the osprey,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the island of the river.</td>
<td>On the island of the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>要姹淑女君子好逑</td>
<td>窈窕淑女君子好逑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyly lissome is the chaste girl,</td>
<td>Shyly lissome is the chaste girl,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A loving mate for the lord’s son.</td>
<td>A loving mate for the lord’s son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>參差荇菜左右流之</td>
<td>參差荇菜左右流之</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up and down the water lilies,</td>
<td>Up and down the water lilies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the left and right drifting them.</td>
<td>To the left and right drifting them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>要姹淑女寤寐求之</td>
<td>窈窕淑女寤寐求之</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyly lissome is the chaste girl,</td>
<td>Shyly lissome is the chaste girl,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awake and asleep seeking her.</td>
<td>Awake and asleep seeking her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhui University Manuscript</td>
<td>Received Shi jing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>求之弗得寤寐思倍— seeks her without getting her, Awake and asleep thinking to pair.</td>
<td>求之不得寤寐思服— Seeking her without success, Awake and asleep thinking of her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>愠哉悠哉輾轉反昃— Longing, oh, longing oh, Tossing and turning to and fro.</td>
<td>愠哉悠哉輾轉反側— Longing, oh, longing oh, Tossing and turning to and fro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>參沙萉菜左右采之— Up and down the water lilies, To the left and right picking them.</td>
<td>參差萉菜左右采之— Up and down the water lilies, To the left and right picking them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>要 onDataChange淑女琴瑟友之— Shyly lissome is the chaste girl, With harp and lute befriending her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>參差萉菜左右教之— Up and down the water lilies, To the left and right selecting them.</td>
<td>參差萉菜左右芼之— Up and down the water lilies, To the left and right choosing them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>要 onDataChange淑女鍾鼓樂之— Shyly lissome is the chaste girl, With bell and drum pleasuring her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Guan Ju” is the first and is generally regarded as the most important poem in the Shi jing (and perhaps in all of Chinese poetry), and thus readers will surely be interested to know if and how the Anhui University manuscript offers any new information about its early interpretation. Although the strict transcription presented above shows numerous orthographic differences with the received text (for instance, eight of the first ten graphs differ to one extent or another), as the kaishu transcription and translation in the side-by-side presentation above shows, most of these differences are probably simply different ways of writing the same words. There may be only two substantive variants, both in the second stanza: the manuscript’s 告, surely to be read as qín 寝 “to
sleep,” as opposed to the received text’s mei 寐 “to sleep” in the second and third couplets; and the last word of the third couplet, written bei 怀 in the manuscript, and fu 服 in the received text. In the first case, qin 寢 and mei 寐 are clearly synonymous; in fact, the Mao Zhuan 毛傳 (Mao tradition) commentary defines mei as qin (寢，寐也). While it is possible that there were graphically similar ways of writing the two words in the Warring States period,6 there is certainly no phonetic contact between them, and thus they would seem to constitute two different words. In the second case, in Chu orthography 怀 routinely stands for the word bei 倍,7 referring to multiples of persons, whereas the fu of the received text is variously glossed as shi 事 “service” or as si zhi 思之 “to think of it.” The translation that I offer above, “to pair” (understanding bei 倍 as cognate with pei 陪) may be too strong, but it does seem that something of this meaning approximates the protagonist’s desire (which, it should be noted, is explicitly expressed with the verb si 思 “to wish for”) to “seek” (qiu 求) the girl.8 This is a topic to which I will return in the concluding section of this study.

There is also one other word (or words) that the Anhui University editors suggest should be understood as different from the reading of the received text: this concerns the recurrent 要翟, which they understand as yao tiao 腰嬥 “slender of waist,”9 as opposed to yaotiao 窈窕, usually understood as a compound word meaning something like “shyly lissome,” as I have translated it.10 The editors’ interpretation, which focuses on the physical attractiveness of the girl in question, seems to be consistent with a number of other unearthed

---

6 The Anhui University editors note that there is evidence that in Warring States Chu script mei was written as 鬈 and as 睡, both of which feature 布 components and both of which resemble 寢 and 寢; Anhui daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian, 70–71, n. 7.

7 The Anhui University editors note that 怀 is often seen in Warring States Chu manuscripts, in which it routinely serves as an alternative form of bei 倍 “double; to add to; to join together with”; Anhui daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian, 71, n. 9. Bei 倍 is also cognate with pei 陪 “to accompany,” which it strikes me is also an appropriate reading here.

8 It is perhaps worth noting in this context that pei 陪 (and perhaps bei 倍) is synonymous with qiu 逑 “mate, match,” used to describe the girl in the preceding stanza.

9 The Anhui University editors note that the original form of the graph yao 要, still apparent in its Chu form, is of two hands cinching the waist; they understand it as the proto-graph for yao 腰 “waist.” Tiao 嬌 is defined in the Shuo wen jie zi 說文解字 as zhi hao mao 直好貌 “straight (or more probably slender) and beautiful appearance.” The Guang yun 廣韻 defines it as “xi yao mao” 細腰貌 “thin waisted appearance.” For these definitions, see Anhui daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian, 70, n. 3.

10 For an excellent discussion of the meaning of yaotiao in the received text, see Martin Kern, “Lost in Tradition: The Classic of Poetry We Did Not Know,” Hsiang Lectures on Chinese Poetry, Vol. 5, Grace S. Fong ed. (Montreal: Centre for East Asian Research, McGill University, 2010), 41–47.
documents that show that people in the Warring States and Western Han read the “Guan ju” poem as being concerned with sexual desire.\textsuperscript{11} Nevertheless, two features render it unconvincing. First, one would expect an expression such as “slender of waist” to be written as \textit{tiao yao} 嬷腰, with the adjective preceding the noun. Second, 要翟, though written differently than \textit{yaotiao} 窹窕, is certainly homophonous with it, or at least nearly so: *Ɂiau *liûk as opposed to *ɁiûɁ *liûɁ,\textsuperscript{12} especially considering that such rhyming binomial words are often written with different graphs and slight differences in pronunciation. Therefore, suggestive though the editors’ interpretation is, it is likely that the manuscript writing of this word does not constitute a lexical variant vis-a-vis the received text. I will address this further in the concluding section of this study.

“Zouyu”騶虞 “The Zouyu” (Mao 25)

皮蔭者葭一發五郙于差從 窹 皮蔭者蒹一□□口。
彼者葭一發五郙于嗟從呼 彼者蒹一□□口

于差從 窹 皮蔭者蒹一發五郙□□□口口口 口口口
于嗟從呼彼者蒹一發五郙□□□口口口

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Anhui University Manuscript} & \textbf{Received Shi jing} \\
彼者葭一發五郙于嗟從呼 & 彼者葭壹發五郙于嗟乎騶虞 \\
Sprouting those many bulrushes; & Sprouting those many bulrushes; \\
One volley shooting five sows. & One volley shooting five sows. \\
Aha, after them, ho! & Aha, oh ho, what a zouyu.
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{11} For the first of these unearthed documents, the \textit{Wu xing}五行 manuscript from Mawangdui 馬王堆, see Jeffrey Riegel, “Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings of \textit{Shijing} Commentary,” \textit{Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies} 57.1 (1997), 149–59. For a similar reading in the Shanghai Museum \textit{Kongzi Shi lun} 孔子詩論 manuscript, see Kern, “Lost in Tradition,” 33–36.

\textsuperscript{12} For these archaic reconstructions, see Axel Schuessler, \textit{Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa} (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009), 197, 237, 173, and 199. I am grateful to several friends for convincing me that this is best understood as a different writing of the same word: Ondřej Škrabal, Jiang Wen 蒋文, and Jeffrey Tharsen.
Anhui University Manuscript | Received Shi jing
---|---
彼茁者蓬一[發五囗]于嗟從呼 | 彼茁者蓬壹發五豵于嗟乎騶虞
Sprouting those many raspberries; One volley shooting five ... | Sprouting those many raspberries; One volley shooting five shoats.
Aha, after them, ho! | Aha, oh ho, what a zouyu.

彼茁者葭一發五麋于嗟乎騶虞
Sprouting those many yarrow stalks; One volley shooting five elks.
[Aha, after them, ho!]

