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Focusing on the early Chinese historiography, this article takes the Duoshiwei 鄭氏微, which is believed to be an abridgment of the Chunqiu (Spring and autumn annals) and written by Chu education official Duojiao 鄭tap, as a starting point. Although the book is no longer existed; in the recent discussion of the nature of the Qinghua bamboo-slip manuscript Xinian 繚 年 and other distinct historical manuscripts, researchers tended to link these excavated texts to Duoshiwei. Therefore, in the second part, this article examines how early Chinese scholars quoted and excerpted the Chunqiu based on the Shiji 史記 and argued that the historical context of early Chinese manuscript culture required closer examination and more evidence before drawing a parallel between excavated texts and a long lost work.

With two case studies in the third and fourth parts, this article compares anecdotes in the transmitted texts such as the Zuozhuan, Guoyu，and excavated texts Xinian, Yuegong qishi 越公其事. In case study 1, the parallel text of the ‘Xigui story’ in Xinian and Zuozhuan, the different rhetoric and discrepancies in interpretation indicates that it was impracticable to establish a direct relationship between the two texts. Moreover, in case study 2, through the comparison of similar discourse in the Guoyu and Yuegong qishi，this article describes the “appropriation of phrases,” which reveals the circulation of ‘Wu-Yue story’ and its various adoption in different texts.
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In this article, I compare two lengthy parallel anecdotes found in the newly discovered manuscript Zhou xun 周訓 and the philosophical compendium from the late Zhanguo period, Lüshi chunqiu 呂氏春秋. Based on this comparison, I argue that the authors of the Lüshi chunqiu borrowed from the Zhou xun. The techniques employed in incorporating the borrowed materials into the respective chapters proved to be virtually identical. Given that the materials under consideration appear in different parts of the Lüshi chunqiu—the relation, the time and the order of composition of which have been the subject of long debates—the present study promises to help us gain a better understanding of the process and principles of its creation. Moreover, I discuss the appearance of the main protagonist of the Zhou xun, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou 周昭文君 (4th c. BC), in the Lüshi chunqiu. In some chapters, he is portrayed as a ruler who acquired considerable fame among his contemporaries. Especially in the state of Qin, his renown was said to have culminated in his recognition as “teacher” (師 尉) by King Hui(wen) of Qin 秦惠文王 (356–311 BC, r. 338–311 BC). In view of these attempts to establish the (historically unlikely) close ties between Lord Zhaowen (and his teachings) and the state of Qin, in the concluding part of this paper, I conjecture in regard to the place of origin of the Zhou xun.
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Introduction

This article examines the relationship between the newly discovered manuscript Zhou xun (周訓) or Instructions of the Zhou and the comprehensive philosophical compendium Lüshi chunqiu (呂氏春秋) from the late decades before the unification of China under the Qin in 221 BC. The direct parallels between the two works involve two lengthy anecdotes which show such a high degree of similarity that it necessitates a clarification of the direction of borrowing between them. Although the relevant parts of the Zhou xun were already tentatively determined as predating the Lüshi chunqiu, this assumption was based on the two texts’ common “Daoist” traits, their general structure, and Lü Buwei’s (呂不韋) personal connection to the supposed place of origin of the Zhou xun.ór

However, some of these features, such as their calendrical structure, are common to a number of early Chinese texts, while others, such as the “Daoist” traits of the Zhou xun and its place of origin, are by no means obvious. Therefore, a careful analysis of the two textual parallels is in order. The fact that the main protagonist of the Zhou xun, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou 周昭文公 (4th c. BC), plays a prominent role in the Lüshi chunqiu has to be considered as well. In addition to clarifying the textual links between the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu, this investigation attempts to view them in the context of the relationship between the two states they are associated with, namely the Zhou 周 and Qin 秦.

I. The Zhou xun 周訓

The Zhou xun is part of the Peking University collection (Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu 北京大學藏西漢竹書), a group of bamboo-strip manuscripts dated to the Western Han and donated to Peking University in 2009.ór Being illegally retrieved by a private party, the circumstances of their discovery and curation remain unknown. Hence, the Peking manuscripts, alongside the Shanghai Museum and Tsinghua University collections, can be characterized as “looted” artefacts. As such, they present scholars with a series of concerns. Among the most serious ethical problems is the fact that the purchase of looted manuscripts raises the concern of complicity of academics in practices of grave desecration by encouraging a black market in stolen artefacts.ór As for scholarly issues, not being able to study the manuscripts in their original archeological environment gives us only a limited picture of their function and purpose.ór The most general problem, however, is that, regardless of how genuine a particular looted document might appear to be, we simply have no means of proving that it is actually not a forgery, at least when using conventional ways of determining the authenticity of manuscripts.ór In the case of the Peking University collection, the suspicion of forgery was raised against the Laozi 老子, its most prominent text.ór Even though this suspicion has been persuasively refuted,ór the mere fact that it could be raised is indicative of the problematic status of the looted manuscripts.

Being aware of these issues, I believe that not investigating the already available looted manuscripts would be equally detrimental given the valuable information they contain even in their fragmented state. The study of the texts from the Shanghai and Tsinghua collections, has, for instance, changed our understanding of early Chinese historiography and philosophy in many ways.

1. Han Wei 韓巍, “Xi-Han zhushu Zhou xun tuogan wenti de tantao” 西漢竹書《周訓》若干問題的探討, in Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu. Sawn 北京大學藏西漢竹書. 丛, ed. Beijing daxue chutu wenxian yanjiusuo 北京大学出土文献研究所 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2015), 278.

6. As Martin Kern, “‘Xi Shuai’ 嫌雉 (‘Cricket’) and Its Consequence: Issues in Early Chinese Poetry and Textual Studies,” Early China 42 (2019): 45–46, has pointed out, forgers might even use blank bamboo strips which are abundant in ancient graves, to make their creation pass the carbon-14 dating test. The only solution to that problem would be testing the ink that characters were written in.
7. Xing Wen 邢文, “‘Beida jian Laozi bianwei’ 北大簡《老子》辨異, Guangming Daily 光明日报, August 8, 2016, 16.
Introduction

This article examines the relationship between the newly discovered manuscript Zhou xun 周訓 (周訓) or Instructions of the Zhou and the comprehensive philosophical compendium Lüshi chunqiu 呂氏春秋 (Annals of Lü Buwei) from the last decades before the unification of China under the Qin 秦 in 221 BC. The direct parallels between the two works involve two lengthy anecdotes which show such a high degree of similarity that it necessitates a clarification of the direction of borrowing between them. Although the relevant parts of the Zhou xun were already tentatively determined as predating the Lüshi chunqiu, this assumption was based on the two texts’ common “Daoist” traits, their general structure, and Lü Buwei's 呂不韋 (d. 235 BC) personal connection to the supposed place of origin of the Zhou xun.1

However, some of these features, such as their calendrical structure, are common to a number of early Chinese texts, while others, such as the “Daoist” traits of the Zhou xun and its place of origin, are by no means obvious. Therefore, a careful analysis of the two textual parallels is in order. The fact that the main protagonist of the Zhou xun, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou 周昭文公 (4th c. BC), plays a prominent role in the Lüshi chunqiu has to be considered as well. In addition to clarifying the textual links between the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu, this investigation attempts to view them in the context of the relationship between the two states they are associated with, namely the Zhou 周 and Qin 秦.

I. The Zhou xun 周訓

The Zhou xun is part of the Peking University collection (Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu 北京大學藏西漢竹書), a group of bamboo-strip manuscripts dated to the Western Han and donated to Peking University in 2009.2 Being illegally retrieved by a private party, the circumstances of their discovery and curation remain unknown. Hence, the Peking manuscripts, alongside the Shanghai Museum and Tsinghua University collections, can be characterized as “looted” artefacts. As such, they present scholars with a series of concerns. Among the most serious ethical problems is the fact that the purchase of looted manuscripts raises the concern of complicity of academics in practices of grave desecration by encouraging a black market in stolen artefacts.3 As for scholarly issues, not being able to study the manuscripts in their original archeological environment gives us only a limited picture of their function and purpose.4 The most general problem, however, is that, regardless of how genuine a particular looted document might appear to be, we simply have no means of proving that it is actually not a forgery, at least when using conventional ways of determining the authenticity of manuscripts.5 In the case of the Peking University collection, the suspicion of forgery was raised against the Laozi 老子, its most prominent text.6 Even though this suspicion has been persuasively refuted,7 the mere fact that it could be raised is indicative of the problematic status of the looted manuscripts.

Being aware of these issues, I believe that not investigating the already available looted manuscripts would be equally detrimental given the valuable information they contain even in their fragmented state. The study of the texts from the Shanghai and Tsinghua collections, has, for instance, changed our understanding of early Chinese historiography and philosophy in many ways.

---

1 Han Wei 韓飛, “Xi-Han zhushu Zhou xun tuogan wenti de tantao” 西漢竹書《周訓》若干問題的探討, in Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu. 三絃, ed. Beijing daxue chutu wenxian yanjiusuo 北京大學出土文獻研究所 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2015), 278.


6 As Martin Kern, “XI Shuai 好受 (‘Cricket’) and Its Consequence: Issues in Early Chinese Poetry and Textual Studies,” Early China 42 (2019): 45–46, has pointed out, forgers might even use blank bamboo strips which are abundant in ancient graves, to make their creation pass the carbon-14 dating test. The only solution to that problem would be testing the ink that characters were written in.

7 Xing Wen 邢文, “Beida jian Laozi bianwei 北大簡《老子》辨異, Guangming Daily 光明日報, August 8, 2016, 16.

Likewise, the study of the Peking university manuscripts, in general, and the Zhou xun, in particular, has the potential to provide new evidence about early China. Returning to the Zhou xun, the corresponding bamboo strips measure 30.4 cm in length and, when fully written, contain 24 characters. The calligraphic style of the work, “Silkworm’s Head and Swallow’s Tail” (can tou yan wei 龜頭燕尾), was found to be closest to the clerical script of the Dingzhou Bajiaolang 定州八角槃 strips. Because the latter were discovered in a grave whose occupant died in 55 BC, it was assumed that the available copy of the Zhou xun was produced some time prior to that, probably during the last years of Emperor Wu of Han 漢武帝 (r. 141–87 BC). In its recovered version, which was published in September 2015, the Zhou xun contains slightly fewer than five thousand characters. This is about one thousand characters fewer than indicated on one of the bamboo strips belonging to this manuscript: “Roughly six thousand (characters)” (da fan liu qian 大凡六千). In terms of philosophical affiliation, the text is mostly believed to be a representative of “Daoism” (dao jia 道家), because the earliest extant catalogue of the Han imperial library, Han shu 漢書 “Yiwen zhi” 聖文志, lists a work titled Zhou xun in fourteen chapters (pian 篇) in the Daoist section. However, as I argued elsewhere, the philosophical thought of the work is by no means specifically Daoist. So even if the two Zhou xun texts in question are, in fact, one and the same text, we have to conclude that its attribution to the Daoist school was most likely based on considerations other than its content.

II. The Structure and Protagonists of the Zhou xun

The Zhou xun contains thirteen chapters corresponding to the twelve months of the year and the “intercalary month” (run yue 閏月) as well as one chapter related to the day of new year’s court ceremony (xianghe zhi ri 享賀之日). Accordingly, on the first day (geng dan 更旦) of every month as well as on the day of the xianghe ceremony, Prince Gong 龔 (共) 太子 is reported to come to the court of his father, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou, to receive instructions on how become a “worthy” (xian 賢) successor to his father’s position. In each case, the instruction is introduced with a standard formula:

It was on the first day of the [X] month, when Crown Prince Gong came to court, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou personally cautioned him with the following reminders. He said:

*(Yiwen zhi) 先令 [X] 月更旦之日，龚（共）太子朝，周昭文公身貳（教）之，用兹念也。曰：*

The conclusion of each instruction is constructed in a similarly standardized manner:

*Having instructed the Crown Prince with these reminders, [Lord Zhaowen] gave him the manuscript [of his speech] and personally enjoined him, saying: “Make effort not to forget these admonitions, [which you have received] on the first day of the [X] month.”*

Because Lord Zhaowen is reported to be based in Chengzhou 淮周, the capital of the East Zhou, while Prince Gong resides in Jia Ru 齊, the capital of the West Zhou, it appears that the author of the Zhou xun, with blatant disregard for historical facts, presented West and East Zhou as a political unity. While this is not the only historical inaccuracy in the text, it is sometimes believed that Lord Zhaowen and Prince Gong really met and that the Zhou xun is the relationship between the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu in the Context of the Late Warring States Period

10 Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu. San, 121–45 (Henceforth: Zhou xun). The edited transcription was prepared by Han Wei and Yan Buke.
11 Zhou xun, 144, strip 211.
12 Han shu 漢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju), 30.1730, 1732r9. For a detailed analysis, see Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu Zhou xun ruogan wenti de tantao,” 265–79.
14 However, there are also a number of passages that cannot be associated with any specific month or date. Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu Zhou xun ruogan wenti de tantao,” 252, gives them the designation: “small chapters” (xia zhang 小章).
Likewise, the study of the Peking university manuscripts, in general, and the *Zhou xun*, in particular, has the potential to provide new evidence about early China.

Returning to the *Zhou xun*, the corresponding bamboo strips measure 30.4 cm in length and, when fully written, contain 24 characters. The calligraphic style of the work, “Silkworm’s Head and Swallow’s Tail” (*can tou yan wei* 蠶頭燕尾), was found to be closest to the clerical script of the Dingzhou Bajiaoslang 定州八角欄 strips. Because the latter were discovered in a grave whose occupant died in 55 BC, it was assumed that the available copy of the *Zhou xun* was produced some time prior to that, probably during the last years of Emperor Wu of Han 漢武帝 (r. 141–87 BC). In its recovered version, which was published in September 2015, the *Zhou xun* contains slightly fewer than five thousand characters. This is about one thousand characters fewer than indicated on one of the bamboo strips belonging to this manuscript: “Roughly six thousand (characters)” (*da fan liu qian* 大凡六千). In terms of philosophical affiliation, the text is mostly believed to be representative of “Daoism” (*dao jia* 道家), because the earliest extant catalogue of the Han imperial library, *Han shu* 漢書 “Yiwen zhi” 諸文志, lists a work titled *Zhou xun* in fourteen chapters (*pian 篇*) in the Daoist section. However, as I argued elsewhere, the philosophical thought of the work is by no means specifically Daoist. So even if the two *Zhou xun* texts in question are, in fact, one and the same text, we have to conclude that its attribution to the Daoist school was most likely based on considerations other than its content.

II. The Structure and Protagonists of the *Zhou xun*

The *Zhou xun* contains thirteen chapters corresponding to the twelve months of the year and the “intercalary month” (*run yue* 閏月) as well as one chapter related to the day of new year’s court ceremony (*xianghe zhi ri* 享賀之日). Accordingly, on the first day (*geng dan* 更旦) of every month as well as on the day of the *xianghe* ceremony, Prince Gong (共) 太子 is reported to come to the court of his father, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou, to receive instructions on how become a “worthy” (*xian* 習) successor to his father’s position. In each case, the instruction is introduced with a standard formula:

It was on the first day of the [X] month, when Crown Prince Gong came to court. Lord Zhaowen of Zhou personally cautioned him with the following reminders. He said:

Having instructed the Crown Prince with these reminders, [Lord Zhaowen] gave him the manuscript [of his speech] and personally enjoined him, saying: “Make effort not to forget these admonitions, [which you have received] on the first day of the [X] month.”

