

Reconstructing the Kongzi shilun : from the arrangement of the bamboo slips to a tentative translation

Autor(en): **Staack, Thies**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **64 (2010)**

Heft 4

PDF erstellt am: **10.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147865>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

RECONSTRUCTING THE *KONGZI SHILUN* FROM THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE BAMBOO SLIPS TO A TENTATIVE TRANSLATION

Thies Staack, University of Hamburg

*Abstract*¹

This study is an attempt to provide a reliably based translation of the so-called *Kongzi shilun*. The first step towards this aim is to reconstruct the arrangement of the bamboo slips that constitute the manuscript. All the useful evidence for this task can be divided according to material and textual criteria and will be systematically analyzed. The former include, among others, the measurements and condition of the slips as well as the “blank end phenomenon”; the latter involve the sequence of the ode categories, textual parallelism, textual and topical coherence, etc. After reconstruction of the arrangement of the slips, new editions of the manuscript are given, both diplomatic and punctuated. The readings of the characters are based on recent studies with some modifications, which are explained in this paper. Finally, an English translation of the *Kongzi shilun* is provided.

1. Why yet another Reconstruction?

Since the publication of its first part in 2001, the corpus often called “Shanghai Museum manuscripts” has become a focal point of scholarly interest in China as well as abroad.² One of the recorded texts, entitled by the editors *Kongzi shilun*

- 1 I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Jiang Guanghui 姜廣輝 (Yuelu Academy of Hunan University at Changsha), Professor Matthias Richter (University of Colorado at Boulder) and the anonymous reviewer of the present paper for their helpful comments, criticism and encouragement. I wish to particularly thank Professor Michael Friedrich (University of Hamburg) not only for proofreading and commenting on a draft version of this article, but also for his continuous help and advice far beyond this. Of course, any shortcomings in the present work are to be attributed entirely to myself.
- 2 Up to now, seven volumes of this manuscript corpus of about 1,200 bamboo slips have been published, each containing photographs of the slips and annotated readings of the characters. For a general introduction, see the preface of the first volume, MA, 2001.

孔子詩論 (“Discourse on the Odes³ by Confucius”, hereafter *Shilun*), has received special attention because of its apparently great significance regarding the study of the history of Odes transmission and the early history of poetics in China. Since its first publication, dozens of articles⁴ as well as a few monographs have appeared,⁵ and the focus of scholarly discussion has meanwhile gradually moved on from basic problems, such as the arrangement of the bamboo slips and analysis of the characters, to more extensive questions like authorship, literary context and the relationship to the extant *Mao shi* prefaces to the Odes.

While much progress has been made in this respect, the basic problems are still being debated and no general consensus has been reached, particularly as far as the arrangement of the slips is concerned. This is illustrated by the great number of reconstructions presented by various Chinese scholars, some of which are completely different from the one by Ma Chengyuan 馬承源, which met with criticism soon after publication.⁶ Yet, attempts at a systematic examination of the arrangement of the bamboo slips, which comprises all the available material and textual evidence, are few and far between.⁷ In many cases, a new edition of the *Shilun* manuscript, which is based on a specific arrangement of the slips, is rather just presented than discussed in detail.⁸ In cases where attention is paid to more detailed explanations, very often only some of the possible criteria have been taken into consideration. As not only the arrangement of the slips, but also the interpretation of many characters in Ma Chengyuan’s edition is by now somewhat outdated, it would not be sufficient just to carry out a new reconstruction of the arrangement in order to arrive at a new edition of the *Shilun*. There-

3 The term “Odes” refers to a group of odes, which in the course of time apparently became a “Canon of Odes” or *Shijing*. Today’s most influential and only complete version of this canon is represented by the Mao-Version or *Mao shi*, cf. for example RUAN, 1980. However, this neither implies that the term “*Shi*” in the *Shilun* refers exactly to this version nor that the process of canonization was already completed by the time the *Shilun* was written.

4 Many of these have been gathered in ZHU / LIAO, 2002. As far as Western scholarship on the *Shilun* is concerned, Martin Kern’s discussions of ode quotations (KERN, 2003, 2005) and his interpretation of the famous *Guanju* ode in ancient manuscripts (KERN, 2007) have hitherto remained the only examples.

5 Mainly LIU, 2003, CHEN, 2004, HUANG, 2004, and XIAO, 2006.

6 For an overview of the most influential arrangements, see Ji, 2004: 2.

7 The most detailed analysis was published by Kang Shaofeng in his dissertation; cf. KANG, 2005.

8 The reconstruction by Li Xueqin (LI, 2002c) became somewhat authoritative and was often taken as a guideline.

fore, the readings given in the *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (yi – wu) wenzi bian* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書(一 – 五)文字編⁹ will be taken as a basis for the editions in the present paper, as this work incorporates most of the results from scholarly discussions up to 2007.¹⁰ As far as a complete translation of the *Shilun* text into English is concerned, the only such endeavor up to now is based on a translation into modern Chinese provided by Jiang Guanghui 姜廣輝.¹¹ A direct translation into English without this intermediate step could provide us with a result which more faithfully reflects the original text. Because of the reasons stated above, a systematic analysis towards a reliable arrangement of the slips, new editions on this basis and finally a translation of the *Shilun* text shall be attempted in the present paper.

As we need to distinguish clearly between the terms “text” and “manuscript”, a short definition may be helpful for the following: Generally speaking, the term “manuscript” refers to a physical object, in this case the bamboo slips together with the ink-written characters on them. A “text” does not necessarily need to have such a physical representation, but is merely constituted by a more or less coherent composition of words, which may exist only in a non-permanent (i.e. oral or mental) form. If these words are written down, a manuscript is produced. We also have to bear in mind that one manuscript can contain several texts, and that a long text can be written down divided into several parts of more than one manuscript. Marc Kalinowski introduced the technical terms “textual unit” and “codicological unit” to distinguish between these two.¹² As it is not perfectly clear whether the *Shilun* constitutes a separate manuscript or was once one part of a manuscript (i.e. scroll, see 2.1.3), it will for now be considered as both a textual as well as a codicological unit. Whenever only one of the aspects, material or textual, is meant, the expressions “*Shilun* manuscript” or “*Shilun* text” will be used.

9 Cf. LI / QU / SUN, 2007.

10 For more detailed renderings of different views concerning the interpretation of most problematic characters, cf. JI, 2004, and HUANG, 2004.

11 The English translation of this modern Chinese version by Jonathan Krause can be found in JIANG, 2008. Martin Kern also translated some parts of the *Shilun* text in two of his articles (cf. KERN, 2003, 2007).

12 Cf. KALINOWSKI, 2005.

2. Arrangement of the Bamboo Slips

Because of its poor condition and the fact that the *Shilun* manuscript has not been retrieved through an archaeological excavation, reconstructing the original arrangement of the bamboo slips is an especially difficult task.¹³ The criteria which provide evidence in this respect can generally be divided into two categories: material and textual. The former refer to all the hints that can be gathered from the manuscript as a physical object, the latter to clues present in the text fragments on the slips, both structural and with regard to content. There are now basically two possible approaches when trying to reconstruct the arrangement of the slips: either the material or the textual criteria are considered as primary and the others are accordingly secondary. In the case of conflicting conclusions from material and textual data, it is therefore still possible to decide on a well-grounded hierarchy of criteria. At first glance, this seems easy to decide upon. It would not have been reasonable to group the more than 1,000 bamboo slips of the Shanghai corpus according to the content of the text fragment on each of them, leaving aside at first their physical appearance (length, width, type and style of script, etc.). Slips of different lengths, for example, could hardly have belonged to the same manuscript, even if they would fit together quite well as far as the content of the respective text fragments is concerned. This is why the editors of the Shanghai Museum took material criteria as their first guideline.¹⁴ However, as will be shown in the course of the present study, strict adherence to the principle that material criteria are primary and textual criteria are secondary can lead to distorted results (see 2.1.2). For this reason, a purely schematic approach is to be avoided. Instead it always needs to be carefully checked and maybe adjusted, if reasonable doubts about particular material criteria arise.

2.1 *Material Criteria*

2.1.1 Measurements and Condition of the Slips

All of the 31 slips or fragments of slips, which have until now been identified as belonging to the *Shilun* manuscript by the editors of the Shanghai Museum, have

13 For a rendering of the ordering work done by the editors, see the preface to the *Shilun* in MA, 2001. A more detailed description of the principles underlying the arrangement of the *Shilun* slips is provided in PU, 2002.

14 MA, 2001: 1–4.

the same width (0.6 cm) and about the same thickness (between 0.11 and 0.13 cm).¹⁵ As only one of them is complete (about 55.5 cm long)¹⁶, no such judgment about their length is possible. The position of the binding notches (*qikou* 契口)¹⁷ on relatively complete slips suggests that the manuscript originally had three bindings. As the material there is more fragile, the bamboo slips tend to break at these bindings, which is in fact quite clearly reflected by the actual length and condition of the fragmented slips (see figure 1 below). On the one hand, this further reconfirms the Shanghai Museum editors' hypothesis that the slips actually belong to the same manuscript. On the other hand, it also provides us with a framework for the reconstruction of their arrangement. A complete slip can be divided into four sections according to its bindings: "top" (*jianshou* 簡首), "upper body" (*jianshen shangduan* 簡身上段), "lower body" (*jianshen xia-duan* 簡身下段) and finally "bottom" (*jianwei* 簡尾).¹⁸ This categorization is helpful when analyzing what position the fragmented slips originally could have had. Figure 1 below shows the slips in the arrangement as proposed by Ma Chengyuan.

15 Cf. PU, 2002: 39–47. Though it is usually said that the manuscript consists of 29 slips, it needs to be pointed out that in Ma's edition fragments have already been joined together in two cases (see #6 and 22). We can also not be sure whether there are slips in the unpublished part of the Shanghai corpus that have not yet been identified as belonging to the *Shilun* or whether some of the slips are completely lost. Note that the bamboo slips of the *Shilun* manuscript are always referred to by their number according to MA, 2001, for example "#1".

16 MA, 2001: 127.

17 These small triangular notches might have served for fixing the bindings, marking their later position or both. If not stated otherwise, the Chinese terminology follows MA, 2001.

18 These distinctions were not made in MA, 2001, but later introduced in LI, 2004: 88–90.




Figure 1: Slips in the arrangement as proposed by Ma Chengyuan¹⁹

19 Cf. MA, 2001: 3–4, of the photo-part. It has to be noted that the position of #14 and 15 was apparently altered after this photo was taken, as #14 appears following #15 here. Moreover, #23 is positioned significantly lower than all the other slips with complete bottom parts, which does not quite seem reasonable and has been adjusted in figure 1. Accordingly, this arrangement seems to represent a mere “draft version”, not the final reconstruction by Ma Chengyuan.

The position of fragmented slips in the top, body or bottom, respectively, is, according to Ma, based upon an analysis of their particular condition as well as textual criteria.²⁰ As we for now are only considering material criteria, the position of a fragmented slip can only be determined on the condition that the slip is long enough (more than half the length of a complete slip), if none of the rounded ends²¹ is preserved. This means that #1, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 25, 26, 28 and 29 cannot be decided upon on the basis of material criteria alone. As in some of the longer fragments, the position of which can be determined, a part of the body is also missing (see #14 and 23), these may originally have been connected with one of the shorter fragments just mentioned. The same is true for the shorter fragments among themselves. Possible connections have to be found later through analysis of textual criteria.²² It can already be gathered that the manuscript must have consisted of at least 23 slips, because this is the smallest possible number we can arrive at by connecting fragments to form bigger entities.²³ However, it is also possible that the manuscript was originally composed of 31 or even more slips, meaning that each fragment belonged to a separate slip.²⁴ Generally speaking, the shortest reasonable reconstruction should always be preferred to another one, which only makes sense under the presumption that one or more slips are missing (Ockham's razor).

We now know the minimum number of slips belonging to the *Shilun* manuscript, but can the dimension and condition of the bamboo slips also give us a clue as to their original arrangement? In his reconstruction, Li Xueqin 李学勤 pointed out that adjacent slips often show similar kinds of fragmentation.²⁵ This seems convincing at first, but it is somehow weakened as an argument when considering the fact that bamboo manuscripts were stored as scrolls. Being rolled up or folded into layers, not only adjacent slips but also those which were textually removed at a certain distance could be physically very close and ac-

20 MA, 2001, point 5 of the notes on the use of the book (*fanli* 凡例).

21 See description of the only complete slip (#2) in MA, 2001: 127.

22 Examination of the breaking points has to be mentioned here as a possible means of identifying two fragments which were once connected. However, drawing conclusions from this is difficult, as the evidence is highly ambiguous. This criterion will therefore not be further examined in the present paper.

23 In fact, this is exactly the number of slips in the reconstruction as proposed in LI, 2004: 89.

24 As will be shown, the tentative reconstruction of the *Shilun* without assumed missing slips presented in this paper arrives at a relatively coherent text. Accordingly, we have no reason to believe that large parts of the manuscript have been lost.

25 For example, #8, 9 and 17 all have a complete top, cf. LI, 2004: 89.

cordingly exposed to similar forces leading to a similar kind of fragmentation. This criterion alone is therefore not very convincing.

2.1.2 Blank Ends

Two questions that have been much debated since the publication of the *Shilun* are the significance and the origin of the blank ends that can be found on at least six of the slips (#2 to 7). “Blank ends” means that characters are only present on the body of these particular slips (i.e. between the first and the last binding); top and bottom apparently do not contain any writing. This phenomenon has been called “left blank/white” (*liubai* 留白) by Ma Chengyuan, and the respective slips are accordingly often referred to as “slips [with] left blank [ends]” (*liubai jian* 留白简).²⁶ However, this labeling was criticized shortly afterwards as inadequate by Fan Yuzhou 范毓周, because it implies that a part of the slips was intentionally left blank by the scribe.²⁷ Whether this was the case is not certain, and we will see that there is considerable evidence pointing in a different direction. In this paper, the more neutral term “blank end slips” (which could be translated as *kongduan jian* 空端简) shall therefore be used. Various theories about the significance and the origin of the blank ends have been proposed. They can be summarized as follows:

1. The “Preface theory”:

Ma Chengyuan supposed that the text on the blank end slips must have some kind of special significance, and for this reason the slips were not completely filled with characters. As the text on #1 to 4 refers to the four ode categories and the Odes in general, but not individual odes, he called this part of the manuscript the “preface” and arranged it apart from the rest.²⁸ Jiang Linchang 江林昌 further developed this idea, proposing that the blank ends could be a kind of accentuation, just like bold letters in modern printing.²⁹ However, the fact that Ma saw slips, which apparently had a different outer appearance (*xingzhi* 形制, being a material criterion), as parts of the same manuscript and the fact that, based on textual evidence, not all of the blank end slips could be considered as belonging to the “preface” (i.e. #5, 6 and 7) has left some room for criticism.