The poem “Zouyu” is the last poem of the “Shao nan” section of both the Anhui manuscript and the received Shi jing. The poem is similar in structure in the two different texts, but in the Anhui manuscript it includes three stanzas whereas the received text includes only two. There is also an important lexical difference (or two), that may influence the overall interpretation of the poem. For the word zou 騒 “groom; to run” in the received text, the manuscript reads cong 從 “to follow,” though, as we will see, the Anhui editors suggest reading it as zong 縱 “to release; relaxed.” Also, the last character of each stanza (though not present in the third stanza, because of a broken bamboo slip) is written 虏, which the editors suggest reading, as customary in Warring States Chu manuscripts, as the final particle hu 乎.13 Hu 乎 (archaic *hâ) and the corresponding character in the received text, yu 虞 (archaic *ngwâ),14 are both written with a “tiger” 虎 component which serves as their phonetic, so it would be a simple matter to regard either as a phonetic loan for the other. However, as the Anhui University editors suggest, it is not necessary to posit a phonetic loan relationship between them; rather, they could simply represent two different readings of the poem.15

13 For 虐 read as the final particle hu 乎 or hu 呼 “to call out,” see Teng Rensheng 滕壬生, Chu xi jianbo wenziban 楚系簡帛文字編 (Wuhan: Hubei jiaoyu, 2008), 121–22.
14 Schuessler, Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese, 49, 52. In the case of yu 虞, it may be that hu 虎 also serves as the semantic component, and that wu 吳 (*ngwâ) serves as an added phonetic component.
15 The editors here explicitly credit Huang Dekuan 黃德寬 with this interpretation. For details, see Huang Dekuan, “Lüelun xinchu Zhanguo Chu jian Shi jing yiwen ji qi jiazhi,” 73.
In the received exegetical tradition, there are two predominant explanations of the poem, centering on the word or words zou yu 騶虞. One tradition treats it as the name of a mythical animal, while another tradition treats it as the name of an officer or officers in charge of the hunt, “groom” and/or “warden.” The Mao Zhuan is representative of the former interpretation, saying of the zouyu that it is “a righteous beast; a white tiger with black markings, which does not eat living things, such that the most sincere virtue responds to it” (騶虞，義獸也，白虎黑文，不食生物；有至信之德則應之).\(^{16}\) On the other hand, the Lu 魯 and Han 韓 traditions of the Poetry, though both lost, are quoted as saying that zou yu is “the officer of the Son of Heaven in command of fowling and hunting” (騶虞，天子掌鳥獸官).\(^ {17}\)

Both the Preface to the Poetry (Shi Xu 詩序) and the commentary of Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200) seem to conflate these two interpretations, stating:

《騶虞》，《鵲巢》之應也。《鵲巢》之化行，人倫既正，朝廷既治，天下純被文王之化，則庶類蕃殖，蒐田以時，仁如騶虞，則王道成也。

“The Game Warden” is a response to “The Magpie's Nest.” With the transforming effect of “The Magpie's Nest,” human relations being correct and the royal court being well governed, all the world was affected by King Wen's transformative influence. The various plants ripened profusely and the hunts were timely, as humane as the zouyu, and then the royal way was complete.\(^ {18}\)

君射一發而翼五豝者，戰禽獸之命；必戰之者，仁心之至

That the lord shoots one shot and chases off five sows is being fearful for the lives of the beasts of prey; being necessarily fearful for them is the epitome of a humane heart.\(^ {19}\)

\(^{16}\) Mao Shi Zheng jian, 1.18b.

\(^{17}\) This was quoted in Xu Shen 許慎, Wu jing yi yi 五經異義; see Chen Shouqi 陳壽祺, Wu jing yi yi shuzheng 五經異義疏證 (rpt. Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2012), 223.

\(^{18}\) Ibid.

\(^{19}\) Ibid. Zheng Xuan’s meaning is not very clear; the translation given here reflects the interpretation of the Mao Shi zhengyi 毛詩正義 (Shisan jing zhushu ed.), 1–5.26 (p. 294): 戰之者，不忍盡殺令五豝；止一發，中則殺一而已. Being fearful for them, he cannot bear to kill all five sows, so he only shoots once, and hitting it then kills one and that is all.
The Anhui editors interpret the manuscript in line with the *Preface to the Poetry* and Zheng Xuan, reading the *cong* 從 of 于嗟從呼, as *zong* 縱 “to relax, to release,” perhaps meaning something like “let them go.” This in turn concerns the interpretation of the second line of each stanza: “*yi fa wu ba/zong/mi* 一發五豝/ 繭/ 麋, which literally means “one shot five sows/shoats/elk.” The interpretation turns on both the meanings of *yi fa* 一發, literally “one shot,” and of the three different types of animals. *Yi fa* can mean that a team of hunters brings down five animals with one volley, as I have translated above, or it can mean that a single hunter shoots only one in five animals, allowing the others to escape, as Zheng Xuan seems to suggest. The *Mao Zhuan* offers no help in this case, stating simply “a female swine is called a *ba*; the warden drives the animals together to await the lord’s shot” (*豕牝曰豝; 虞人翼五豝以待公之發*). As for the animals, as noted above, the received text is in only two stanzas, the first concerning the hunting of “sows” (*ba* 豬) and the second of “shoats” (*zong* 繭). The *Mao Zhuan* makes a point of defining *ba* 繭 as a “female pig” (*豕牝曰豝*), which might not be appropriate targets of a hunt, whence the suggestion that the herd should simply be culled. On the other hand, the manuscript adds a third stanza in which the prey is “elk” (*mi* 麋), which the *Erya* 爾雅 (*Approaching Eloquence*), among other texts, explicitly defines as a “male elk” (*麋, 牝麔*). Whereas the hunting of sows and shoats might be questionable, male elk would certainly seem to be a legitimate target of a hunt.

In a lecture at the Institute of History and Philology at Academia Sinica in Taiwan, Yan Shixuan 颜世鉉 has proposed reading this poem as a simple hunting song. He resisted Huang Dekuan’s interpretation of *cong* 從 as *zong* 縱 “to relax, to release,” and suggested that it is more straightforward to read it as the character itself in the sense of “to follow” or “to chase after.” Also arguing that the animals mentioned in the poem were legitimate prey, he suggested that it is important to differentiate between the “original” intent...
of a poem and the intent and understanding of subsequent transmitters and editors. This, of course, is an old topic in the interpretation of the *Shi jing*, but the Anhui manuscript provides important new evidence with which to debate the meaning of the *Shi jing* poem “Zouyu,” and perhaps other poems of the collection as well.

“Huang Niao” 黃鳥 “Yellow Birds” (Mao 131)

黃鳴止于桑隹從穆公子車中行惟此中行 [51]

黃鳴止于桑隹從穆公子車中行惟此中行

口夫之道臨亓穴惴惴其慄彼蒼者天殲我良人如可贖也人百其身黃鳴止于桑隹從穆公子車 [52]

口夫之道臨亓穴惴惴其慄彼蒼者天殲我良人如可贖也人百其身黃鳴止于桑隹從穆公子車

咸虎隹此咸虎百夫之優臨亓穴惴惴其慄彼蒼者天殲我良人如可贖也人百其身黃鳴止于棘誰 [53]

咸虎隹此咸虎百夫之優臨亓穴惴惴其慄彼蒼者天殲我良人如可贖也人百其身黃鳴止于棘誰

從穆公子車奄思惟此奄思百夫之德臨亓穴惴惴其慄彼蒼者天殲我良人如可贖也人百其身 [54]

從穆公子車奄思惟此奄思百夫之德臨亓穴惴惴其慄彼蒼者天殲我良人如可贖也人百其身

---

25 Yan Shixuan quotes Wei Yuan 魏源 (1794–1856), *Shi gu wei* 詩古微 as making this point: 夫詩有作詩者之心，而又有采詩、編詩者之心焉。有說詩者之義，而又有賦詩、引詩者之義焉。作詩者自道其情，情達而止，不計聞者之如何也。...作詩者意盡於篇中，序詩者事徵於篇外。是毛傳仍同三家，不以序詩為作詩。With the *Poetry*, there is the intention of the ones who made the poems, and there is also the intention of those who collected the poems and who edited the poems. There is the meaning of those who explain the poems, and there is also the meaning of those who recited the poems and quoted the poems. Those who made the poems simply stated their feelings, and with the feelings expressed they stopped, without taking into account how the listener might react.... The thought of those who made the poems is entirely within the poems, while the affairs documented by those who put the poems in sequence is outside of the poems. In this, the *Mao Zhuan* is just the same as the other Three Schools; we should not consider the sequencing of the poems to be the making of the poems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anhui University Manuscript</th>
<th>Received Shi Jing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>敛棲黄鳥止于桑</td>
<td>交交黃鳥止于棘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kriad- kriad</em> the yellow birds,</td>
<td>Stopping on the mulberry tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping on the mulberry tree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>誰從穆公子車仲行</td>
<td>誰從穆公子車奄息</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will follow Duke Mu?</td>
<td>Who will follow Duke Mu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Hang of the Zi Ju clan.</td>
<td>Yan Xi of the Zi Ju clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>唯此仲行百夫之御</td>
<td>維此奄息百夫之御</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let it be this Junior Hang,</td>
<td>Let it be this Yan Xi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A model one of a hundred.</td>
<td>A special one of a hundred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>臨其穴惴惴其慄</td>
<td>臨其穴惴惴其慄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking down upon his pit,</td>
<td>Looking down upon his pit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trembling, trembling is his shaking.</td>
<td>Trembling, trembling is his shaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼蒼者天殣我良人</td>
<td>彼蒼者天殣我良人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That azure heaven up above,</td>
<td>That azure heaven up above,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How it cuts off our finest men.</td>
<td>How it cuts off our finest men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>如可贖也人百其身</td>
<td>如可贖兮人百其身</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah, if we could but ransom him,</td>
<td>Oh, if we could but ransom him,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hundred men would give their lives.</td>
<td>A hundred men would give their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>敛棲黃鳥止于楚</td>
<td>交交黃鳥止于桑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kriad- kriad</em> the yellow birds,</td>
<td>To and fro flit the yellow birds,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping on the hardwood tree.</td>
<td>Stopping on the mulberry tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>誰從穆公子車鍼虎</td>
<td>誰從穆公子車仲行</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will follow Duke Mu?</td>
<td>Who will follow Duke Mu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhen Hu of the Zi Ju clan.</td>
<td>Junior Hang of the Zi Ju clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>唯此鍼虎百夫之御</td>
<td>維此仲行百夫之防</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let it be this Zhen Hu,</td>
<td>Let it be this Junior Hang,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A defender of a hundred.</td>
<td>A stalwart one of a hundred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anhui University Manuscript  | Received Shi Jing
---|---
臨其穴惴惴其慄 | 臨其穴惴惴其慄
Looking down upon his pit, | Looking down upon his pit,  
Trembling, trembling is his shaking. | Trembling, trembling is his shaking.