Because Lord Zhaowen is reported to be based in Chengzhou 成周, the capital of the East Zhou, while Prince Gong resides in Jia Ru 鄉鄙, the capital of the West Zhou, it appears that the author of the *Zhou xun*, with blatant disregard for historical facts, presented West and East Zhou as a political unity. While this is not the only historical inaccuracy in the text, it is sometimes believed that Lord Zhaowen and Prince Gong really met and that the *Zhou xun*...
represented the actual record of their conversations. However, as I argued elsewhere, the evidence speaks for the late Warring States period as the time of the text’s creation.

Prince Gong appears in the early sources mainly as an heir apparent, who predeceased his father, thus leaving the latter with the necessity of choosing a successor from among other (initially less obvious) candidates. However, it is not clear whether that unfortunate successor to the throne was identical with his rightful successor using examples of the virtuous rulers of the past.

Despite his portrayal as a “worthy” ruler in the Zhou xun, Lord Zhao wen remains a marginal figure in the pre-Han and early Han sources, appearing, except for the Lushi chunqiu, only in the Zhanguo ce (Strategies of Warring States). And even there, it is not actually certain whether the related stories feature the protagonist of the Zhou xun. In the “Dong Zhou” chapter there is first a story about Lord Wen of Zhou, mostly identified as Lord Zhao wen of Zhou due to the similarity in their posthumous titles. He received advice not to reinstall a popular prime minister Gongshi Ji, dismissed earlier, because historical evidence often suggested that the assassins of their rulers “were great officials, who received much praise” (jie da chen jian yu zhe ye 吾大臣見善者也).

In another story from the same chapter, we find a conversation between a ruler of Zhou (Zhou jun 順君) and Du He 杜赫, who advises the ruler, the head of a small state with limited resources, to employ a minister of great abilities who has not yet become prominent and whose service is thus still relatively inexpensive. This ruler is identified as Lord Zhao wen mainly based on the fact that the Lushi chunqiu also mentions a dialogue between Du He 杜赫 and Lord Zhao wen (see Section VI below).

Even if these two stories featured Lord Zhao wen of Zhou, we do not find any particular praise for him here. He is depicted as one among many other rulers of that turbulent period, concerned with his own survival.

In the Zhou xun, Lord Zhao wen’s instructions can be divided into three different kinds: a) general “theoretic” or philosophical reflections on what constitutes a “worthy” ruler and a suitable heir apparent (chapters one and twelve); b) “historical” anecdotes about worthy rulers, which constitute the remainder of the text and invariably start with the formula “in the past” (xi 前); and, finally, c) personal admonitions of Prince Gong, which, appearing in eight different chapters, are conducted after historical examples and mostly begin with the formula “now, you are …” (jin ru 今汝). The parallels with the Lushi chunqiu appear only in the “historical” anecdotes.

The first is found in chapter seven and it will be examined in the next section.

III. The Zhou xun (Ch. 7) and the Lushi chunqiu (8.5 “Ai shi” 愛士)

The first common story appears in the “seventh month” instruction in the Zhou xun and in the “Ai shi” chapter in the Lushi chunqiu, the last chapter
represented the actual record of their conversations.\(^{16}\) However, as I argued elsewhere, the evidence speaks for the late Warring States period as the time of the text’s creation.\(^{17}\)

Prince Gong appears in the early sources mainly as an heir apparent, who predeceased his father, thus leaving the latter with the necessity of choosing a successor from among other (initially less obvious) candidates.\(^{18}\) However, it is not clear whether that unfortunate successor to the throne was identical with the protagonist of the Zhou xun. In the latter, Prince Gong features as someone not yet worthy of the throne, highlighting the necessity of his education. Lord Zhaowen, on the other hand, is introduced as a ruler (of a small state) concerned with moral excellence, attempting to inculcate high moral values in his rightful successor using examples of the virtuous rulers of the past.\(^{19}\)

Despite his portrayal as a “worthy” ruler in the Zhou xun, Lord Zhaowen remains a marginal figure in the pre-Han and early Han sources, appearing, except for the Lüshi chunqiu, only in the Zhanguo ce 戰國策 (Stratagems of Warring States).\(^{20}\) And even there, it is not actually certain whether the related stories feature the protagonist of the Zhou xun. In the “Dong Zhou” 東周 chapter there is first a story about Lord Wen of Zhou 周文君, mostly identified as Lord Zhaowen of Zhou due to the similarity in their posthumous titles.\(^{21}\) He received advice not to reinstall a popular prime minister Gongshi Ji 君史邱, dismissed earlier, because historical evidence often suggested that the assassins of their rulers “were great officials, who received much praise” (jie da chen jian yu zhe ye 皆大臣見譽者也).\(^{22}\) In another story from the same chapter, we find a conversation between a ruler of Zhou (Zhou jun 周君) and Du He 杜赫, who advises the ruler, the head of a small state with limited resources, to employ a minister of great abilities who has not yet become prominent and whose service is thus still relatively inexpensive.\(^{23}\) This ruler is identified as Lord Zhaowen mainly based on the fact that the Lüshi chunqiu also mentions a dialogue between Du He 杜赫 and Lord Zhaowen (see Section VI below).\(^{24}\)

Even if these two stories featured Lord Zhaowen of Zhou, we do not find any particular praise for him here. He is depicted as one among many other rulers of that turbulent period, concerned with his own survival.

In the Zhou xun, Lord Zhaowen’s instructions can be divided into three different kinds: a) general “theoretic” or philosophical reflections on what constitutes a “worthy” ruler and a suitable heir apparent (chapters one and twelve); b) “historical” anecdotes about worthy rulers, which constitute the remainder of the text and invariably start with the formula “in the past” (xi 前); and, finally, c) personal admonitions of Prince Gong, which, appearing in eight different chapters, are conducted after historical examples and mostly begin with the formula “now, you are …” (jin ru 今汝). The parallels with the Lüshi chunqiu appear only in the “historical” anecdotes.\(^{25}\) The first is found in chapter seven and it will be examined in the next section.

### III. The Zhou xun (Ch. 7) and the Lüshi chunqiu (8.5 “Ai shi” 愛士)

The first common story appears in the “seventh month” instruction in the Zhou xun and in the “Ai shi” chapter in the Lüshi chunqiu, the last chapter

---

\(^{16}\) Yan Buke, “Beida zhushu Zhou xun jianjie,” 73. While Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu Zhou xun ruogan wenti de tantao,” 260–64, determines the Zhou xun as a philosophical work akin to the masters’ texts, he still maintains that this works goes back to the actual meetings between Lord Zhaowen and Prince Gong.

\(^{17}\) Fech, “The Zhou xun and ‘Elevating the Worthy,”’ 157, 171, 172–76.


\(^{19}\) For more, see Fech, “The Zhou xun and ‘Elevating the Worthy,”’ 157–58.


\(^{21}\) See Fan Xiangyong, ed. and comm., Zhanguo ce jianzheng, 34n1, and Zhanguo ce jiujiao hukao 戰國策集校正校考, ed. and comm., Zhu Zugeng 趙國政, ext. and rev. ed. (Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2008), 26–27n1.


\(^{23}\) Zhanguo ce jianzheng, 67 (§1.23: “Du He yu zhong Cui yu Zhou Du赫欲重景於周”). For translation, see Crump, trans., Chu-Kao 章釗, 46.

\(^{24}\) Wu Rongzeng, “Dong-Zhou, Xi-Zhou liangguo shi yanjiu,” 146. Zhu Zugeng, ed. and comm., Zhanguo ce jiujiao hukao, 58n1, quotes Gu Guangnan 郭光南 (1799–1862), who maintains that this encounter took place in the 36th year of Xian Wang of Zhou 周顯王 (r. 368–321 BC), which was around year 333 BC.

from book 8, “Zhong qiu ji” 仲秋記 (Second Month of Autumn), which corresponds to the eighth month of the year. The Zhou xun reads as follows (curly brackets indicate passages missing from the Peking version and completed based on the parallels in the Lüshi chunqiu):

- It was on the first day of the seventh month, when crown Prince Gong came to court. Lord Zhaowen of Zhou personally cautioned him with the following reminders. He said:

Each passage in the Zhou xun may be interpreted as saying that the men who had eaten the animal gathered a 300-men-strong force out of the members of their families, and not that those same three hundred men actually ate one horse. (Chen Qiyou 陈奇猷 notes that the text should be interpreted as saying that the meal was divided among the 300 guests, as in the Lüshi chunqiu sin jiaoshi 中秋记新校释, ed. and comm. Chen Qiyou, Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002, p. 846.)

The Relationship between the Zhou xun and the Lüshi chunqiu in the Context of the Late Warring States Period

Zhao wen [91] gave him the manuscript [of his speech] and personally enjoined him, saying: “Make effort not to forget these admonitions, [which you have received] on the first day of the seventh month.”

28 The missing part is reconstructed based on the parallel in the Lüshi chunqiu (xin jiaoshi, 8.464).

29 In the Han Shi waizhuan (Han Shi waizhuan jishi 韓詩外傳記), ed. Xu Weiyu 徐世瑜 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), 10.351–52 and Shuoyuan 説苑, it shows significant deviations from the Zhou xun. These deviations only underscore the latter’s affinity to a story in the Lüshi chunqiu 8.5 (“Ai shi” 咫士), which is almost identical (apart from the two “framing” formulas of the Zhou xun). Two accounts are juxtaposed in the table below:


27 Commenting on this passage in the Lüshi chunqiu, Chen Qiyou 陈奇猷 notes that the text should be interpreted as saying that the men who had eaten the animal gathered a 300-men-strong force out of the members of their families, and not that those same three hundred men actually ate one horse. See Lüshi chunqiu sin jiaoshi 吕氏春秋新校释, ed. and comm. Chen Qiyou, Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002, p. 846n14.
from book 8, “Zhong qiu ji” (Second Month of Autumn), which corresponds to the eighth month of the year. The Zhou xun reads as follows (curly brackets indicate passages missing from the Peking version and completed based on the parallels in the Lāshi chunqiu):

- It was on the first day of the seventh month, when crown Prince Gong came to court. Lord Zhaowen of Zhou personally cautioned him with the following reminders. He said:

  “In the past, when Duke Mu of Qin rode in a chariot, it had a mishap. The right horse got loose and was caught by some country-people. When Duke Mu went himself to find it, he saw that the country-people were about to eat it on the southern slope of Mount Qi. The duke exclaimed, ‘Eating the meat of a noble steed and not washing it down with wine, I am afraid you will hurt yourself.’ So, passing around some wine, he left. A year later was the battle of Hanyuan. The army of Jin had already surrounded Duke Mu’s chariot and Liang Youmi of Jin had already grabbed a hold of Duke Mu’s left horse. [Sitting] to the right of Duke Hui of Jin, Lu Shi seized a spear and attacked Duke Mu’s left arm, striking off six layers of his armor. As a result, the duke won a great victory over Jin, captured two “framing” formulas of the Huainanzi. The two accounts are juxtaposed in Zhou xun 8.5 (‘Ai shi’).”

27 Commenting on this passage in the Lāshi chunqiu, Chen Qiyou notes that the text should be interpreted as saying that the men who had eaten the animal gathered a 300-men-strong force out of the members of their families, and not that those same three hundred men actually ate one horse. See Lāshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi 裔氏春秋新校釋, ed. and comm. Chen Qiyou (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002), 8.464n14.

28 The missing part is reconstructed based on the parallel in the Lāshi chunqiu (xin jiaoshi, 8.464).

29 The Relationship between the Zhou xun and Lāshi chunqiu in the Context of the Late Warring States Period

Zhaowen [191] gave him the manuscript [of his speech] and personally enjoined him, saying:

“Make effort not to forget these admonitions, [which you have received] on the first day of the seventh month.”

The story about how Duke Mu of Qin 秦穆公 延公 (r. 659–621 BC) was saved by some country-people, whom he previously treated graciously by not only forgiving them for eating his escaped horse but also offering them some wine to properly digest their meal, belongs among the most popular early Chinese anecdotes. As it appears in the Huainanzi 淮南子, Han Shi waizhuan 韓詩外傳, Shuoyuan 説苑, and Shuoyuan 説苑, it shows significant deviations from the Zhou xun. These deviations only underscore the latter’s affinity to a story in Lāshi chunqiu 8.5 (“Ai shi” 愛士), which is almost identical (apart from the two “framing” formulas of the Zhou xun). The two accounts are juxtaposed in the table below:

28 The missing part is reconstructed based on the parallel in the Lāshi chunqiu (xin jiaoshi, 8.464).

29 In the Han Shi waizhuan (Han Shi waizhuan jishu 韓詩外傳集釋, ed. Xu Weiyu 許維遠 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980], 10.351–52) and Shuji (5.188–89), no moral is given to the story. The Huainanzi (Huainanzi jishu 淮南子集釋, ed. and comm. He Ning 何寧 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998], 13.975) interprets it as “an example of earning [people’s] gratitude with little effort” (ci yong yue er wei de zhe ye 以此購而為德者也). The Shuoyuan (Shuoyuan jiaozheng 說苑校證, ed. and comm. Zhang Zongfu 張宗福 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987], 6.125), finally, sees it as a case of “how blessings return to the one who spreads kindness” (ci de cha er fa fan ye 此德出而福反之).
### Table 1: The account of Duke Mu of Qin 契穆公 and the country-people in the Zhou xun and the Lüshi chunqiu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhou xun</th>
<th>Lüshi chunqiu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 爲秦穆公乘馬而車為敗</td>
<td>爲秦穆公乘馬而車為敗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 右服失而野人得之。</td>
<td>右服失而僕人取之。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 穆公自往求之。</td>
<td>穆公自往求之。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>見獲者為將賞之於稷山之陽。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>穆公嘆曰：</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>食駟馬之肉而不盡飲酒，</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>悽忿其傷女也！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>於是饗飲而去。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>處一年，為韓原之戰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>爲韓原之戰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>爲韓原之戰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>爲韓原之戰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>爲韓原之戰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>爲韓原之戰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>爲韓原之戰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>謝大恩賜。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>獻公所歸。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>此《書》之所謂曰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>君者子則正以行禮；</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>讖人則宜以盡其力，</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>人君不可以無務行德愛人乎？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>行德愛人則民親其上，</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 21</td>
<td>人主其務以無務行德愛人乎？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 22</td>
<td>行德愛人則民親其上，</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>其上則君子為其死矣。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently, the first three units of the two texts are identical: (I) the narrative, (II) a quote from an authoritative source (the Documents and the Odes, respectively; note that the relevant passage does not appear in either the transmitted Shuijing 書經 or the Shijing 詩經), and (III) a rhetorical question revealing the real addressee of this story: a ruler. In terms of structure, their only difference concerns the conclusion in the Lüshi chunqiu (IV) that “when [the superior] performs acts of kindness and loves others, the people will be close to their superior. When the people are close to the superior, they will all

---

31 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.464.

be happy to die for their lord.”