26 MA, 2001: 121–122.

27 FAN, 2002b.

28 MA, 2001: 121–122. Note that Ma included #1 into the preface part, though he is not sure, if #1 is a blank end slip, cf. MA, 2001: 126.

29 JIANG, 2004: 132.

2. The “Fading theory”:

Li Xueqin’s already mentioned reconstruction was the first to be significantly different from Ma’s. It was mostly based on textual parallelism that Li discovered on #21, 22 and 6, and which suggests that these three slips were originally adjacent in exactly this order. As #6 has (at least) one blank end, he accordingly placed all other blank end slips following it at the end of the *Shilun* manuscript. Relying on textual patterns, Li assumed that the top of #6 (now lost) must have contained characters, though its bottom is definitely blank.³⁰ Because seeing them as a kind of accentuation was no longer suitable, he had to provide another explanation for the blank ends. Li inferred that the blank ends had once contained characters, but that these characters had faded due to some natural or man-made chemical process and were by now completely gone.³¹

3. The “Scraping theory”:

Zhou Fengwu 周鳳五 suggested that there must once have been characters at the blank ends, which had later been scraped off.³² He furthermore assumed that this might have been related to an ancient custom of deliberately destroying grave goods before placing them in the grave.³³

4. The “Fragmentary model theory”:

Jiang Guanghui brought up a new idea. He proposed that the model the scribe of the *Shilun* was copying could already have been fragmentary. For this reason, the scribe left some blank spots which, on the one hand, pointed out to the reader that there were parts missing and, on the other hand, provided room for later emendation.³⁴ Fan Yuzhou even considered the possibility that the blank ends in the *Shilun* directly reflect the condition of the model, which might have had the same dimensions, with the top and bottom parts of some slips already lost.³⁵

30 Li, 2004: 90.

31 Li, 2004: 89–90.

32 ZHOU, 2002: 187.

33 ZHOU, 2002: 190.

34 JIANG, 2002: 3–4. Although Jiang’s theory speaks in favor of the former possibility, it needs to be pointed out here, that we do not know whether the scribe was copying from another source, was writing from memory, or during recitation or dictation.

35 FAN, 2002a.

5. The “Register theory”:

Another solution was proposed by Peng Hao 彭浩. He holds the opinion that a different mode of writing was used on the blank end slips. Each slip was first divided into an upper, middle and lower register. Afterwards, the upper register of all slips was filled first, then the middle one and so on. For unknown reasons, apparently the upper and lower registers have been erased (see “Scraping theory”).³⁶

6. The “Theory of separate manuscripts”:

Liao Mingchun 廖名春 pointed out that the blank end slips and the completely filled ones should not be considered part of the same manuscript because of their different outer appearance. The 23 completely filled slips (for him also including #1) seem to belong to the same manuscript as *Zi gao* 子羔³⁷ as far as form and content are concerned. The blank end slips seem to be of a different origin and should therefore not be mixed with the former.³⁸

As can be seen, the theories on the blank ends are manifold. For our purpose of reconstructing the original arrangement of the slips, the one important question is whether the two kinds of slips were once mixed or actually separated. To put it in other words: do the blank ends really constitute a material difference (i.e. a material criterion) by which the blank end slips need to be distinguished from the others?

A fading of the characters, as proposed by Li Xueqin, seems to be quite unlikely regarding the fact that the pattern of the fading is so regular. On each of the blank end slips the characters are easily legible on the body of the slip but completely gone at the ends. There are, however, several hints that some kind of scraping was applied to the ends of these slips. Many scholars who closely studied the photographs or even had the opportunity to look at the original slips in the Shanghai Museum reported to have seen such traces. These include Fan Yuzhou³⁹, Zhou Fengwu⁴⁰, Hu Pingsheng 胡平生⁴¹ and Peng Hao⁴². Liao Mingchun also described traces of a knife, although he does not believe that there

36 PENG, 2004: 297–298.

37 This manuscript is included in the second volume of the Shanghai corpus, cf. MA, 2002.

38 LIAO, 2002a: 10–11.

39 FAN, 2002b.

40 ZHOU, 2002: 187.

41 HU, 2002a: 49.

42 PENG, 2004: 297.

actually could have been characters scraped off.⁴³ We can gather from these observations that some kind of manual work (most probably with a special erasing knife) must have been applied to the blank ends. Against this background, the theories suggesting a fragmentary model (Jiang Guanghui) or some special layout (Ma Chengyuan, Liao Mingchun) as the reason for this phenomenon seem somewhat far-fetched. For both purposes, it would have been totally sufficient to just leave the ends blank. An additional scraping is at least unnecessary; moreover it brings with it the danger of breaking the slips in the scraping process. This leaves us with the “Scraping theory” (Zhou Fengwu) and the “Register theory” (Peng Hao). If the blank end slips were really divided into registers originally, why are these so different in size? The upper and lower register would have contained eight or nine characters each, the middle one consisting of the whole body of the slip, amounting to about 40 characters.⁴⁴ This seems quite unlikely and leads us to Zhou’s “Scraping theory” as the overall most probable theory explaining the blank ends on some slips of the *Shilun*.⁴⁵ From the preceding considerations, we can conclude that the blank ends on #2 to 7 should not be considered a material criterion suggesting a division between completely filled slips and those with blank ends.⁴⁶ All available evidence leads to the conclusion that every slip of the *Shilun* was originally completely filled with characters. This allows for all of the slips to be rearranged in the reconstruction process and also shows that emendations of the text at the blank ends based on textual criteria are generally possible.

2.1.3 Scroll Affiliation

Ma Chengyuan already pointed out that the *Shilun* resembles two other manuscripts of the Shanghai corpus, *Lu bang da han* 魯邦大旱 and *Zi Gao*, in both the style of script and the measurements of the slips.⁴⁷ This allows for the possibility that these three textual units originally were parts of the same codicological unit (i.e. scroll).⁴⁸ Ma, however, has some doubts about this because only

43 LIAO, 2002a: 12.

44 LI, 2004: 88–90, provides a survey of the number of characters on the slips and calculates the average number in the different sections of a slip.

45 Unfortunately, infrared photographs of the *Shilun* slips, which could provide further evidence, have not been published (or even made?) yet.

46 Kang Shaofeng reached the same conclusion in his dissertation; cf. KANG, 2005: 52. As will be shown below, textual criteria support it as well.

47 The *Lu bang da han* manuscript is, like the aforementioned *Zi Gao*, included in MA, 2002.

48 On the technical terms “textual / codicological unit”, see KALINOWSKI, 2005.

the title “*Zi Gao*” has been found on the back of slip #3 of the *Zi Gao* manuscript, and this could hardly be the title of all three textual units.⁴⁹ Li Ling 李零 remarked that it was indeed quite common to subsume texts with different content under a single title that was only directly connected to one of them. He supposed that *Shilun*, *Zi Gao* and *Lu bang da han* were three parts of one codicological unit, and that slip #1 of the *Shilun* contains the end of the *Zi Gao* as well as the beginning of the *Shilun* textual unit, just divided by an “ink-knot”⁵⁰. However, Li also admitted that divisions between textual units are normally further marked in a manuscript by some left blank space.⁵¹ After publication of the second volume of the Shanghai Museum manuscripts, precisely these spaces could be found at the end of *Zi Gao* and *Lu bang da han*.⁵² It therefore became clear that slip #1 of the *Shilun* could not contain a part of either the *Zi Gao* or the *Lu bang da han* textual unit. The only other possibilities are the following two:

1. This slip contains the end of a fourth textual unit, the rest of which has been completely lost.
2. The slip does not necessarily have to constitute the beginning of the *Shilun*, as has often been proposed, but could also be placed elsewhere in the reconstruction.

The latter solution is far more probable considering that there are in fact possible links to other slips inside the *Shilun* as far as content is concerned (see 2.2.4). The use of the ink-knot on two other occasions in the *Shilun* (on #5 and 18) also suggests that its function is not restricted to marking the end of a complete textual unit. Although we still do not know whether or not *Shilun*, *Zi Gao* and *Lu bang da han* originally belonged to the same scroll, we can gather from the above observations regarding scroll affiliation that the position of #1 and all the other slips in their reconstructed sequence will have to be determined based on textual criteria.

49 MA, 2001: 121.

50 Li, 2002: 21. The names for text-markers vary in different publications. Ma, for example, calls the mentioned marker, which divides longer text-sections, *mojie* 墨節, and the single short stroke dividing shorter sections *moding* 墨釘, cf. MA, 2001, point 7 of the notes on the use of the book (*fanli*). In the present paper, the direct translations of these terms, “ink-knot” and “ink-nail”, shall be used, as these names do not imply any judgment regarding their function.

51 Li, 2002: 14.

52 Cf. the photos in MA, 2002.

2.2 Textual Criteria

Textual criteria include all the evidence provided by the text written on the *Shilun* bamboo slips. Since we assume that all the text fragments present on these slips were once part of a coherent text, we have to find the links between these fragments in order to reconstruct the whole. In other words, we have to analyze the criteria that constitute the coherence of this particular text.⁵³ Ma Chengyuan already mentioned some of these criteria in the preface to the first edition of the *Shilun*. For example, after he had determined which of the four categories the odes on the slips belonged to, the slips were grouped accordingly. Subsequently, these groups themselves were put in the same order in which the categories are mentioned on #2 and 3.⁵⁴ Pu Maozuo 濮茅左 pointed out stable groups of odes that are mentioned more than once, always keeping constant the discussed titles and their order, as a further criterion.⁵⁵ These criteria shall now be discussed and supplemented by further evidence, which can be drawn from textual parallelism as well as lexical and topical coherence.

2.2.1 Ode Categories and their Order

Though most parts of the *Shilun* text are concerned with the discussion of individual odes, there are also more general statements about whole categories of odes. These can be found on #2 to 5, where three categories are explicitly mentioned: *Song* 訟, *Da xia* 大夏 and *Bang feng* 邦風, apparently referring to the categories called *Song* 頌, *Da ya* 大雅 and *Guo feng* 國風 in the *Mao shi*.⁵⁶

53 We have to bear in mind the possibility that the *Shilun* text represents a (fragmentary) collection of materials and would accordingly be a collection of texts rather than one coherent text. Until proven wrong, however, the latter theory is for now adopted as a working hypothesis.

54 MA, 2001: 121–122. This method naturally only worked for slips that just referred to odes of one category. If they contained odes of different categories, the slips were placed at the end of the manuscript (see #18 to 29).

55 PU, 2002: 15.

56 As the characters referring to the traditional categories *ya* and *song* in the *Shilun* most probably represent a graphical variant (*song* 訟 instead of *song* 頌) or a phonetic loan (*xia* 夏 [*grâ?] instead of *ya* 雅 [*ŋrâ?], cf. SCHUESSLER, 2007), respectively, the traditional names from the *Mao shi* shall be retained in the present paper. The name *Bang feng* however, being a lexical variant of *Guo feng* (i.e. a different word with a similar or equal meaning has been used), shall not be changed, as it seems to be the original name of the category; cf. MA, 2001: 127–129.

Though the fourth traditional category *Xiao ya* 小雅 is not mentioned explicitly, it can be concluded from the analysis of textual parallelism (see 2.2.3 below) that the name of one category is missing on #2 and 3. The description of this category suggests that it is most likely to be *Xiao ya*.⁵⁷ Ma Chengyuan pointed out that the order in which the categories are mentioned on #2 and 3 is an exact inversion of their order in the *Mao shi*.⁵⁸ It can be doubted, however, that this is real proof of a substantial difference between the *Shilun* and the *Mao shi* order and can be taken as a direct guideline for the reconstruction of the arrangement of the slips. The reason for this is the second appearance of the categories *Bang feng* and *Song* on #4 and 5. Between these, two other categories, most probably *Xiao ya* and *Da ya*, are obviously commented on. Although there is a possibility that *Xiao ya* were mentioned after *Da ya* in this case, the actual content of the comments suggests that the order of the categories on #4 and 5 is *Bang feng*, *Xiao ya*, *Da ya*, *Song*, corresponding to the traditional *Mao* order.⁵⁹ Liao Mingchun already emphasized that an inverted sequence in the *Shilun* does not at all prove that the *Mao* sequence is “incorrect”; there are plainly two different possibilities for listing the categories.⁶⁰ With regard to the fact that the *Shilun* also includes both sequences, it seems to be nothing more than a kind of stylistic device, as Pu Maozuo and Jiang Linchang proposed.⁶¹ As far as the order of these sequences themselves is concerned, both possibilities (schematically A-B-C-D-D-C-B-A or D-C-B-A-A-B-C-D) would generally be reasonable. The question arising for the reconstruction is whether the sequence of the categories as rendered on #2 and 3 or 4 and 5, respectively, is significant for the structure of the whole *Shilun* text, and whether an arrangement of the 29 slips could be carried out according to this at all. As the *Shilun* clearly shows, the different ode categories already existed at the time it was composed. Ma Chengyuan furthermore identified all but five of the ode titles in the *Shilun* with ones from the *Mao shi*.⁶² Ji Xusheng 季旭昇 later found matches for all the titles.⁶³ Assuming that

57 Cf. MA, 2001: 129.

58 The sequence starts with *Song* and ends with *Bang feng*; cf. MA, 2001: 129.

59 Cf. Ji, 2004: 16.

60 LIAO, 2002b: 44.

61 PU, 2002: 25; JIANG, 2004: 134–135.

62 See table in MA, 2001: 160–161.

63 One exception is a title mentioned on #17, which the *Mao shi* contain more than once. However, it apparently belongs to the *Bang / Guo feng* in any case; cf. Ji, 2004: 3–5. It should also be noted that a clear identification of the second ode mentioned on #26 as either *Mao*

the affiliation of these titles to their respective categories was also established at the time the *Shilun* was written and did not differ from the *Mao shi*, we can analyze how the titles and categories were distributed over the slips of the manuscript:

Slip (<i>apud</i> Ma)	Ode titles (No. <i>apud</i> Mao)	Respective categories (<i>apud</i> Mao)
1	—	
2	—	
3	—	
4	—	
5	266	S
6	266(Q), 269, 271	S
7	241(Q), 236(Q)	DY
8	193, 194, 191, 195, 196, 197, 198, 165	XY
9	166, 185, 187, 176, 214	XY
10	1, 4, 9, 12, 16, 27, 28	BF
11	1, 4, 9, 12	BF
12	4	BF
13	12, 16	BF
14	1(Q)	BF
15	16	BF
16	27, 28, 2	BF
17	100, 76, 68/92/116, 72	BF
18	64, 123	BF
19	45(Q), 64	BF
20	123	BF
21	206, 174, 136, 106, 152, 235, 266	XY, BF, DY, S
22	136, 106, 152, 235	BF, DY
23	161, 7	XY, BF
24	16	BF
25	67, 70, 212, 207	BF, XY
26	26, 35/201, 202, 148	BF, XY

35 or Mao 201 is in fact not possible. Ji Xusheng points this out elsewhere in his study; cf. Ji, 2004: 60–61.