彼蒼者天殲我良人 | 彼蒼者天殲我良人
That azure heaven up above, | That azure heaven up above,  
How it cuts off our finest men. | How it cuts off our finest men.

如可贖兮人百其身 | 如可贖兮人百其身
Ah, if we could but ransom him, | Oh, if we could but ransom him,  
A hundred men would give their lives. | A hundred men would give their lives.

交交黃鳥止于棘 | 交交黃鳥止於楚
*Kriâu- kriâu* the yellow birds,  
Stopping on the bush of thorns. | To and fro flit the yellow birds,  
Stopping on the hardwood tree.

誰從穆公子車奄思 | 誰從穆公子車鍼虎
Who will follow Duke Mu?  
Yan Si of the Zi Ju clan. | Who will follow Duke Mu?  
Zhen Hu of the Zi Ju clan.

惟此奄思百夫之德 | 維此鍼虎百夫之禦
Let it be this Yan Si,  
A virtuous one of a hundred. | Let it be this Zhen Hu,  
A defender of a hundred.

臨其穴惴惴其慄 | 臨其穴惴惴其慄
Looking down upon his pit,  
Trembling, trembling is his shaking. | Looking down upon his pit,  
Trembling, trembling is his shaking.

彼蒼者天殲我良人 | 彼蒼者天殲我良人
That azure heaven up above,  
How it cuts off our finest men. | That azure heaven up above,  
How it cuts off our finest men.

如可贖兮人百其身 | 如可贖兮人百其身
Ah, if we could but ransom him,  
A hundred men would give their lives. | Oh, if we could but ransom him,  
A hundred men would give their lives.
“Huang Niao” 黃鳥 “Yellow Birds” or “The Orioles” (Mao 131) is another of the most famous songs in the Shi jing, particularly important for its historical reference. It purports to describe the scene at the tomb of Duke Mu of Qin 秦穆公 (r. 659–621), as three noble-men of the Zi Ju 子車 clan prepared to follow him in death.26 The Anhui manuscript version of this poem is almost identical with the received text, except that the order of the three stanzas is different. In the received text, Zi Ju Yan Xi 子車奄息 is the subject of the first stanza, Zi Ju Zhong Hang 子車仲行 of the second, and Zi Ju Zhen Hu 子車鍼虎 of the third. By contrast, the manuscript places Zi Ju Zhong Hang first, followed by Zi Ju Zhen Hu, and then Zi Ju Yan Si 子車奄思.27 It may also be noted that one of these names, Yan Si 奄思 in the manuscript as opposed to Yan Xi 奄息 in the received text, is different, but differences in the writing of proper names are very common in all pre-Qin sources and the two words are almost homophonous.28 Indeed, the only immediate difference between the two texts is in the first line of each stanza, in which the manuscript writes ming 呜 “to call” where the received text writes niao 鳥 “bird.” This seems clearly to be a simple mis-writing on the part of the manuscript scribe (that this it is a mis-writing is clear from the adjective huang 黃 “yellow” before it, certainly not an appropriate modifier for a bird-call). Nevertheless, this mis-writing may reveal how the scribe understood another issue that has divided readers of this poem. The reduplicative that opens this first line of each stanza is written 𪁉 (i.e., 𪁉𪁉) in the manuscript and jiao jiao in the received text. Although the Mao Zhuan seems to understand jiao jiao as descriptive of the birds’ flying to and fro from one type of tree to another, other readers have understood it

26 This event is narrated also in the Zuo zhuan 左傳 (6th year of Duke Wen 文公); see Chunqiu Zuo zhuan Zhengyi 春秋左傳正義, Shisan jing zhushu ed. (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1980), 19a.142 (p. 1844).

27 Different ordering of the stanzas vis-à-vis the Mao version of the Shi is a fairly pervasive feature of the Anhui University manuscript, occurring in fifteen of the fifty-seven poems; for a complete listing and study of the feature, see Yuasa Kunihiro 湯淺邦弘, “On the Question of Inverted Stanzas in the Anda-Slip Shi jing Poem "Si tie,"” 147–169. It seems to me likely that this difference in sequence of stanzas may be due to a codicological feature seen, for instance, in the Fuyang 阜陽 manuscript of the Shi jing, whereby whole stanzas were written on individual bamboo slips. As these slips came undone, it would have been natural for different readers—and thus different editors—to put them in different orders. For the Fuyang manuscript, see Hu Pingsheng 胡平生 and Han Ziqiang 韓自強, Fuyang Han jian Shi jing yanjiu 阜陽漢簡詩經研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1988).

28 Si 奄 is in the zhi 職 rhyme class (reconstructed as *sa) and xi 息 is in the zhi 職 rhyme class (reconstructed as sak); see Schuessler, Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese, 103, 111.
to be onomatopoeia for the call of the birds.\(^{29}\) I suspect that the manuscript’s scribe’s writing \textit{niao} 鳥 “bird” as \textit{ming} 鳴 “to call” may have been the result of his subconscious voicing of the birds’ calls.

“\textit{Shuo Shu}” 碩鼠 “Big Rat” (Mao 113)

碩鼠碩鼠毋食我黍三歲貫女莫 ... \[80\]
碩鼠碩鼠毋食我麥三歲孌女莫「我肯德逝將去女」

逝彼樂樂樂樂愛得我直碩鼠碩鼠毋食我麥三歲孌女莫我肯與逝將去女適彼樂樂土樂土樂土愛得我所碩

... 壽我苗三歲孌女莫我肯與逝將去女適彼樂土樂土樂土爰得我所石 碩鼠碩鼠無食我黍

---

碩鼠碩鼠無食我黍
Big rat, big rat,
Don't eat my grain.

三歲嬿女莫我肯與
For three years I was linked to you,
You don't deign to join with me.

逝將去女適彼樂土
Now I am about to leave you,
And go off to that happy land.

樂土樂土愛得我所
The happy land, the happy land,
Where I will get where I belong.

碩鼠碩鼠無食我苗
Big rat, big rat,
Don't eat my sprouts.

三歲嬿女莫我肯勞
For three years I was linked to you,
You don't deign to give me credit.

逝將去女適彼樂郊
Now I am about to leave you,
And go off to that happy 'burb.

樂郊樂郊誰之永號
The happy 'burb, the happy 'burb,
It is the place long to call out.
“Shuo shu” 廃鼠 “Big Rat,” which is a poem in the “Wei feng” 魏風 section of the Shi jing, is found in the “Hou” 侯 section of the Anhui University manuscript.30 As noted in the introduction to this study, the “Hou” section of the manuscript is anomalous within the Shi jing tradition; several studies have already been published, either formally or online, suggesting identifications of it,31 but none of these would seem to be conclusive. Like “Shuo shu,” the other five poems in the “Hou” section are also found in the “Wei feng” section of the Shi jing, though in a different order.32

Like the poem “Huang niao,” the sequence of the first two stanzas of “Shuo shu” is different from that of the received Shi jing. Nevertheless, also like “Huang niao,” although there are numerous orthographic differences between the manuscript version of the poem and the received text, there are in fact very few differences of wording between the two versions of the poem. The Anhui University editors suggest that the luan 䜌 found in the second couplet of each stanza should be regarded as a phonetic loan for the guan 贯 “to penetrate; to link” of the received text; luan 䜌, which is the phonetic of and probably the proto-form of luan 攴 “to link,” but which can surely be read as luan (*rô̂n), is in the same rhyme class as guan (*kôns), and thus by most standards of textual criticism constitutes an acceptable phonetic loan.33 On the other hand, it seems to me that luan 攴 “to entangle; to link” is a reasonable reading within this line, such that there is no need to posit a phonetic relationship with the guan of the received text. It is just as likely that the two words are synonyms. The same is more or less true of the only other words that differ between the two versions: the last word of the same couplet in the second stanza (the first

30 The top portion of slip 81 is broken, with about eight characters missing. The top portion of slip 82 is broken, with one character missing.
32 In the received Shi jing, there are seven poems in the “Wei feng”: the six found in the “Hou” section of the Anhui manuscript, and also the poem “Ge ju” 葛屨 (Mao 107), which is the first poem in the “Wei feng.” In the Anhui manuscript, “Ge ju” is likewise the first poem of the “Wei” 魏 section, though the other nine poems in that section are found in the “Tang feng” 唐風 section of the received text of the Shi jing.
33 Anhui daxue cang Zhanquo zhujian (yi), 123, n. 3. For the archaic reconstructions, see Schuessler, Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese, 272 and 265.
stanza of the received text), *yu* 與 “to join with; to give to” and the corresponding *gu* 顧 “to look back upon”; the Anhui editors simply note that the two words are similar both in meaning and pronunciation. 34 Again, either word is suitable in the context.