Although the above juxtaposition reveals a number of deviations on the level of individual words, these mainly concern characters that are similar either graphically (e.g. and qi 棋, line 14; shu 舒 and sui 濕, line 16), or phonetically (e.g. qu 齪 and qu 取, line 11; wa 于 and wo 有, line 14; ma 母 and ma 無, line 21) or semantically (e.g. de 得 and qu 取, line 2; fen 討 and dou 頭, line 15; tu 濕 and huo 禽, line 17; jun 騎 and zhu 主, as well as hui 惠 and ai 爱, line 21). Some variants reflect the inconsistent use of semantic determinatives in early manuscripts (liang 棲 and liang 棲, line 11; shu 投 and tou 投, line 12; ke 克 and ke 克, line 16). All this was very common in the early periods of Chinese history when the writing system was not yet standardized.32

As for the variants in which counterparts are missing in another text, it is interesting to see that they appear in the Zhou xun only twice. In lines 12–13, we find characters zuo mei 左袂, qi 其 and yun 隇, which are absent from the counterpart. As a consequence, the Zhou xun narrates that the Jin warrior Lu Shi 路石 attacked Duke Mu’s “left sleeve” (zuo mei 左袂), “striking off six layers of his armor” (qi jia yun zhe yi liu zha 其甲癸之六札), whereas in the Lüshi chunqiu the same person attacked Duke Mu’s “armor” (jia 甲), “piercing through six layers” (shou zhi zhe yi liu zha 其之癸之六札). Moreover, in line 21, the Zhou xun references “the common people” (shu ren 哲人), while the Lüshi chunqiu only speaks of “the people.”

In other cases, graphs without counterparts are all to be found in the Lüshi chunqiu. Determining their function, we can distinguish between the cases in which they clarify the grammatical relation between the individual words or

---

32 The Old Chinese pronunciation of the characters is reconstructed based on Axel Schuessler, Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammatica Serica Recensia (Honolulu, Hawai‘i: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009).

Table 1: The account of Duke Mu of Qin 秦穆公 and the country-people in the Zhou xun and the Lüshi chunqiu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhou xun</th>
<th>Lüshi chunqiu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>順者秦穆公車馬而車為政。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>人民而野人得之。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>當公自往求之。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>未聞人將貴之於輔臣之稱。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>當公嘗曰：</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>此駿馬之肉而遍飲酒。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>子欲其傷女也！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>於是偏服而去。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>處一年，為韓原之戰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>已無穆公之車矣。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>委棄無存，已無穆公之車矣。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>委棄無存，已無穆公之車矣。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>其甲裝者已六柲矣。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>野人茂公之車。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>野人茂公之車。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>大於此等。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>當公時至，</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>此《書》之所謂曰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>君子則宜以行德。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>順人則宜以盡其“力”之者也。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>人君則可以無務行德乎？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>行德愛人則民親其上，</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently, the first three units of the two texts are identical: (I) the narrative, (II) a quote from an authoritative source (the Documents and the Odes, respectively; note that the relevant passage does not appear in either the transmitted Shijing 書經 or the Shijing 詩經), and (III) a rhetorical question revealing the real addressee of this story: a ruler. In terms of structure, their only difference concerns the conclusion in the Lüshi chunqiu (IV) that “when [the superior] performs acts of kindness and loves others, the people will be close to their superior. When the people are close to the superior, they will all be happy to die for their lord.”

Although the above juxtaposition reveals a number of deviations on the level of individual words, these mainly concern characters that are similar either graphically (且 and qi 故, line 14; shu 謁 and sui 追, line 16), or phonetically (jīn 封 and jī 由, line 11; wēi 于 and wéi 有, line 14; ma 莫 and ma 無, line 21) or semantically (de 得 and qu 取, line 2; fèn 奮 and dou 鬥, line 15; hui 懷 and huo 恍, line 17; jun 君 and zhu 主, as well as huí 惠 and ai 愛, line 21). Some variants reflect the inconsistent use of semantic determinatives in early manuscripts (liang 梁 and liang 梁, line 11; shu 影 and tou 影, line 12; ke 跨 and ke 克, line 16). All this was very common in the early periods of Chinese history when the writing system was not yet standardized.33

As for the variants in which counterparts are missing in another text, it is interesting to see that they appear in the Zhou xun only twice. In lines 12–13, we find characters zuo mei 左袂, qi 其 and yun 陨, which are absent from the counterpart. As a consequence, the Zhou xun narrates that the Jin warrior Lu Shi 路石 attacked Duke Mu’s “left sleeve” (zuo mei 左袂), “striking off six layers of his armor” (qi jia yun zhe yi liu zha 其甲者已六札), whereas in the Lüshi chunqiu the same person attacked Duke Mu’s “armor” (jia 甲), “piercing through six layers” (zhong zhi zhe yi liu zha 仲之者已六札). Moreover, in line 21, the Zhou xun references “the common people” (shu ren 賽人), while the Lüshi chunqiu only speaks of “the people.”

In other cases, graphs without counterparts are all to be found in the Lüshi chunqiu. Determining their function, we can distinguish between the cases in which they clarify the grammatical relation between the individual words or

---

31 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.464.
32 The Old Chinese pronunciation of the characters is reconstructed based on Axel Schuessler, Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensia (Honolulu, Hawai‘i: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009).
phrases (zhe 著, line 1; er 而, line 12; zhi 之, line 14; qi 其, lines 19 and 21; jun 君, line 20) and the cases in which they are significant for the content of the story (li 力 and ji 疾, line 15; and fan 反, line 17). Particularly interesting appears to be the phrase “exerted their entire strength” (bi 以便) (line 15), because it corresponds to the quote from the Odes (unit II, line 20), which states that for a “lenient” (kuan 賜) ruler people of low social standing (jian ren 階人) will “exhaust their strength” (jin qi li 劍其力). In the Zhou xun, where such correspondence is missing, the connection between the anecdote and the relevant quote from the Documents seems less evident.

The same applies to the link between the quotation of the authoritative source (unit II) and the subsequent rhetorical question (unit III). In the Lüshi chunqiu (line 21), this question uses the expression “to perform acts of kindness” (xing de 行德), thus establishing a link to the Odes quotation (yi xing qi de 以行其徳). Such a direct verbal link is missing from the Zhou xun. However, by thus connecting the two units, the reading of the Lüshi chunqiu becomes problematic insofar as, in the quoted Classic, a ruler does not perform “acts of goodness,” but elicits them from the “gentlemen” (junzi 君子)† by being “upright” (zheng 正). In other words, the rhetorical question as formulated here confuses the role of a ruler with that of his subordinates as expressed in the preceding quote.

The last passage (part IV), absent from the Zhou xun, uses sortes to arrive at the general conclusion that, when treated by their ruler with kindness, the people will willingly sacrifice their lives on his behalf. Yet because it starts with the phrase “to perform acts of kindness” (xing de 行德) as related to a ruler, it also appears problematic. Furthermore, this conclusion seems redundant as it merely reiterates, in exaggerated form, the already established point that the people will readily exert their utmost efforts for a kind ruler.

The question why the two works identify the authoritative source differently is not trivial and needs to be addressed. Han Wei maintains that the literary form of the quoted lines is closer to the Documents than the Odes.†

Indeed, we have a similar sounding passage in the ancient-script shu chapter “Lü ao” 旅獒:

Complete virtue allows no contemptuous familiarities. When [a ruler] treats superior men with such familiarity, he cannot get them to give him all their hearts; when he so treats inferior men, he cannot get them to put forth for him all their strength.

Except here the ruler is urged by his minister—in an “instruction” (xun 訓)—not to be contemptuous to his people. Was then the identification of this source as an Ode mistaken? Intriguingly, in the “Almanacs” (ji 錄) section of the Lüshi chunqiu no explicitly quoted source is ever referred to as a “Document” (Shu 書). In one case, there is a quote from the chapter “Hong fan” 鴻 (洪) 篇, but it is introduced by its title and not by the generic term shu. It is in the subsequent “Examinations” (lan 論) that we find explicit citations from the shu, but only in connection to indications of their supposed origin, resulting in titles, such as, Xia shu 夏書, Shang shu 商書 or Zhou shu 周書.† The Odes, on the other hand, is the only source to be cited explicitly in the “Almanacs,” as Shi 詩, appearing there rather frequently. Against this backdrop, it seems likely that the authors of the “Almanacs” replaced Shu with Shi simply because a Shu citation went against their conventions.

To sum up the above, there is no doubt that we are dealing with the same account. Their variants show, however, that, if we assumed a link between these two particular instantiations of the story, that link would be neither that

---


35 For references to this account in the encyclopedias from the Tang and Song periods, see Ho Che Wah 刻華 and Chu Kwok Fan 朱國廉, eds., Citations of the Lüshi Chunqiu Found in the Leishu Compiled in the Tang and Song Dynasties (in Chinese) (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2006), 8.60–62.

36 Han Wei, “Xi-Hun zhihuo Zhou xun ruogao wenti de tantao,” 281.


38 Shanggu zhenyi 尚書正義 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2000), 13.388.

39 Here I disagree with Michael Frederic Carson, who claims in his dissertation, The Language of the “Lu-shih ch’un-ch’u”: Some Characteristic Features of Grammar and Style in a Third Century B.C. Text (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Washington, 1980), 436, that, in the “Almanacs” section, “only two texts are cited explicitly, the Shih ching and the Shu ching” (i.e. the Shijing and the Shujing).


41 Tien Feng-tai, Lüshi chunqiu tanwei, 357–59.
phrases (zhe 著, line 1; er 而, line 12; zhi 之, line 14; qí 其, lines 19 and 21; jun 聘, line 20) and the cases in which they are significant for the content of the story (li 力, and ji 疾, line 15; and fan 反, line 17). Particularly interesting appears to be the phrase “exerted their entire strength” (bi li 破力 ) (line 15), because it corresponds to the quote from the Odes (unit II, line 20), which states that for a “lenient” (kuai 賽) ruler people of low social standing (jian ren 階人) will “exhaust their strength” (jin qi 令其力). In the Zhou xun, where such correspondence is missing, the connection between the anecdote and the relevant quote from the Documents seems less evident.

The same applies to the link between the quotation of the authoritative source (unit II) and the subsequent rhetorical question (unit III). In the Lüshi chunqiu (line 21), this question uses the expression “to perform acts of kindness” (xing de 行德), thus establishing a link to the Odes quotation (yi xing qi de 以行其德). Such a direct verbal link is missing from the Zhou xun. However, by thus connecting the two units, the reading of the Lüshi chunqiu becomes problematic insofar as, in the quoted Classic, a ruler does not perform “acts of goodness,” but elicits them from the “gentlemen” (junzi 君子) by being “upright” (zheng 正). In other words, the rhetorical question as formulated here confuses the role of a ruler with that of his subordinates as expressed in the preceding quote.

The last passage (part IV), absent from the Zhou xun, uses sorites to arrive at the general conclusion that, when treated by their ruler with kindness, the people will willingly sacrifice their lives on his behalf. Yet because it starts with the phrase to “perform acts of kindness” (xing de 行德) as related to a ruler, it also appears problematic.35 Furthermore, this conclusion seems redundant as it merely reiterates, in exaggerated form, the already established point that the people will readily exert their utmost efforts for a kind ruler. The question why the two works identify the authoritative source differently is not trivial and needs to be addressed. Han Wei maintains that the literary form of the quoted lines is closer to the Documents than the Odes.36 Indeed, we have a similar sounding passage in the ancient-script Shu chapter “Lü ao” 旅獒：

Complete virtue allows no contemptuous familiarity. When [a ruler] treats superior men with such familiarity, he cannot get them to give him all their hearts; when he so treats inferior men, he cannot get them to put forth for him all their strength.37

德盛不狎侮，狎侮君子，侫以尽人心；狎侮小人，侫以尽其力。38

Except here the ruler is urged by his minister—in an “instruction” (xun 訓)—not to be contemptuous to his people. Was then the identification of this source as an Ode mistaken? Intriguingly, in the “Almanacs” (ji 吉) section of the Lüshi chunqiu no explicitly quoted source is ever referred to as a “Document” (Shu 書). In one case, there is a quote from the chapter “Hong fan” 鳳（洪）範, but it is introduced by its title and not by the generic term Shu.39 It is in the subsequent “Examinations” (lan 諦) that we find explicit citations from the Shu, but only in connection to indications of their supposed origin, resulting in titles, such as, Xiu shu 頭書, Shang shu 上書 or Zhou shu 周書.40 The Odes, on the other hand, is the only source to be cited explicitly in the “Almanacs,” as Shi 書, appearing there rather frequently.41 Against this backdrop, it seems likely that the authors of the “Almanacs” replaced Shu with Shi simply because a Shu citation went against their conventions.

To sum up the above, there is no doubt that we are dealing with the same account. Their variants show, however, that, if we assumed a link between these two particular instantiations of the story, that link would be neither that

---


35 For references to this account in the encyclopedias from the Tang and Song periods, see Ho Che Wah 刈雋華 and Chu Kwok Fan 朱國藩, eds., Citations of the Lüshi Chunqiu Found in the Leishu Compiled in the Tang and Song Dynasties 唐宋類書徵引《呂氏春秋》資料彙編 (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2006), 8.60–62.

36 Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu Zhou xun ruogan wenti de tiantao,” 281.


38 Shangshu zhengyi 尚書正義 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2000), 13.388.

39 Here I disagree with Michael Frederic Carson, who claims in his dissertation, The Language of the “Lü-shih ch’ung-ch’u”: Some Characteristic Features of Grammar and Style in a Third Century B.C. Text (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Washington, 1980), 436, that, in the “Almanacs” section, “only two texts are cited explicitly, the Shih ching and the Shu ching” (i.e. the Shijing and the Shijing).


41 Tien Feng-tai, Lüshi chunqiu tanwei, 357–59.
of a direct copying nor that of a dictation. The process at hand most likely involved both oral transmission and copying as well as a certain amount of deliberate alterations.

In the next step, I consider units III and IV in the larger context of the respective texts. In the Zhou xun, the quotation from the Documents with its reference to the ruler’s “uprightness” (zheng 正) and “leniency” (kuan 寬) links the given narrative to a number of other chapters. Such thematic links between “historical” anecdotes, “theoretical” instructions and admonitions appear throughout the Zhou xun. Thus, although the text makes no formal distinction between its philosophical argument and explanatory “historical” anecdotes and does not organize them in strict correspondence, characteristic of some pre-Qin and early Han books, its author(s) appear(s) to have been familiar with this practice. In the Lüshi chunqiu, the story is connected to the introductory discussion of chapter 8.5:

Clothes are there because people get cold; food is there because people get hungry. Hunger and cold are great calamities for people. To save people from them is the right thing to do. But when people are distraught and exhausted, it is even worse than when they are hungry and cold. Thus, a worthy ruler will certainly take pity on their distress and have sympathy for their exhaustion. Such a ruler will have an eminent reputation and will win the support of the shi of his state.

42 For instance, the notion of “uprightness” is especially prominent in the first chapter of the Zhou xun. According to Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu Zhou xun ruo gan we ni de tannat,“ 266, it resembles the concept of “valuing uprightness” (gai zheng 贊正) as attributed to Liezi 列子 in the Zhanguo ce. On the other hand, the importance of the ruler’s “leniency” towards the masses is discussed in the twelfth chapter (Zhou xun, 138, strips 149–50).