27	114, 28, 41, 91(?)	BF
28	46, 219	BF, XY
29	87, 124, 183	BF, XY

Figure 2: Distribution of odes and ode categories over the slips⁶⁴

The table in Figure 2 shows that 18 of the altogether 25 slips, which refer to individual odes by mentioning their title or providing a quotation, are only concerned with one of the four ode categories. #5 and 6 are concerned with the *Song*, #7 with the *Da ya* and #8 and 9 with the *Xiao ya*, so far fitting very well into the frame created by Ma Chengyuan.⁶⁵ As for the *Bang feng*, the assignment of slips to this category shown in figure 2 is quite different from Ma's. #10 to 20 as well as 24 and 27 exclusively refer to odes belonging to the *Bang feng* category.⁶⁶

As we can see, it would be possible to arrange the above-mentioned 18 slips according to one of the sequences rendered on #2 and 3 or 4 and 5, respectively. The slips referring to the ode categories and the Odes in general (#1) are most likely to belong to either the beginning or the end of the manuscript, because they contain a kind of summarization. However, this would still leave unclear the position of the seven slips that refer to ode titles of more than one category (i.e. #21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28 and 29).

We can gather from the above analysis that a strict arrangement of the whole *Shilun* according to separate ode categories is not possible. Even though these categories seem to have existed in a fixed order (either “forward” or “backward”), the division between them was apparently not very strict in at least one part of the text. The reason for certain odes to appear together on the same bamboo slip can in some cases not be sought in their affiliation to the same ode category.

64 The identification of ode titles follows Ji, 2004: 3–5. References to a certain ode by a quotation only without explicitly mentioning the title are indicated by “(Q)”. The ode categories are referred to in abbreviated form: “S” = *Song*, “DY” = *Da ya*, “XY” = *Xiao ya*, and “BF” = *Bang feng*. For an explanation of the question mark behind Mao 91 on #27, see the explanatory notes (3.2).

65 Cf. MA, 2001: 131–147.

66 Ma Chengyuan's *Bang feng* part only includes #10 to 17. The main reason for this is that Ma identified an ode title appearing on #18 and 20 as referring to the *Xiao ya* ode *Di du* 狄杜 (Mao 169), cf. MA, 2001: 148. Ji Xusheng and others have shown that this title refers instead to the ode *You di zhi du* 有狄之杜 (Mao 123); cf. Ji, 2004: 49–50.

2.2.2 Fixed Groups of Odes

Ma Chengyuan pointed out that a group of seven odes is apparently discussed three times on #10 to 16, starting with a very short comment of just one character for each ode, followed by a more detailed discussion.⁶⁷ As the titles *Guan ju* 閼雒 (Mao 1), *Jiu mu* 樛木 (Mao 4), *Han guang* 漢廣 (Mao 9), *Que chao* 鵲巢 (Mao 12), *Gan tang* 甘棠 (Mao 16), *Lü yi* 綠衣 (Mao 27) and *Yan yan* 燕燕 (Mao 28) appear in an unchanged order every time they are mentioned, this leads to the conclusion that the seven odes are likely to constitute a fixed group, which shall be named here the “*Guan ju* group”, after the first of its members. This group is apparently exclusively discussed in one passage of the *Shilun*, which means that every slip referring to one or more of the above titles possibly also belongs to this very passage. More specifically, these are the already mentioned #10 to 16 as well as 24.⁶⁸ The second such group comprises *Wan qiu* 宛丘 (Mao 136), *Yi jie* 猗嗟 (Mao 106), *Shi jiu* 鴉鳩 (Mao 152), *Wen wang* 文王 (Mao 235), *Qing miao* 清廟 (Mao 266), *Lie wen* 烈文 (Mao 269) as well as *Hao tian you cheng ming* 昊天有成命 (Mao 271) and shall accordingly be named the “*Wan qiu* group”. The first five titles are mentioned on #21, the first four appear again on #22, which led Ma Chengyuan to believe that this group contains five odes, being discussed in a similar way as the above *Guan ju* group.⁶⁹ Based upon the fact that *Qing miao* is also mentioned on #6 and the text there shows structural parallelism to #21 and 22 (see next chapter), Li Xueqin further extended this group of five odes by *Lie wen* and *Hao tian you cheng ming*.⁷⁰ #6, 21 and 22 therefore constitute a second cluster belonging together in terms of group structure.

Summarizing the above observations, the following slips are likely to belong together:

1. #10 through 16 along with 24 (*Guan ju* group)
2. #6, 21 and 22 (*Wan qiu* group)

67 MA, 2001: 140–141. Cf. Li, 2002c: 5.

68 The latter slip refers to *Gan tang*, see figure 2. As will be shown further below, however, this mentioning of *Gan tang* belongs to another passage.

69 MA, 2001: 150–152.

70 Li, 2002c: 6. #5, mentioning *Qing miao* as well, is not likely to belong to the same cluster of slips, at least as far as group structure is concerned. The *Qing miao* inherits the position of the fifth ode in the *Wan qiu* group. On #5, however, it is mentioned at the beginning of a new passage indicated by an ink-knot just before the title. Cf. MA, 2001: 131.

The order of the slips inside such clusters cannot be determined by the analysis of group structure alone. For this task, we have to take textual parallelism into consideration.

2.2.3 Textual Parallelism

Pu Maozuo has already pointed out that textual parallelism is an important means of reconstructing the original arrangement of the *Shilun* slips.⁷¹ Although the degree of formulaic structure seems to vary – some parts of the *Shilun* text show a very strict parallel structure, whereas others are written in a much less regulated style – the phenomenon is still worthy of analysis. Parallel structures provide us with valuable evidence for several slips having originally belonged together, if they can be found on more than one slip. Below, cases of textual parallelism that appear in the *Shilun* are at first illustrated by an example and then abstracted to a formula and discussed further.⁷²

1. Example: “頌, 平德也, 多言...” (#2)
 “大雅, 盛德也, 多言...” (#2)
 Formula: “[ode category]XX也多言...” (#2 and 3)
 (occurring twice completely, once partly)

The above parallelism appears in its complete form on #2, where the ode categories *Song* and *Da ya* are characterized in short by a two-character phrase followed by “*ye*” 也. The last part of it can also be found on #3, where the name of the category and the short characterization are missing.⁷³ As has already been shown, the blank end slips were most likely completely filled with characters before they got partly erased. Accordingly, the first part of the parallelism on #3 (including an ode category) is likely to have been lost due to the scraping. As this passage is followed by the discussion of the *Bang feng* category and the text on #2 refers to *Song* and *Da ya*, it is reasonable to assume that the phrase at the

71 Pu, 2002: 19–20.

72 Readings of all characters as well as punctuation in the examples appear according to the annotation in LI/QU/SUN, 2007: 748–751. In the abstracted formulas (for practical reasons always appearing without Pinyin), the variable parts are replaced by the wildcard character “X” or a general description in square brackets. The latter can stand for more than one character. For translations of the examples, which are not given here due to methodological considerations, please refer to the complete translation in part 4.

73 Cf. MA, 2001: 128–129.

beginning of #3 belongs to the discussion of *Xiao ya*. Supporters of the theory that no characters have ever been written on the blank ends must assume that there is one slip missing between #2 and 3, carrying both the end of the discussion of *Da ya* (starting on #2) as well as the beginning of the comments on *Xiao ya* (ending on #3). As this missing slip then should have been a blank end slip as well, we can calculate that there would have been writing amounting to about 40 characters.⁷⁴ Of these, 36 would be in reference to the *Da ya*.⁷⁵ Comparing to this the length of the comments on *Song* and *Xiao ya* (after “*duo yan*” 多言) with only 18 and 10 characters, respectively, this discussion seems disproportionately long and therefore rather unlikely. If we, however, assume that the bottom of #2 and the top of #3 once carried characters, the length of the *Da ya* comment can be calculated at about 13 characters⁷⁶, which matches the length of the other comments quite well. We can conclude that the above textual parallelism is both a hint that #2 and 3 were originally connected as well as supplementary evidence that once there must have been characters written at the blank ends.

2. Example: “...其用心也將何如? 曰: 邦風是已” (#4)
 Formula: “...其用心也將何如曰[ode category]是已” (#4 and 5)
 (occurring once completely, three times partly or in abbreviated form)

In this parallelism the naming of an ode category represents the answer to the (rhetorical) question “*qi yong xin ye jiang he ru?*” 其用心也將何如 (“What should [one] set [one’s] heart on?”). Being fully formulated only at the first two occasions on #4, it appears in an abbreviated form on #5 (“... *he ru? yue: Song shi yi*” ... 何如? 曰: 頌是已). However, the pattern of question and answer remains intact.⁷⁷ As the beginning of this discussion of the ode categories can be found on #4 and the end on #5, the two slips should have been originally connected in exactly this order. Supposing that the bottom of #4 and the top of #5 originally contained about 17 characters (following Li Xueqin)⁷⁸, the first five of these must have been “*yue Xiao ya shi yi*” 曰小雅是已 as they directly follow

74 Cf. Li, 2004: 90.

75 We arrive at a number of 36 characters by subtracting four characters belonging to the *Xiao ya* discussion missing on #3 (“*Xiao ya XX*”).

76 Following Li, 2004: 90, we could amend in all 17 characters at the top and bottom of a slip. From these, we again have to subtract four (see the preceding footnote).

77 Cf. MA, 2001: 130–131.

78 Cf. Li, 2004: 90.

the question “*qi yong xin ye jiang he ru?*” and should be concerned with the *Xiao ya* category. According to the parallel structure, the end of the 17 character passage is most likely to have read “*he ru yue Da ya*” 何如曰大雅, leaving seven unknown characters for the actual comment on the *Da ya* category.⁷⁹

3. Example: “*xiang mu zhi shi, han guang zhi zhi*” (#10)
 “*xiang mu zhi shi, ze yi qi lu ye*” (#11)
 Formula A: “[ode title]之X” (#10)
 (occurring seven times)
 Formula B: “[ode title]之X...也” (#11 and 16)
 (occurring five times completely, once partly)

A characteristic of the already mentioned *Guan ju* group (see 2.2.2) is that the seven odes are discussed several times with comments of varying length. As the first character on #10 is at the same time the first character of the discussion of *Guan ju*, this slip is likely to have been the first to refer to the *Guan ju* group. The above textual parallelism A (a comment of only one character’s length per ode title) is changed to B on #11 and 16, where each comment is extended by three to five characters and a final “*ye*” 也.⁸⁰ As the discussion of *Yan yan*, the last ode of the *Guan ju* group, on #16 is followed by a new passage referring to an ode that does not belong to the group, this slip should constitute the end of the cluster concerned with this group of odes.⁸¹ #11 should be arranged before #16 as textual parallelism B can be found on both of the slips. #10 and 11 accordingly constitute a kind of bracket between which #12 to 15, which also refer to the *Guan ju* group, have to be arranged. If we order these four slips according to the sequence of the odes that are discussed on them, the result is as follows: #14 (*Guan ju*), #12 (*Guan ju, Jiu mu*), #13 (*Han guang, Que chao, Gan tang*), #15

79 A fully formulated question instead of the abbreviated one is highly unlikely in this case, as this would leave only two characters for the comment on the *Da ya* category (17 minus 15 already belonging to parallel phrases). A missing slip with at least 25 characters (40 for a complete blank end slip minus the already mentioned 15) of comment on the *Da ya* category is rather improbable as well. The comments on the other categories before the respective rhetorical question are much shorter (*Bang feng*: 6 characters, *Xiao ya*: 11 characters, *Song*: 4 characters); cf. MA, 2001: 130–131.

80 It is worth mentioning that the discussion of *Guan ju* on #11 ends on another final particle; cf. MA, 2001: 141.

81 Cf. MA, 2001: 145.

(*Gan tang*).⁸² Li Xueqin suggested that the fragmented #14 and 12 as well as #13 and 15, respectively, originally belonged to one slip.⁸³ As the actual condition of the fragments allows for this possibility (see figure 1) and the textual evidence does not contradict this either, it is therefore accepted here. This leads us to a most reasonable arrangement of #10 to 16 in the following order:

10-(14+12)-(13+15)-11-16.⁸⁴

4. Example: “吾以甘棠得宗廟之敬. 民性固然” (#24)
 Formula: “吾以[ode title]得...民性固然...” (#16, 20 and 24)
 (occurring twice completely, twice partly)

The above parallelism apparently appears for the first time almost directly following the discussion of the *Guan ju* group on #16. It is repeated completely with a different ode title on #24 and can also be found on #20. The latter obviously contains two occurrences of this parallelism referring to two different odes, albeit in an incomplete form. At the top of the slip, there is “*min xing gu ran*” 民性固然, and at the end “*wu yi Di du de*” 吾以杖杜得.⁸⁵ Cao Feng 曹峰 points out that #24 might well have followed #16 originally, because the text at the beginning of the first and the end of the latter would together form two sentences with a completely parallel structure:⁸⁶

#16 (end): “...XX之見X也則”.

#24 (beginning): “以XX之X也XX之見X也則以XX之X也...”.

Joining these two parts, we arrive at the structure:

“XX之見X也則以XX之X也XX之見X也則以XX之X也”.