There is, however, one important feature of the manuscript version of this poem that may also have affected the transmission of the poem in later times: this has to do with punctuation. The final two characters of the third couplet of each stanza are followed by repetition marks: 樂 = 或, 樂 = 土, and 樂 = 蒿. The Anhui editors note that in the Mao *Shi*, the corresponding characters are repeated three times: 適彼樂土, 樂土樂土 “And go off to that happy land. The happy land, the happy land”; 適彼樂國, 樂國樂國 “And go off to that happy state. The happy state, the happy state”; 適彼樂郊, 樂郊樂郊 “And go off to that happy ‘burb. The happy ‘burb, the happy ‘burb.” However, they state that since such a triple repetition function for this repetition mark has not been seen in other unearthed manuscripts, they also suggest that the manuscript might read instead as 適彼樂國, 樂, “And go off to that happy land, Happy land.” This means that the first line of the following couplet would have only two characters, 35 which the editors say might preserve an early reading. Given the standard four-character lines of the “Guo feng” poems, this is extremely unlikely. Indeed, Liu Gang 刘刚, a member of the Anhui University editorial team, has released a study of a *Shi jing* poem not found in the Anhui manuscript, the poem “You bi” 有駜 “They Are Stout” (Mao 298) of the “Lu song” 鲁颂 section, in which he discusses this duplication mark and its attendant problems. 36 He notes first of all that Wu Kejing 鄔可晶 has pointed out that in the Tsinghua “Qi ye” manuscript there are several places where duplication marks have to be understood as double duplicatives. 37 To give just one example, slip 3 reads: 作歌一終曰：脂 酒. This should be read as 作歌一終曰《樂樂脂酒》: 樂樂脂酒 “makes a song in one stanza, called ‘Pleasing, pleasing the tasty wine’; ‘Pleasing, pleasing the tasty wine.” The duplication mark after *le* 樂 “pleasing” indicates that it is first to be read twice (i.e., 樂樂), and then the same duplication mark together with the duplication marks after *zhi jiu* 脂酒 indicate that the entire (four-character) phrase is to be repeated. Thus, the one character *le* 樂 is to be read four times. In this way, there is precedent—even if it is not at all common—for reading the duplication marks after 樂或,
樂土 and 樂蒿 in the Anhui manuscript version of “Shuo shu” as indicating that both characters are to be repeated and then repeated again.

This suggests that in this line too, the Anhui manuscript and the Mao Shi share the same reading. However, of interest for the transmission of the Shi jing, the Han Shi waizhuan 韓詩外傳 reveals a different reading of this poem:

> 逝將去女，適彼樂土。
> 適彼樂土，爰得我所。
>     Now I am about to leave you, And go off to that happy land. 
>     Going off to that happy land, Would that I get where I belong.

Over one hundred years ago, Yu Yue 俞樾 (1821–1906) suggested that the difference between the Mao Shi and the Han Shi waizhuan reading was doubtless brought about by different understandings of duplication marks. While Yu concluded that the Han Shi waizhuan reading should be preferred, the Anhui manuscript now seems to give support to the Mao Shi reading. In either event, if Yu Yue (and Liu Gang) are correct in their analysis of the function of these duplication marks, and there would seem to be no better explanation of the marks in the “Shuo shu” poem, this means that at some point in the course of transmission of the Poetry, different scribes were looking at duplication marks and understanding them differently. This would seem necessarily to be evidence of visual copying from a written original.

“Qiang you Ci” 墻有茨 “On the Wall there are Prickly Vines” (Mao 46)

又蜃蜃不可敟也申殽之言不可譲也□□ [85]

牆有蜃蜃不可敟也申殽之言不可譄也□□

讀也言之辱也蜃又蜃蜃不可敟也申殽之言不可譄也申殽之言不可詳也所可詳也言之長也蜃又蜃蜃不可詳 [86]

讀也言之辱也牆有蜃蜃不可敟也申殽之言不可詳也所可詳也言之長也

也申殽之言不可道也所可道也言之獻也 [87]

也申殽之言不可道也所可道也言之獻也

39 Of course, it is also possible that different manuscript versions of the text used duplication marks differently, but without any further evidence we can only speculate about this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anhui University Manuscript</th>
<th>Received Shi jing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>壁有螾螾不可欶也</td>
<td>壁有茨不可埽也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the walls there are vermin,</td>
<td>On the walls there is star-thistle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which cannot be coughed off, oh.</td>
<td>Which cannot be swept off, oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>壁之言不可讀也</td>
<td>壁之言不可道也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is said at the midnight hour</td>
<td>What is said within the walls,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot be stated out loud, oh.</td>
<td>Cannot be stated outright, oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>言之辱也</td>
<td>言之醜也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What can be) stated out loud, oh,</td>
<td>What can be stated outright, oh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the most shameful of words, oh.</td>
<td>Are the filthiest of words, oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>壁有螾螾不可殱也</td>
<td>壁有茨不可束也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the walls there are vermin,</td>
<td>On the walls there is star-thistle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which cannot be spat off, oh.</td>
<td>Which cannot be baled up, oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>壁之言不可詳也</td>
<td>壁之言不可詳也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is said at the midnight hour</td>
<td>What is said within the walls,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot be made explicit, oh.</td>
<td>Cannot be made explicit, oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>言之長也</td>
<td>言之長也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can be made explicit, oh,</td>
<td>What can be made explicit, oh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the commonest of words, oh.</td>
<td>Are the commonest of words, oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>壁有螾螾不可喫也</td>
<td>壁有茨不可埽也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the walls there are vermin,</td>
<td>On the walls there is star-thistle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which cannot be puffed off, oh.</td>
<td>Which cannot be swept off, oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>壁之言不可道也</td>
<td>壁之言不可道也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is said at the midnight hour</td>
<td>What is said within the walls,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot be stated outright, oh.</td>
<td>Cannot be stated out loud, oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>言之辱也</td>
<td>言之辱也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can be stated outright, oh,</td>
<td>What can be stated out loud, oh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the filthiest of words, oh.</td>
<td>Are the most shameful of words, oh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This poem corresponds to the poem “Qiang you Ci” 墻有茨 “On the walls There is Star-thistle” of the Yong feng section of the Shi jing. The Preface to the Poetry provides a historical context for this poem: “A man of Wei satirized his superior. The Ducal Son Wan was incestuous with the Dowager Mother. The people of the state were pained by it, but could not speak of it out loud” (衛人刺其上也。公子頑通乎君母，國人疾之，而不可道也). In fact, this was one of the more sordid tales of the Spring and Autumn period.40 It began during the reign of Duke Xuan of Wei 衛宣公 (r. 718–700 BC). Prior to becoming ruler of Wei, Duke Xuan had sired a son, Gongzi Ji 公子伋, with one of the secondary consorts of his father. When the duke in turn came to power, he named this son the crown prince. Later he arranged for Duke Xi of Qi 齊僖公 (r. 729–698 BC) to send his daughter, Xuan Jiang 宣姜, to be Gongzi Ji’s wife. However, when Xuan Jiang arrived in Wei, Duke Xuan, smitten with her beauty, took her as his own consort. Together they sired two sons: Gongzi Shou 公子壽 and Gongzi Shuo 公子朔.Late in Duke Xuan’s life, Xuan Jiang, realizing that she was the legitimate wife of the crown prince Gongzi Ji, feared that he would take revenge on her when he came to power. She conspired with her younger son, Gongzi Shuo, to have Ji killed, so that her elder son, Shou, would become crown prince. According to the story, the plan was to send Ji to Qi, and to have him killed on the road. However, Shou and Ji were bosom buddies, and when Shou became aware of the plot, he attempted to stop it. When Ji persevered in going despite the threat to his life, Shou went along with him. Getting Ji drunk the night before the ambush, Shou stole his clothes and travel documents, and went off the next morning to be killed himself. When Ji heard of this, he too went to the assassins and was also put to death. At the loss of his two favorite sons, the elderly Duke Xuan took to his bed and died. This left Gongzi Shuo, the only remaining son, as Duke Xuan’s successor, known posthumously as Duke Hui of Wei 衛惠公 (r. 699–696, 686–669 BC).

The story does not end with his succession. Shortly after he came to power, two associates of Gongzi Ji and Gongzi Shou, both of them half-brothers by other consorts of Duke Xuan, joined forces to overthrow Duke Hui, driving him into exile, in Qi, in 696 BC. They installed one of Ji’s younger brothers, Qianmou 黔牟, as ruler of Wei. However, after Qianmou ruled for ten years, Duke Xiang of Qi 齊襄公 (r. 697–686 BC), patron of the exiled Duke Hui of Wei, invaded

40 This story is first alluded to in both the Chunqiu 春秋 and Zuo zhuan 左傳 in the 16th year of Duke Huan 桓公 (696 B.C.) and then more fully in the Zuo zhuan for the 2nd year of Duke Min 閔公 (660 B.C.); Chunqiu Zuo zhuan zhengyi, 7.56 (p. 1758), 11.86 (p. 1788); see too Stephen Durrant, Wai-yee Li and David Schaberg, Zuo Tradition Zuozhuan 左傳: Commentary on “The Spring and Autumn Annals” (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016), Vol. 1, 127, 241.
Wei, and ousted Qianmou, who went to the royal Zhou capital for protection. Duke Xiang of Qi arranged for Gongzi Ji’s other younger brother, Gongzi Wan 公子頑, to be the new husband of Xuan Jiang. Although the people of the state apparently viewed this relationship as a scandal, Xuan Jiang and Gongzi Wan together sired five children. This poem, “Qiang you ci” 墻有茨 is supposed to refer to their relationship.