43 See, for instance, the discussion on the necessity for a ruler to treat his people with kindness (he 德) from the “second month” instruction (Zhou xun, 125, strips 37–38) and the story about King Zhao of Chu 楚昭王 (r. 516–489 BC) and his people from the “fourth month” (Zhou xun, 127, strips 54–64).

44 See, for instance, the six “Chu shuo” 馀說 chapters in the Han Feizi 楚非子, which are divided into the more “theoretical” “canons” (jing 覆) and illustrative “explanations” (shuo 說). For more information on these chapters, see David Schaberg, “Chinese History and Philosophy,” 400–1. In the same work, there are also the chapters “Jie Lao” 解老 and “Yu Lao” 于老 respectively applying the exegetical strategies of philosophical reasoning and illustrative example to the Laozi 老子. For more, see Sarah A. Queen, “Han Feizi and the Old Master: A Comparative Analysis and Translation of Han Feizi Chapter 20, ‘Jie Lao,’ and Chapter 21, ‘Yu Lao,’” in Dao Companion to the Philosophy of Han Fei, ed. Paul R. Goldin (Dordrecht: Springer, 2013), 197–256.


46 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.46d.

47 In an early edition, it had the title “Paying Attention to Difficulties” (Shen qiong 惦懮). Chen Qiyou, ed. and comm., Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.465n1.

of a direct copying nor that of a dictation. The process at hand most likely involved both oral transmission and copying as well as a certain amount of deliberate alterations.

In the next step, I consider units III and IV in the larger context of the respective texts. In the Zhou xun, the quotation from the Documents with its reference to the ruler’s “uprightness” (zheng 正) and “leniency” (kuan 宽) links the given narrative to a number of other chapters.42 Such thematic links between “historical” anecdotes, “theoretical” instructions and admonitions appear throughout the Zhou xun.43 Thus, although the text makes no formal distinction between its philosophical argument and explanatory “historical” anecdotes and does not organize them in strict correspondence, characteristic of some pre-Qin and early Han books,44 its author(s) appear(s) to have been familiar with this practice. In the Lüshi chunqiu, the story is connected to the introductory discussion of chapter 8.5:

Clothes are there because people get cold; food is there because people get hungry. Hunger and cold are great calamities for people. To save people from them is the right thing to do. But when people are distraught and exhausted, it is even worse than when they are hungry and cold. Thus, a worthy ruler will certainly pity on their distress and have sympathy for their exhaustion. Such a ruler will have an eminent reputation and will win the support of the shi of his state.45

Without this introduction, it would remain unclear how the tale about Duke Mu of Qin’s generosity towards some uncivilized country-people fits into a chapter that, at least in the present version,46 has the title “Loving the shi.” After all, the shi—a term which I will leave untranslated due to its multiple connotations—initially belonged to “the lowest stratum of hereditary aristocracy” but retained the air of nobility even during the Zhanguo period, a time of great social mobility.47 The introduction clarifies that it is by empathizing with the common people that a ruler can win over the able shi.

As for the formula “this is what [X] is referring to when it says” (cf [X] zhi suo wei ye 此 [X] 之所謂也) with which the two works quote from the Classics, it is very common in the Zhou xun, appearing in Lord Zhouwen’s historical anecdotes (chapters four, seven and nine), theoretical explications (chapter one) and personal admonitions of Prince Gong, such as the following passage from the tenth chapter:

Now, if you were able to be worthy, then, although the City of Ru is small, how would it be inferior to the three Jin in their beginning? [But] if you are not worthy, then, although the Zhou have one thousand war chariots, it would almost be as if they merely fought on foot. But to start off with one thousand chariots and forfeit them, ending up fighting on foot, is something that the ancients regarded as disastrous. Not only can it be regarded as disastrous, but it actually harms one’s ancestors (11):

| Is it not what the Documents is referring to when it says: "Do not bring shame upon your ancestors?" |

---

42 For instance, the notion of “uprightness” is especially prominent in the first chapter of the Zhou xun. According to Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu Zhou xun ruogan wen ti dantao,” 266, it resembles the concept of “valuing uprightness” (gai zheng 负正) as attributed to Liezi 列子 in the Zhanguo ce. On the other hand, the importance of the ruler’s “leniency” towards the masses is discussed in the twelfth chapter (Zhou xun, 138, strips 149–50).

43 See, for instance, the discussion on the necessity for a ruler to treat his people with kindness (善德) from the “second month” instruction (Zhou xun, 125, strips 37–38) and the story about King Zhao of Chu 楚昭王 (r. 516–489 BC) and his people from the “fourth month” (Zhou xun, 127, strips 54–64).

44 For instance, the six “Chu shuo” 釋說 chapters in the Han Feizi 漢鈍子, which are divided into the more “theoretical” “canons” (jing 經) and illustrative “explanations” (shuo 説). For more information on these chapters, see David Schaberg, “Chinese History and Philosophy,” 400–1. In the same work, there are also the chapters “Jie Lao” 解老 and “Yu Lao” 于老 respectively applying the exegetical strategies of philosophical reasoning and illustrative example to the Laozi 老子. For more, see Sarah A. Queen, “Han Feizi and the Old Master: A Comparative Analysis and Translation of Han Feizi Chapter 20, ‘Jie Lao,’ and Chapter 21, ‘Yu Lao,’” in Dao Companion to the Philosophy of Han Fei, ed. Paul R. Goldin (Dordrecht: Springer, 2013), 197–256.


46 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.46d1.

47 In an early edition, it had the title “Paying Attention to Difficulties” (Shen qiong 慎聰). Chen Qiyou, ed. and comm., Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.46d5n1.

In the Lüshi chunqiu, on the other hand, this formula can be found only in the above account and in section 15.4, presenting the encounter between the illustrious minister of the state of Jin, Zhao Dun 趙盾 (d. 601 BC), also known under his posthumous title Zhao Xuanzhi 趙宣子, and a starving man. Quite remarkably, the same story also appears in the Zhou xun (see next chapter).

The last common element of the two accounts, namely, the rhetorical question addressing a ruler (ren jun 人君 / ren zhu 人主) and based on the phrase “how can …” (bu ke 胡可), can be, with some variations, found on eight occasions in seven different chapters of the Zhou xun, while appearing only three times in the Lüshi chunqiu. In addition to the above story, it also features in the subsequent anecdote from the same chapter “Ai shi” about another Jin minister and the founder of the Zhao state, Zhao Jianzi 趙簡子, or Zhao Yang 趙鞅 (d. 476 BC), sacrificing his beloved white mule to save the life of a minor official named Yangcheng Xuqu 陽城胥渠. Because later this man proved to be instrumental in Zhao’s victory over Di, the anecdote concludes with the question: “How can a ruler not be fond of the shi?” (ren zhu qi bu kei bu hao shi 人主其胡可以不好士) whatever the connection between the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu, the fact that this uncommon formula (at least for the Lüshi chunqiu) appears in two subsequent (chronologically ordered) stories of the same chapter, shows that its authors were attempting to unify its format. It is also noteworthy that both stories include depictions of combat and that the concluding passage of the chapter likewise deals with military matters. This is consistent with the overall topic of book 8, which, corresponding to autumn, implies initiation of warfare.

The next parallel story is the anecdote depicting the encounter between Zhao Dun and a starving man. As noted above, it shares several characteristics with the previous account and I deal with it in the following section.

IV. The Zhou xun (Ch. 9) and the Lüshi chunqiu (15.4 “Bao geng” 報更)

In the Zhou xun, the beginning of this chapter is missing but, from its ending, we can conclude that the relevant instruction was “delivered” on the first day of the ninth month. The translation of the missing part is given based on the parallel text in the Lüshi chunqiu. The commonality between the two texts is underscored by their unusual designation of Zhao Dun as Zhao Xuanmeng 趙宣孟, combining his posthumous title “venerable” (xuan 宣) with the indication of his seniority among his siblings, “Eldest” (meng 孟).

• It was on the first day of the ninth month, when Crown Prince Gong came to court. Lord Zhaowen of Zhou personally cautioned him with the following reminders. He said:

In the past, when Zhao Xuanmeng was on his way up to [the Jin capital] Jiang, he saw a starving man who was lying beneath a withered mulberry, unable to rise. Xuanmeng stopped his chariot and lowered [a pot with] rice porridge. Tilting [the pot], [Xuanmeng] fed it to him. The hungry man choked several times before regaining his vision. Xuanmeng asked him: “What did you do to be starving like this?” The man replied: “Your servant had an office in Jiang. When returning home, my supplies of grain ran out. I was ashamed to beg and resented to steal. So I ended up starving like this?”. When asked why, he replied: “Your servant has an aged mother. I am going to give the meat to her”. Xuanmeng said: “Eat this...

50 It appears once in chapters 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12 and twice in the so-called “small chapters.”
52 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.465. For translation, see Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 264.

53 Knoblock and Riegel, intro., Annals of Lü Buwei, 42–43. In view of the above, I disagree with Tao Hongqing 陶弘慶 (1859–1918) and Chen Qiyou 謝秋 (Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.469n20) that, in its received version, the chapter is in disarray and that the Odes quotation from Duke Mu of Qin story was originally placed after the rhetorical question in the account of Zhao Jianzi and Yangcheng Xuqu, referring to both anecdotes.
54 For this paragraph, translation quoted from Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 352; for the rest of the anecdote, compare with ibid., 353.
In the Lüshi chunqiu, on the other hand, this formula can be found only in the above account and in section 15.4, presenting the encounter between the illustrious minister of the state of Jin, Zhao Dun 趙濬 (d. 601 BC), also known under his posthumous title Zhao Xuanzi 趙宣子, and a starving man. Quite remarkably, the same story also appears in the Zhou xun (see next chapter).

The last common element of the two accounts, namely, the rhetorical question addressing a ruler (ren jun 人君 ren zhu 人主) and based on the phrase “how can …” (bu ke 胡可), can be, with some variations, found on eight occasions in seven different chapters of the Zhou xun,50 while appearing only three times in the Lüshi chunqiu. In addition to the above story, it also features in the subsequent anecdote from the same chapter “Ai shi” about Zhao Dun, sacrificing his beloved white mule to save the life of a minor official named Yangcheng Xuqu 杨城胥. Because later this man proved to be instrumental in Zhao Dun’s victory over Di 狄, the anecdote concludes with the question: “How can a ruler not be fond of the Shi?” (ren zhu qi bu key bu hao shi 人主其胡可以不好士) 51 Whatever the connection between the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu, the fact that this uncommon formula (at least for the Lüshi chunqiu) appears in two subsequent (chronologically ordered) stories of the same chapter, shows that its authors were attempting to unify its format. It is also noteworthy that both stories include depictions of combat and that the concluding passage of the chapter likewise deals with military matters.52 This is consistent with the overall topic of book 8, which, corresponding to autumn, implies initiation of warfare. 53

The next parallel story is the anecdote depicting the encounter between Zhao Dun and a starving man. As noted above, it shares several characteristics with the previous account and I deal with it in the following section.

IV. The Zhou xun (Ch. 9) and the Lüshi chunqiu (15.4 “Bao geng” 報更)

In the Zhou xun, the beginning of this chapter is missing but, from its ending, we can conclude that the relevant instruction was “delivered” on the first day of the ninth month. The translation of the missing part is given based on the parallel text in the Lüshi chunqiu. The commonality between the two texts is underscored by their unusual designation of Zhao Dun as Zhao Xuanmeng 趙宣孟, combining his posthumous title “venerable” (xuan 宣) with the indication of his seniority among his siblings, “Eldest” (meng 孟).

{ • It was on the first day of the ninth month, when Crown Prince Gong came to court. Lord Zhaowen of Zhou personally cautioned him with the following reminders. He said:}

{In the past, when Zhao Xuanmeng was on his way up to [the Jin capital] Jiang, he saw a starving man who was lying beneath a withered mulberry, unable to rise. Xuanmeng stopped his chariot and lowered [a pot with] rice porridge. Tilting [the pot], [Xuanmeng] fed it to him. The hungry man choked several times before regaining his vision. Xuanmeng asked him: “What did you do tǐn zuǐ to be starving like this?” The man replied: “Your servant had an office in Jiang. When returning home, my supplies of grain ran out. I was ashamed to beg and resented to steal. So I ended up be starving like this?”}

{Xuanmeng gave him two strips of dried meat. The man bowed receiving them but did not dare to eat. When asked why, he replied: “Your servant has an aged mother. I am going tǐn zuǐ to give the meat to her.” Xuanmeng said: “Eat this

50 It appears once in chapters 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12 and twice in the so-called “small chapters.”

51 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.465. For translation, see Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 203-4. For a short discussion of the historical significance of this anecdote, see Xu Fuhong 許富宏, Lüshi chunqiu xian Qin shiliao kaoqian 蘭氏春秋先秦史料考前 (Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2017), 240-41.

52 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.465. For translation, see Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 264.

53 Knoblock and Riegel, intro., Annals of Lü Buwei, 42-43. In view of the above, I disagree with Tao Hongqing 陶弘景 (1859-1918) and Chen Qiyou (Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 8.469n20) that, in its received version, the chapter is in disarray and that the Odes quotation from Duke Mu of Qin story was originally placed after the rhetorical question in the account of Zhao Jianzi and Yangcheng Xuqu, referring to both anecdotes.

54 For this paragraph, translation quoted from Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 352; for the rest of the anecdote, compare with ibid., 353.
and I will give you more." He then presented the man with another two bundles of dried meat as well as [more than] a hundred pieces of cash and left, resuming his journey up the river.

Three years later, Duke Ling of Jin wanted to have Xuanmeng killed. He had knights (shi) hide in a chamber to await him. When the wine was served, Xuanmeng realized what was happening and left in the middle of drinking. Duke Ling ordered the knights hiding in the chamber to quickly chase after and kill him. One man quickly pursued Xuanmeng and was first to catch up with him. [But] when he saw Xuanmeng’s face, he said: "Oh! It is your lordship! I ask for permission to go back and die on your lordship’s behalf." Xuanmeng asked: "What is your name?" Turning to go, the man replied: "What difference would my name make? Your servant is the man who was starving beneath the withered mulberry." He then returned, fought and died. As a consequence, Xuanmeng was able to survive. [111]

This is what the Documents is referring to when it says:

“No act of kindness, however minute, is small.

And so, if by being once kind to a single shi, one could own his own life, how much greater [would the result be of] being kind to ten thousand shi men?

And so, the Odes says:

"The valiant warrior, he is shield and wall for the lord."

Perfectly arrayed are the many shi, with them King Wen achieved peace.”