82 The sequence of the odes in the *Guan ju* group can be gathered from #10 (see 2.2.2 above). In those cases where there is no title given, Ma Chengyuan’s interpretation is followed; cf. MA, 2001: 142–144. However, there is one exception: #14 is considered as being completely concerned with *Guan ju*; cf. Li, 2002b: 91.

83 Li, 2002c: 5.

84 Separate slips are indicated by the sign “-” dividing them. In cases where two fragments are assumed to have been part of the same slip, these are linked by a “+” sign and put in parentheses for further clarification.

85 Cf. MA, 2001: 145, 149, 153.

86 CAO, 2002: 204.

This can be divided into two sentences with exactly the same structure:

“XX之見X也則以XX之X也”.

Accordingly, it is reasonable to suggest that the first of the three slips #16, 20 and 24 must have been #16, followed by #24 and 20 in this order. As #16 is now part of two sequences of slips, at the end of one (see third parallelism above) and at the beginning of another, we can link these two to form a longer sequence of the following slips:

10-(14+12)-(13+15)-11-16-24-20.

5. Example: “鴉鳩曰：其儀一兮，心如結也，吾信之” (#22)
 Formula: “[ode title]曰[ode citation]吾X之” (#6 and 22)
 (occurring four times completely, twice partly)

This textual parallelism occurs on #6 and 22 and belongs to the discussion of the *Wan qiu* group (see 2.2.2 above). Beginning on #21 after the phrase “*Kongzi yue*” 孔子曰 the titles of five odes are mentioned, each followed by a short comment according to the pattern “[ode title]吾X之”. On #22, these comments are further specified. It becomes clear that the evaluation “吾X之” especially refers to certain verses of each particular ode, as a citation is now given as well (“[ode title]曰[ode citation]吾X之”). Contradicting Ma Chengyuan, Li Xueqin suggested that the citations and discussions on #6, which show exactly the same pattern as the text on #22, are strong evidence indicating that the two slips belong together. This hypothesis and the reconstruction⁸⁷ that is based on it triggered the discussion about the blank end slips. After this has been resolved (for the time being) in favor of Li Xueqin and other scholars who suggested that the blank ends must originally have contained characters (see 2.1.2), we can follow Li’s hypothesis and consider #21, 22 and 6 as originally having followed each other in this order.⁸⁸

87 Cf. Li, 2002c, and Li, 2004: 90–91. In these articles, Li also explains why the *Wan qiu* group should have consisted of seven rather than five odes.

88 Liao Mingchun challenged Li Xueqin’s reconstruction, arguing that it only works on the presumption that there were three verses cited from the *Qing miao*, whereas normally only two are used; cf. LIAO, 2002a: 13. However, there is another exception from this rule in the discussion of *Lie wen* on #6. In this case, even four verses are cited, which makes Liao’s criticism much less convincing; cf. MA, 2001: 133.

Having analyzed the textual parallelism manifest in the *Shilun* as quite obvious formulaic structures, we can further examine the more subtle ones which only appear in the form of a consistent length of ode comments.⁸⁹ Although this length varies significantly in the *Shilun*, three groups can be distinguished:⁹⁰

1. Long discussions with repetitions (groups of odes) and/or ode citations:
#5 to 7, 10 to 16, 18 to 22 along with 24.
2. Comments of medium length (from three up to more than ten characters):
#8, 9 and 23.
3. Short comments (at least one, but always fewer than ten characters):
#17, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29.

Regarding the length of comments, it is more likely that two slips of the same group were connected rather than ones belonging to different groups. This is, however, only true if there is no significant change of comment length from one type to another on a certain slip. Exactly that seems to be the case on #21. Before the discussion of the *Wan qiu* group beginning with “*Kongzi yue*” 孔子曰, two odes belonging to the *Xiao ya* category are commented on.⁹¹ As these comments are of medium length (eleven and seven characters, respectively), this provides a possible link to #8, 9 or 23. Cao Feng also found a common textual parallelism, the phrase “*ze yi*” 則以, on #9 and 21.⁹² Since the only other slips that also contain this phrase (#11 and 24) are in the middle of other clusters already reconstructed in this chapter, it is quite reasonable to assume that #9 was originally followed by #21.

2.2.4 Lexical and Topical Coherence

In the less strictly structured passages of the *Shilun* text, lexical and topical coherence reflected by the frequent use of certain expressions or a constant topic is

89 The phrase “*Kongzi yue*” (“Master Kong said”), which appears several times in the *Shilun*, is not categorized as a textual parallelism here for the following reason. The fact that it merely indicates the speaker does not mean that slips containing the phrase are likely to belong together. They should rather be placed apart from each other, for a repeated indication of the speaker is only necessary under certain circumstances (for example, at the beginning of a new passage or to indicate a change of speaker) that usually occur at longer intervals.

90 #1 to 4 are missing in the following listing, since they do not contain any discussions of individual odes.

91 These are *Wu jiang da che* (Mao 206) and *Zhan lu* (Mao 174); cf. MA, 2001: 150.

92 CAO, 2002: 205.

one of the few criteria providing evidence for the reconstruction. Under the main topic, obviously being something like “the Odes”, various subtopics can be discerned. Slips that refer to the same subtopic and/or show certain peculiar expressions should therefore be grouped together.⁹³

Since we can be quite sure that #1 does not constitute the link between *Zi Gao* and the *Shilun* (see 2.1.3), we have to search for other possible connections inside the *Shilun*. Li Xueqin pointed out that the text on #5 refers to “*wang de*” 王德 (“royal virtues”), which could be connected to “*wang*” 王 as part of the phrase “*xing ci zhe qi you bu wang hu*” 行此者其有不王乎 (“That someone who acts like this, will not become a true king, could that even happen?”) on #1.⁹⁴ In fact, the mentioning of “*wang de*” is followed by a characterization of what constitutes these virtues.⁹⁵ This would match well with the final question above. Because every other occurrence of “*wang*” inside the *Shilun* text (on #2, 6, 7, 8, 21 and 22) is embedded within other contexts, the most likely link to the beginning of #1 is the end of #5.

Another part of Ma Chengyuan’s reconstruction, which seems to be a “loose end”, is the beginning of #2 preceding the discussion of the four ode categories. The text refers to King Wen receiving “*ming*” 命 (“the mandate”) and Ma Chengyuan accordingly assumed that this passage ought to refer to some ode from the *Da ya* category.⁹⁶ Pang Pu 龐樸 suggested that this part of the manuscript could have been following #7, where King Wen and the mandate are mentioned as well.⁹⁷ This also fits Ma Chengyuan’s analysis, claiming that #7 refers to the *Da ya* odes *Huang yi* 皇矣 (Mao 241) and *Da ming* 大明 (Mao 236), which both praise royal virtue.⁹⁸ The text on #7 and at the beginning of #2 therefore shows identical expressions and refers to the same ode category, which provides us with considerable evidence to assume a link between #7 and 2.

A third peculiarity can be noted on #20 and 27. Both contain the character “*que*” 雀, which cannot be found in any other part of the manuscript. The discussion preceding “*Kongzi yue*” 孔子曰 on #27 could accordingly be a part of the one starting on #20 with the phrase “*wu yi Di du de ...*” 吾以杖杜得

93 Those slips the connection of which has already been established on the basis of textual parallelism will not be examined here any more. The focus will be on those slips which up to this stage of the analysis could not be reliably connected to others.

94 LI, 2002c: 6.

95 Cf. MA, 2001: 131.

96 MA, 2001: 127.

97 Cf. PANG, 2002: 235–236.

98 MA, 2001: 135.

This is further supported by the fact that the length of this discussion (about 35 characters)⁹⁹ would correspond well with the average length of the comments following “吾以[ode title]得” (42 characters for *Ge tan* 葛覃, 30 for *Gan tang* 甘棠, 38 for the yet unknown ode on #20).¹⁰⁰

Finally, we notice on #25, 28 and 29 a frequent mentioning of the verb “zhi” 知 (“know; realize”).¹⁰¹ This word is used in discussions of two odes on #28 and 29, in one case on #25. In fact, on #25 and 28 it is part of the same expression “zhi yan” 知言. This suggests that these three highly fragmented slips somehow belong together. However, since the comments are rather short, their exact original order is hard to determine.

2.3 Summary of the Results and Reconstruction

The analysis has shown so far that some of the criteria provide less, others more help for the task of reconstructing the arrangement of the *Shilun* bamboo slips. Textual parallelism has proven to be of particular importance. In order to arrive at a reliable reconstruction, we must take into consideration all the available evidence. In the following, the results from the above analysis shall now be reconsidered and combined to supplement each other. As we found from the examination of material criteria, the blank end slips do not have to be arranged apart from the others (see 2.1.2), and apparently all slips (including #1) belong to the *Shilun* manuscript, since there is no material evidence contradicting this assumption (see 2.1.3).¹⁰² Moreover, we could draw further conclusions, which provide us with a framework for the reconstruction, through analysis of the measurements and condition of the bamboo slips (see 2.1.1). The analysis of textual criteria brought more substantial evidence. Through examination of textual parallelism (see 2.2.3) and fixed ode groups (see 2.2.2), we were able to identify the first clusters of slips that are likely to have belonged together originally. The largest of these consists of nine slips:

99 The missing bottom of #20 would have contained about nine characters; at the top of #27 four characters are missing (cf. Ji, 2004: 44). Adding to these 13 characters the extant single character on #20 and 21 characters on #27, we arrive at an overall length of 35 characters.

100 The above calculation relies on Li Xueqin’s reconstruction of #16, 24 and 20; cf. Li, 2002c: 7. As has already been shown, the three slips can be connected on the basis of textual parallelism (see 2.2.3).

101 Cf. CAO, 2002: 206.

102 Textual criteria do not contradict this either, as the text on #1 shows similarities to other parts of the *Shilun* (see 2.2.4).

10-(14+12)-(13+15)-11-16-24-20.

The text on these slips exclusively mentions odes of the *Bang feng* category (see 2.2.1). The same is true for #17, 18, 19 and 27. Of these, #18 and 19 are most probably two fragments of the same slip, for they both refer to the ode *Mu gua* 木瓜 (Mao 64, see figure 2).¹⁰³ In any case, #18 was most likely the last of the four because of the ink-knot at its end. As #27 can be linked with #20 on the basis of lexical and topical coherence (see 2.2.4), we arrive at the following most probable order for the four remaining *Bang feng* slips: 27-17-(19+18). Accordingly, we can reconstruct the following continuous *Bang feng* cluster, which for the present purpose shall be termed as “sequence 1”.

Sequence 1: 10-(14+12)-(13+15)-11-16-24-20-27-17-(19+18).

The second cluster of slips, which could be connected through analysis of textual parallelism as well as fixed ode groups, is: 21-22-6. As #9 and 21 have also shown similarities (see 2.2.3), this cluster can be supplemented by one more slip. We also found out that #8 and 9 are the only slips which exclusively refer to *Xiao ya* odes (see 2.2.1, figure 2) and should therefore not be separated. Accordingly, we arrive at the following cluster: 8-9-21-22-6. As we have seen, the two reconstructed sequences of the four ode categories on #2 and 3 or 4 and 5 respectively are supported by textual parallelism. The order of the ode categories in the two sequences is exactly the contrary; #4 and 5 following #2 and 3 would be as reasonable as the opposite. However, evidence drawn from lexical and topical coherence allows for the addition of #7 before #2 and 3 as well as #1 after #4 and 5 (see 2.2.4). Considering this, the following arrangement seems most reasonable: 7-2-3-4-5-1.¹⁰⁴ The only possible link with the detailed discussion of the *Da ya* on #7 are #21, 22 and 6, which also contain citations from individual odes. With this in mind, we are able to establish a second long sequence of slips.

Sequence 2: 8-9-21-22-6-7-2-3-4-5-1.

103 Li Xueqin connects the two fragments directly in his reconstruction; cf. LI, 2002c: 7. This solution is adopted here (for further explanations, see explanatory notes to #19 below).

104 #1 contains the most general comments, for the text refers to the Odes on the whole. It should therefore be placed before or after the two sequences where ode categories are discussed.

The sequences 1 and 2 above already contain 24 of the overall 29 slips of the *Shilun* manuscript. Sequence 1, only discussing *Bang feng*, is likely to have constituted the beginning; sequence 2 with its references to the ode categories and the odes in general (on #2, 3, 4, 5 and 1) the end of the text. The remaining #23, 25, 26, 28 and 29 all discuss odes from the two categories of *Bang feng* and *Xiao ya* (see figure 2). #23 can most probably be linked with #8 at the beginning of sequence 2 because of its medium length comments (see 2.2.3). The text (very short comments) and the condition (only half of the body extant) of #25, 26, 28 and 29 make it difficult to decide the order in which to put these fragments, and whether or not any of them were once part of the same slip. Because of their high variability, they shall for now be left in the arrangement as proposed by Ma Chengyuan and be treated as individual slips, which are placed in between the two sequences that have already been reconstructed.

The above considerations lead to the following final arrangement of the *Shilun* bamboo slips:

10-(14+12)-(13+15)-11-16-24-20-27-17-(19+18)-25-26-28-29-23-8-9-21-
22-6-7-2-3-4-5-1.

In this reconstruction, the *Shilun* text begins with a discussion of the *Bang feng* (#10 to 18) followed by a combined discussion of *Bang feng* and *Xiao ya* (#25 to 23). A passage referring exclusively to *Xiao ya* is rendered on the next three slips (#8 to 21). The final part consists of a combined discussion of *Bang feng*, *Da ya* and *Song* (#21 to 6), the last two of which are being further enlarged upon (#6 and 7), as well as comments on the ode categories (#2 to 5) and the Odes in general (#1). The arrangement of the slips according to this reconstruction is presented in figure 3 below.




Figure 3: Arrangement of the slips according to the new reconstruction¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ Fragments that can apparently be linked on the basis of the present analysis are displayed accordingly. #25 to 29 are left at the position of the upper body, which must still be considered tentative. The placement of #1 and 17 follows Pu Maozuo's analysis based on the position of the binding notches; cf. Pu, 2002: 39, 44.

From this survey we can conclude that any reconstruction of this kind can only be an approximation of the original arrangement of slips, because the high degree of fragmentation leads to numerous uncertainties. Most probably, this problem could only be definitely solved if another, less fragmented copy of the *Shilun* were found. While the present arrangement of the slips must therefore be regarded as tentative, it nevertheless provides us with a quite reliable basis for new editions of the *Shilun* text.