The Anhui University manuscript of this poem is generally similar to that of the received text, but does contain certain differences that may reveal different meanings, at least of detail if not of general interpretation. Perhaps least important of these, the order of stanzas is once again different, with the first and third stanzas reversed. Perhaps more important, the first line of each stanza reads differently: for the received text’s ci 芝 “star-thistle” clinging to the walls, the manuscript reads jili 螨, a type of small insect such as “vermin” (I would almost want to translate it as “creepy-crawler,” if only for the alliterative effect).41 The Anhui University editors read 螨 as a phonetic loan for jili 螨藜 “prickly vine,” noting that the Mao Zhuan glosses ci 芝 as jili 螨藜, and that both the Er ya and Shuo wen jie zi 說文解字 Discussing Pictographs and Explaining Composite Graphs equate jili 螨藜 and ci 芝.42 In my translation above, I have translated the manuscript “literally.” I would not wish to claim that jili 螨 “vermin” is necessarily the “correct” or “original” reading, but I would suggest it is a possible reading. Clearly, whether it is to be read as jili 螨 “vermin” or as jili 螨藜 “prickly vine,” or even as ci 芝 “star-thistle,” whatever is on the wall(s) is meant to symbolize the problems that cannot be talked about. “Prickly-vine” and “star-thistle” may well be appropriate botanical symbols of such prickly problems, but surely “vermin” would also be an apt metaphor. What is more, I would suggest too that there is some evidence that the manuscript scribe intended a meaning such as this; whereas all three verbs in the following lines of the received text, sao 扫 “to sweep off,” xiang 襄 (usually understood as rang 攘) “to brush off,” and shu 束 “to bind, to bale,” are usually understood to involve brushing aside something (such as a plant), the verbs in the manuscript are written with significs having to do with the mouth: shuo 欠, usually “to suck,” but also “to cough; to spit” (as if dispelling something poisonous, cognate with sou 呵);.eu; and 嘿. Although the latter two of these characters are apparently unknown in the received lexicography, and it is not

41 I thank Ondřej Škrabal again for suggesting that it might be interesting to read these two graphs in the manuscript “literally.”

42 Anhui da xue cang Zhangguo zhu jian (yi), 118 n. 1. For the Mao Zhuan gloss, see Mao Shi Zheng jian, 2.1a. For the Er ya and Shuo wen jie zi glosses, see Er ya Guo zhu, 8.10b; Shuo wen jie zi Duan zhu 說文解字段注 (Sibu beiyao ed.), 1B.15b (writing the word ci 芝 and quoting this line of the Shi as 墻有齊).
entirely clear (at least to me) why it would be necessary to use one’s mouth to get rid of vermin (or some similar small insect), it is at least notable that all three verbs are written consistently.\(^{43}\) (It might be interesting to note too that the verbs in the following lines, *du* “to recite,” *xiang* “to specify,” and *dao* “to state,” all have to do with “speech,” which of course is also a function of the mouth.) The Anhui University editors do not even consider the possibility of reading these lines literally, apparently assuming that the received text is more or less “correct” in its botanical symbolism.

There is one other orthographic difference concerning which the Anhui University editors do depart from the Mao text, even if they adopt a reading that is at least attested by the Han 韓 tradition of the *Poetry*. This is found in the phrase 中妹之言, which recurs in the second couplet of each stanza, and which corresponds with the phrase Zhong gou zhi yan 中蕉之言 of the received text. There have been three predominant interpretations of the term *zhong gou* 中蕉: the “inner chamber,” which is the reading of the *Mao Zhuan;\(^{44}\) “(illicit) sexual relations,” presumably understanding *gou* 蕭 as the proto-graph for *gou* 娼, which seems to be the interpretation of Zheng Xuan;\(^{45}\) and “midnight,” which is the reading of the Han Shi.\(^{46}\) The Anhui editors transcribe the manuscript graph 为 as 燕, and say that it derives directly from the oracle-bone graph 燕, which has been identified by Huang Tianshu 黃天樹 as the term for midnight.\(^{47}\) This need not suggest that the other readings are unsupported, but only that the scribe responsible for the Anhui manuscript understood this line to refer to “midnight.”

“Xishuai” 蟋蟀 “A Cricket” (Mao 114)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>蟋蟀才堂朊叔元朊</th>
<th>者不樂日月朊毋已內 獻思叔叔好</th>
<th>[101]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>蟋蟀在堂朊哲其逝今者不樂日月其邁毋已內康猶思其外好</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{43}\) David Lebovitz reminds me that *xiang* 襄 is also written with two “mouth” components, so it may well be that this character should be read as *xiang*.

\(^{44}\) The *Mao zhuan* says simply nei gou ye 内蕉也 “inner chamber”; see *Mao Shi Zheng jian*, 3.1b–2a; see too, for instance, Legge, *The She King*, 75.

\(^{45}\) *Ibid.* It must be admitted that Zheng Xuan’s explanation is open to different interpretations in its own right.

\(^{46}\) The *Han Shi* 韓詩 states: “Zhong gou is midnight, and refers to words of licentious talk” (中蕉,中夜,謂淫辭之言也); see Yuan Mei 袁梅, *Shi jing yiwen huikao bianzheng* 詩經異文彙考辯證 (*Jinan: Qi-Lu*, 2013), 69.

\(^{47}\) Anhui daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian, 118, citing Huang Tianshu 黃天樹, *Huang Tianshu guwenzhi lunji* 黃天樹古文字論集 (*Beijing: Xueyuan*, 2006), 185–188.
樂母無良士戲，熠熠才堂戲，齊元肅今者不樂日月元彷母已大癟猷思亓
樂好樂母無良士。[102]
樂毋無良士熠熠蟋蟀在堂歲肅其暮今者不樂日月其除母已大癟猷思其
懼好樂母無良士

懼懼蟋蟀在堂役車其休今者不樂日月亓滔
毋已大康職思其居

Anhui University Manuscript  

蟋蟀在堂嘂齋其逝
A cricket is in the hall,
The year-star is about to be gone.

今者不樂日月其邁
Now it is that we are not pleased,
The sun and moon will be going.

毋已內康懼思其外
Do not yet be at ease within,
Still think of what is outside it.

好樂毋無良士熠熠
Love and pleasure ought not waste,
The fine man so halting halting.

蟋蟀在堂歲肅其暮
A cricket is in the hall,
The year-star is about to be dark.

今者不樂日月其除
Now it is that we are not pleased,
The sun and moon will be removed.

毋已大康懼思其懼
Do not yet be greatly at ease,
Still think of what it fears.
Once again, the Anhui University manuscript poem corresponds very closely with the received Shi jing poem “Xishuai,” even if the first and second stanzas are reversed in the two poems. There are several other variants, of greater or lesser lexical significance. For instance, the *yu*矞 of the first couplet of the manuscript’s first stanza and the *yu*聿 of the corresponding second stanza of the received text are essentially different instantiations, different spellings if you will, of the same word; the nominalizing agent *zhe*者 of the second couplet of each stanza is certainly different from the *wo*我 “we” of the received text, but does not entail much difference of meaning; the third couplet of each stanza in the manuscript begins with the prescriptive negative *wu*毋 “don’t,” whereas the received text has the descriptive negative *wu*無 “there is not”; the *nei*內 “inner” of the same couplet differs from the received text’s *da*大 “great” in the corresponding second stanza;\(^{48}\) the second phrase of that

---

48 The Anhui University editors suggest that because of the two character’s graphic similarity, *nei*內 may be a mistake for *da* 大. I suspect that it is more likely that *da* would be a
couplet begins with the word you 猶 “still” in the manuscript and zhi 職 “only” in the received text; the last word of that couplet in the second stanza reads ju 懼 “fearful” in the manuscript and the homophonous ju 居 “to reside” in the received text; the first phrase of the last couplet of each stanza has wu 無 “not” where the received text has huang 荒 “waste”; and the very last words of the poem are fu fu 浮浮 “floating floating” in the manuscript as opposed to xiu 休休 “graceful graceful” in the received text. Any one of these variants is doubtless worthy of extended discussion. However, the manuscript version and the received version have exactly the same number of phrases, in the same order (other than the reversal of the first two stanzas), have the same perspective of speech, the same rhymes, and exactly the same content. It is hard to deny that the two texts reflect essentially one and the same poem.

**Tentative Conclusions**

I think that there can be little doubt that the publication of the Anhui University manuscript of the *Shi jing* will come to be viewed as a momentous event in the long history of scholarship on this classic. It is much to be regretted that the manuscript has come to light by way of a tomb robbing. It is unfortunate too that it is fragmentary. Nevertheless, it will surely be the subject of study for decades to come. Much of this study will be devoted, at least initially, to the mistake for nei, which contrasts nicely with the concluding wai 外 “outside, outer” of the couplet.

49 It seems likely that this wu 無 “not” in the manuscript was a transformation of wang (*mang) 無 “not; non-existent,” which in turn is essentially homophonous with the huang (*hmâng) 荒 “waste” of the received text; for both reconstructions, see Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese,* 89.