How can a ruler not devote himself to caring for the shi? Having instructed the Crown Prince with these reminders, [Lord Zhaowen] gave him the manuscript [of his speech] and personally enjoined him, saying:[112] "Make effort not to forget these admonitions, [which you have received] on the first day of the ninth month." [112]

• "惟有九月而甚之日，㝞（共）大子朝，周昭文公身貳（教）之，用作念也。" [113]

昔趙宣孟將上之姊，見㝞甚之下，有钁人卽不能起者，宜孟止。" 55

The story likewise belongs among the most popular anecdotes from the pre-imperial and early imperial eras, appearing inter alia in the Zuozhuan Left-hand and Shiji. According to these two sources, the banquet incident was only one among several attempts by Duke Ling of Jin to assassinate Zhao Dun. In the Zuozhuan’s account, Zhao Dun was saved by

55 Reconstructed based on the parallel in the Lishi chaunqi (xin jiaoshi, 15.901).

56 Unlike the editors of the Zhou xun (134n3), who interpret the character 甚 as juan (cleanse, making clean), Chen Jian 陳劍 argues that the graph in question should be read as qing 情 (till, pour out), see “Zhou xun ‘wei xia sun gui er bu zhi’ jie” (134n3), “為下唯撫而誰之” 情, Center for Research on Chinese Classical Classics and Paleography at Fudan University, June 18, 2016, accessed April 20, 2020, http://www.gwc.fudan.edu.cn/Web/Show/?2835. I agree with this interpretation as the object of this action is represented by the graph 荀, which is evidently a variation of the character 荀 (rice porridge), designating a kind of rice porridge that the ancient Chinese kept in a pot when traveling. It is noteworthy that, in an account of Zhao Dun’s earlier assassination attempt at the behest of Duke Ling of Jin, the Gongyang zuan 公羊传 emphasizes Zhao Dun’s frugality. It reports that, despite his elevated position, he dined on a simple rice porridge with fish (zu xun 鱼饭); see Chunqiu Gongyang zuan zhushu 春秋公羊傳疏证, comm. He Xing 何休, sub-comm. Xu Yan 徐彦 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2000), 15.385 (Xuan 6). For translation, see The Gongyang Commentary on The Spring and Autumn Annals, trans. Harry Miller (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 15.150. Thus, it is tempting to think that “rice porridge” as mentioned here was supposed to invoke other stories about Zhao Dun among the educated readers.
Three years later, Duke Ling of Jin wanted to have Xuanneng killed. He had knights (shi) hide in a chamber to await him. When the wine was served, Xuanneng and was first to catch up with him. [But] when he saw Xuanneng’s face, he said: "Oh! It is your lordship! I ask for permission to go back to quickly chase after and kill him. One man quickly pursued Xuanneng and die on your lordship’s behalf."

After instructing the Crown Prince with these reminders, [Lord Zhao Wen] gave him the manuscript [of his speech] and personally

The story likewise belongs among the most popular anecdotes from the pre-imperial and early imperial eras, appearing inter alia in the Zuozhuan and Shiji. According to these two sources, the banquet incident was only one among several attempts by Duke Ling of Jin to assassinate Confucius (r. 620 – 607 BC) to have Zhao Dun assassinated. In the Zuozhuan’s account, Zhao Dun was saved by

55 Reconstructed based on the parallel in the Lüshi chunqiu (xin jiaoshi, 15.901).

56 Unlike the editors of the Zhou xun (134n3), who interpret the character anganese as ji (cleanse, making clean), Chen Jian 陈剑 argues that the graph in question should be read as qing 晴 (till, pour out), see “Zhou xun ‘wei xia sun gui er bu zhi’ jie” (周RunWith these reminders, [Lord Zhao Wen] gave him the manuscript [of his speech] and personally enjoined him, saying: "Make effort not to forget these admonitions, which you have received) on the first day of the ninth month." [122]
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and I will give you more." He then presented the man with another two bundles of dried meat as well as [more than] a hundred pieces of cash and left, resuming his journey up the river.

and I will give you more.” He then presented the man with another two bundles of dried meat as well as [more than] a hundred pieces of cash and left, resuming his journey up the river.
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and I will give you more.” He then presented the man with another two bundles of dried meat as well as [more than] a hundred pieces of cash and left, resuming his journey up the river.

and I will give you more.” He then presented the man with another two bundles of dried meat as well as [more than] a hundred pieces of cash and left, resuming his journey up the river.

and I will give you more.” He then presented the man with another two bundles of dried meat as well as [more than] a hundred pieces of cash and left, resuming his journey up the river.
two different men: his guard named Tiiming, who recognized Duke Ling’s plans to ambush Zhao Dun and helped his master escape the scene, sacrificing his life to repay Zhao Dun’s kindness. Unlike Shi Miming, Ling Zhe seems to have managed to escape the scene unhurt. The Shiji, on the other hand, reports that Shiiming (sometimes transcribed as Shimi Ming), previously saved by Zhao Dun from starvation, was the only person who rescued the latter at Duke Ling’s banquet and who managed to escape.61

This happy ending takes a tragic turn in the corresponding accounts of the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu, which place great emphasis on how eagerly the Lüshi chunqiu, the family name of the guard is recorded as Qi 62. Unlike Shi Miming, Ling Zhe seems to have recognized Zhao Dun from the banquet and who managed to escape.

Table 2: The story about Zhao Dun and a starving man in the Zhou xun, Lüshi chunqiu, and Shuoyuan (Part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhou xun</th>
<th>Lüshi chunqiu</th>
<th>Shuoyuan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>赵宜言将之之上</td>
<td>趙宜言將之之上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>有宜言之而退者</td>
<td>有宜言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
<td>宜言将之之上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
<td>為之言之而退者</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the level of individual words, differences between the texts, again, mostly involve characters that are similar either graphically (對 and dui 對, line 9; shu 進 and sui 進, line 21), or phonetically (kha和khar合, line 11; la1 合 and la2 合, lines 13 and 19), or semantically (ji 姫 and e 萬, line 8; ci 此 and shi 是, line 8; hu 福 and qian 欽, line 20). Some variants again demonstrate the ambiguity in regard to semantic determinatives (ceng 曾 and zeng 增, line 11) in early texts. Characters without counterparts (if we exclude the Shuoyuan) mostly serve as emphasis (yi 瑜, line 6) or for grammatical clarification (hou 後, line 6; zhi 之, line 13; er 而, line 21). The Shuoyuan version sometimes supports the reading of the Zhou xun (e`ren 面人, line 6; ji

---

58 In the parallel account of the Gongyng zhuan, the family name of the guard is recorded as Qi (Chungiu Gongying zhuan zhushu, 15.386 [Xuan 6]).


60 Yang Bojun pointed out the phonetic proximity of the four variants Ti 昂, Qi 前, Qi 祁, and Shi 施 (Chungiu Zuzhou zhu, 2:695n [Xuan 2]).


62 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 15.901.

two different men: his guard named Ti Ming 蒼明, who recognized Duke Ling’s plans to ambush Zhao Dun and helped his master escape the scene, sacrificing his life in the process, and a man called Ling Zhe 靜皙, who, prior to this event, was saved by Zhao Dun from starvation and eventually became Duke Ling’s bodyguard. Unlike Shi Ming, Ling Zhe seems to have managed to escape the scene unharmed.59 The Shiji, on the other hand, reports that Shi Ming 尚明 (sometimes transcribed as Shimi Ming), previously saved by Zhao Dun from starvation, was the only person who rescued the latter at Duke Ling’s banquet and who managed to escape.60

This happy ending takes a tragic turn in the corresponding accounts of the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu, namely, the Shuoyuan 説苑. Thus, in the tables below, I juxtapose these three texts. Given the length of the story, I divide it into two parts. The first part is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhou xun</th>
<th>Lüshi chunqiu</th>
<th>Shuoyuan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ……</td>
<td>省適莒國罷上之硃。</td>
<td>趙適莒將上之硃。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ……</td>
<td>省適莒之。</td>
<td>趙適莒下。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ……</td>
<td>有傑人指不能起者。</td>
<td>有傑人，不能動。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 畢。</td>
<td>宜孟於車。</td>
<td>宜孟於車。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 為下人者亦善之。</td>
<td>為之下之，與爾善之。</td>
<td>為之下，自含之善之。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 備人再習再與之。</td>
<td>備人再習再與之。</td>
<td>備人再習再與之。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 宜孟門之曰：</td>
<td>宜孟門之曰：</td>
<td>宜孟門之曰：</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 談何為之而若此。</td>
<td>談何為之而若此。</td>
<td>談何為之而若此。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 對曰：</td>
<td>對曰：</td>
<td>對曰：</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 宜孟於門，而問棄之。</td>
<td>宜孟於門，而問棄之。</td>
<td>宜孟於門，而問棄之。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 拜行乞而得自取。</td>
<td>拜行乞而得自取。</td>
<td>拜行乞而得自取。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 故至於此。</td>
<td>故至於此。</td>
<td>故至於此。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 宜孟子之國二。</td>
<td>宜孟與國二。</td>
<td>宜孟與國二。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 拜受而弗飲食。</td>
<td>拜受而弗飲食。</td>
<td>拜受而弗飲食。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 當其故，</td>
<td>當其故，</td>
<td>當其故，</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 對曰：</td>
<td>對曰：</td>
<td>對曰：</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 拜受而弗飲食。</td>
<td>拜受而弗飲食。</td>
<td>拜受而弗飲食。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 宜孟子：</td>
<td>宜孟子：</td>
<td>宜孟子：</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 則食之，吾更與女。</td>
<td>則食之，吾更與女。</td>
<td>則食之，吾更與女。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 乃復求之國二與國百。</td>
<td>乃復求之國二與國百。</td>
<td>乃復求之國二與國百。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 迷</td>
<td>失之</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the level of individual words, differences between the texts, again, mostly involve characters that are similar either graphically (射 and 瞄 射, line 9; shu 迥 and sui 迴, line 21), or phonetically (kuaì 快 and kuaì 快, line 11; lai 来 and lai 来, lines 13 and 19), or semantically (ji 之 and e 艾, line 8; ci 此 and shì 是, line 8; hu 幽 and qian 潛, line 20). Some variants again demonstrate the ambiguity in regard to semantic determinatives (ceng 聲 and zeng 聲, line 11) in early texts. Characters without counterparts (if we exclude the Shuoyuan) mostly serve as emphasis (yi 以, line 6) or for grammatical clarification (hou 後, line 6; zhi 之, line 13; er 而, line 21). The Shuoyuan version sometimes supports the reading of the Zhou xun (e'ren 騰人, line 6; ji

58 In the parallel account of the Gongyung zhuo, the family name of the guard is recorded as Qi 欲 (Chungiu Gongyung zhuo zhuo, 15.386 [Xuan 6]).
60 Yang Bojun pointed out the phonetic proximity of the four variants Ti 蒼, Qi 欲, Qi 欲, and Shu 舒 (Chungiu Zuzaciu zhuo, 2:659n [Xuan 2]).
62 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 15.901.
For references to this account in the encyclopedias from the Tang and Song periods, see Ho Che Wah and Chu Kwok Fan, eds., Chutian of the Lüshi Chunqiu Found in the Leishu Compiled in the Tang and Song Dynasties, 15.127–28.

The second part of the story is juxtaposed here:

**Table 3: The story about Zhao Dun and a starving man in the Zhou xun, Lüshi Chunqiu, and Shuoyuan (Part 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhou xun</th>
<th>Lüshi Chunqiu</th>
<th>Shuoyuan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 裕三年</td>
<td>1. 裕三年</td>
<td>1. 裕三年</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 慚臯公親毅宜孟</td>
<td>2. 慚臯公親毅宜孟</td>
<td>2. 慚臯公親毅宜孟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 伏士與房中以侍</td>
<td>3. 伏士與房中以侍</td>
<td>3. 伏士與房中以侍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 銘</td>
<td>因銘於宜孟</td>
<td>因銘於宜孟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 翆宜之，中飲而出</td>
<td>翆宜之，中飲而出</td>
<td>翆宜之，中飲而出</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 懷公令房中之士疾逐之</td>
<td>懷公令房中之士疾逐之</td>
<td>懷公令房中之士疾逐之</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 一人遂走，先及宜</td>
<td>一人遂走，先及宜</td>
<td>一人遂走，先及宜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 見宜盡之面，曰</td>
<td>見宜盡之面，曰</td>
<td>見宜盡之面，曰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 敕！君邪！</td>
<td>敕！君邪！</td>
<td>敕！君邪！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 曰為君死</td>
<td>曰為君死</td>
<td>曰為君死</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 宜孟曰：「而名之誰？」</td>
<td>宜孟曰：「而名之誰？」</td>
<td>宜孟曰：「而名之誰？」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 宜曰</td>
<td>宜曰</td>
<td>宜曰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 尺人</td>
<td>尺人</td>
<td>尺人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 長斷而死，宜孟逃去</td>
<td>長斷而死，宜孟逃去</td>
<td>長斷而死，宜孟逃去</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, we see that the variants between the individual characters are similar either graphically (shu 善 and sui 萬, lines 14), phonetically (qi- 崧 and fai- 盪, line 13), or semantically (ji 鶉 and jie 位, line 7; sheng 生 and huo 活, lines 14 and 30; ai 爱 and ai 爱, line 35). There are, again, examples for deviating semantic determinatives (shi 之 and dai 待, line 3; huan 環 and huan 還, line 14; xiong 兄 and kuang 冴, line 31; sheng and nings 宁, line 34). Characters without counterparts mostly serve the purpose of grammatical clarification, as, for instance, the particles qie 且 (line 12 in the Zhou xun) and er 而 (lines 6 and 31 in the Lüshi Chunqiu). The Shuoyuan, while alternately supporting variants of the Zhou xun (三, line 1; qie 且, line 12; ai 爱, line 35) and the Lüshi Chunqiu (hao 活, lines 14 and 18), contains a long passage (I.1) which is absent from both. It reads,
Table 3: The story about Zhao Dun and a starving man in the *Zhou xun*, *Lüshi chunqiu*, and *Shuoyuan* (Part 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhou xun</th>
<th>Lüshi chunqiu</th>
<th>Shuoyuan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>饮三年。</td>
<td>饮三年。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>晋公刻宜根。</td>
<td>晋公刻宜根。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>丁氏飲房中待。</td>
<td>丁氏飲房中待。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>殟。</td>
<td>殟。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>宜根。</td>
<td>宜根。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>晋公刻房中之士疾迫之。</td>
<td>晋公刻房中之士疾迫之。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>一人倒邊。先至宜根。</td>
<td>一人倒邊。先至宜根。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>見宜根之面，曰。</td>
<td>見宜根之面，曰。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>敛！君邪！</td>
<td>敛！君邪！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>蓼為君反死。</td>
<td>蓼為君反死。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>宜根曰：「而名為誰？」</td>
<td>宜根曰：「而名為誰？」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>復反，且對曰：「何以名為？」</td>
<td>復反，且對曰：「何以名為？」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>其妻妻之，飲根也。</td>
<td>其妻妻之，飲根也。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>俄而死，宜根逃生。</td>
<td>俄而死，宜根逃生。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, we see that the variants between the individual characters are similar either graphically (*shu 舒 and sui 遂*, lines 14), phonetically (*yoe 委 and yoe 資*, line 13), or semantically (*yue 委 and ju 汲*, lines 7; *sheng 生* and *hao 惠*, lines 14 and 30; *ai 爱* and *ai 爱*, line 35). There are, again, examples for deviating semantic determinatives (*shi 时* and *dai 待*, line 3; *huan 璽* and *huan 还*, line 14; *xing 兴* and *kuang 超*, line 31; *dong and ning 宁*, line 34). Characters without counterparts mostly serve the purpose of grammatical clarification, as, for instance, the particles *qie 且* (line 12 in the *Zhou xun*) and *er 而* (lines 6 and 31 in the *Lüshi chunqiu*). The *Shuoyuan*, while alternately supporting variants of the *Zhou xun* (三, line 1; *qie 且*, line 12; *ai 爱*, line 35) and the *Lüshi chunqiu* (*hao 惠*, lines 14 and 18), contains a long passage (I.1) which is absent from both. It reads,

64 For references to this account in the encyclopedias from the Tang and Song periods, see Ho Che Wah and Chu Kwok Fan, eds., *Chations of the Lüshi Chunjiqu Found in the Leishu Compiled in the Tang and Song Dynasties*, 15:127–28.