3. New Editions of the *Shilun*

Having reconstructed an arrangement of the *Shilun* slips we are now able to display the whole text in its new order. However, as plenty of research has already been devoted to the analysis of certain characters, and since their interpretation has in many cases completely changed since Ma Chengyuan's publication in 2001, we should not rely on this first edition alone for the character readings. Instead, the basis for the new editions presented in this paper, both diplomatic and punctuated, will be the interpretation of the characters as provided in the *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (yi – wu) wenzi bian* (hereafter SWB), published in 2007.¹⁰⁶

A diplomatic edition will be the first subject of this chapter.¹⁰⁷ It provides the readings for all characters in the manuscript, i.e. the modern standard characters (in full form) of the words written. In each case, the interpretation of a certain character in this edition differs from the one given in the SWB, this is explained in the notes following the diplomatic edition. After these explanatory notes, a punctuated edition of the *Shilun* text is provided as the basis for trans-

106 Cf. LI/QU/SUN, 2007: 748–751. Of course, this is not true for the arrangement of the slips, which relies completely on the reconstruction presented in this paper. The SWB provides two kinds of annotation (*shiwén* 釋文) for the *Shilun*. The first (pp. 742–747) contains a detailed transcription of the character forms in the manuscript into their *kaishu* 楷書 script pendant without changing the component structure, while the second (pp. 748–751) provides the readings of the characters, or the standard characters of the actual words the character forms in the manuscript (supposedly) stand for. The latter will serve as the basis for the editions in this paper.

107 “Diplomatic” in this respect means that nothing is added that cannot be found in the manuscript itself. However, this only refers to punctuation and other marks such as quotation marks, normally used to facilitate reading. The characters are presented in their modern standard forms.

lation. Since the Odes are the general topic of the *Shilun*, we cannot help bearing in mind the extant version of these odes, namely the *Mao shi*. The existence of such a transmitted counterpart (at least for the ode titles and ode citations in the *Shilun*) is at the same time both helpful and problematic. Of course, the *Mao shi* can support the interpretation of characters in the *Shilun*. But there is the danger of being influenced towards an interpretation that accords with the content of the *Mao shi* but may be rather unlikely as far as palaeographic and/or phonologic evidence is concerned. Therefore, the *Mao shi* will be carefully consulted and referred to in the explanatory notes as well, whereas they shall not be taken as the general guideline for the interpretation of the characters in the following editions.

3.1 Diplomatic Edition

The numbers of the slips (still according to Ma Chengyuan) are provided in parentheses behind the respective passage of text. An ink-knot is represented by “■”; an ink-nail by “_”. Emendations are based on the analysis of textual parallelism, as discussed in this paper, and always indicated by square brackets. If only the number of missing characters can be determined, this is represented by an equal number of squares “□” (in case of a missing top or bottom normally nine). Should this number be incalculable, the edition shows three dots instead.

關雎之改_ 樛木之時_ 漢廣之智_ 鵲巢之歸_ 甘棠之保_ 綠衣之思_ 燕燕之情_ 曷曰動而皆賢於其初者也_ 關雎以色喻於禮[□□□□□□□□](10)兩矣_ 其四章則喻矣_ 以琴瑟之悅擬好色之願以鐘鼓之樂[□□□□]好反入於禮不亦能改乎_ 樛木福斯在君子不[亦□□乎_ 漢廣□□□](14+12)[□□]可不攻不可能不亦知恆乎_ 鵲巢出以百輛不亦有離乎_ 甘[棠□]及其人敬愛其樹其保厚矣_ 甘棠之愛以召公[□□□□□□□□□](13+15)[...]情愛也_ 關雎之改則其思益矣_ 樛木之時則以其祿也_ 漢廣之智則知不可得也_ 鵲巢之歸則離者(11)[□□□□□□□□□]召公也_ 綠衣之憂思古人也_ 燕燕之情以其獨也_ 孔子曰吾以葛覃得祇初之詩民性固然_ 見其美必欲反其本夫葛之見歌也則(16)以□□之故也_ 后稷之見貴也_ 則以文武之德也_ 吾以甘棠得宗廟之敬_ 民性固然甚貴其人必敬其位悅其人必好其所爲惡其人者亦然[吾以](24)[木瓜得]幣帛之不可去也_ 民性固然其隱志必有以喻也_ 其言有所載而後入或前之而後交人不可干也_ 吾以扶杜得爵□[□□□□□□□□□](20)[□□□□]如此何斯爵之矣離其所愛必曰吾奚舍之寶贈是已_ 孔子曰蟋蟀知難_ 仲氏君子_ 北風不絕人之怨子立不[□□□□□□□□□](27)[...]東方未明有利詞_ 將仲之言

不可不畏也_揚之水其愛婦惻_采葛之愛婦[...] (17) [□□□□□□□□] □志既曰天也猶有怨言_木瓜有藏願而未得達也_因木瓜之報以喻其怨者也杖杜則情熹其至也■ [□□□□□□□□] (19+18) [...] 君子] 陽陽小人_有兔不逢時_大田之卒章知言而有禮_小明不[...] (25) [...] □忠_擲柏舟悶_谷風悲_蓼莪有孝志_隰有萋楚得而悔之也[...] (26) [...] □惡而不文牆有茨慎密而不知言_青蠅知[...] (28) [...] 患而不知人_涉溱其絕拊而士_角枕婦_河水知[...] (29) [...] 鹿鳴以樂始而會以道交見善而效終乎不厭人_兔置其用人則吾取□ (23) 十月善諱言_雨無正_節南山皆言上之衰也王公恥之小旻多疑矣言不中志者也小宛其言不惡小有仁焉_小弁巧言則言讒人之害也_伐木 [□□□] (8) 實咎於己也_天保其得祿蔑疆矣巽寡德故也_祈父之責亦有以也_黃鳥則困而欲反其故也多恥者其病之乎菁菁者莪則以人益也裳裳者華則 [□□] (9) 貴也將大車之囂也則以爲不可如何也湛露之益也其猶醕與_孔子曰宛丘吾善之_猗嗟吾熹之_鳴鳩吾信之_文王吾美之清 [廟吾敬之烈文吾悅] (21) [之昊天有成命吾□] 之宛丘曰詢有情而無望吾善之猗嗟曰四矢變以禦亂吾熹之_鳴鳩曰其儀一兮心如結也吾信之文 [王] 在上於昭于天吾美之 (22) [清廟曰肅雝顯相濟濟] 多士秉文之德吾敬之烈文曰作競維人丕顯維德於乎前王不忘吾悅之昊天有成命二后受之貴且顯矣頌 □□□□□□□□ (6) [...] 懷爾明德曷誠謂之也有命自天命此文王誠命之也_信矣_孔子曰此命也夫_文王雖欲已得乎此命也 □□□□□□ [□□] (7) □□□□□□□□□□ 時也文王受命矣_頌平德也多言後其樂安而遲其歌紳而易_其思深而遠至矣_大雅盛德也多言 □□□□□□□□□□ (2) [□□□□] □ [小雅] □□ 也多言難而怨懟者也衰矣小矣邦風其內物也博觀人欲焉大斂材焉其言文其聲善孔子曰唯能夫 □□□□□□□□ [□] (3) [□] □□□□□□□□□□ 曰詩其猶平門_與賤民而豫之其用心也將何如曰邦風是已_民之有感患也上下之不和者其用心也將何如 [曰小雅是已 □□□] (4) □□□□ [何如曰大雅] 是已有成功者何如曰頌是已■ 清廟王德也_至矣_敬宗廟之禮以爲其本秉文之德以爲其業_肅雝 [□□□□□□□□] (5) [...] 行此者其有不王乎■ 孔子曰詩無隱志樂無隱情文無隱意 [...] (1)

3.2 Explanatory Notes

The subsequent notes are divided according to slips. They always include a reference to the particular character form in the SWB. If necessary for the analysis, references for each separate component to the SWB or, if the component cannot be found there as a separate component, the *Chu xi jianbo wenzi bian* 楚系簡帛文字編 (hereafter CXWB) are also provided.¹⁰⁸ Throughout the subsequent ex-

108 Cf. TENG, 2008. Each such reference includes the short title of the book, followed by the page and – after a period – the number of the character on that page. All reconstructions of

planatory notes, the following conventions shall be used to distinguish between a character and a word: if a certain word is meant, this is indicated by the transliteration of this word in Pinyin followed by its standard character in curly brackets; if a certain character is meant, this is indicated by the character in square brackets followed by its standard reading in Pinyin transliteration.

#10:

保 The character written in the manuscript is [保] *bao* (cf. SWB 389.2). As the word *bao* {保} makes perfect sense in the context here, there is no need to interpret the character as writing *bao* {報}.¹⁰⁹

#13:

輜 Written as [兩] *liang* (SWB 381.3). In this case, the character refers to the word *liang* {輜}, later represented by a different character which includes the component for “chariot” [車] *che* and shall therefore be used in this edition as well.¹¹⁰

#16:

祇 Written as [氏] *shi* (SWB 567.1). Chen Jian 陳劍 proposed that the character could stand for the verb *zhi* {祇} in this place.¹¹¹ Since “honoring the beginning” (*zhi chu* 祇初) accords well with the following notion of “returning to the roots” (*fan qi ben* 反其本) and the component [氏] *shi* is known to interchange with the component [氐] *di* (cf. ZGZ 754), this edition follows Chen. A phonetic loan of *di* {氐} [*ti?] for *zhi* {祇} [*ti] seems reasonable.

#24:

□□ The second (cf. SWB 686.4) and third character (apparently not contained in the SWB!) on this slip are both fragmented and Ma Chengyuan only delivers a transcription for the third one.¹¹² The interpretation of these two characters is correspondingly difficult and in any case not very persuasive, as they are barely legible. Therefore, this edition only shows two squares. The reading as “fine and coarse linen” (*chi xi* 絺綌), as proposed by Chen Jian, suits the context (discussion of the ode *Ge tan* 葛覃) perfectly well.¹¹³ Furthermore, both of the characters in the *Shilun* seem to contain a “grass” component [艸] *cao* (cf. SWB 28–37). This leaves the possibility that the above words for two kinds of linen, which also appear in the text of the discussed ode, but in that case are written with both characters containing a

Old Chinese follow Schuessler’s *Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese*. Other works cited for reference include He Linyi’s 何琳儀 *Zhanguo guwen zidian* 戰國古文字典 (ZGZ) and Karlgren’s *Grammata Serica Recensa* (GSR).

109 Cf. LI, 2002b: 92.

110 Cf. MA, 2001: 143.

111 CHEN, 2002: 11.

112 Cf. MA, 2001: 153.

113 Cf. CHEN, 2002: 10–11.

“silk” component [絲] *si*, were meant in the *Shilun*, too. For referring to a kind of cloth made from some plant fiber, a character with the component [艸] *cao* would seem more reasonable. While character emendations shall be avoided in the edition, “fine and coarse linen” will be tentatively used in the subsequent translation.

#20:

[木瓜] The title of this ode (Mao 64) has been emended on the basis of Ma’s analysis of the subsequent comment.¹¹⁴

喻 Written as [俞] *yu* (SWB 417.6). Ma interpreted the character as writing *yu* {喻}.¹¹⁵ This is reasonable, since [俞] *yu* and [喻] *yu* belong to the same phonetic series (GSR 125). Schuessler reconstructs {俞} [*lo] and {喻} [*joh or *loh].

干 The character written in the manuscript (cf. SWB 232.2) consists of the components [角] *jiao* (SWB 232.1) and [干] *gan* (SWB 106.4). Jiang Guanghui interprets it as writing the word *gan* {干} [*kân] with the meaning “not following the rules of conduct when meeting” (*jian bu yi li* 見不以禮).¹¹⁶ Since this fits the context very well and the character in the manuscript belongs to the same phonetic series as [干] *gan* (cf. ZGZ 992.1/994.3), this suggestion is followed here.

#27:

已 Written as [巳] *si* (SWB 648.8). This character can also be found on #4, 5 and 7, and was in each case transcribed as [也] *ye* by Ma.¹¹⁷ However, the upper halves of [巳] *si* and [也] *ye* reveal a clear distinction (cf. SWB 648.8 and SWB 560.1). Since the character [巳] *si* most probably denotes a word with a similar function as the final particle *ye* {也} [*laʔ] and He Linyi provides evidence for [巳] *si* being used to write *yi* {已} [*lɛʔ] in some cases (cf. ZGZ 63), the character shall be interpreted accordingly throughout the *Shilun*.

子立 Ji Xusheng, who listed an ode title counterpart from the *Mao shi* for each *Shilun* ode title, follows Feng Shengjun 馮勝君 here in interpreting the two characters as standing for *Zi jin* 子衿.¹¹⁸ Accordingly, the ode is identified as Mao 91 belonging to the *Bang feng* category in figure 2. Since the phonetic evidence provided to suggest a connection between the words *li* {立} [*rəp] and *jin* {衿} [*kəm]¹¹⁹ is rather vague, this edition follows Li Ling. He proposed that the above two characters could refer to another ode title, which may not be included in the *Mao shi*.¹²⁰ This means that we cannot definitely associate the title with Mao 91, despite the fact that all other odes mentioned on #27 belong to the *Bang feng* category (see figure 2).

114 Cf. MA, 2001: 149.

115 MA, 2001: 140.

116 JIANG, 2007: 217.

117 MA, 2001: 130–131, 134, 157.

118 Cf. FENG, 2002: 12.

119 Since Schuessler’s dictionary does not include a lemma for *jin* {衿} his reconstruction for the phonophoric component *jin* {今} is provided here.

120 LI, 2002: 30.

#19:

- 因 Li Xueqin already suggested that #19 and 18 could be linked directly, which implied that the character fragment at the end of #19 and the one at the beginning of #18 must be two parts of the same character [因] *yin*.¹²¹ In the SWB, the editors connected the two fragments. The resulting character facilitates comparison with other forms (cf. SWB 330.1). Li Xueqin's hypothesis is apparently right, and the two fragmented slips are therefore directly connected in this edition, too.

#18:

- 喻 See #20 above.