50 Although these two words would seem to have nothing in common, and the characters for them in kaishu楷書 form are quite distinct, the right sides of the two characters may be similar enough to have been easily mistakeable: fu 浮 vs. xiu 休.

51 There are preliminary reports that from July 2014 through January 2015, archaeologists affiliated with the Jingzhou Museum 荊州博物館 excavated cemeteries at Xiajiatai 夏家台 and Liujiatai 劉家台, just to the north of Jingzhou 荊州 and south of Yingnan 郢南 village respectively. Xiajiatai tomb 106, dated to the Warring States period, is said to have contained more than 100 bamboo slips, including the first fourteen poems from the Bei feng 邙風 section of the *Shi jing*; see "Zui zao de *Shi jing* chutu yu Jingzhou" 最早的《詩經》出土於荊州; http://www.360doc.com/content/17/0429/09/8527076_6495273 08.shtml, accessed 9 October 2019.

52 Because of the unprovenanced nature of the Anhui University manuscripts, there is no way to know how many more, if any, slips the *Shi* manuscript may have originally contained in addition to the 117 numbered slips.
paleography of the text. As our understanding of the text itself becomes more mature, other studies will take up the thorny question of how to integrate this new evidence into our evolving understanding of the *Poetry* and its tradition. For now, I will offer below just two preliminary thoughts on the basis of the preceding survey of six different poems as seen in the manuscript. Both of these thoughts concern questions of similarity and difference, first on a micro-level—to what extent is the wording of the Anhui manuscript similar to or different from that of the received text, and then on a macro-level—to what extent can this Anhui manuscript be identified with the received text of the *Shi jing* in general? I will restrict my comments to just the analyses of the six poems introduced above. Just as those analyses were tentative, so too should these thoughts be viewed as tentative, meant more to raise questions than to state conclusions.

The script in which the manuscript is written is obviously different from the *kaishu* 嵐書 script in which the received text of the *Shi jing* has come to us. Nevertheless, within this difference, there are varying degrees of similarity. In some cases there is a one-to-one correspondence between the characters of the manuscript and the characters of the received text; in some cases there is no apparent relationship between the characters of the two texts; and in other cases the characters are superficially different but appear to refer to the same underlying words in the two different writing systems. It is the last of these categories that is often ambiguous, requiring judgment on the part of the reader: to what extent do the differences mask the same underlying word, or to what extent do the differences indicate different words?

In his study of the poem “Zouyu” discussed above, Yan Shixuan quotes Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭 as warning of two pernicious tendencies in the way that scholars relate manuscript versions of ancient texts to received versions of those texts: an “urge to equate” (*qu tong* 趨同) and a desire to “establish difference” (*li yi* 立異).

在將簡帛古書與傳世古書（包括同一書的簡帛本和傳本）相對照的時候, 則要注意防止不恰當的「趨同」和「立異」 兩種傾向。前者主要指將簡帛古書和傳世古書意義本不相同之處說成相同, 後者主要指將簡帛古書和傳世古書中彼此對應的、意義相同或很相近的字說成意義不同。

When correlating bamboo and silk ancient texts and transmitted ancient texts (including bamboo and silk versions and transmitted versions of the same text), it is important to resist two inappropriate tendencies: “the urge to equate” and “establishing difference.” The former is primarily to
conflate content of bamboo and silk texts and received texts that is basically different; the latter is to explain as different corresponding graphs in bamboo and silk texts and received texts the meaning of which is similar or very close.\textsuperscript{53}

In the article from which this passage is drawn, Qiu examines mistakes of both of these kinds that he claims to have made in his own work explicating manuscripts with either corresponding received texts or with similar wording. While he is careful to call out the harmful effects of both tendencies, if I am not mistaken in my reading, he is more concerned with the latter tendency, the desire to “establish difference,” than he is with the former.\textsuperscript{54} As opposed to one “mistake” that he made due to accepting the reading of the received text—an example of the “urge to equate,” Qiu cites three examples in which he proposed a different reading from a received text (or in which he did not identify a corresponding received text) but for which he subsequently became convinced that the correct reading was in fact that of a received text.

Scott Cook has also discussed the same two tendencies.\textsuperscript{55} Cook begins by identifying the problem:

For the purposes of this review, I would like to focus my attention on one particular aspect of working with certain excavated texts that goes most centrally to the core of what makes them valuable to us, but which, if not properly understood and treated with caution, can constitute a potential source of harm as well. This is the issue of “reading” these texts against their received counterparts—an issue that is discussed, from various

\textsuperscript{53} Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, “Zhongguo gudianxue chongjian zhong yinggai zhuyi de wenti” 中國古典學重建中應該注意的問題, in Qiu Xigui, Qiu Xigui xueshu wenji: Jiandu boshu juan 裘錫圭學術文集: 简牘帛書卷 (Shanghai: Fudan daxue, 2012), 339.

\textsuperscript{54} This statement follows upon several pages where Qiu was at pains to show how he misread lines in the Guodian 郭店 manuscripts by not paying sufficient attention to corresponding passages in the received literature. It is then followed in turn by one simple example of a mistake he made in too readily accommodating his reading of a passage in the Guodian Laozi 老子 to the received Laozi, occupying a little over half a page, and then one more example, but covering a page and a half, of how he went wrong by trying to “establish difference.” Of course, the number of characters devoted to one problem is not necessarily indicative of the importance accorded to that problem, but the overall tenor of Qiu’s argument shows, to me at least, that he is more concerned with the problems pertaining to “establishing difference” than with those stemming from an “urge to equate.” See Scott Cook, Review of Sarah Allan and Crispin Williams, editors. The Guodian Laozi: Proceedings of the International Conference, Dartmouth College, May 1998, China Review International 9.1 (2002), 54–64.
angles, most prominently in the essays by William Boltz, Qiu Xigui, and Gao Ming.

After paying due deference to the contributions that unearthed manuscripts can make to the reading of received literature, and after acknowledging that there are countless problems with the received literature, Cook nevertheless concludes this portion of his discussion with the following plea for the “intrinsic authority” of the received texts.

So, while we must certainly recognize and be prepared to correct the countless errors and misreadings that these early editors have left us with, we should not go so far as to strip them altogether of that “intrinsic authority” they seem to carry due to their venerable age. Indeed, in some respects the source of their authoritativeness—limited as it is—is akin to that of the archaeologically excavated texts themselves: they each represent determinations of the text made at a time much closer to the source than any we are able to make today (to the extent, of course, that these early editions themselves have not been subject to later corruption). The value of the early received editions vis-à-vis the excavated texts is simply that they were written down in standardized graphs in which lexical ambiguity is no longer as much of an issue—we can at least be reasonably sure of what those early editors thought the text meant, which is more than we can say in the case of the excavated texts (p. 56).

As evidence of the authoritative nature of received texts, Cook then spends five pages critiquing an argument by William G. Boltz that the Guodian 郭店 manuscript of the Zi yi 緇衣 Black Jacket provides a preferable reading of the first chapter of that text to the corresponding reading in the received text in the Li ji 禮記 Record of Ritual. Employing both paleography and also traditional textual criticism, Cook argues instead that the received text is still to be preferred. Finally, referring to a parallel text in the Xunzi 荀子, he concludes that this parallel “reflects the received version of the ‘Zi yi’ line in question so neatly that we are almost compelled to give the latter greater weight because of it—unless, of course, we find that it just makes too much sense for our tastes.”

Despite his cri de couer for the authority of received texts, Cook’s qualification of making “too much sense for our tastes” would seem to leave great leeway for each individual reader to arrive at her own reading.

56  Cook, Review of The Guodian Laozi, 61 (emphasis in the original).
Be this as it may, Cook is surely right that it is “the ‘reading’ of manuscripts against their received counterparts” “that goes most centrally to the core of what makes [unearthed manuscripts] valuable to us.” Among scholars who work with unearthed manuscripts, he and Qiu are the two leading authorities in the West and in China respectively, and in their own work they have both explored the problems involved with considerable subtlety, subtlety that the quotations above cannot adequately reflect. However, these quotations do suffice to raise the issue. I propose to pursue it here only with respect to the Anhui University manuscript of the *Shi jing* vis-à-vis the received text of the *Shi jing*, and indeed only with respect to the six poems that I introduced above. My discussion will perhaps inevitably take issue with some of the decisions the editors have made in “reading” the manuscript. Even though they have occasionally been ready to challenge the received text, as in the case of their reading the 要翟 of the manuscript version of “Guan ju” as *yao tiao* 腰嫺 “slender of waist,” as opposed to the *yaotiao* 嫺嫺 “shyly lissome” of the received text, there are also numerous places where I feel they have been all too ready to accommodate the text of the manuscript to the reading of the received text. Despite the critical nature of what I will say in the next few paragraphs, let me say at the outset that I very much appreciate the work that the editors have done; it forms the basis of any interpretation that I might offer.