This is what is called kindness through virtue (15). And so, if you are kind to gentlemen, the gentlemen will bring you blessings; if you are kind to petty people, the petty people will exhaust their force [on your behalf] (16–17). Now, if by being kind to one person, one was able to survive, how much greater [would the result be of] being kind to ten thousand men (18–19)? Therefore, it is said: No act of kindness is [too] tiny; no feeling of resentment is [too] small (20). How can one not foster virtue, eradicate resentment, and serve other people’s benefit (21–22)? Whoever spreads benefit will receive blessings; whoever disseminates hatred will invite disasters; whatever takes shape inside will resonate with things happening outside. How can one not pay attention [to this]? (23–26).

It is remarkable that the two sentences juxtaposing gentlemen and petty people (16–17) appear, with some variations, in the anecdote about Duke Mu of Qin and the country-people,68 whereas the two subsequent lines (18–19) appear in the Zhou xun and the Lüshi chunqiu between the citations of the Documents and the Odes (lines 29–31). This validates the assumption that many early Chinese texts are formed out of interchangeable and malleable “building blocks.”69 In the given passage, different “blocks” are connected by means of rhyme, as the characters shen 申, ren 人, shen 慎 (lines 18, 19, 22 and 26) all belong to the rhyme group shen 申.

Just like in the example from the previous chapter, the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu share the first three units, which are: (I) the anecdote, (II) the quotations from the Documents and Odes, and, finally, (III) the rhetorical question emphasizing the necessity of caring for the shi. In the Lüshi chunqiu, there is again an additional unit (IV) following the rhetorical question: “The shi are surely hard to find. Only he who searches broadly will succeed. If he searches broadly, none will remain hidden from him” (line 36).70 This part is not directly connected to the story, but seems to reflect the text’s overall concern with recognition of worthies. It has to be noted that this part appears to be similar in structure to the additional sentences from the first story we analyzed. That is to say, it starts by repeating the last phrase of the preceding

70 Tien Feng-tai, Lüshi chunqiu tamwei, 356–57.
72 Mozi jiange 墨子解蔽, ed. and comm. Sun Yirang 孫詡薦, coll. and punct. Sun Qizhi 孫治齊 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001), 8.248. In light of the parallel in the Lüshi chunqiu, the expression de ji 德夑 (to obtain pearl) has been mostly interpreted as the phonetic variant of de ji 德夑 (kindness that is minute) (ibid.). Compare the translation in The Mozi: A Complete Translation, trans. and amom. Ian Johnston (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2010), 303.
This is what is called kindness through virtue (15). And so, if you are kind to gentlemen, the gentlemen will bring you blessings; if you are kind to petty people, the petty people will exhaust their force [on your behalf] (16–17). Now, if by being kind to one person, one was able to survive, how much greater [would the result be] of being kind to ten thousand men (18–19)? Therefore, it is said: No act of kindness is [too] tiny; no feeling of resentment is [too] small (20). How can one not foster virtue, eradicate resentment, and serve other people’s benefit (21–22)? Whoever spreads benefit will receive blessings; whoever disseminates hatred will invite disasters; whatever takes shape inside will resonate with things happening outside. How can one not pay attention [to this]? (23–26).

It is remarkable that the two sentences juxtaposing gentlemen and petty people (16–17) appear, with some variations, in the anecdote about Duke Mu of Qin and the country-people, whereas the two subsequent lines (18–19) appear in the Zhou xun and the Lüshi chunqiu between the citations of the Documents and the Odes (lines 29–31). This validates the assumption that many early Chinese texts are formed out of interchangeable and malleable “building blocks.” In the given passage, different “blocks” are connected by means of rhyme, as the characters shen 聲, ren 人, shen 慎 (lines 18, 19, 22 and 26) all belong to the rhyme group shen 聲.

Just like in the example from the previous chapter, the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu share the first three units, which are: (I) the anecdote, (II) the quotations from the Documents and Odes, and, finally, (III) the rhetorical question emphasizing the necessity of caring for the shi. In the Lüshi chunqiu, there is again an additional unit (IV) following the rhetorical question: “The shi are surely hard to find. Only he who searches broadly will succeed. If he searches broadly, none will remain hidden from him” (line 36). This part is not directly connected to the story, but seems to reflect the text’s overall concern with recognition of worthies. It has to be noted that this part appears to be similar in structure to the additional sentences from the first story we analyzed. That is to say, it starts by repeating the last phrase of the preceding part, in this case shì 之, and concludes with an exclamatory particle yǐ 矣.

As for the formula “this is what the Documents is referring to when it says” (ci Shu zhi suowei ye 此《書》之所謂也), while being very common in the Zhou xun, it appears only at this juncture in the Lüshi chunqiu, where other Shu-sources are always preceded by the verb yue 曰.79 In fact, as discussed above, the term Shu 書 is itself highly unusual in the Lüshi chunqiu when used alone to refer to a text. As for its content, the Shu-line “No act of kindness, however minute, is small” (de ji wu xiao 德幾無小) is not part of any transmitted compilations of the Documents. This phenomenon is characteristic of most Shu citations found in the transmitted sources as well as the newly unearthed manuscripts.71 At the same time, this line is phonetically identical to the first part of the saying attributed to the text Qin Ai 契艾 in the chapter “Ming gui, Xia” 明鬼, Xia 明鬼下 (Percipient Ghosts III) of the Mozi 墨子: “No pearl is too small to obtain; no lineage is too great to exterminate” (de ji wu xiao, mei zong wu da 得璦無小，滅宗無大).72 Variants based on phonetic proximity such as this are among the most common patterns of variation among Shu citations found in different texts.73

The Shi citation, on the other hand, is remarkable as it combines lines from two poems that belong to different sections of the Shi jing (Mao 7 from the “Gufeng” 勝風 and 235 from the “Da ya” 大雅) into a single passage by using their commonalities in topic and rhyme (rhyme group: geng 莊). This practice is very uncommon for the early exegesis of the Odes and was possibly prompted by the authors’ wish to present a greater body of authoritative evidence to substantiate the moral of the story. The appearance of the possessive particle zhi 之 in the Zhou xun (line 33) constitutes another interesting feature. As such, it accentuates the grammatically already obvious

---

67 Shuoyuan jianzhezong, 6.125. This anecdote appears in the same chapter, titled “Fu en” 復恩 (Requiring a favor), as the story about Zhao Dun and a starving man.
70 Tien Feng-tai, Lüshi chunqiu tamenwei, 356–57.
72 Mozi jiangue 墨子銘鑑, ed. and coll. Sun Yirang 孫怡讓, coll. and punc. Sun Qizhi 孫啟治 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001), 8.248. In light of the parallel in the Lüshi chunqiu, the expression de ji 德幾 (to obtain pearl) has been mostly interpreted as the phonetic variant of de ji 德幾 (kindness that is minute) (ibid.). Compare the translation in The Mozi: A Complete Translation, trans. and annot. Ian Johnston (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2010), 303.
point that the warriors are protectors of their lords. What is the reason for this move, given that it was not only redundant but also changed the tetrasyllabic meter of the poem? Now, the omission of some particles, such as the final 云 in the lines of the Shi, and the ensuing change of meter was quite common in the Shi-quotations found in the early manuscripts.\(^6\) However, such a deliberate addition in the manner seen in the Zhou xun was indeed rare, at least in the available documents. It is noteworthy that in the only other available early instance of this line’s citation, which is found in the Zuozhuan,\(^7\) the sentence is interpreted to the effect that it is the lords who are the shields and walls of the people and not vice versa.\(^7\) It is thus tempting to think that the Zhou xun’s characteristic reading could be an attempt to redress the Zuozhuan’s playful interpretation of the line, but that conjecture has to remain speculative given the available evidence and given the fact that the Zhou xun also took considerable liberty with its exegetic approach to this Classic.

Concluding the comparison between the Zhou xun and Liši chunqiu, I would like to point out that the manner in which the two works connect the two points of view is quite characteristic of the rest of the Liši chunqiu, while frequently featuring in the Zhou xun.\(^7\)

V. Lord Zhaowen in the “Bao geng” Chapter

Remarkably, the next story in the “Bao geng” chapter features the Zhou xun’s main protagonist, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou. He is said to have graciously treated the political advisor Zhang Yi 張儀 (d. 310 BC) at the time when the latter was still a relatively unknown man. After becoming prime minister of Qin, Zhang Yi repaid Lord Zhaowen for his kind treatment by making him respected by the rulers of the far larger and mightier states:

Zhang Yi was a “minor son” of the house of Wei. When travelling west to Qin, he passed through East Zhou. A retainer spoke to Lord Zhaowen about [Zhang Yi], saying: “Zhang Yi of the house of Wei is a talented 使 and he is travelling west to Qin. I hope your lordship will treat him with courtesy.” Lord Zhaowen received him in an audience and said to him: “I have heard that you are going to Qin. My own state is small and insufficient to keep you. But, even though you are leaving [for Qin], can you be really sure to be given an opportunity [to implement your policies]? Should you not be given such an opportunity, then I would like to ask you to return as a favor to me and, even though my state is small, I will be willing to share it with you.” When Zhang Yi turned to go, he bowed twice facing north. When Zhang Yi finally departed, Lord Zhaowen saw him off and provided him with supplies. Zhang Yi arrived in Qin and, after some time, King Hui was pleased with him and made him prime minister. Of those whom Zhang Yi treated with kindness, none equaled Lord Zhaowen. Zhou had one thousand chariots, yet Zhang Yi treated it with more respect than a state with ten thousand chariots. He made King Hui of Qin regard Lord Zhaowen as his teacher. At Fengze meeting, the king of Wei served as Lord Zhaowen’s driver and the king of Han as his guard on the right. Even today his reputation has not been forgotten. This is due to Zhang Yi’s influence.\(^7\)


75 Ho Che Wah and Chan Hung Kan 陳雄根, eds., Citations from the Shijing to Be Found in Pre-Han and Han Texts 先秦兩漢典籍引《詩經》資料彙編 (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2004), 9.
77 See, for instance, chapter one. Zhou xun, 123, strips 14–17.
78 Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 354.
79 Liši chunqiu xin jiaozhi, 15.902.
point that the warriors are protectors of their lords. What is the reason for this move, given that it was not only redundant but also changed the tetrasyllabic meter of the poem? Now, the omission of some particles, such as the final ใ in the early manuscripts. However, such a deliberate addition in the manner seen in the Zhou xun was indeed rare, at least in the available documents. It is noteworthy that in the only other available early instance of this line’s citation, which is found in the Zuozhuan, the sentence is interpreted to the effect that it is the lords who are the shields and walls of the people and not vice versa. It is thus tempting to think that the Zhou xun’s characteristic reading could be an attempt to redress the Zuozhuan’s playful interpretation of the line, but that conjecture has to remain speculative given the available evidence and given the fact that the Zhou xun also took considerable liberty with its exegetical approach to this Classic.

Concluding the comparison between the Zhou xun and Lüshi chunqiu, I would like to point out that the manner in which the two works connect the Sishu and the ensuing change of meter was quite common in the Zhou xun.

V. Lord Zhaowen in the “Bao geng” Chapter

Remarkably, the next story in the “Bao geng” chapter features the Zhou xun’s main protagonist, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou. He is said to have graciously treated the political advisor Zhang Yi 張儀 (d. 310 BC) at the time when the latter was still a relatively unknown man. After becoming prime minister of Qin, Zhang Yi repaid Lord Zhaowen for his kind treatment by making him respected by the rulers of the far larger and mightier states:

Zhang Yi was a “minor son” of the house of Wei. When travelling west to Qin, he passed through East Zhou. A retainer spoke to Lord Zhaowen about [Zhang Yi], saying: “Zhang Yi of the house of Wei is a talented น or he is travelling west to Qin. I hope your lordship will treat him with courtesy.” Lord Zhaowen received him in an audience and said to him: “I have heard that you are going to Qin. My own state is small and insufficient to keep you. But, even though you are leaving [for Qin], can you be really sure to be given an opportunity [to implement your policies]? Should you not be given such an opportunity, then I would like to ask you to return as a favor to me and, even though my state is small, I will be willing to share it with you.” When Zhang Yi turned to go, he bowed twice facing north. When Zhang Yi finally departed, Lord Zhaowen saw him off and provided him with supplies. Zhang Yi arrived in Qin and, after some time, King Hui was pleased with him and made him prime minister. Of those whom Zhang Yi treated with kindness, none equaled Lord Zhaowen. Zhou had one thousand chariots, yet Zhang Yi treated it with more respect than a state with ten thousand chariots. He made King Hui of Qin regard Lord Zhaowen as his teacher. At Fengze meeting, the king of Wei served as Lord Zhaowen’s driver and the king of Han as his guard on the right. Even today his reputation has not been forgotten. This is due to Zhang Yi’s influence. 張儀，魏氏餘子也，將西遊於秦，過東周，客有語之於昭文君者曰：

“魏氏人張儀，材士也。將西遊於秦，願君之禮待之也。”昭文君見而謂之曰：‘聞客之至，寡人之國小，不足以留客，雖濟然豈必遇哉？客或不遇，請為寡人一歸也。國雖小，請與客共之。’張儀遂走。北面再拜，張儀曰：昭文君以客而貴之，至於秦，留有聞。惠王說而相之。張儀所徳於天下者，無若昭文君，周，千乘也，重還萬乘也，今秦惠王師之，逢澤之會，魏王當為師，韓王為右，名號至今不，此張儀之力也。”

If we take the Shiji as a reference, then this account appears to show similar disregard for historical facts as the Zhou xun. According to the former, the meeting at Fengze took place in 342 BC, long before Zhang Yi assumed the prime minister position in Qin (i.e. 328 BC). Moreover, Sima Qian 司馬遷 (d. 90 BC) was a contemporary of Zhang Yi and could have known of the meeting.

75 Ho Che Wah and Chan Hung Kan 陳鴻樑, eds., Citations from the Shijing to Be Found in Pre-Han and Han Texts 先秦兩漢典籍引〈詩經〉資料彙編 (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2004), 9.
77 See, for instance, chapter one. Zhou xun, 123, strips 14-17.
78 Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 354.
79 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 15.902.
suggests that the meeting was organized to pay respects to Zhou’s “Son of Heaven” (Tianzi 天子) for bestowing the status of “hegemon” (hu 伯) upon Duke Xiao of Qin.Thus, King Hui of Qin’s father, in 343 BC. Thus, presenting Lord Zhaowen as the main beneficiary of the Fengze meeting was inaccurate for a number of reasons. His fame in Qin and his position as “teacher” of King Hui of Qin, likewise, appear questionable.