#25:

- 陽 Written as [腸] *chang* (SWB 218.1). Since this character is followed by a reduplication mark (*chongwen hao* 重文號), Ma interpreted it as an alternative title for the ode *Dang* 蕩 (Mao 255), which starts with the phrase *dang dang* 蕩蕩.¹²² Li Ling proposed that it could instead be the last part of the ode title *Junzi yang yang* 君子陽陽 (Mao 67).¹²³ As all characters [腸] *chang* [*d-laŋ], [蕩] *dang* [*dôŋʔ] and [陽] *yang* [*laŋ] belong to the same phonetic series (GSR 720), [腸] *chang* could well be a phonetic loan to write both corresponding words. However, Li Ling's interpretation shall be followed here, because Mao 67 definitely has a title that includes a redoubled expression. Furthermore, the comment “*xiao ren*” 小人 (“common person”) in the *Shilun* accords well with the content of this ode.¹²⁴ The two characters before [腸] *chang* are therefore supplemented in this edition.

#29:

- 患 Written as a graphical variant of [倦] *juan* (SWB 497.6). Ma supposed that this character stands for the word *juan* {卷} and is part of the ode title *Juan er* 卷耳 (Mao 3).¹²⁵ However, Ji Xusheng pointed out that the same character appears on #4, where it needs to be understood in a different way.¹²⁶ Moreover, the same character stands for the word *huan* {患} in the *Xing qing lun* 性情論 manuscript, as can be gathered from the corresponding passage in the Guodian *Xing zi ming chu* 性自命出.¹²⁷ Since this interpretation also fits the context of both #29 and 4, and since we cannot be sure that the two characters in the *Shilun* really stand for an ode title, this character is considered as writing the word *huan* {患}.
- 拊 According to the SWB editors, the character in the manuscript is a graphical variant of [律] *lu* (cf. SWB 399.4). However, they express some uncertainty about this interpretation. The character seems to consist of the three components [人] *ren* (cf. SWB 385.1), [又] *you* (cf. SWB 142.6) and [木] *mu* (cf. SWB 291.1). Li Ling suggested it should be transcribed as

121 Li, 2002c: 7.

122 MA, 2001: 155.

123 Li, 2002: 32.

124 Cf. HUANG, 2004: 103–104.

125 MA, 2001: 159.

126 Ji, 2004: 65.

127 Cf. Ji, 2004: 16.

[拊] *fu*, with [付] *fu* as a phonophoric.¹²⁸ This seems reasonable when we compare the character with others from the Shanghai corpus containing the component [付] *fu*, such as [拊] *fu* (cf. SWB 603.3). Since the word *fu* {拊} [*po] does not make sense in this passage, Liu Xinfang 劉信芳 proposed the reading *fu* {拊} [*pho?].¹²⁹ As [拊] *fu* and [拊] *fu* belong to the same phonetic series (GSR 136), this interpretation shall be accepted.

枕 The character in the manuscript (cf. SWB 383.2) consists of the three components [市] *fu* (cf. CXWB 723.3), [采] *bian* (cf. CXWB 92.2) and [臼] *jiu* (cf. CXWB 677.4). Liao Mingchun interprets it as a graphical variant of [枕] *zhen* and as representing part of the alternative title *Jiao zhen* 角枕 for the ode *Ge sheng* 葛生 (Mao 124).¹³⁰ Ji Xusheng supports this suggestion, pointing out that similar forms of [枕] *zhen*, also containing a [臼] *jiu* component, have been found in manuscripts from Xinyang 信陽 (cf. CXWB 547.1).¹³¹ Since this form (with an additional [臼] *jiu*) of the phonophoric component [尢] *yin* can also be seen in the character [沈] *shen* from the Shanghai Museum manuscripts (cf. SWB 509.8), the present edition follows Liao Mingchun.

#23:

At the end of the slip, a character seems to be missing.¹³² As regards context, we would expect an object for the preceding verb *qu* {取}, or at least the pronoun *zhi* {之}. However, because there is just a slight trace of ink left on the right side of the slip, we cannot be sure if there was once a [之] *zhi*, some other character or nothing at all.

#8:

讒 Written as consisting of the two components [言] *yan* (SWB 111.1) and [虫] *chong* (ZGZ 1173.3), the latter redoubled (cf. SWB 125.3). The SWB editors suggest that the redoubled [虫] *chong* on the right side is an erroneous form of the component, which is also used as the right part of the character [流] *liu* (cf. forms in SWB 514.3 and CXWB 951.9). Li Ling instead supposed the right half of the character to be an erroneous form of the redoubled [兔] *tu* component in [讒] *chan*.¹³³ Since the word *chan* {讒} also appears in the *Mao shi* text of both odes that are supposedly discussed in this passage and fits the context as well, this interpretation is followed.¹³⁴

#9:

己 The character in the manuscript is categorized as a graphical variant of [斯] *si* by the SWB editors (cf. SWB 619.1). However, the character is quite different from the other two forms

128 LI, 2002: 31.

129 LIU, 2003: 257–258.

130 LIAO, 2002c: 270.

131 JI, 2004: 66.

132 Cf. the enlarged photographic reproduction in MA, 2001: 35. Traces of ink as well as some rubbing or scraping (resulting in a different color of the bamboo slip at that place) are visible at the end of #23.

133 LI, 2002: 36.

134 Cf. text of Mao 197 and 198 in RUAN, 1980: 453–454.

used to write *si* {斯} in the *Shilun*. It is missing the [斤] *jin* component on the right side and is written with [廾] *ji* instead of [冫] *qi* as the lower left part.

Ma identified the character as [其] *qi*.¹³⁵ But the word *qi* {其} is normally written using the characters [廾] *ji* or [冫] *qi* in the *Shilun* (cf. SWB 235.8). Hu Pingsheng therefore suggested that it was used to write *ji* {己}.¹³⁶ Since the words *qi* {其} [*gə] and *ji* {己} [*kə?] both belong to the *zhi* 之 rhyme group and both have a velar initial (cf. ZGZ 26.5 and 27.6), this interpretation is followed here.

- 困 Written as [困] *kun* (cf. SWB 330.4). As the SWB edition also shows [困] *kun* in the first annotation (cf. SWB 744), the reading *yin* {因} in the second one (cf. SWB 750) appears to be a mistake.

#21:

- 醜 The character in the manuscript (cf. SWB 624.1) consists of the components [車] *che* and [它] *ta*. With regard to the content of *Zhan lu* 湛露 (Mao 174), Ma Chengyuan interpreted it as writing the word *tuo* {醜}.¹³⁷ Since the meaning of the word that is normally written with the character in the manuscript, “the swiftness of a chariot”, would seem obscure in the given context, Ma’s interpretation is followed.

The phrase “*zhi yi ye*” 之益也, a part of the comment on the ode *Zhan lu* 湛露 (Mao 174), is missing in the second annotation of the SWB edition (cf. SWB 750). The reading *yi* {益} was chosen on the basis of the interpretation of the same character on #11 (cf. SWB 744 and 749).

The reading *yi* {義} in the comment to the ode *Wan qiu* 宛丘 (Mao 136) is another mistake. It should be *shan* {善} (cf. SWB 746 and 750).

#22:

- 變 Written as a graphical variant of [竟/弁] *bian* (cf. SWB 420.1). The character is part of an ode citation, the *Mao shi* show *fan* {反} instead.¹³⁸ Since a phonetic loan connection is rather improbable [*brans vs. *pan?], Ji Xusheng proposed the reading *bian* {變} [*prans] for this character.¹³⁹

- [王] Since the actual condition of #22 (see figure 3) casts doubt on the emendation of several characters, as proposed by Ma Chengyuan and the SWB editors, the present edition follows Li Xueqin’s reconstruction. Li suggested that the phrase “*wen wang*” 文王 is the title of the commented ode and, at the same time, also part of the following ode citation.¹⁴⁰ Therefore only one character needs to be emended.

135 MA, 2001: 137.

136 HU, 2002b: 282–283.

137 MA, 2001: 150.

138 MA, 2001: 152.

139 JI, 2004: 73–74.

140 Cf. LI, 2002c: 8. This interpretation reasonably presupposes that unnecessary reduplication was avoided. It is, furthermore, possible that the reduplication mark that would have clarified the reading of the passage in question was lost.

#6:

作 Written as [𠄎] *zha* (cf. SWB 581.2). The character appears to be part of an ode citation. The *Mao shi* have *wu* {無} instead. Ma pointed out that the characters [𠄎] *zha* and [亡] *wang* (cf. SWB 577.3), which was often used to write *wu* {無}, look very similar in the Shanghai Museum manuscripts. He therefore believes the character [無] *wu* in the *Mao shi* to be a mistake.¹⁴¹ Ji Xusheng, however, pointed out that the phrase “*wu jing*” 無競 was very common in early Chinese literature and therefore the [𠄎] *zha* in the *Shilun* should rather be a mistaken [亡] *wang*.¹⁴² The fact remains that the character written is definitely [𠄎] *zha*, which in other manuscripts from the Warring States period, as well as in the *Zi Gao* from the Shanghai corpus, normally stands for the word *zuo* {作} (cf. ZGZ 577 and SWB 581.2 as well as 781–782 for the readings in the annotation for *Zi Gao*). Since the phrase “*zuo jing*” 作競 in the sense of “to rise up to strength” apparently fits the context as well as “*wu jing*” 無競, the former interpretation is accepted.

#3:

欲 Written as [谷] *gu* (cf. SWB 516.3). Ma and the SWB editors interpret the character here as writing *su* {俗}.¹⁴³ However, the same character stands for the word *yu* {欲} on #9 and 16, and most probably also on #7 of the *Shilun*.¹⁴⁴ Given the fact that the reading *yu* {欲} makes sense in this context, it would seem reasonable to assume the same usage here.

#4:

The only thing to be pointed out here is that this edition follows Ma’s placement of a caesura behind the word *men* {門}. To stress the fact that there has to be such a caesura, Ma in his annotation also included the ink-nail that can be found in the manuscript.¹⁴⁵

#1:

意 The character in the manuscript is identified as an incomplete [言] *yan* by the SWB editors (cf. SWB 111.1). Li Xueqin, however, pointed out that this character is different from any other [言] *yan* in the *Shilun* due to its additional horizontal stroke at the top.¹⁴⁶ He further

141 MA, 2001: 133.

142 Cf. Ji, 2004: 75.

143 Cf. MA, 2001: 129–130.

144 Cf. MA, 2001: 137, 145. Contradicting Ma, the SWB editors read the character on #7 in the same way (cf. annotation on pp. 742–751).

145 Cf. MA, 2001: 130. This marker is hardly visible on the photo included in the annotation. However, it can be seen very clearly on the magnified photograph of #4 in the first part of the book, cf. MA, 2001: 16.

146 This is nicely illustrated by the forms gathered in the SWB. Comparing those on page 111 with those on pages 113 and 114, the difference is quite evident. Moreover, although character forms like the one on #1 of the *Shilun* are found in other manuscripts of the Shanghai corpus, none are found within the *Shilun*.

suggested that it is very similar to [音] *yin* (cf. SWB 127.2) and could therefore be a fragmented [意] *yi* character (cf. ZGZ 1.3).¹⁴⁷ Li's interpretation is followed here.

3.3 Punctuated Edition

In the present edition, all of the punctuation in the manuscript was changed to modern punctuation: a comma or period replaces an ink-nail, while an ink-knot is indicated by a blank line. Paragraphs roughly indicating the beginning of a new section have been inserted. Moreover, supplemental punctuation has also been emended to mark ode citations, ode titles, questions etc. The numbers of the slips have been omitted to improve legibility. Wherever more than nine consecutive characters (approximately the length of the top or bottom of a slip) are missing, it is indicated by three dots.

《關雎》之改，《樛木》之時，《漢廣》之智，《鵲巢》之歸，《甘棠》之保，《綠衣》之思，《燕燕》之情，曷？曰：動而皆賢於其初者也。《關雎》以色喻於禮。[□□□□□□□□]兩矣，其四章則喻矣。以琴瑟之悅擬好色之願，以鐘鼓之樂[□□□□]好。反入於禮，不亦能改乎？《樛木》福斯在君子，不[亦□□乎？]《漢廣》[□□□□]可得。不攻不可能，不亦知恆乎？《鵲巢》出以百輛不亦有離乎？《甘[棠]□]及其人，敬愛其樹，其保厚矣。《甘棠》之愛以召公[...《綠衣》...《燕燕》...]¹⁴⁸情愛也。《關雎》之改，則其思益矣。《樛木》之時，則以其祿也。《漢廣》之智，則知不可得也。《鵲巢》之歸，則離者[□□□□□□□□]召公也。《綠衣》之憂，思古人也。《燕燕》之情，以其獨也。孔子曰：吾以《葛覃》得祇初之詩。民性固然，見其美必欲反其本。夫葛之見歌也，則以□□之故也。后稷之見貴也，則以文武之德也。吾以《甘棠》得宗廟之敬。民性固然，甚貴其人，必敬其位。悅其人，必好其所為。惡其人者亦然。[吾以《木瓜》得]幣帛之不可去也。民性固然，其隱志必有以喻也。其言有所載而後入，或前之而後交，人不可干也。吾以《杕杜》得爵[...]如此何？斯爵之矣。離其所愛，必曰：吾奚舍之？賓贈是已。孔子曰：《蟋蟀》知難。《仲氏》君子。《北風》不絕人之怨，《子立》不[...]《東方未明》有利詞。《將仲》之言不可不畏也。《揚之水》其愛婦愁。《采

147 Li, 2002a: 31.

148 The two ode titles were emended on the basis of the *Guan ju* group structure (see 2.2.2 above).

葛》之愛婦[...《柏舟》...] ¹⁴⁹ 曰志。既曰：“天也”，猶有怨言。《木瓜》有藏願而未得達也。因《木瓜》之報以喻其怨者也。《杕杜》則情愫其至也。

[...《君子》陽陽] 小人。《有兔》不逢時。《大田》之卒章，知言而有禮。《小明》不[...]忠。《邶·柏舟》悶。《谷風》悲。《蓼莪》有孝志。《隰有萇楚》得而悔之也。[...]惡而不文。《牆有茨》慎密而不知言。《青蠅》知[...]患而不知人。《涉溱》其絕拊而士。《角枕》婦。《河水》知[...]《鹿鳴》以樂始而會，以道交。見善而效，終乎不厭人。《兔置》其用人，則吾取口。

《十月》善諱言。《雨無正》，《節南山》皆言上之衰也，王公恥之。《小旻》多疑矣，言不中志者也。《小宛》其言不惡，小有仁焉。《小弁》，《巧言》則言讒人之害也。《伐木》[□□□]實咎於己也。《天保》其得祿蔑疆矣，巽寡德故也。《祈父》之責，亦有以也。《黃鳥》則困而欲反其故也，多恥者，其病之乎？《菁菁者莪》則以人益也。《裳裳者華》則[□□]貴也。《將大車》之囂也，則以為不可如何也。《湛露》之益也，其猶醜與！

孔子曰：《宛丘》吾善之，《猗嗟》吾憇之，《鳴鳩》吾信之，《文王》吾美之，《清廟》吾敬之，《烈文》吾悅之，《昊天有成命》吾口之。《宛丘》曰：“詢有情，而無望”，吾善之。《猗嗟》曰：“四矢變，以禦亂”，吾憇之。《鳴鳩》曰：“其儀一兮，心如結也”，吾信之。“文[王]在上，於昭于天”，吾美之。[《清廟》曰：“肅雝顯相，濟濟]多士，秉文之德”，吾敬之。《烈文》曰：“作競維人，丕顯維德，於乎，前王不忘”，吾悅之。“昊天有成命，二后受之”，貴且顯矣。《頌》[...]“懷爾明德”，曷？誠謂之也。“有命自天，命此文王”，誠命之也，信矣。孔子曰：此命也夫？文王雖欲已，得乎？此命也。[...]時也。文王受命矣。

《頌》平德也。多言後，其樂安而遲，其歌紳而易，其思深而遠，至矣。《大雅》盛德也。多言[...小雅]□□也。多言難而怨懟者也。衰矣，小矣。《邦風》其內物也，博觀人欲焉，大斂材焉。其言文，其聲善。

孔子曰：唯能夫[...]曰：詩其猶平門。與賤民而豫之，其用心也將何如？曰：《邦風》是已。民之有感患也，上下之不和者，其用心也將何如？[曰：《小雅》是已。□□□]□□□□何如？曰：《大雅》]是已。有成功者何如？曰：《頌》是已。

《清廟》王德也，至矣。敬宗廟之禮，以為其本，“秉文之德”，以為其業。“肅雝[...”...]行此者其有不王乎？

孔子曰：詩無隱志，樂無隱情，文無隱意[...].