The Anhui editors’ reading of 要翟 in the manuscript version of “Guan ju” as *yao tiao* 腰嫺 “slender of waist” would seem to be a classic example of what Qiu Xigui refers to as “establishing difference.” As noted above, it would be unproblematic to read these two characters as homophonous with the *yaotiao* 嫺嫺 of the received text: *Ɂiau *liâuk as opposed to *ɁiûɁ *liûɁ. After all, the writing of this rhyming binomial expression was quite fluid in early texts: it is written *jiaoshao* 茭芍 (*krâu *diauk)57 in the Mawangdui 馬王堆 *Wu xing* 五行 manuscript, and, as Ma Ruichen 馬瑞辰 (1782–1835) has argued, *yaojiao* 窹糾 (*ɁiûɁ *kiuɁ)58 in the *Shi jing* poem “Yue chu” 月 出 “The Moon Comes Out” (Mao 143),59 so using two other characters to write the word is not unusual. The editors were doubtless influenced by the meanings of the separate characters of which the binome is composed: 要, which the editors note is a pictograph of two hands cinching the waist, and thus the protograph for *yao* 腰 “waist”; and 翟, which the editors interpret, reasonably, as *tiao* 腦, which is defined in in the *Shuo wen jie zi* as *zhi hao mao* 直好貌 “straight (or more probably slender) and beautiful appearance,” and in the *Guang yun* 廣韻 as

58 Ibid, 173, 171.
“xi yao mao” 細腰貌 “thin waisted appearance.” However, as Martin Kern has noted, “such descriptive rhyming, alliterative, or reduplicative binomes cannot be decoded based on the meaning of each character. Instead, they constitute indivisible words.”

Whereas in this reading of 要翟, the editors adopt an implicitly sexual reading of this most important of poems of the Shi jing, nevertheless in another one of their readings from the same poem they revert all too easily to the received text. For the line 求之弗得, 寤寐思伓, although they note that the final character 伓 is routinely used in Chu script to write the word bei 倍 “to pair,” which would seem to be a natural desire of the poem’s male persona “to pair” with the girl of his desire (and thus an appropriate object of the verb si 思 “to wish for” preceding it), still they gloss the character as fu 服, the corresponding word in the received text, stating simply that the pronunciations of the two words were close and that they could be interchanged in antiquity. In so stating, they simply accept the reading of the received text: 求之不得, 寤寐思服, even though the reading of this word fu is quite uncertain in the received tradition of the Shi jing. Usually meaning either “clothing,” “service, responsibility,” or even “to surrender, to submit,” the Mao Zhuan glosses it, almost inexplicably—though certainly influentially—as “to think about it/her” (思之也). Zheng Xuan, with somewhat better lexical support, defines it as “service, duty” (事也), and then almost comically goes on to describe its meaning for this poem: “In seeking the sagely woman but not getting her, when she wakes up then she thinks of her own official duty, and with whom she should share it” (求賢女而不得, 覺寐則思己職事, 當誰與共之乎). Is it not easier to imagine that the sleepless poet was wishing “to pair” (bei 倍 or pei 陪) with the young woman, whether she was slender of waist or not? What is more, this
would make an appropriate response to the last line of the preceding stanza: 君子好逑 “A loving mate for the lord’s son,” qiu 逑 and pei 陪 being virtually synonymous. In short, at the risk of being accused of wishing to “establish difference,” I would suggest that the reading of the Anhui manuscript is far preferable to the reading of the received Shi jing, despite whatever authority the Mao Zhuan might have.

In the presentation of the poem “Zouyu” above, I have already surveyed the traditional interpretations of the poem, which though they differ in important details are in agreement at least that this is a hunting poem. As we have seen above, both the Preface to the Poetry and the Mao Zhuan interpret the characters 駃虞 to refer to a righteous animal (yishou 義獸) that is so humane (ren 仁) that it does not eat the flesh of other living animals. On the other hand, Zheng Xuan reads the characters separately as zou 駃 “grooms” and yu 虞 “warden,” referring to the huntsmen assisting the lord in the hunt. In the Anhui manuscript, these two characters are written as 從. As discussed above, the Anhui editors note that in Chu script 贳 regularly stands for hu 乎, and they read it here unproblematically as a sentence final exclamation, even though, as we have also seen above, it would certainly be possible to demonstrate a phonetic connection between hu 乎 (*hâ) and yu 虞 (*ngwa). This might be another instance of “establishing difference.” On the other hand, for the manuscript’s 從, the base meaning of which when read as cong is “to follow,” but which also has numerous attested uses as “to chase,”65 and which is thus synonymous with the base meaning of the received text’s zou 駃, “to rush; to chase” (also written as qu 趨 or 趣), the editors follow Huang Dekuan in reading the word as zong 縄 “to relax, to release.”66 This is entirely informed by the interpretation of the received text; according to this interpretation, although this is a hunting song, it is about a hunt that culls only one in every five animals. I would submit, as has Yan Shixuan, that such a moralistic reading is more reflective of Han-dynasty interpretations than it would be of any earlier hunting song.

As evidence of such an earlier hunting song, one might look to one of the Qin Stone Drums (秦石鼓) as a poem more or less contemporary with the Anhui copy of the “Zouyu” poem.67 The “Tian che” 田車 or “Hunting Chariot”

65  For just some of these uses, see Yan Shixuan, “Shi Shao nan ‘Zou yu’ ‘zou yu’ jie,” 10.
66  While it is easy to see how cong 從 “to follow; to chase” and zou 駃 or qu 趨 “to rush; to chase” are related, it would be more difficult to see any relationship between zong 縄 “to relax; to release” and zou (or qu). Indeed, a substitution of cong 從 for zou 駃 might be seen as a classic example of lectio facilior, a word “easier” to write and understand replacing a more difficult word (though recognizing that this principle does not apply as predictably with Chinese as with some other languages).
The hunting chariot is ever so steady;
The metal-ornamented reins are X-ly.
The mailed four-horse teams are completely select.
The left outer-steed is spirited;
The right outer-steed is robust.
We hereby ascend the plain.

Our war-chariots come to a halt on a knoll;
The palace-chariot is unhitched.
We draw our bows and wait to shoot.
The tailed-deer and wild boars are ever so numerous;
Stags and hinds, pheasants and hares.
Their [flight] is helter-skelter;
Their [movement?] is flurried and X.

... coming out, approach (?) ...
... tire? ...
Grasping [the bows] they vigorously shoot.
The throngs [of hunters and footmen] go romping about,
Where the noblemen find pleasure.

---


According to this poem, the “pleasure” the noblemen find resides entirely in their “vigorously shoot[ing]”; the hunt was not an exercise in morality. Read in the light of this poem, I would submit that the 從 of the Anhui manuscript of “Zouyu” should certainly be read literally as the word cong: “after them.”

Finally, I have also had occasion above to discuss in some detail the poem “Qiang you ci.” There we have seen that the first line of each stanza reads 壁有蛩蛩, but that the Anhui editors have stated that jili 螟蛩, usually understood to be a type of small insect or vermin, is a loan character for the homophonous jili 菟藜 “prickly vine.” They go on to explain that jili 菟藜 “prickly vine” is in turn synonymous with ci 茨 “star-thistle,” which is the reading of the received text. Moreover, consistent with this loan interpretation, they read each of the verbs in the following lines of the first couplet of each stanza as having to do with clearing vegetation, in line with the received text, even though in the manuscript these verbs are supplied with different signifies that refer to blowing or coughing. I will not repeat the argument made above for the appropriateness of reading 蟲蛩 literally as vermin. Instead, while I am happy to admit that jili 菟藜 “prickly vine” can certainly be understood as an appropriate metaphor for something bad, I would suggest that “vermin” might be just as good a metaphor for something vile and perhaps even untouchable.

More to the point, I would also suggest that there is no need to choose between these two metaphors. It is possible—even likely—that at some stage in the written transmission of this poem, the metaphor was written simply 疾, which is to say without any explicit signific. Subsequent readers of the poem would have been free to supply whatever signific they determined to be appropriate in order to make sense of these two graphs. (Indeed, they would have had to supply a signific in order to make appropriate sense of the characters.) This would have been true too of anyone who might have copied the poem, especially if making use of a new or more explicit script. I would submit that it is entirely possible that one copyist—and thus also one writer of the poem (in the sense that in a manuscript culture, a copyist is also a writer, in the full sense of the word)—might have understood the metaphor to be about creepy-crawly insects, and so added an “insect” 虫 signific to both graphs, while another copyist—and thus also another writer—understood it to be about prickly vegetation, and so added a “grass” 草 signific to both graphs. This “prickly vine” or “star-thistle” reading and writing is not necessarily more “correct” just because it happens to stand on the authority of the Mao text of the Poetry, though I should hasten to add as well that neither is the “vermin” reading and writing more “correct” because it is now the earliest attested form. Nevertheless, I would submit that by too readily accepting the authority of the Mao Poetry, the Anhui editors have missed an excellent opportunity to
explore some of the contributions that the Anhui manuscript might make to our understanding of how the poetry was created and transmitted prior to the Han dynasty. Finally, with all due respect to those editors, and also to Qiu Xigui and Scott Cook, I would suggest that in interpreting unearthed manuscripts with received counterparts, the “urge to equate” is generally a more pernicious problem that the desire to “establish difference.”