Lord Zhaowen’s portrayal here is sometimes seen as echoing the above-mentioned story in the Zhanguo ce, in which an unnamed ruler of Zhou is advised by Du He to hire a talented person who has not yet become prominent and whose service is thus still affordable. However, I argue that the point here is rather that, to ensure the services of a promising shi, a ruler should treat him with utmost respect and provide him ample material support, regardless of one’s limited resources. Moreover, inaccurate as it might be, the Lüshi chunqiu’s account is much more complimentary to Lord Zhaowen than the Zhanguo ce is toward the unnamed interlocutor of Du He.

The most salient question here is how we can explain the fact that Lord Zhaowen features in the “Bao geng” chapter immediately after the Zhao Dun story, which appears in the collection of “his” admonitions to Prince Gong in the Zhou xun. The most likely scenario is that the authors of this chapter associated the anecdote about Zhao Dun with the Zhou xun and its main protagonist. This was certainly only possible if they were familiar with the latter text (and borrowed from it). A comparison of the two anecdotes shows that some of their textual features, while not appearing in the rest of the Lüshi chunqiu, were characteristic of the entire Zhou xun, and speaks to this direction of borrowing. Furthermore, the fact that the “Examinations” part of the Lüshi chunqiu contains two Zhou shu citations with parallels in the Zhou xun suggests that, in the latter case, the Zhou shu may have even been quoted as an authoritative shu source.

While the direction of borrowing seems now clear, the comparison of the two accounts suggested that their differences are best understood as a result of a complex transmission process involving dictation, copying and a certain amount of deliberate modifications. I argue that this seeming complexity can be accounted for by the following considerations. First, neither of the compared texts is identical to the materials that circulated at Lü Buwei’s court. After all, both the Peking University copy of the Zhou xun and, to a far greater extent the received Lüshi chunqiu, are separated from the borrowing event by centuries of transmission which, without doubt, resulted in a wealth of intentional and unintentional changes. Moreover, it stands to reason that several copies of the Zhou xun were in circulation during the late Warring States period. Thus, variations between the instantiations of the two anecdotes discussed here could also stem from them belonging to different transmission lineages of the text.

Returning to the story about Lord Zhaowen and Zhang Yi, we see that it does not seem to have been part of the common lore, as no other known source mentions their encounter and Zhang Yi’s gratitude. Lord Zhaowen’s supposed fame (xian 昔) as a wise ruler, heralded in the introductory passage of the “Bao geng” chapter, is likewise missing from the extant sources. On the contrary, according to the Han shu, Gujünren biao, Lord Zhaowen belonged to the “lower” section of the “middling” group (ching xia 中下). This made him, at best, a mediocre ruler, even less prominent than the roughly contemporaneous head of the rival West Zhou, Duke Wu (武公), listed two positions above. Moreover, Lord Zhaowen’s allegedly unrestrained respect for the shi, as depicted in the story, seems over-amplified even when compared to “his” teachings in the Zhou xun. Thus, it is not unlikely that the story either goes back to a lost anecdote or that it was, in fact, fabricated by the authors of the chapter.

Below, I analyze the depiction of Lord Zhaowen in other parts of the Lüshi chunqiu to see whether it is consistent with his portrayal in the “Bao geng” chapter.

---

81 Refer to note 23. See also Wu Rongzeng, "Dong-Zhou, Xi-Zhou liangguo shi yanjiu," 146.

82 The first citation “As if approaching the brink of a deep abyss, as if treading on thin ice” (ruo lin shen yuan, rao li bo bing 落臨深淵，若履薄冰) from chapter 15.1 (“Shen du”慎大) (Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 15.850) is actually a famous line from Mao 195, but it also appears in the first chapter of the Zhou xun (123, strip 17). The second citation “As for the people, if you are kind to them, they will support you; if you are unkind to them, they will be your enemy” (min shan zhi ze xx ye, bu shan ze chou ye 民善之則翕也，不善則離也) from chapter 19.5 (“Shi wei”德為) (ibid., 19.1289) has a clear parallel in King Wen’s (referred to by his personal name Chang 昌) instruction to his son Fa 發, the future King Wu of Zhou, found in one of the “small chapters” of the Zhou xun (142, strips 187–88). While these two passages frequently appear in other early texts, it is only in the Lüshi chunqiu that they are attributed to the Zhou shu.

83 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 15.901. For translation, see Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 352. It is mainly based on the “Bao geng” chapter that Lord Zhaowen is sometimes identified as the most prominent and able person among the ruling elite of the late Zhou dynasty (c.f. Wu Rongzeng, "Dong-Zhou, Xi-Zhou liangguo shi yanjiu," 147).

84 Han shu, 20.946.
suggests that the meeting was organized to pay respects to Zhou’s “Son of Heaven” (Tianzi 天子) for bestowing the status of “hegemon” (bo 伯) upon Duke Xiao of Qin 娄孝公 (r. 361–338 BC), King Hui of Qin’s father, in 343 BC. Thus, presenting Lord Zhaowen as the main beneficiary of the Fengge meeting was inaccurate for a number of reasons. His fame in Qin and his position as “teacher” of King Hui of Qin, likewise, appear questionable.

Lord Zhaowen’s portrayal here is sometimes seen as echoing the above-mentioned story in the Zhanguo ce, in which an unnamed ruler of Zhou is advised by Du He to hire a talented person who has not yet become prominent and whose service is thus still affordable.81 However, I argue that the point here is rather that, to ensure the services of a promising shi, a ruler should treat him with utmost respect and provide him ample material support, regardless of one’s limited resources. Moreover, inaccurate as it might be, the Lüshi chunqiu’s account is much more complimentary to Lord Zhaowen than the Zhanguo ce is toward the unnamed interlocutor of Du He.

The most salient question here is how we can explain the fact that Lord Zhaowen features in the “Bao geng” chapter immediately after the Zhao Dun story, which appears in the collection of “his” admonitions to Prince Gong in the Zhou xun. The most likely scenario is that the authors of this chapter associated the anecdote about Zhao Dun with the Zhou xun and its main protagonist. This was certainly only possible if they were familiar with the latter text (and borrowed from it). A comparison of the two anecdotes shows that some of their textual features, while not appearing in the rest of the Lüshi chunqiu, were characteristic of the entire Zhou xun, and speaks to this direction of borrowing. Furthermore, the fact that the “Examinations” part of the Lüshi chunqiu contains two Zhou shu citations with parallels in the Zhou xun suggests that, in the latter case, the Zhou shu may have even been quoted as an authoritative shu source.82

While the direction of borrowing seems now clear, the comparison of the two accounts suggested that their differences are best understood as a result of a complex transmission process involving dictation, copying, and a certain amount of deliberate modifications. I argue that this seeming complexity can be accounted for by the following considerations. First, neither of the compared texts is identical to the materials that circulated at Lü Buwei’s court. After all, both the Peking University copy of the Zhou xun and, to a far greater extent the received Lüshi chunqiu, are separated from the borrowing event by centuries of transmission which, without doubt, resulted in a wealth of intentional and unintentional changes. Moreover, it stands to reason that several copies of the Zhou xun were in circulation during the late Warring States period. Thus, variations between the instantiations of the two anecdotes discussed here could also stem from them belonging to different transmission lineages of the texts.

Returning to the story about Lord Zhaowen and Zhang Yi, we see that it does not seem to have been part of the common lore, as no other known source mentions their encounter and Zhang Yi’s gratitude. Lord Zhaowen’s supposed fame (xiān 萬) as a wise ruler, heralded in the introductory passage of the “Bao geng” chapter,83 is likewise missing from the extant sources. On the contrary, according to the Han shu’s Gujinren biao, 古今人物, Lord Zhaowen belonged to the “lower” section of the “middling” group (zhòng jià 下中),44 This made him, at best, a mediocre ruler, even less prominent than the roughly contemporaneous head of the rival West Zhou, Duke Wu 武公, listed two positions above. Moreover, Lord Zhaowen’s allegedly unrestricted respect for the shi, as depicted in the story, seems over-amplified even when compared to “his” teachings in the Zhou xun. Thus, it is not unlikely that the story either goes back to a lost anecdote or that it was, in fact, fabricated by the authors of the chapter.

Below, I analyze the depiction of Lord Zhaowen in other parts of the Lüshi chunqiu to see whether it is consistent with his portrayal in the “Bao geng” chapter.

81 Refer to note 23. See also Wu Rongzeng, “Dong-Zhou, Xi-Zhou liangguo shi yanjiu,” 146.

82 The first citation “As if approaching the brink of a deep abyss, as if treading on thin ice” (ruo lin shen yuan, rao li bo bing 若臨深淵，若履薄冰) from chapter 15.1 (“Shen da” 應大) (Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 15.850) is actually a famous line from Mao 195, but it also appears in the first chapter of the Zhou xun (123, strip 17). The second citation “As for the people, if you are kind to them, they will support you; if you are unkind to them, they will be your enemy” (min shan zhi ze xu ye, bu shan ze chou ye 民善之則 remedy, 不善則禍也) from chapter 19.5 (“Shi wei” 治威) (ibid., 19.1289) has a clear parallel in King Wen’s (referred to by his personal name Chang 昌) instruction to his son Fa 超, the future King Wu of Zhou, found in one of the “small chapters” of the Zhou xun (142, strips 187–88). While these two passages frequently appear in other early texts, it is only in the Lüshi chunqiu that they are attributed to the Zhou shu.

83 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 15.901. For translation, see Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 352. It is mainly based on the “Bao geng” chapter that Lord Zhaowen is sometimes identified as the most prominent and able person among the ruling elite of the late Zhou dynasty (c.f. Wu Rongzeng, “Dong-Zhou, Xi-Zhou liangguo shi yanjiu,” 147).

84 Han shu, 20.946.
VI. Lord Zhaowen in Other Chapters of the Lüshi chunqiu

In addition to the “Bao geng” chapter, Lord Zhaowen also features in chapter 13.7 (“Yu da” 諭大):

Master Ji said: '[…] Therefore, it is said, 'When All-under-Heaven is in great disorder, no state is at peace; when the whole state is in disorder, no family is at peace; when the whole family is in disorder, no individual is at peace.' This expresses my meaning. The setting of the small, therefore, invariably depends on the large, and the securing of the large inevitably depends on the small. Small and large, noble and base, they depend on each other, and only so can they obtain their happiness.

[So,] the setting of the base and the small depends on the honorable and the large, which is explained in [the cases of] Bo Yi’s persuading Lord Si of Wei to use methods of [true] kingship, in Du He’s persuading Lord Zhaowen of Zhou to bring peace to All-under-Heaven, and in Kuang Si of Wei to use methods of [true] kingship, in Du He’s persuading Lord Zhaowen of Zhou to bring peace to All-under-Heaven, and in Kuang Si of Wei to use methods of [true] kingship.

Du He replied, "If what I teach is unfeasible [for you], then Zhou cannot be at peace. If what I teach is feasible [for you], then Zhou will be at peace of itself." This is what is called "bringing peace without bringing peace." 80

Lüshichunqiu xinjiaoshi (2015), 82.

Book 13 ("Youshi lan") is often regarded as containing clues about the intended design of the "Examinations" (jian 謓) part of the work. This design involved a strict separation between the more philosophical guidelines (jing 觐) and explanatory stories (jie 解); however, it was not realized. 85 The "theoretical" part in this chapter emphasizes the dependence of the "small" on the "large," while also mentioning their interdependence. The corresponding content to the brief mentions of Lord Si of Wei 衛卿君 (d. 293 BC) and Lord Zhaowen of Zhou can be found together in chapter 26.2 ("Wu da" 諭大). 86 Book 26 ("Shi rong lun" 土容論), in which it appears, is the last book of the entire work and is sometimes viewed as having been created in a hasty attempt to "fill in the gaps that existed in the overall design of the text." 87 The relevant passage, which remarkably is not identified as an "explanation" to any theory, reads:

Bo Yi offered a persuasion on the methods of [true] kingship to Lord Si of Wei.

Lord Si responded, "What I possess is only a state of one thousand chariots. I wish to receive instruction [which considers this fact]."

Bo Yi replied, "Wu Huo [was able to] lift a thousand jin, how much more [was he able to lift] a single jin?"

Du He offered a persuasion on how to bring peace to All-under-Heaven to Lord Zhaowen of Zhou. Lord Zhaowen said to Du He, "I wish to learn how to bring peace to Zhou."

Du He replied, "If what I teach is unfeasible [for you], then Zhou cannot be at peace. If what I teach is feasible [for you], then Zhou will be at peace of itself." This is what is called "bringing peace without bringing peace." 89

Lüshi chunqiu xinjiaoshi (2015), 82.

This passage appears almost verbatim in the Huainanzi and serves there as an illustration for the Laozi line: "The great cutting does not sever" (da zhi wu ge 88)

88 The relevant dialogue between Kuang Zhang 匡章 (aka. Tian Zhang 田章, fl. 334–295) and Hui Shi 惠施 (ca. 380–ca.305 BC) is found in book 21 (Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 21.1474).
89 For the arrangement of “explanations” in different chapters of the work, see Ho Che Wah, “Lüshi chunqiu bianpai jiegou changtan,” 72–74.
90 Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, trans., Annals of Lü Buwei, 649.
91 Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi, 26.1714. Xu Fuhong, Lüshi chunqiu xian Qin shiliang kaozheng bianian, 91, places this encounter in the year 314 BC.
VI. Lord Zhaowen in Other Chapters of the *Lüshi chunqiu*

In addition to the “Bao geng” chapter, Lord Zhaowen also features in chapter 13.7 (“Yu da” “論大”):

Master Ji said: ‘[…] Therefore, it is said, “When All-under-Heaven is in great disorder, no state is at peace; when the whole state is in disorder, no family is at peace; when the whole family is in disorder, no individual is at peace.” This expresses my meaning. The setting of the small, therefore, invariably depends on the large, and the securing of the large inevitably depends on the small. Small and large, noble and base, they depend on each other, and only so can they obtain their happiness.”

[So,] the setting of the base and the small depends on the honorable and the large, which is explained in [the cases of] Bo Yi’s persuading Lord Si of Wei to use methods of [true] kingship, in Du He’s persuading Lord Zhaowen of Zhou to bring peace to All-under-Heaven, and in Kuang Zhang’s refuting Hui Shi with regard to making a true king of the king of Qi.

Zhadu said: ‘[…] Therefore it is said, “When all under Heaven is in great disorder, all under Heaven has no peace; one kingdom in disorder, all under Heaven is disorder; a family in disorder, all under Heaven has no peace; an individual in disorder, all under Heaven has no peace.” This expresses my meaning. The settling of the small, therefore, invariably depends on the large, and the securing of the large inevitably depends on the small. Small and large, noble and base, they depend on each other, and only so can they obtain their happiness.”

The corresponding jing (線) and explanatory stories (jie 辭); however, it was not realized. The “theoretical” part in this chapter emphasizes the dependence of the “small” on the “large,” while also mentioning their interdependence. The corresponding content to the brief mentions of Lord Si of Wei 衛嗣君 (d. 293 BC) and Lord Zhaowen of Zhou can be found together in chapter 26.2 (“Wu da” “論大”).

Book 26 (“Shi rong lun” 士容論), in which it appears, is the last book of the entire work and is sometimes viewed as having been created in a hasty attempt to “fill in the gaps that existed in the overall design of the text.” The relevant passage, which remarkably is not identified as an “explanation” to any theory, reads:

Bo Yi offered a persuasion on the methods of [true] kingship to Lord Si of Wei.