149 The ode title was emended by Yang Zhesheng based on the analysis of the subsequent comment (YANG, 2004).

4. Translation¹⁵⁰

The “change” of *Guan ju*, the “right time” of *Jiu mu*, the “prudence” of *Han guang*, the “homecoming”¹⁵¹ of *Que chao*, the “protection” of *Gan tang*, the “longing” of *Lü yi*, the “feelings” of *Yan yan*, what [about them]? Implementing them, [these odes] are all [becoming] more virtuous than they were at the beginning. In *Guan ju*, the rules of conduct are explained through sexual desires. [...] two [a pair?]. This is explained in the fourth stanza. By the delight in zither and harp, lustful desires are imitated; by the enjoyment of bells and drums [...] fondness. Someone who turns and channels [these feelings] according to the rules of conduct, is he not also capable of changing? In *Jiu mu*, the blessings are thus with the gentleman. Is it not [also ...? In *Han guang* ...] achievable, not to go about something one is not able to do; is it not also knowing things, which cannot be changed? If one leaves [accompanied] by a hundred chariots, [as described in] *Que chao*, is it not still a departure? In *Gan [tang ...]* and his [the Duke of Shao’s] people, respected and cared for his tree. His protection [of the people] was powerful. The care in *Gan tang* is founded on the Duke of Shao [... *Lü yi* ... *Yan yan* ...] feelings and affection. The “change” in *Guan ju* represents overflowing longings. The “right time” in *Jiu mu* is based on the blessings [for the gentleman]. The “prudence” of *Han guang* is to know that something cannot be achieved. The “homecoming” of *Que chao* is [...] departing [... *Gan tang* ...] the Duke of Shao. The “worries” of *Lü yi* are longings for a person from the past. The “feelings” of *Yan yan* convey being lonely.

Master Kong said: Through *Ge tan* I understand the odes, which honor the beginnings. The nature of the people is unquestionably like this: when they see the beauty of something, they want to go back to its origin. So, that grass-cloth vine is sung about is because of [the fine and coarse linen, which is made from it]¹⁵².

150 To be able to follow the numerous references to the content of certain odes made in the text, it is highly recommended to consult either a translation of the *Mao shi*, for example WALEY / ALLEN, 1996, or the original text. The *Mao shi* title and number of every ode included in the *Shilun* can easily be found with the help of the ode title synopsis (see Appendix). I have tried to find a compromise between legibility and faithful rendering of the original. I, therefore, beg readers to pardon the occasional stiffness of my phrasing.

151 What is meant here is the departure of a bride from her parents’ house, the husband returning her to his home. Cf. WALEY / ALLEN, 1996: 13–14.

152 The part with “fine and coarse linen” has been tentatively emended only in this translation; see explanatory notes for #24.

That Hou Ji is highly valued is because of the virtue of [Kings] Wen and Wu. Through *Gan tang* I understand the respect for the ancestral temple. The nature of the people is unquestionably like this: if they value [someone's] personality highly, they will surely respect the place [where he can be worshipped]. If they delight in the personality [of someone], they will surely like what he does. If they detest the personality, it will be accordingly. [Through *Mu gua* I understand] the necessity of fabrics and silk [as presents]. The nature of the people is unquestionably like this: There has to be something whereby their hidden intentions may be alluded to. Their words are only heard after something has been brought along [as a present]. It is also possible to prepose them [i.e. the words] and hand over [a present] afterwards. The people cannot violate against [this habit]. Through *Di du* I understand [...] the ranks of nobility [...], what is it like? This is what it means to award a rank. Parting from the ones you love, you will surely say, "How can I let them go?" Seeing off guests – this is what it is about.

Master Kong said: *Xi shuai*: knowing difficulties; *Zhong shi*: a gentleman; *Bei feng*: not ending the people's grudge; *Zi li* [...] not [...]; *Dong fang wei ming*: has keen-witted words; words in *Jiang zhong*: must be respected; *Yang zhi shui*: half-hearted love for a wife; love for a wife in *Cai ge*: [... *Bo zhou*:...] aspirations. What is said by "This is Heaven!"¹⁵³ is that there are still words of grudge. *Mu gua*: has hidden desires, but they are not fulfilled. That is why the "repaying"¹⁵⁴ of *Mu gua* alludes to grudge. *Di du*: real happiness about the arrival [of a beloved person].

[*Junzi*] *yang yang*: a common person; *You tu*: meeting the right time; last stanza of *Da tian*: knowing words and conforming to the rules of conduct; *Xiao ming*: [...] not [...] loyalty; *Bo zhou* from Bei: depressing; *Gu feng*: embittering; *Liao e*: filial aspirations; *Xi you chang chu*: regretting something after having reached it; [...] hate and being not refined; *Qiang you ci*: being cautious about secrets but not knowing words; *Qing ying*: knowing [...] worries but not knowing people; *She zhen*: being a nobleman through abandoning one's comfort; *Jiao zhen*: a married woman; *He shui*: knowing [...]; *Lu ming*: to gather starting with music

153 This sentence is probably a reaction to the insight that a certain unfavorable situation cannot be changed in any way, since a higher authority, "Heaven", planned it to be like that.

154 This refers to giving presents to a lover. Cf. translation of *Mu gua* in WALEY / ALLEN, 1996: 54–55.

and encountering each other according to the right way. Seeing the aptness [of others, one] imitates it. People do not grow tired of doing this their whole lives. The using of the people in *Tu ju*: I accept it.

Shi yue: good at using reprimanding words; *Yu wu zheng* and *Jie nan shan*: both talking about the decline of superiors. Kings and dukes should be ashamed of [these odes]. *Xiao min*: has many doubts, [because] words do not accord with intentions; words in *Xiao wan*: not evil [but] there is little benevolence in them; *Xiao bian* and *Qiao yan*: talking about the harm [caused by] slanderers; *Fa mu*: [...] really putting the blame on oneself; *Tian bao*: limitless blessings, because of submission to the virtue of [one's] lord; the blame of *Qi fu*: indeed having its reason; *Huang niao*: meeting difficulties and wanting to return home. Would people who have feelings of shame blame somebody [for that]? *Jing jing zhe e*: profiting from a person; *Chang chang zhe hua*: valuing [...]; the clamor of *Jiang da che*: I consider it useless; the overdone [drinking] of *Zhan lu*: it is resembling reddened faces!

Master Kong said: I consider *Wan qiu* exquisite, I am fond of *Yi jie*, I trust in *Shi jiu*, I consider *Wen wang* as beautiful, [I respect] *Qing* [*miao*, I delight in *Lie wen*, I ... *Hao tian you cheng ming*.] *Wan qiu* says, "He truly has feelings, [but] he has nothing to offer as a sacrifice." This is what I consider exquisite. *Yi jie* says, "Of four arrows [everyone hits a] different [target] to ward off disorder." This is what I am fond of. *Shi jiu* says, "His bearing is uniform, his heart like a knot." This is what I trust in. "[King] Wen dwells up high, oh, he shines in heaven!" This is what I consider beautiful. [*Qing miao* says, "Solemn and harmonious are the masters of ceremony, numerous] the many noblemen, adhering to the virtue of [king] Wen." This is what I respect. *Lie wen* says, "Rising up to strength is the man, most distinguished the virtues. Oh, the former kings are not forgotten!" This is what I delight in. "Great Heaven had a mandate to establish [a kingdom], the two sovereigns [Wen and Wu] received it." They are valuable and noble. The *Song* [...] "I¹⁵⁵ am moved by your bright virtue." What [does this mean]? He [i.e. Shang Di] has really talked to him [i.e. King Wen]. "A mandate came from Heaven, which instructed this King Wen." He [Shang Di] really gave the mandate to him [King Wen], this is trustworthy. Master Kong said: This is

155 "I" in this citation from Mao 241 as well as the following "He" presumably refer to the deity Shang Di. Cf. the text of this ode in RUAN, 1980: 519–523.

the *mandate*! Even if King Wen had wanted to end it, would this have been possible? This is the mandate. [...] right time. King Wen received the mandate.

The *Song* [are about] even virtue. They tell us much about the later generations.¹⁵⁶ Their music is tranquil and slow, their song is noble and unassuming, their longing admiration is deep and far reaching, it is perfect. The *Da ya* [are about] abundant virtue. They tell us much about [... The *Xiao ya* are about ...]. They tell us much about calamities as well as grudge and discontent. [Virtue] has declined, [it] is small. As regards the things contained in the *Bang feng*, we can abundantly see people's desires and gather a wealth of [useful] material from them. Their words are beautiful, their sounds are exquisite.

Master Kong said: Only an able person [...] said¹⁵⁷: The Odes, they really are like an even gate. In order to come close to the low people and delight in them [i.e. the Odes], what should one set one's heart on? It is the *Bang feng*! [To learn about] the grief and the worries of the people, the discord of superiors and inferiors, what should one set one's heart on? [It is the *Xiao ya*!....what should one set one's heart on?] It is the [*Da ya*]! In case someone is establishing merit, what should one set one's heart on? It is the *Song*!

Qing miao [shows] royal virtue. It is perfect. It makes the respect for the rules of conduct in the ancestral temple its basis, "the adherence to the virtues of [King] Wen" its business. "Solemn and harmonious [...]" That someone who acts like this, will not become a true king, could that even happen?

Master Kong said: In the Odes there are no hidden intentions, in the music there are no hidden emotions, in the writings there are no hidden meanings [...].

156 The word "hou" 後 ("later generations") most probably refers to the rulers of the house of Zhou; cf. MA, 2001: 127.

157 It can hardly be determined who is speaking here and in the following instances only indicated by "yue". It is not even clear whether the speaker changes from Confucius to another person or not.

5. Concluding remarks

The reconstruction of the text shows quite clearly that the *Shilun* is not a treatise written by a single person but rather a collection of statements referring to particular odes, ode categories and also the Odes in general. Most of these statements are explicitly attributed to Confucius. Whether or not some of these, or at least the questions he seems to answer in some parts of the text, were elaborated upon by another person (possibly one of his disciples) cannot be said for sure. There remains the possibility that these questions were nothing more than a rhetorical device. While generally not representing a well organized treatise, various parts of the text show a focus on certain ode categories, and these passages might have been carefully arranged by the author with the sequence of the ode categories in mind. The reconstructed text supports this assumption, as it roughly reflects the order of the ode categories in the extant *Mao shi* (see 2.3 above). Variations in the stylistic patterning of the *Shilun* text further suggest that it was compiled from several parts of diverse origin. Some passages (for example the ones on #21-22-6 or 16-24-20) show a very elaborate style with distinct textual parallelism, while others (for example on #25, 26, 28 and 29) could originally have been concise notes meant to serve as a basis for later elaboration or as a mere reminder.¹⁵⁸ Accordingly, those last mentioned passages turned out to be the most difficult to translate. In some cases where there is only an ode title followed by one character, the actual meaning can be rather obscure, which is one of the reasons why this translation still should be considered tentative.

Of course, the same is also true for the reconstructed arrangement of the *Shilun* bamboo slips and the editions based on it. However, the editions provided in the present paper still represent a falsifiable and hopefully rather reliable basis for further studies. Since the relationship of the *Shilun* to the extant prefaces, its literary context, its significance for transmission of the Odes and further questions, e.g. whether the proposed reordering entails a different perspective on the function of the text in late Warring States society, or what its intended audience and its place in the history of canonization were, would all warrant more extensive treatment, which is however beyond the scope of the present paper, such interpretations shall be saved for another day.

One problem that occurred in the course of this study is the incalculable degree of proximity between the collection of odes the *Shilun* refers to, and the

158 Especially these latter passages may indeed have belonged to a “didactic” master-disciple setting.

extant odes transmitted in the *Mao shi*. Without the assumption that the two were at least similar, the *Shilun* text would be even more obscure, or almost incomprehensible. However, due to the numerous hints from ode titles as well as ode citations, which suggest a certain degree of similarity, the utilization of the *Mao shi* as a tentative reference text appears to be justifiable.