Having made this point, let me now turn to the second topic that I would like to address in these concluding thoughts: what the Anhui manuscript might tell us about how the poetry was created and transmitted prior to the Han dynasty. The *Shi* Poetry was certainly the most important collection of ancient literature during the pre-Qin period. Aside from its intrinsic literary value, its importance within the literary tradition of ancient China is attested by the hundreds of quotations of the poems in pre-Qin works. It is quoted over 150 times in just the *Zuo zhuan* alone, and hundreds of times more in such early sources as the *Lunyu* 論語, *Mozi* 墨子, *Mengzi* 孟子, *Xunzi* 荀子, *Li ji* 禮記, and *Lü shi Chunqiu* 呂氏春秋. By no later than the Warring States period, the *Shi* was routinely cited as the first of the Six Classics. Nevertheless, over the last twenty years or so, it has become increasingly popular in the Western world to question the textual status of the *Shi* during this period. Although such doubts about the written nature of the *Shi* are by now widespread among western scholars, there is little doubt that the driving force behind them has been Martin Kern. Beginning with his first publication concerning a *Shi jing* poem in the year 2000, he has published a long series of studies arguing that both the original creation and subsequent transmission of the poetry owed largely—even primarily—to the oral culture of ancient China.

Probably the most authoritative statement of Kern’s position is to be found in his contribution to *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature*.

Quoting and reciting the Poetry was primarily a matter of oral practice. Regardless of the writings excavated from a small number of elite tombs, the manuscript culture of Warring States China must have been of limited depth and breadth. The available stationery was either too bulky (wood and bamboo) or too expensive (silk) for the extensive copying of texts.

---

69 For a compendium of these quotations, see Ho Che Wah 何志華 and Chan Hung Kan 陳雄根, *Xian-Qin Liang Han dianji yin Shi jing ziliao huibian* 先秦兩漢典籍引《詩經》資料彙編 (added English Title: *Citations from the Shijing to Be Found in Pre-Han and Han Texts*) (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2004).

and their circulation over vast distances.... While local writing of technical, administrative, legal, economic, military, and other matters existed in the different regions of the Warring States, the extensive circulation of the Classics probably did not depend on writing. No pre-imperial source speaks of the circulation of the Classics as writings, or of the profound difficulties involved in transcribing them among distinctly different calligraphic and orthographic regional traditions. Not one of the numerous invocations of the *Poetry* in the *Zuo Tradition* and the *Discourses of the States* mentions the use of a written text; invariably, they show the ability of memorization and free recitation—in the literary koine mentioned above—as a hallmark of education.

In Warring States times, no particular written version of the *Poetry* (or the *Documents*) was considered primary or authoritative. Only the institutionalization of official learning (*guanxue*) at the Qin and Han imperial courts led to written versions of the Classics taught at court, especially at the Imperial Academy founded in 124 bc, and called for textual stabilization and standardization. Meanwhile, the sheer amount of graphic variation combined with archaic poetic idiom of the *Poetry* would have made private reading impossible.71

In his most recent contribution to this topic, expanding upon his comments about early manuscripts, Kern has examined a poem in the Tsinghua University manuscript *Qi ye* 輕夜 *Toasting Qi* that contains a poem corresponding in much of its wording with the poem “Xishuai” in the received *Shi jing*, but also showing manifest differences.72 Kern argues that the two poems could not have been produced by “a simple model of consistent visual copying from a written original.”

A simple model of consistent visual copying from a written original cannot explain why one text has more phrases than the other, why shared phrases and entire lines appear in different places in the two poems,

---


why the two poems differ in their perspectives of speech, why they have different rhymes, why they are contextualized and historized in different ways, and why they contain phrases and lines of entirely different content. Whatever textual practices led to the two texts we now have (and possibly numerous others we no longer have, or have yet to discover), they must have included acts beyond those performed by faithful scribes. What can be ruled out for the two “Xi shuai” poems, however, is clear: there is no direct line from one version to the other where a scribe copied the former from the latter, if by “copied” we mean an attempt to reproduce an existing model with some degree of fidelity.73

This conclusion concerning these two poems would seem to be unproblematic. Indeed, the great majority of scholars who have written on the two poems do in fact view them as two different poems such that there would be no “consistent visual copying” from one to the other.74

---

73 Kern, “Xi Shuai”蟋蟀 (“Cricket”) and Its Consequences,” 52.
74 Kern cites ten different studies that he consulted: Li Xueqin 李學勤, “Lun Qinghua jian Qi ye de Xi shuai shi”論清華簡《耆夜》的《蟋蟀》詩, Zhongguo wenhua 中國文化 33 (2011), 7–10; Li Feng 李峰, “Qinghua jian Qi ye chudu ji qi xiangguan wenti”清華簡《耆夜》初讀及其相關問題, in Disijie guoji hanxue huiyi lunwenji: Chutu cailiao yu xin shiyue 第四屆國際漢學會議論文集: 出土材料與新視野, ed. Li Zongkun 李宗焜 (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan, 2013), 461–91; Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, “Qinghua jian Qi ye jujie”清華簡《耆夜》句解, Wenwu 文物 2012.1, 77–93; Chen Minzhen 陳民鎮, “Xi shuai zhi ‘zhi’ ji qi shixue chanshi: jianlun Qinghua jian Qi ye Zhong zuo Xi shuai benshi”《蟋蟀》之“志”及其詩學闡釋——兼論清華簡《耆夜》周公作《蟋蟀》本事, Zhongguo shige yanjiu 《中國詩歌研究》9 (2013), 57–81; Cao Jianguo 曹建國, “Lun Qinghua jian zhong de Xi shuai”論清華簡中的《蟋蟀》, Jianghan kaogu 江漢考古 2011.2, 110–15; Li Rui 李銳, “Qinghua jian Qi ye xutan”清華簡《耆夜》續探, Zhongyuan wenhua yanjiu 《中原文化研究》2014.2, 55–62; Chen Zhi 陳致, “Qinghua jian suojian gu yinzhi li jQi ye zhong gu yishi shijie”清華簡所見古飲至禮及《耆夜》中古佚詩試解, Chutu wenxian 出土文獻 1 (2010), 6–30; Hao Beiqin 郝貝欽, “Qinghua jian Qi ye zhengli yu yanjiu”清華簡《耆夜》整理與研究, M.A. thesis (Tianjin Normal University 天津師範大學, 2012); Marcel Schneider, “The ‘Qi’ye ‘耆夜’ and ‘Zhōu Gōng zhī qín wǔ 周公之琴舞’ from the Qinghuá Bamboo Manuscripts: An Annotated Translation,” Licentiate dissertation (University of Zurich, 2014), as well as my own study “Unearthed Documents and the Question of the Oral Versus Written Nature of the Classic of Poetry,” Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 75.2 (December 2015), 331–75, esp. 342. Of these, those by Hao Beiqin 郝貝欽 and Marcel Schneider are not available to me. However, despite Kern’s statement that “Nearly all studies contend it is just one poem” (p. 49), in fact quite the opposite is the case. Other than the studies by Li Xueqin 李學勤 and two of his students (Huang Huaixin 黃懷信 and Chen Minzhen 陳民鎮), all of the other studies (those by Li Feng 李峰, Cao Jianguo 曹建國, Li Rui 李銳, Chen Zhi 陳致, as well as by myself), draw precisely the opposite conclusion: that we are dealing here with two different poems.
However, when Kern goes on to say, a few pages later, that “It is easy to imagine how other ‘Xi shuai’ poems, were they to be discovered, would likewise be different,” and “If this is true of ‘Xi shuai,’ it will also be true of other texts in the Poetry,” it is not so easy to agree with him. As we have seen, the Anhui manuscript does contain another “Xishuai” poem. To be sure, there are differences between the Anhui manuscript version of “Xishuai” and the received Shi jing version of the poem: as with several other poems that we have examined, the order of stanzas is different, and there are also several words that are different in the two different texts. Nevertheless, I would submit that the Anhui manuscript version of the poem is not so different as to constitute an entirely different poem. What is more, at least one of the differences between the two versions is almost certainly the result of visual copying at some point in the course of the transmission of the text.

“Xishuai” is in no way exceptional within the Anhui University manuscript of the Shi jing. Among just the poems introduced in this essay, “Guan ju,” “Huang niao,” “Shuo shu” and “Qiang you ci” are also essentially the same as the corresponding poems in the received text, notwithstanding the sorts of differences examined just above. There are, of course, other types of differences between the Anhui manuscript and the received text, principal among which are the different order in which the various “Airs” (feng 風) of the states appear, as well as the sequences of poems within some of them. Different people will attribute different weight to these differences; it may be a classic “glass half full, glass half empty” question regarding the developing canonical status of the poetry or Poetry. For me, the Anhui University manuscript shows the metaphorical glass that is the canonical status of the Shi to be well more than half full. However, regardless of how one might view the contents of this glass, I am certain that all future studies of the early history of the Shi jing will have to take account of it, and that past conclusions should be rethought in the light of it.

75 Kern, “Xi Shuai”蟋蟀 (“Cricket”) and Its Consequences,” 57, 58.
76 This concerns the nei 内 “inner” of the third couplet of the first stanza of the manuscript version of the poem, which differs from the received text’s da 大 “great” in the corresponding second stanza. The two characters are visually quite similar, but very different in terms of pronunciation (*nûts vs. *dâs). I have also suggested (n. 36 above) that the difference between the manuscript’s fu 浮 and the received text’s xiu 休 may also be due to the graphic similarity of the two characters. Needless to say, this does not entail any direct influence between the Anhui University manuscript, which after all has been underground for the last 2300 or more years, and the received Shi jing. However, we can surely assume that there were other similar manuscripts circulating above ground during the Warring States period, both in the ancient state of Chu and also in other states of northern China, and that some at least of these manuscripts survived long enough to have a direct influence on the Mao 毛 version of the Shi.
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