Lord Si responded, “What I possess is only a state of [true] kingship. I wish to receive instruction [which considers this fact].” Bo Yi replied, “Wu Huan [was able to] lift a thousand chariots, how much more [was he able to lift] a single jin?”

Du He offered a persuasion on how to bring peace to All-under-Heaven to Lord Zhaowen of Zhou. Lord Zhaowen said to Du He, “I wish to learn how to bring peace to Zhou.”

Du He replied, “If what I teach is unfeasible [for you], then Zhou cannot be at peace. If what I teach is feasible [for you], then Zhou will be at peace of itself.” This is what is called “bringing peace without bringing peace.”

The relevant dialogue between Kuang Zhang 匡章 (aka. Tian Zhang 天章, fl. 330-ca.305 BC) and Lord Zhaowen of Zhou xun (気が, fl. 334-295) and serves there as an illustration for the Laozi line: “The great cutting does not sever” (da zhi wu ge 無割).
This demonstrates how one and the same anecdote, when used in different contexts, can substantiate very different positions. In contrast to the anecdote in the *Zhanguo ce*, in which Du He advises a ruler of Zhou to make his political decisions based on the fact that Zhou is a small state with limited resources, here, the same advisor urges Lord Zhaowen to adopt the broadest possible perspective on governing affairs, focusing on the All-under-Heaven. This inconsistency could be resolved by disassociating Lord Zhaowen from the unnamed ruler of Zhou whom Du He was persuading. Some evidence for this disassociation could be seen above. However, it could also be the case that multiple anecdotes about Lord Zhaowen and Du He circulated in early China, supporting different intellectual and political agendas.

When mentioned in the "Bao geng" chapter together with Zhao Dun and Lord Mengchang 孟嘗君 (born Tian Wen 天文, d. ca. 280 BC), Lord Zhaowen served as a prime example for how one can benefit from respecting the *shi*. Here, however, the point seems less obvious and less laudatory. Accordingly, Lord Zhaowen, just like Lord Si of Wei, (falsely) assumed that ruling their small states involved a different set of principles than ruling All-under-Heaven. While having been corrected by their advisors, it is unclear from the stories, as they are portrayed in the text, whether the two rulers concurred with their advisors and, if so, what this actually entailed politically. It is tempting to relate Lord Zhaowen’s separate encounters with Zhang Yi and Du He, for instance, to the effect that his kind treatment of Zhang Yi was based on Du He’s advice. However, in the end, it has to be stated that the transmitted *Lüshi chunqiu* does not provide any evidence for such claims. In view of this, this compendium’s anecdotes about Lord Zhaowen appear to fall into two categories: the one associating him with Du He (possibly highlighting his confusion about the principles of governance) and the one presenting him as Zhang Yi’s benefactor (yielding him respect from Qin and other mighty states).

In the last section of this paper, I will address Lord Zhaowen’s alleged connection to the state of Qin and explore the question of whether this connection can also be substantiated for the work attributed to him.

### VII. The *Zhou xun* and the State of Qin

As shown above, the “Bao geng” chapter maintains that among the states of the late *Zhanguo* period, it was Qin that developed especially close ties to Lord Zhaowen. The first Qin ruler to adopt the title “king” (wang 王), King Hui of Qin, is even said to have made Lord Zhaowen his "teacher." That any of these events happened in reality is very unlikely. However, the historicity of this anecdote is irrelevant here insofar as its mere existence already shows that a certain group of people saw fit to put it into circulation. Leaving aside the question of whether this group was involved in the creation of the *Zhou xun* or/and the *Lüshi chunqiu*, it seems obvious that the main goal of this anecdote was to bolster Lord Zhaowen’s prestige, especially, in Qin. And this, on the other hand, would have made little sense if there was no writing associated with him. Thus, in the end, the account of Lord Zhaowen’s encounter with Zhang Yi appears to communicate a specific relevance of the *Zhou xun* for Qin.

---


94 Lord Si of Wei is mentioned in the *Han shu* “Guojinren biao” (20.945–46) as elder contemporary of Lord Zhaowen of Zhou, while according to the *Shiji* (15.730) he ascended the throne only in 324 BC. In Ban Gu’s *Zhanguo ce jianzheng* (32–92) classification, this ruler belonged to the "higher" subsection of the lowest group (*xia xiang 下相*), occupying one rank below Lord Zhaowen who is listed in the "lower" subsection of the "middling" group (*zhong xia 中下*).
This demonstrates how one and the same anecdote, when used in different contexts, can substantiate very different positions. In contrast to the anecdote in the Zhanguo ce, in which Du He advises a ruler of Zhou to make his political decisions based on the fact that Zhou is a small state with limited resources, here, the same advisor urges Lord Zhaowen to adopt the broadest possible perspective on governing affairs, focusing on the All-under-Heaven. This inconsistency could be resolved by disassociating Lord Zhaowen from the unnamed ruler of Zhou whom Du He was persuading. Some evidence for this disassociation could be seen above. However, it could also be the case that multiple anecdotes about Lord Zhaowen and Du He circulated in early China, supporting different intellectual and political agendas.

When mentioned in the "Bao geng" chapter together with Zhao Dun and Lord Mengchang 孟嘗君 (born Tian Wen 天文, d. ca. 280 BC), Lord Zhaowen served as a prime example for how one can benefit from respecting the shi. Here, however, the point seems less obvious and less laudatory. Accordingly, Lord Zhaowen, just like Lord Si of Wei, falsely assumed that ruling their small states involved a different set of principles than ruling All-under-Heaven. While having been corrected by their advisors, it is unclear from the stories, as they are portrayed in the text, whether the two rulers concurred with their advisors and, if so, what this actually entailed politically. It is tempting to relate Lord Zhaowen’s separate encounters with Zhang Yi and Du He, for instance, to the effect that his kind treatment of Zhang Yi was based on Du He’s advice. However, in the end, it has to be stated that the transmitted Lüshi chunqiu does not provide any evidence for such claims. In view of this, this compendium’s anecdotes about Lord Zhaowen appear to fall into two categories: the one associating him with Du He (possibly highlighting his confusion about the principles of governance) and the one presenting him as Zhang Yi’s benefactor (yielding him respect from Qin and other mighty states).

In the last section of this paper, I will address Lord Zhaowen’s alleged connection to the state of Qin and explore the question of whether this connection can also be substantiated for the work attributed to him.

### VII. The Zhou xun and the State of Qin

As shown above, the “Bao geng” chapter maintains that among the states of the late Zhanguo period, it was Qin that developed especially close ties to Lord Zhaowen. The first Qin ruler to adopt the title “king” (wang 王), King Hui of Qin, is even said to have made Lord Zhaowen his “teacher.” That any of these events happened in reality is very unlikely. However, the historicity of this anecdote is irrelevant here insofar as its mere existence already shows that a certain group of people saw fit to put it into circulation. Leaving aside the question of whether this group was involved in the creation of the Zhou xun or/and the Lüshi chunqiu, it seems obvious that the main goal of this anecdote was to bolster Lord Zhaowen’s prestige, especially, in Qin. And this, on the other hand, would have made little sense if there was no writing associated with him. Thus, in the end, the account of Lord Zhaowen’s encounter with Zhang Yi appears to communicate a specific relevance of the Zhou xun for Qin.

---


94 Lord Si of Wei is mentioned in the Han shu 漢書 (20.945–46) as elder contemporary of Lord Zhaowen of Zhou, while according to the Shiji (15.730) he ascended the throne only in 324 BC. In Ban Gu’s 袁固 (32–92) classification, this ruler belonged to the “higher” subsection of the lowest group (xia shàng 下上), occupying one rank below Lord Zhaowen who is listed in the “lower” subsection of the “middling” group (zhong xia 中下).
I contend that there are more reasons to assume a certain connection between this work and the state of Qin. First, as Han Wei has already noticed, some graphs are characteristic of Qin orthography.96 Secondly, in the instruction from the “intercalary month” (run yue 閏月), the text uses the term “single-piece manuscript” (dvi 墨).97 This term is associated with the Qin state and its earliest appearance (in the available documents) can be traced back to July 26, 217 BC.98 Staack links the appearance of this term to “lexical changes directly following the Qin unification” in 221 BC.99 However, I argue that, since we only have access to a small fraction of the pre-imperial Qin documents, it is likely that evidence of earlier mentions of this term may yet to be discovered. But even if the time of its first appearance is debatable, its association with Qin seems certain. Moreover, in the fifth chapter, the Zhou xun used the term “earth pounder convicts” (cheng dan 城旦), one of the harshest sentences in the legal system of the Qin and Han dynasties, as corroborated by a wealth of excavated legal documents.100

Linguistic evidence aside, the Zhou xun also seems to appeal to Qin’s historic “identification with the Zhou,”101 who saw themselves as the righteous successors to the Zhou.102 The setting of the Zhou xun, in which one of the last illustrious and able noblemen of the Zhou instructs his obscure successor, would have been particularly relevant for the Qin. Certainly, Lord Zhaowen, the head of a small Zhou principality, did not have the formal authority of a “Son of Heaven,” yet his depiction as King Hui of Qin’s teacher meant to highlight his renown even among the most illustrious of Qin sovereigns.

96 Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu Zhou xun ruogan wenti de tantao,” 255.
97 Zhou xun, 140, bamboo strip 167. I would like to thank Thies Staack for pointing this out to me.
102 Especially after Lü Buwei 魯不韋 led the final campaign against the East Zhou, sealing the fate of the Zhou dynasty (Shiji, 5.219. For translation, see Nienhauser et al., trans., The Grand Scribe’s Records, 1:122).

These points speak to the possibility of the Zhou xun having been created in the state of Qin.

Conclusion

The present analysis shows that the authors of the Lüshi chunqiu not only borrowed two stories from the Zhou xun, but also used its main protagonist and “author” for the initial design of some of its parts. It is noteworthy that they chose the stories that fit the outline of their work thematically. Most chapters of the Zhou xun explicitly discuss the issue of power transfer based on the hereditary principle. And in some chapters, the ruler is strongly admonished to devise some measures (of the “Han Feizian” mold) to protect his position against potential ministerial encroachments. Such passages were clearly of little interest to the egalitarian-minded authors of the Lüshi chunqiu.103 Thus, the two chapters dealing with a ruler’s kindness towards the common people and the shi appear to have been a natural choice.

It also became apparent how scholars working under the auspices of Lü Buwei attempted to blend the borrowed contents with the rest of a particular chapter by composing introductions, which either established a connection between the different stories or explained their common points. Moreover, the practice of providing short concluding discussions of a general nature to the borrowed anecdotes also became clear. Because these techniques can be attested in both the “Almanacs” and “Examinations” parts of the Lüshi chunqiu, it stands to reason that their editors were following the same editorial principles when dealing with borrowed materials, at least in the case of the Zhou xun. Whether we can conclude from this that the Lüshi chunqiu was produced in one piece, as is sometimes claimed,104 is open to discussion, but it certainly would be too far-fetched to claim that the “Almanacs” and “Examinations” were composed independently from each other.

I contend that there are more reasons to assume a certain connection between this work and the state of Qin. First, as Han Wei has already noticed, some graphs are characteristic of Qin orthography.\(^96\) Secondly, in the instruction from the “intercalary month” (*run yue* 閏月), the text uses the term “single-piece manuscript” (*dvi* 擘).\(^97\) This term is associated with the Qin state and its earliest appearance (in the available documents) can be traced back to July 26, 217 BC.\(^98\) Staack links the appearance of this term to “lexical changes directly following the Qin unification” in 221 BC.\(^99\) However, I argue that, since we only have access to a small fraction of the pre-imperial Qin documents, it is likely that evidence of earlier mentions of this term may yet to be discovered. But even if the time of its first appearance is debatable, its association with Qin seems certain. Moreover, in the fifth chapter, the *Zhou xun* used the term “earth pounder convicts” (*cheng dan* 城旦), one of the harshest sentences in the legal system of the Qin and Han dynasties, as corroborated by a wealth of excavated legal documents.\(^100\)

Linguistic evidence aside, the *Zhou xun* also seems to appeal to Qin’s historic “identification with the Zhou,”\(^101\) which saw themselves as the righteous successors to the Zhou.\(^102\) The setting of the *Zhou xun*, in which one of the last illustrious and able noblemen of the Zhou instructs his obscure successor, would have been particularly relevant for the Qin. Certainly, Lord Zhaowen, the head of a small Zhou principality, did not have the formal authority of a “Son of Heaven,” yet his depiction as King Hui of Qin’s teacher meant to highlight his renown even among the most illustrious of Qin sovereigns.

These points speak to the possibility of the *Zhou xun* having been created in the state of Qin.

**Conclusion**

The present analysis shows that the authors of the *Lüshi chunqiu* not only borrowed two stories from the *Zhou xun*, but also used its main protagonist and “author” for the initial design of some of its parts. It is noteworthy that they chose the stories that fit the outline of their work thematically. Most chapters of the *Zhou xun* explicitly discuss the issue of power transfer based on the hereditary principle. And in some chapters, the ruler is strongly admonished to devise some measures (of the “Han Feizian” mold) to protect his position against potential ministerial encroachments. Such passages were clearly of little interest to the egalitarian-minded authors of the *Lüshi chunqiu*.\(^103\) Thus, the two chapters dealing with a ruler’s kindness towards the common people and the *shi* appear to have been a natural choice.

It also became apparent how scholars working under the auspices of Lü Buwei attempted to blend the borrowed contents with the rest of a particular chapter by composing introductions, which either established a connection between the different stories or explained their common points. Moreover, the practice of providing short concluding discussions of a general nature to the borrowed anecdotes also became clear. Because these techniques can be attested in both the “Almanacs” and “Examinations” parts of the *Lüshi chunqiu*, it stands to reason that their editors were following the same editorial principles when dealing with borrowed materials, at least in the case of the *Zhou xun*. Whether we can conclude from this that the *Lüshi chunqiu* was produced in one piece, as is sometimes claimed,\(^104\) is open to discussion, but it certainly would be too far-fetched to claim that the “Almanacs” and “Examinations” were composed independently from each other.

---

96 Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu *Zhou xun* ruogan wenti de tantao,” 255.
97 *Zhou xun*, 140, bamboo strip 167. I would like to thank Thies Staack for pointing this out to me.
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In the West, it is debatable whether children, adult or dependent, have filial obligations to their parents. By contrast, filial piety serves as one of the essential virtues in the Confucian tradition, which had not only dominated pre-modern East Asian societies but is recently promoted by 21st century Chinese government. Loving one’s parents, in turn, is said to be the most fundamental and strongest human emotion praised by Confucians. This paper is not to provide justifications for treating filial piety as a virtue. But using a temporal framework, it offers a more complicated reading of the affection for parents presented in the Analects and the Mencius. While young children have strong emotional attachment to parents, adults’ love to their parents is sporadic and inconsistent. To address the deficit of emotions in adults’ interaction with their parents, Confucians use young children’s mindset—strong affection to parents—to both justify and motivate filial actions. This paper criticizes the view that simply equalizes consanguineous affection to xiao (filial piety). It contends that xiao, as a virtue, cannot be automatically generated by original family affection. Instead, filial-oriented rituals, as Confucians advocate, is supposed to foster an affectionate relation between parent and child.
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