Appendix: Ode title synopsis

Ode title in the <i>Shilun</i>	Ode title in the <i>Mao shi</i>	<i>Mao</i> - Number
<i>Bei Bo zhou</i> 邶柏舟	<i>Bo zhou</i> 柏舟	26
<i>Bei feng</i> 北風	<i>Bei feng</i> 北風	41
<i>Cai ge</i> 采葛	<i>Cai ge</i> 采葛	72
<i>Chang chang zhe hua</i> 裳裳者華	<i>Chang chang zhe hua</i> 裳裳者華	214
<i>Da tian</i> 大田	<i>Da tian</i> 大田	212
<i>Di du</i> 杖杜	<i>You di zhi du</i> 有杖之杜	123
<i>Dong fang wei ming</i> 東方未明	<i>Dong fang wei ming</i> 東方未明	100
<i>Fa mu</i> 伐木	<i>Fa mu</i> 伐木	165
<i>Gan tang</i> 甘棠	<i>Gan tang</i> 甘棠	16
<i>Ge tan</i> 葛覃	<i>Ge tan</i> 葛覃	2
<i>Gu feng</i> 谷風	<i>Gu feng</i> 谷風	35/201
<i>Guan ju</i> 關雎	<i>Guan ju</i> 關雎	1
<i>Han guang</i> 漢廣	<i>Han guang</i> 漢廣	9
<i>Hao tian you cheng ming</i> 昊天有成命	<i>Hao tian you cheng ming</i> 昊天有成命	271
<i>He shui</i> 河水	<i>Mian shui</i> 沔水	183
<i>Huang niao</i> 黃鳥	<i>Huang niao</i> 黃鳥	187
<i>Jiang da che</i> 將大車	<i>Wu jiang da che</i> 無將大車	206
<i>Jiang zhong</i> 將仲	<i>Jiang zhong zi</i> 將仲子	76
<i>Jiao zhen</i> 角枕	<i>Ge sheng</i> 葛生	124
<i>Jie nan shan</i> 節南山	<i>Jie nan shan</i> 節南山	191
<i>Jing jing zhe e</i> 菁菁者莪	<i>Jing jing zhe e</i> 菁菁者莪	176
<i>Jiu mu</i> 樛木	<i>Jiu mu</i> 樛木	4
[<i>Junzi</i>] <i>yang yang</i> [君子]陽陽	<i>Junzi yang yang</i> 君子陽陽	67
<i>Lie wen</i> 烈文	<i>Lie wen</i> 烈文	269

<i>Lu ming</i> 鹿鳴	<i>Lu ming</i> 鹿鳴	161
<i>Lü yi</i> 綠衣	<i>Lü yi</i> 綠衣	27
<i>Mu gua</i> 木瓜	<i>Mu gua</i> 木瓜	64
<i>Qi fu</i> 祈父	<i>Qi fu</i> 祈父	185
<i>Qiang you ci</i> 牆有茨	<i>Qiang you ci</i> 牆有茨	46
<i>Qiao yan</i> 巧言	<i>Qiao yan</i> 巧言	198
<i>Qing miao</i> 清廟	<i>Qing miao</i> 清廟	266
<i>Qing ying</i> 青蠅	<i>Qing ying</i> 青蠅	219
<i>Que chao</i> 鵲巢	<i>Que chao</i> 鵲巢	12
<i>She zhen</i> 涉溱	<i>Qian chang</i> 褰裳	87
<i>Shi jiu</i> 鳴鳩	<i>Shi jiu</i> 鳴鳩	152
<i>Shi yue</i> 十月	<i>Shi yue zhi jiao</i> 十月之交	193
<i>Tian bao</i> 天保	<i>Tian bao</i> 天保	166
<i>Tu ju</i> 兔置	<i>Tu ju</i> 兔置	7
<i>Wan qiu</i> 宛丘	<i>Wan qiu</i> 宛丘	136
<i>Wen Wang</i> 文王	<i>Wen Wang</i> 文王	235
<i>Xi shuai</i> 蟋蟀	<i>Xi shuai</i> 蟋蟀	114
<i>Xi you chang chu</i> 隰有萋楚	<i>Xi you chang chu</i> 隰有萋楚	148
<i>Xiao bian</i> 小弁	<i>Xiao bian</i> 小弁	197
<i>Xiao Min</i> 小旻	<i>Xiao Min</i> 小旻	195
<i>Xiao ming</i> 小明	<i>Xiao ming</i> 小明	207
<i>Xiao wan</i> 小宛	<i>Xiao wan</i> 小宛	196
<i>Yan yan</i> 燕燕	<i>Yan yan</i> 燕燕	28
<i>Yang zhi shui</i> 揚之水	<i>Yang zhi shui</i> 揚之水	68/92/116
<i>Yi jie</i> 猗嗟	<i>Yi jie</i> 猗嗟	106
<i>You tu</i> 有兔	<i>You tu</i> 有兔	70
<i>Yu wu zheng</i> 雨無正	<i>Yu wu zheng</i> 雨無正	194
<i>Zhan lu</i> 湛露	<i>Zhan lu</i> 湛露	174
<i>Zhong shi</i> 仲氏	<i>Zhong shi</i> 仲氏	28
<i>Zi li</i> 子立	?	?

References

- AI Lan 艾蘭 (Sarah Allan); XING Wen 邢文 (ed.)
 2004 *Xin chu jian bo yanjiu – Xin chu jian bo guoji xueshu yantao hui wenji*
 新出簡帛研究 – 新出簡帛國際學術研討會文集. Beijing: Wenwu
 chubanshe.
- CAO Feng 曹峰
 2002 “Dui ‘Kongzi shilun’ di ba jian yihou jianxu de zai tiaozheng – cong
 yuyan tese de jiaodu ru shou” 對《孔子詩論》第八簡以後簡序的
 再調整 – 從語言特色的角度入手. In: ZHU / LIAO, 2002: 199–209.
- CHEN Jian 陳劍
 2002 “‘Kongzi shilun’ bushi yi ze” 《孔子詩論》補釋一則. *International
 Research on Bamboo and Silk Documents Newsletter* 2.3: 10–11.
- CHEN Tongsheng 陳桐生
 2004 ‘Kongzi shilun’ yanjiu 《孔子詩論》研究. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- FAN Yuzhou 范毓周
 2002a “Guanyu Shanghai bowuguan cang Chu jian ‘Shilun’ de liu bai wenti”
 關於上海博物館藏楚簡《詩論》的留白問題. *Jianbo yanjiu* 簡帛
 研究.
 <<http://www.jianbo.org/Wssf/2002/fanyuzhou02.htm>>, last accessed
 on 28.07.2009.
- 2002b “‘Shilun’ ‘liu bai’ wenti de zai tantao” 《詩論》“留白”問題的再探
 討. *Jianbo yanjiu* 簡帛研究.
 <<http://www.jianbo.org/Wssf/2002/fanyuzhou10.htm>>, last accessed
 on 28.07.2009.
- FENG Shengjun 馮勝君
 2002 “Du Shangbo jian ‘Kongzi shilun’ zhaji” 讀上博簡《孔子詩論》札
 記. *Guji zhengli yanjiu xuekan* 古籍整理研究學刊 2002.2: 11–13.
- HE Linyi 何琳儀
 1998 *Zhanguo guwen zidian – Zhanguo wenzi shengxi* 戰國古文字典 – 戰
 國文字聲系. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- 2002 “Hu jian ‘Shilun’ xuanshi” 滬簡《詩論》選釋. In: ZHU / LIAO,
 2002: 243–259. (=ZGZ)
- HU Pingsheng 胡平生
 2002a “Zuo hao ‘Shilun’ de bianlian he kaoshi” 做好《詩論》的編聯和考
 釋. *Wenyi yanjiu* 文藝研究 2002.2: 48–50.
- 2002b “Du Shangbo cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu ‘Shilun’ zhaji” 讀上博藏戰
 國楚竹書《詩論》劄記. In: ZHU / LIAO, 2002: 277–288.

HUANG Huaixin 黃懷信

2004 *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu 'Shilun' jieyi* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書《詩論》解義. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe.

Ji Xusheng 季旭昇 (ed.)

2004 “*Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (yi)*” *duben* 《上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書(一)》讀本. Taibei: Wanjuanlou.

JIANG Guanghui 姜廣輝

2002 “Zai lun gu ‘Shi xu’” 再論古《詩序》. *International Research on Bamboo and Silk Documents Newsletter* 2.3: 3–6.

2007 “Shangbo cang jian zhengli yu Kong men shi jiao” 上博藏簡整理與孔門詩教. In: LIN / JIANG, 2007: 191–226.

2008 “A Modern Translation of Confucius’ Comments on the Poetry (Kongzi Shilun)”. *Contemporary Chinese Thought* 39.4: 49–60.

JIANG Linchang 江林昌

2004 “Shi xi Shangbo jian ‘Shi shuo’ de bianlian yu jiegou” 試析上博簡《詩說》的編聯與結構. In: AI / XING, 2004: 127–141.

KALINOWSKI, Marc

2005 “La production des manuscrits dans la Chine ancienne. Une approche codicologique”. *Asiatische Studien* 59.1: 131–168.

KANG Shaofeng 康少峰

2005 ‘*Shilun*’ *jianzhi, jianxu ji wenzi shidu yanjiu* 《詩論》簡制、簡序及文字釋讀研究. Diss., Sichuan daxue.

KARLGREN, Bernhard

1972 *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1957. (= GSR)

KERN, Martin

2003 “Early Chinese Poetics in the Light of Recently Excavated Manuscripts”. In: *Recarving the Dragon: Understanding Chinese Poetics*. Olga Lomová (ed.). Prague: Charles University, The Karolinum Press: 27–72.

2005 “The Odes in Excavated Manuscripts”. In: *Text and Ritual in Early China*. Martin Kern (ed.). Seattle: University of Washington: 149–193.

2007 “Excavated Manuscripts and their Socratic Pleasures: Newly Discovered Challenges in Reading the ‘Airs of the States’”. *Asiatische Studien* 61.3: 775–793.

LI Ling 李零

2002 *Shangbo Chu jian san pian jiao du ji* 上博楚簡三篇校讀記. Taibei: Wanjuanlou.

LI Shoukui 李守奎; QU Bing 曲冰; SUN Weilong 孫偉龍

2007 *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (yi – wu) wenzi bian* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書(一 – 五)文字編. Beijing: Zuojia chubanshe. (= SWB)

LI Xueqin 李學勤

2002a “Tan ‘Shilun’ ‘Shi wang yin zhi’ zhang” 談《詩論》“詩亡隱志”章. In: *Wenyi yanjiu* 文藝研究 2002.2: 31–33.

2002b “‘Shilun’ shuo ‘Guanju’ deng qi pian shiyi” 《詩論》說《閔雎》等七篇釋義. *Qi Lu xuekan* 齊魯學刊 2002.2: 90–93.

2002c “‘Shilun’ jian de bianlian yu fuyuan” 《詩論》簡的編聯與復原. *Zhongguo zhexue shi* 中國哲學史 2002.1: 5–8.

2004 “Zai shuo ‘Shilun’ jian de bianlian” 再說《詩論》簡的編聯. In: AI / XING, 2004: 88–91.

LIAO Mingchun 廖名春

2002a “Shangbo ‘Shilun’ jian de xingzhi he bianlian” 上博《詩論》簡的形制和編連. *Kongzi yanjiu* 孔子研究 2002.2: 10–16.

2002b “Shanghai bowuguan cang ‘Zhanguo Chu zhushu – Kongzi shilun’ yanjiu qianjian” 上海博物館藏《戰國楚竹書·孔子詩論》研究淺見. *Wenyi yanjiu* 文藝研究 2002.2: 42–45.

2002c “Shanghai bowuguan cang Shilun jian jiaoshi zhaji” 上海博物館藏詩論簡校釋劄記. In: ZHU / LIAO, 2002: 260–276.

LIN Qingzhang 林慶彰; JIANG Qiuhua 蔣秋華 (ed.)

2007 *Jingdian de xingcheng, chuanliu yu quanzhu (yi)* 經典的形成、傳流與詮註(一). Taibei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju.

LIU Xinfang 劉信芳

2003 *Kongzi shilun shuxue* 孔子詩論述學. Hefei: Anhui daxue chubanshe. MA Chengyuan 馬承源 (ed.)

2001 *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (yi)* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書(一). Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe.

2002 *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu (er)* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書(二). Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe.

PANG Pu 龐樸

2002 “Shangbo cang jian ling jian” 上博藏簡零箋. In: ZHU / LIAO, 2002: 233–242.

PENG Hao 彭浩

2004 “‘Shilun’ liubai jian yu gu shu de chaoxie geshi” 《詩論》留白簡與古書的抄寫格式. In: XIE / ZHU, 2004: 297–298.

PU Maozuo 濮茅左

2002 “‘Kongzi shilun’ jianxu jiexi” 《孔子詩論》簡序解析. In: ZHU / LIAO, 2002: 9–50.

RUAN Yuan 阮元

1980 *Shisan jing zhushu – fu jiaokan ji* 十三經注疏 – 附校勘記. 2 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.

SCHUESSLER, Axel

2007 *ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

TENG Rensheng 滕壬生

2008 *Chu xi jianbo wenzi bian (zengding ben)* 楚系簡帛文字編(增訂本). Wuhan: Hubei jiaoyu chubanshe. (= CXWB)

WALEY, Arthur; Joseph R. ALLEN

1996 *The Book of Songs. The Ancient Chinese Classic of Poetry*. Translated from the Chinese by Arthur Waley. Edited with additional Translations by Joseph R. Allen. New York: Grove Press.

XIAO Bing 蕭兵

2006 *Kongzi shilun de wenhua tuiyi* 孔子詩論的文化推繹. Wuhan: Hubei renmin.

XIE Weiyang 謝維揚; ZHU Yuanqing 朱淵清 (ed.)

2004 *Xin chutu wenxian yu gudai wenming yanjiu* 新出土文獻與古代文明研究. Shanghai: Shanghai daxue chubanshe.

YANG Zesheng 楊澤生

2004 “Shuo ‘ji yue »tian ye«, you you yuan yan’ ping de shi ‘Yong feng – Bo zhou’” 說“既曰‘天也’，猶有怨言”評的是《鄘風·柏舟》. In: XIE / ZHU, 2004: 47–50.

ZHOU Fengwu 周鳳五

2002 “Lun Shangbo ‘Kongzi shilun’ zhujian liu bai wenti” 論上博《孔子詩論》竹簡留白問題. In: ZHU / LIAO, 2002: 187–191.

ZHU Yuanqing 朱淵清; LIAO Mingchun 廖名春 (ed.)

2002 *Shangboguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu yanjiu* 上博館藏戰國楚竹書研究. Shanghai: Shanghai shudian.